

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

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

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

Our Father God, we come seeking wide horizons around our noisy days. Through our preoccupied and cluttered lives we would clear a highway for Thy holy purposes. As we have undertaken on this continent a government of, by, and for the people, may we not lack the spiritual quality and a sense of the divine sovereignty, without which no such government can long endure.

Grant us such a vision of the vast sweep of Thy purposes that we may be delivered from the bondage of irritating trifles and be less disturbed by the little annoyances of everyday life. Help us to learn such wisdom and serenity that the depths of our hearts may remain calm, however others may disturb the surface of our lives, and so to correct our perspective that little things may not distort our vision of the eternal splendors. We ask it through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GILLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Tuesday, April 11, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DARBY was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and Friday.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

Aiken	Frear	Knowland
Anderson	Fulbright	Langer
Benton	George	Leahy
Bricke	Gillette	Lehman
Bridges	Graham	Lucas
Butler	Gurney	McCarran
Cain	Hayden	McCarthy
Capehart	Hendrickson	McClellan
Chapman	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Chavez	Hill	McKellar
Connally	Hoey	McMahon
Cordon	Holland	Magnuson
Darby	Ives	Martin
Donnell	Jenner	Maybank
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Eaton	Kefauver	Neely
Ellender	Kenn	O'Connor
Ferguson	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Flanders	Kligore	Robertson

Russell	Taft	Watkins
Saltonstall	Taylor	Wherry
Schoeppel	Thomas, Okla.	Wiley
Sparkman	Thomas, Utah	Williams
Stennis	Tydings	Withers

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to House bill 5422. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches, and without taking the Senator from Washington from the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS OF APPRECIATION OF MEMBERS OF JAPANESE NATIONAL DIET ON VISIT TO UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from Brig. Gen. Courtney Whitney, United States Army, transmitting, at the request of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the House of Councilors, resolutions of appreciation adopted by the Japanese National Diet on March 17 and 18, 1950, for the consideration and courtesies shown to members of the Diet on the occasion of their official visit to the United States which, with the accompanying resolutions, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DIVINE GUIDANCE WEEK—INVITATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO ATTEND POHICK CHURCH, LORTON, VA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the rector, and vestry of Pohick Church, of Lorton, Va., signed by David D. Mayne, M. V., extending an invitation to Members of the Congress to attend the morning service of the church on April 16, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m., inaugurating Divine Guidance Week, which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REVISED ESTIMATES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 158)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation, involving an increase of \$1,190,000, for the fiscal year 1951, for the Treasury Department, in the form of amendments to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REVISED ESTIMATES, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. Doc. No. 155)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation, involving an increase of \$19,460, for the fiscal year 1951, for the legislative branch, in the form of amendments to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 159)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the amount of \$86,000, and a proposed provision for the fiscal year 1951 for the Post Office Department, in the form of amendments to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 157)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1951, in the amount of \$275,000, for the Department of the Interior, in the form of an amendment to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REVISED ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 154)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation involving an increase of \$2,754,400, for the fiscal year 1951, for the Department of the Interior, in the form of an amendment to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REVISED ESTIMATES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. Doc. No. 156)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation, involving an increase of \$114,400, for the fiscal year 1951, for the District of Columbia, in the form of amendments to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL COMMISSION OF UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

A letter from the Secretary of State, informed the Senate that, pursuant to a rec-

ommendation of the Committee on Membership of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH and Representative MIKE MANSFIELD had been appointed to the National Commission, each to serve a term ending in 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of February 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Agency for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to location of the Air Force Academy in California

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has authorized the establishment of an Air Force Academy to be known as the West Point of the Air; and

"Whereas California has ideal living conditions and the finest climate in the world with excellent flying conditions; and

"Whereas, in California, young aviators can be trained in all kinds of flying conditions since California has the Pacific Ocean on the west, some of the highest mountains in the Nation in the east, the great Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, as well as the lowest points in the Nation, Death Valley and Imperial Valley, and many other different types of areas, with the result that in this State may be found flying conditions similar to those to be found in any part of the world; and

"Whereas there would be little danger in this State of damage to aviation equipment caused by the elements; and

"Whereas the Federal Government receives billions of dollars in taxes from the people of California and, therefore, it is only just that a portion of these amounts should be expended in this State for public-works projects which would promote the welfare of the people of this State as well as assist the great aviation industry located in this State; and

"Whereas, for these reasons, California is eminently qualified to be the site of the proposed Air Force Academy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Federal Government be memorialized to establish the Air Force Academy in this State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to transmit copies of this

resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, Honolulu, T. H.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 4

"Whereas the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, has consistently supported and championed the great cause of statehood for Hawaii; and

"Whereas the Honorable Harry S. Truman has firmly and convincingly demonstrated his support and championship of statehood for Hawaii by his messages to the Congress of the United States of America on the State of the Union and by other official statements and documents issued by and prepared at the White House; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii and future State of Hawaii are deeply grateful for the splendid help and strong support of the President of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Constitutional Convention of Hawaii, That the people of the Territory and the future State of Hawaii by their constitutional convention delegates duly assembled at Honolulu on April 4, 1950, do hereby express and convey their sincere gratitude and deep appreciation to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, for his consistent support and championship of the great cause of statehood for Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America.

Nelson Kiyoshi Doi, Teruo Ihara, Frank C. Luiz, Richard J. Lyman, Jr., Tom T. Okino, Thomas T. Sakakihara, James Kiyoji Yamamoto, Takao Yamauchi, Peter Kawahara, Earl A. Nielsen, Sakuichi Saki, Charles H. Silva, Marguerite K. Ashford, J. Pia Cockett, Kazuo Kage, Harold T. Kido, Harold W. Rice, W. O. Smith, Richard St. Sure, Cable A. Wirtz, Arthur D. Woolaway, J. Garner Anthony, Samuel K. Apollona, Jr., Alexander H. F. Castro, Nancy Corbett, Flora K. Hayes, William H. Heen, Richard M. Kageyama, Elizabeth R. Kellerman, Katsumi Kometsani, John K. Lai, Nils P. Larsen, Herbert K. H. Lee, W. Harold Loper, Hebdon Porteus, Harold S. Roberts, C. Nils Tavares, Henry A. White, Benjamin O. Wist, Trude M. Akau, Edward C. Bryan, George Dowson, Hiram L. Fong, Yasutaka Fukushima, James F. Gilliland, Edward B. Holroyde, Frank Y. Kam, Masao Kanemaru, Charles E. Kauhane, Samuel Wilder King, Chuck Mau, Steere G. Noda, Frederick Ohrt, Herbert M. Richards, Clarence Y. Shimamura, Arthur K. Trask, James K. Trask, Randolph Crossley, H. S. Kawakami, Jack H. Mizuha, Charles A. Rice, Toshio Serizawa, Frank G. Silva."

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF HAWAII OF 1950,

Honolulu, T. H., April 7, 1950.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted by the Constitutional Convention of Hawaii of 1950 on April 4, 1950.

SAMUEL WILDER KING,
President of the Convention.
HEBDON PORTEUS,
Secretary of the Convention.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors, La Feria Water Control and Im-

provement District, Cameron County No. 3, La Feria, Tex., relating to the restoration of the planning funds for civil functions of the Corps of Engineers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Conference of Provincial Governors and City Mayors of Manila, P. I., relating to the recognition of certain guerrillas, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Local No. 560, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), of El Cerrito, Calif., signed by E. J. Amiot, financial secretary-treasurer, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 110, the so-called labor extension bill; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by local 110, the Miscellaneous Employees Union, AFL, of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 2311, to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Conference of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Council, Jewish People's Fraternal Order, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 2311, to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from William E. Fahy, of Rochester, N. Y., expressing his appreciation to the Congress for Federal aid to veterans' education under Public Law 346; ordered to lie on the table.

PROTEST AGAINST HOOVER COMMISSION REPORTS ON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—LETTER FROM WISCONSIN VETERANS COUNCIL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously reported the very strong opposition of the members of veterans' organizations in my State of Wisconsin to those phases of the Hoover Commission reports dealing with America's veterans. I have invited attention to the fact that veterans who have contacted me have emphasized very clearly that their objection is not to the Hoover approach in general. After all, the veterans of the United States are taxpayers, and they appreciate the fact that the Hoover Commission has made many notable suggestions in other fields for conserving the taxpayers' resources and achieving long overdue efficiency and economy in the Federal Government.

I have, however, pointed out that Wisconsin's ex-servicemen are deeply concerned about the proposed dismemberment of the Veterans' Administration, just as I am so concerned. I, for one, and they, certainly don't want to see the veterans of Wisconsin get the run-around once again—running from agency to agency trying to get the services which our grateful Nation promised them and which is their due for having saved our Republic.

I have in my hand, an important communication from the secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin Veterans Council, a distinguished spokesman both for the American Legion and for the council, Mr. Jack L. Spore. I believe that his message will be of interest to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN VETERANS COUNCIL,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 4, 1950.

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

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Wisconsin Veterans Council at its meeting on January 27, 1950, at Milwaukee, Wis., went on record opposing the Hoover Commission report insofar as it pertains to veterans and agreed to use its efforts to see that that part of it which would dismember the Veterans' Administration and which affects the rights of veterans be not enacted into law, and furthermore, that it favors the bringing about of such economies within the Veterans' Administration as are necessary.

The Wisconsin Veterans Council is composed of representatives from eight nationally chartered veterans' organizations which we are listing below:

1. United Spanish War Veterans.
2. Veterans of Foreign Wars.
3. Military Order of the Purple Heart.
4. Army and Navy Union.
5. Disabled American Veterans.
6. AMVETS.
7. Marine Corps League.
8. The American Legion.

The Wisconsin Veterans Council strongly favors a continuation of the present system whereby all veterans' problems are cared for by the Veterans' Administration. It is the desire of this council, then, that you oppose the adoption of the Hoover Commission report insofar as it relates to veterans.

Thank you in advance for whatever assistance you can give when this important question is brought up for discussion and debate.

Sincerely,

JACK L. SPORE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 451. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for certain penalties for unlawful use of examination papers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1480);

S. 3357. A bill to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 1482); and

S. 3377. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 1481).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 3398. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain land for purposes of the Colonial National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. GILLETTE, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 3299. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest landowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3400. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Richard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR):

S. 3401. A bill for the relief of Joseph Umberto Montalban-Troy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 3402. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lee Vance Sanders;

S. 3403. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Eloise Whitebear Pease;

S. 3404. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Genevieve M. Conger; and

S. 3405. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Julia Jackson Sanders; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3406. A bill for the relief of Lee Yee Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 3407. A bill for the relief of Luther R. Stevens; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENTON:

S. 3408. A bill for the relief of Sophie Strauss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHOONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 3409. A bill to establish the Wyoming Jackson Hole National Park in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CODIFICATION OF FEDERAL LAWS RELATING TO HOUSING

Mr. BRICKER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 252), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is requested to prepare and transmit to the Senate, on or before January 15, 1951, in form suitable to be printed, a codification of all Federal laws relating to housing, which codification shall contain (1) appropriate explanatory notes and annotations to each section of such codification and (2) suitable headings, reference tables, and indices.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 7 OF 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 253), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 7 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 13, 1950.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 8 OF 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 254), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 8 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 13, 1950.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 9 OF 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 255), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 9 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 13, 1950.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 11 OF 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 256), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 11 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 13, 1950.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The 1948 Flood Control Act—Public Law 858, Eightieth Congress—provided for a survey of the Chowan River and its tributaries in North Carolina which river flows past Edenton, N. C. Inadvertently, a small, but important, creek which also flows through the town of Edenton and is known as Filberts Creek was not included since it flows into the Edenton Bay instead of the Showan River. I was just notified of this discrepancy on yesterday and therefore request that this creek be added under the survey provisions of the bill.

The amendment would require the insertion of "Filberts Creek at Edenton, N. C.," between lines 4 and 5 on page 47, of the bill.

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

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—WITHDRAWAL OF AMENDMENT

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw an amendment intended to be proposed by myself and the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], designated as "3-21-50—A," to the bill now under consideration, House bill 5472, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Food for Thought," delivered by him April 6, 1950, at New Orleans, La., before members of the council of the Chamber of Commerce of New Orleans, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION TO HIM OF ANNUAL AWARD OF METROPOLITAN CONFERENCE OF TEMPLE BROTHERHOODS

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator LEHMAN on the occasion of the presentation to him of the annual award of the Metropolitan Conference of Temple Brotherhoods in New York City, on April 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—BROADCAST BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD program No. 2 in his broadcasts to the people of Pennsylvania on Happenings in Washington, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS—ARTICLE BY LINDSAY ROGERS

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the third installment of a series of three articles entitled "When Congress Fumbles for Facts," written by Lindsay Rogers and published in the New York Herald Tribune on Friday, March 31, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY BROWNING LIBRARY—TRIBUTE TO DR. A. JOSEPH ARMSTRONG

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Douglas Hammond, of Ensley, Ala., paying tribute to Dr. A. Joseph Armstrong, director of English at Baylor University, which appears in the Appendix.]

ENDORSEMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE ACHESON BY THE NEW YORK YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUB, INC.

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution endorsing Secretary of State Dean Acheson adopted by the New York Young Democratic Club, Inc., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POINT 4 PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY PAUL MANNING

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding the point 4 program by Paul Manning, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—ARTICLE BY HELEN DELICH

[Mr. O'CONNOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the third of a series of articles dealing with the American merchant marine, written by Helen Delich and published in the Baltimore Sun of April 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THERE ARE TWO WORLDS—EDITORIAL FROM THE MAGAZINE EAGLE

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "There Are Two Worlds," from the April issue of Eagle, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TEXAS WHEAT OUTLOOK—ARTICLE FROM THE FORT WORTH (TEX.) STAR-TELEGRAM

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Texas Wheat Outlook Bad, But Soaking Rain Still Can Save Crop," published in the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, of April 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATURAL GAS LEGISLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE CLEVELAND NEWS

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "CROSSER and YOUNG Lack Faith in Free Enterprise," from the Cleveland News of April 4, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION OF RELIEF PAYMENTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Relief Payments To Be Cut 8 Percent," published in today's issue of the Washington Times-Herald.

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

RELIEF PAYMENTS TO BE CUT 8 PERCENT

Public assistance payments will be cut 8 percent May 1, bringing the total decrease for the fiscal year to 20 percent.

The cut is necessary because the welfare department is receiving 40 more cases a month than were anticipated in the budget, said Gerard M. Shea, public welfare director yesterday.

However, Shea added, the department has requested a deficiency appropriation of \$92,000. If it is received before June 1, payments retroactive to May 1 will restore the 8 percent cut.

The city's 6,700 relief cases will receive \$27,000 less every 2 weeks, according to Shea's estimates. Previous cuts of 7 and 5 percent have been put into effect.

Here are the cuts that will be put into effect in the different public assistance classifications:

Old age, now receiving \$38 a month, will be cut by \$3.54; needy blind, \$40.65 payments, \$3.60 cut; dependent children (family), \$71.40 payment, \$6.40 cut; general public assistance (family), \$55.44 payment, \$5 cut.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as part of the same insertion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Relief Funds Cut; Needy Face Crisis," written by Dorothea Andrews, and published in today's issue of the Washington Post. According to this article the Harris family of Washington is expected to live and clothe itself on \$13.33 apiece each month.

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

RELIEF FUNDS CUT; NEEDEY FACE CRISIS

(By Dorothea Andrews)

The Harris family has to figure out how to feed and clothe itself on \$13.33 apiece next month.

This is because the Harris family is on District relief, and all relief grants have been cut back 8 percent by the Public Welfare Department starting May 1.

It will be the second time this year the Harris family has had to pull in its belts. They started out with \$87 per month, then were cut back to \$76 when a 12-percent cut was made. The latest relief cut leaves them \$70.

Of this amount, \$30 is a flat allowance, of which \$25 goes for rent, \$3 for utilities, \$2 for refrigeration. The cut which reduces the family's allowance to \$40 per month comes in the basic personal needs items.

And Mrs. Harris, 35, who can't go out and get a job because she has arrested tuberculosis, will have to absorb the cut for herself, her 12-year-old son and a 6-year-old daughter, both in school.

Her husband, 37, can't help either. He could have 4 years ago, before he also contracted tuberculosis, had to give up his Government job and enter a sanatorium.

Mrs. Harris will have the diet problems, the deciding as to basic personal needs like food, clothing, household necessities, insurance, medicine, school books, carfare and lunch money, the hard wear and tear that children give their clothes.

All of this on the \$40 a month left for basic personal needs.

CASE IS TYPICAL

The case of the Harris family is typical of what will happen on May 1 when the Public Welfare Department of the District of Columbia sends out its regular public-assistance checks, each cut back 8 percent from this month's skimpy total.

Gerard M. Shea, Public Welfare Director, announced the cut yesterday because the Department simply hasn't the money to meet the mounting number of requests for help.

Only decision welfare authorities could make was to cut back relief grants until Congress comes through with \$92,000, now contained in a deficiency appropriation request, which would tide the program over until July.

Edgar Morris, Welfare Board Chairman, in a letter to the District Commissioners, has pointed out that since present grants are based on 1946 living costs, and since welfare recipients already this year have taken a 12-percent cut in their monthly aid checks, the new cut really adds up to a 45-percent cut from the amount of money relief cases need for basic subsistence.

CUT-BACKS WIDESPREAD

Old-age-assistance cases, which started out the year with \$43 per month, got cut back to \$38, are, effective May 1, reduced to \$34.46. Aid to dependent children (individual cases), which started out with \$19 per month, got cut back to \$16.72, now to \$15.22. Aid-to-the-blind cases and single general public-assistance cases, which started out the year with \$45 per month grants, got cut back to \$40.60, now to \$37.

The Public Welfare Board has known since January that unless Congress appropriated more money, it would have to cut back relief grants. First proposal was to institute the cut on April 1. The slice was deferred to May 1 in the hope Congress might act in time to make the reduction unnecessary.

Shea explained that the lack of funds was caused entirely by the increase in number of persons applying for assistance. During the 1949 fiscal year this number averaged 650 per month. But during the first 6 months of the current fiscal year welfare officials have been getting 770 such requests per month. During the first 4 weeks of January 1950, they got 802. They have been investigating each request and have found 35 percent of all suppliants are both eligible and in need.

This has added an overload of 42 new cases a month above the estimated apportionment. In asking Congress for \$92,000, however, the Welfare Board was assuming that the number of new cases added during the January-June 1950 period would be 1,652, or 216 more than the number of cases added during the preceding 6 months.

If Congress appropriates the deficiency funds early in May, as hoped, the Welfare Board will be able to restore the 8-percent cut in relief grants in June checks.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as part of the same insertion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Thailand Reports \$10,000,000 United States Aid," published in today's Washington Post.

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

THAILAND REPORTS \$10,000,000 UNITED STATES AID

BANGKOK, April 11.—The United States has granted \$10,000,000 worth of arms and other military aid to a Thailand threatened by communism, Premier Pibul Songgram disclosed today.

This was the first concrete manifestation of decisions reached at the Bangkok conference in February.

Philip C. Jessup, United States Ambassador at Large, set forth the United States position there of giving military assistance to Asian nations displaying the will to stand against the Communist tide.

Under Songgram's leadership, the tiny kingdom of Thailand has taken its place alongside democratic powers in the cold war against communism. The war is more hot than cold in southeast Asia, which lies athwart the mighty new Communist nation of China and itself is riddled with Reds.

The military aid in the form of arms as well as equipment, such as bulldozers, to build badly needed military roads in north Thailand was given to help the Government resist infiltration by Communists, the Premier said.

(In Washington the State Department declined to comment on Songgram's statement.)

PRINTING OF EXTRANEOUS MATTERS IN BODY OF RECORD

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota introduced three newspaper articles and asked that they be printed in the body of the RECORD. I did not object to their being printed in the body of the RECORD, and I am not going to object. I merely invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are gradually getting back into the practice of introducing editorials and news items into the body of the RECORD, which all of us know is against the rules of the Senate, and is not good practice. They should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from Illinois objecting?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I am not objecting. I am merely inviting the attention of Senators on both sides of the aisle to the fact that we should try to follow the rules and precedents with respect to the introduction of matters of this kind. It is bad practice to introduce news articles and editorials into the body of the RECORD, and I merely invite the attention of Senators to that fact. I think we should conform to the parliamentary procedure of the Senate as closely as we possibly can.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The procedure is that such items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and that rule will be followed on objection by any Senator.

COMMUNISM IN HAWAII

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me relative to communism in Hawaii, and several newspaper items along the same line.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate to two news stories in yesterday morning's Times-Herald and Post, in which a man named Richard M. Kageyama admitted at the very first session of the hearings in Hawaii of the House Un-American Activities Committee that he was formerly a member of the Communist Party. The news stories are as follows:

"[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 11, 1950]

"HONOLULU OFFICIAL ADMITS RED TIE—KAGEYAMA MEMBER OF STATEHOOD GROUP

"HONOLULU, April 10.—One of Honolulu's top city officials, who is also a member of the convention drafting a Hawaii state constitution, admitted to congressional spy hunters today that he is a former Communist.

"The sensational testimony was given by Richard M. Kageyama, one of the seven members of Honolulu's Board of Supervisors, at the opening of an investigation by a House Un-American Activities Subcommittee into possible communism fifth column activities in Hawaii.

"Kageyama said he gave the full story of his Communist activities to William A. Wheeler, an investigator for the Un-American Activities Committee, in November 1949.

"Later, he said, he signed territorial loyalty oaths denying membership in the party in accordance with instructions from Wheeler who wanted him to 'keep mum' until today's hearing.

"The hearing was opened with the declaration that it 'should alert Hawaii and the entire American Nation to the dangers of a Red Pearl Harbor.'"

"[From the Washington Post of April 11, 1950]

"HONOLULU CITY BOARD MEMBER ONCE WAS RED

"HONOLULU, April 10.—Richard M. Kageyama, Nisei member of the Honolulu City-County Board of Supervisors, admitted at the first session of the congressional Un-American Activities Committee hearings today that he was formerly a member of the Communist Party.

"Kageyama, a surprise witness, said he was led into the party by John E. Reinicke, high school teacher on the island of Hawaii in the 1930's. Reinicke later taught in Honolulu, but he and his wife, Aiko, also a teacher, lost their jobs 2 years ago for their asserted affiliation with the Red party.

"Kageyama said he quit the party after 9 months in 1946 because 'I felt the Communist Party was not meant for people who live in a democratic Nation.' They had proved they were not for the common people."

"His admission surprised Honolulu Democratic circles and Territorial Central Committee Chairman Lau Ah Chew immediately called for a committee meeting to throw Kageyama out of the party.

"The witness, a 34-year-old real-estate man and war veteran, also was expected to lose his seat as delegate to the State constitutional convention. Along with 62 other delegates, he had signed an oath declaring he had not belonged to any subversive organization during the past 5 years."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Kageyama is a member of the Honolulu City-County Board of Supervisors. He was also recently elected a member of the unofficial Territorial constitutional convention called to draft a proposed constitution for Hawaii to use if it should be granted statehood.

One news story refers to his testimony as sensational. The other states "his admission surprised Honolulu Democratic circles and Territorial Central Committee Chairman Lau Ah Chew immediately called for a committee meeting to throw Kageyama out of the party." Mr. President, I do not know why this testimony should have surprised anyone. I had thought it was common knowledge in Hawaii that Kageyama was a Communist. During my investigation in the Territory in 1948 many people referred to him as a Communist.

With reference to Mr. Lau Ah Chew, I will remind the Senate that on page 5 of my report on Hawaii, I state that this man, at that time chairman of the Oahu County Democratic Committee, was the key figure in delivering the Democratic Party of the Territory into the hands of the Communist-controlled ILWU group in 1948. At this point I will insert two paragraphs from my report in the RECORD.

The paragraphs from the report are as follows:

On March 9, 1948, Lau Ah Chew, chairman of the Oahu County Democratic Committee, announced that all Democratic precinct clubs on Oahu would become inactive as of midnight, March 31, 1948, and that new officers and delegates to the Territorial convention of the Democratic Party would be elected on April 1, 1948. This was the big Communist coup.

This action of Chew in dissolving all Democratic precinct clubs was planned to place the advantage in the precinct elections in the hands of the Communist-controlled ILWU element. In spite of considerable opposition to Chew's order, Democratic precinct elections were held generally on April 1, 1948. They resulted in a clean sweep for the Communist-controlled ILWU group. That group thereupon took over the Democratic Party organization in the Territory, lock, stock, and barrel. The former Democratic Party became the Communist apparatus in the Territory of Hawaii.

I will also insert in the RECORD an article from the Sunday, April 9, New York Times entitled "Bridges Verdict Leaves Union's Future in Doubt."

The article is as follows:

BRIDGES VERDICT LEAVES UNION'S FUTURE IN DOUBT, BUT WEST COAST SHIPOWNERS ARE NOT WRITING OFF ILWU'S MILITANCY

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

SAN FRANCISCO, April 8.—The conviction of Harry R. Bridges at the end of his 4½-month trial for perjury and conspiracy posed questions this week for the leadership and the rank and file of his 65,000-member union.

How are the fortunes of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union going to be affected by the verdict, finding its leader guilty of lying at his 1945 naturalization hearing when he swore he never had been a member of the Communist Party? Is the union automatically weakened or strengthened? What will be the effect if Bridges is deported, as the Government intends he eventually shall be?

The verdict, provided the higher courts uphold it, means the potential loss to the ILWU of three of its top leaders, since James R. Robertson, first vice president, and Henry Schmidt, international representative, were found guilty of helping Bridges win American citizenship fraudulently. All are

liable to prison terms and fines, with a deportation move against Bridges a foregone conclusion. The three men represent the left wing element that has controlled the international from its inception.

DARN SIGHT WEAKER

Bridges immediately took the position that the conviction would make the union "a darn sight weaker." Schmidt suggested the action would "solidify it." Right-wingers, who are in the saddle in local 10 of San Francisco, Bridges' home local, were saying nothing.

A good many shipowners, who have been through bitter struggles with Bridges and his men, but who now are trying to "get along" with the union as a result of the "new look" compact that followed the 1948 maritime strike, suggested that the verdict weakened the "top influence" in the union without being harmful to the organization as a whole.

The more anti-Bridges employers insisted that the union automatically was better off, and that it would be better off still "as soon as Bridges is deported." Less embittered ones paid tribute to the ILWU president as having been meticulous in keeping his word and living up to every paragraph in the present contract, signed 2 years ago.

There are some things to favor the view that Bridges' loss at this time might be less serious for the union than it would have been 2 or 3 years earlier. He put his finger on this himself when he said after his conviction: "We've got everything bedded down for a long pull."

CONTRACTS RUN TO 1951

In other words, the ILWU has a coast-wide no-strike, no lock-out contract with the Pacific Maritime Association that runs until June 15, 1951. The accord resulted from the 1948 strike and it brought a vowed determination on both sides to cooperate and try to win back lost business for west coast ports. The union has contracts expiring in Hawaii at the same time. It recently signed a 3-year extension, with a wage increase, of its agreement with the Distributors Association of Northern California, representing about 200 leading warehouses.

There already is speculation over a possible successor to Bridges, despite the waiting time ahead during the verdict's appeal. Asked the other day whether Lou Goldblatt, the union's secretary-treasurer, might become acting president, the ILWU head replied that was "purely speculative."

Germain Bulcke, second vice president of the international, is popular among the longshoremen. Jack Hall, international representative in Hawaii, is influential in the union. Portland, Seattle, and San Pedro also have possible candidates.

This article deals with the conviction of Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, and his two top assistants in the union. Of particular interest in the article is the statement that Jack Hall, the top man in the union in Hawaii, is being discussed as a possible successor to Bridges as leader of this Communist-controlled union. Hall was named by me in my report as a member of the Territorial Communist executive committee in 1947. It is interesting to have this verification of Hall's Communist background by this special writer of the New York Times.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has the floor by unani-

mous consent. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if he will yield to me to make a short speech.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the Senator from Missouri and to the majority leader that it is perfectly agreeable to me to yield to the Senator from Missouri for that purpose. The Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Indiana, who have two short speeches, wish to have me yield at this time so they can make them. It is perfectly agreeable to me to yield for that purpose if I secure unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor. I would not yield without having secured such unanimous consent. There may be some objection to that procedure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri make that request?

Mr. KEM. Yes, Mr. President, I make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with all due deference to the Senator from Missouri, I still insist that matters should be discussed in a proper way. The measure which is now before the Senate has been delayed for many, many months. We are supposed to have the floor now to discuss the unfinished business. With all due deference to and with the highest respect for the Senator from Missouri, I must object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR ON FRIDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to have the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Washington listen to the request I shall now make.

I ask unanimous consent that if on Friday the Senate shall have concluded action on House bill 5472, which is the unfinished business, the Senate then proceed to the call of the calendar of unobjected-to bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. Did I understand him to say, in his request, if the Senate had concluded action on the unfinished business?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And if the Senate had acted on all the amendments to the bill which is now before the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that if the now pending bill is completely out of the way by Friday at noon, the Senate then proceed to the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I shall not object provided it is strictly understood that the proposed procedure will not take place unless the Senate has taken final action on the pending bill.

Mr. LUCAS. The request is made on the basis that action on the pending bill will then have been concluded. The Senator from Illinois expresses a fervent hope that action on the bill will be concluded long before that time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I join in that hope, with a prayer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. I am not going to object to the unanimous-consent request. I think the calendar should be called.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Illinois feel we can call the entire calendar in one afternoon?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator from Nebraska asked me that question. For the information of the Senator, I will say that we will begin the call of the calendar at the point where we left off on February 1. We will not call the calendar from the beginning. I am satisfied we can finish the call of the calendar in one afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not object. I think the calendar should be called. The calendar, however, is very long, and if consideration of bills on the calendar should continue beyond a reasonable hour, possibly it would be well to recess and finish the calendar at some other time. I make that suggestion by reason of the length of the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest to my friend from Nebraska that we can consider that matter when we get to it. If there is considerable discussion on many bills, and the session threatens to become prolonged, we can discuss the point suggested by the Senator at that time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask the distinguished majority leader, what will be the effect of the proposed schedule on the ECA legislation? Will that come before the Senate when the present unfinished business has been disposed of?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to reply to the distinguished Senator from Texas in this way, that should we conclude the pending bill before Friday, we will then proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3304, which is the bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended. However, if that is done, I would move on Friday to lay that bill aside temporarily in order to enable the Senate to proceed to the call of the calendar.

I will say to my friend from Texas that a great number of Senators have asked about the call of the calendar, and I feel that the calendar must be called as soon as possible. I believe we can complete the call of the calendar in 1 day, and then proceed to the consideration of the bill in which the Senator from Texas is so interested, and in which, of course, all other Members of the Senate are interested.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas merely wanted to be advised as to the status of the ECA bill, so he could be governed accordingly. I am glad of the Senator's statement.

Mr. LUCAS. In further reply to the Senator from Texas, I may add that the Democratic policy committee yesterday unanimously agreed to the consideration of Senate bill 3304 following the disposition of the unfinished business, the measure now being debated by the Senate.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to cooperate with the Senator from Illinois in his proposal for the consideration and action on other business by the Senate. Cannot the Senator from Illinois couple his unanimous-consent request with a further request that the Senate begin voting on the amendment now pending, and all other amendments to the pending bill, tomorrow afternoon at 4 o'clock?

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for the suggestion, but I doubt the wisdom of coupling two requests for unanimous-consent agreements. I should like to get this one out of the way; and then perhaps a little later in the afternoon, as matters develop, we may be able to reach a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the Senator's bill and all amendments thereto. I hope we may be able to arrive at such an agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request proposed by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask the distinguished majority leader whether any consideration has been given in regard to bringing up the conference report on the basing-point bill, Senate bill 1008?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator from Maryland asked that question, because yesterday at the meeting of the Democratic policy committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who was a guest at that time in regard to another matter, advised me that when a motion is made to consider Senate bill 3304, he would move to displace it in order to make it possible to bring up the conference report on the so-called basing-point bill. I hope he will not do that, but he says he feels it is necessary to do so.

In my own mind, I am convinced that the bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is the most important measure the Senate has to consider at the present time. I think we should act on it with all convenient speed.

The basing-point bill has been here a long time, and I feel that we can wait a little longer before taking up the conference report on it. I hope the Senator from Maryland, who is interested in that measure, will try to persuade the Senator from Nevada, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who is handling that matter, to restrain himself a little longer, so that we shall not have to have another vote on a motion relative to taking it up.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that

my reason for making the observation is that I believe the conference report on Senate bill 1008 should enjoy a preferred position, in that the Senate conferees have received from the Senate instructions which they have endeavored to carry out to the best of their ability. The House has acted twice on this matter. In the conference, we who were the Senate conferees gave assurance to the House conferees that if and when there was agreement in the conference, we would do our best to see that prompt action was taken by the Senate. That agreement was reached among the conferees, following the special assignment of the matter on the floor of the Senate in January.

The House acted on that measure several weeks ago; but unfortunately we have not been able to have the matter brought up in the Senate.

I do not think it will take long to dispose of it, once it is brought up. It has been thoroughly debated, and we are in reach of the goal, whatever it may be.

I am not arguing now for or against the conference report, but simply for an opportunity to have it considered on its merits.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator from Maryland with respect to the time to be taken on the conference report on the basing-point bill. I doubt if any measure has been more thoroughly discussed on the floor of the Senate than has the basing-point bill and the conference report upon it. We should dispose of it within at least a few hours. However, my understanding is that a number of speeches will be made on that measure; and I understand that we shall have to go over and over the same ground which the Senate has already gone over time and time again.

Although I cannot tell any other Senator what he should do, and I would not wish to do so, yet it seems to me that a complete record has been made in regard to the basing-point bill; so much so, that I doubt that any further points are yet to be developed. After a brief explanation of the conference report on that bill, we should be able to vote on it one way or the other. I venture to assert that every Senator knows at this moment exactly how he will vote on that question. Senators could, of course, talk for 3 or 4 days regarding it; but I do not believe further debate would result in changing a single vote on that measure on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, I heartily agree with the statement the Senator has made; and I believe that not more than 1 or 2 hours, if that much, would be required by Senators on our side of the question.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In corroboration of the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, I would say that already several speeches have been made on the conference report on the basing-point bill, for instance, speeches by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and other Senators. So I do not think there will be need for extended debate on the report, and I agree entirely with what the Senator

from Illinois has said. I do not think further debate will result in changing any votes in the Senate, because I think every Member of the Senate knows at this time how he will vote on that question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I would not make that statement if the bill had not been considered over and over again. After all, the conference report was before the Senate last year, but was returned to a further conference. Now the report from the further conference is here. So it seems to me that the opponents and the proponents of the conference report should be able to agree in regard to a time for voting on that measure; I believe they should be able to get together regarding a unanimous-consent agreement, so that we would know exactly how much time would be required for that matter.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think that should be done and can be done. Certainly we shall devote our best efforts to bring about such an agreement, and shall confer with the fair-minded Senators who may be opposing our position in regard to that measure. I do not believe there is any intention on the part of any Senator to engage in a filibuster on the conference report, and I am confident that we can reach an agreement.

Mr. DOUGLAS rose.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois, who is on his feet, and seems to be desirous of having me yield to him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to make a statement, if I may do so.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who is very much interested in this matter, and has taken the lead in opposing the basing-point proposal, is unavoidably absent from the Senate, and will not return until the 19th of April. So I do not think we should reach an agreement until after he has had a chance to return and to look over the situation. However, I can promise both my good friend the senior Senator from Illinois and my good friend the Senator from Maryland that we have no intention of filibustering the measure. We simply believe there should be an adequate, but not a prolonged, period of debate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement which has been made by the majority leader and also his efforts to work out the legislative program for the coming period. I have no disposition at all to hold up the consideration of the bill amending the ECA Act of 1948, and I am not adverse at all to making it the unfinished business, following the calling of the calendar.

I am interested in a remark which was made by the majority leader, namely, that a unanimous-consent agreement might be reached between the proponents

and the opponents of the proposed basing-point legislation, particularly with respect to the time for the Senate to vote upon the conference report. I should like to inform the distinguished majority leader that in his absence, when he was officially away from the Senate, I believe, it was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that any time on April 19, 20, or 21 would be agreeable to him as a time for voting on the conference report on the basing-point bill, and that he would agree to a proposal for a unanimous-consent agreement for the vote to be taken on that measure on one of those afternoons, with the time to be divided between the opponents and the proponents. That would permit of ample debate between now and then.

With that thought in mind, I wonder whether the distinguished majority leader would entertain at the proper time a proposal for a unanimous-consent agreement, so that we could work out an agreement which would be satisfactory to all parties—those interested in the ECA, those interested in the call of the calendar, those interested in the measure which now is the unfinished business, and those interested in the conference report on the basing-point bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will discuss that situation with the various Senators who are interested in the various measures to which he has referred, and if he can work out some sort of agreement for a time to vote on the basing-point bill conference report on a certain day—let us say, for instance, on April 21, at 4 o'clock, with the time to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents—that will be perfectly agreeable to me. I should like to get the proposed basing-point legislation out of the way, of course.

However, as I said a moment ago, I do not consider it so important as the measure we shall take up when we dispose of the bill which is now the unfinished business.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry, namely, whether agreement to the type of unanimous-consent request which has been made by the majority leader would have the effect of denying to a Member of the Senate the right to request the regular order in regard to privileged and material matters, such as conference reports.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A conference report is a privileged matter in the Senate. Unless such an agreement abridged that right, it would be in order, of course, for any Senator to move to take up a conference report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, still reserving the right to object, I wish to address a question to the majority leader, namely, whether it is his intention, by means of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement to have the calendar called on Friday, to have that unanimous-consent agreement supersede any privileged matter which may theretofore be pending before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I had not included that in the request, I may say to my friend

from Oregon, but it seems to me that, once we start calling the calendar, I doubt if any motion of that kind, if made, would prevail, because I do not believe that the Senate, after having agreed to proceed with the call of the calendar, would set aside that agreement even for a privileged matter such as a conference report.

Mr. MORSE. I think the majority leader is probably correct as to what the decision of the Senate would probably be at that time, and I am not going to object to this request. But I think it is only fair to make this statement for the RECORD at the present time: The junior Senator from Oregon has a growing concern about a tendency in the Senate to set aside privileged matters. I think the rules of the Senate in regard to privileged matters ought to be rather religiously followed rather than to be more honored by their breach than by their observance. When a privileged matter is on the desk of the Senate awaiting action, I believe it ought to be disposed of in accordance with the intent of the rules of the Senate. Certain privileged matters have been pending before the Senate now for some time, the basing-point being one example, and in my opinion it is more in keeping with orderly procedure to get privileged matters out of the way. Therefore, while not objecting to this particular unanimous consent request, I want the RECORD to be made perfectly clear that in all probability on future occasions the junior Senator from Oregon will object to any unanimous consent agreement proposal which does not exempt privileged matters from its terms.

Mr. CORDON rose.

Mr. LUCAS. In reply to the very forthright statement of the Senator from Oregon, I should like to have him know that I do not disagree with his premise and his conclusion. However, it seemed to me that the ECA bill was so important from the standpoint of the country and of the world that, this once at least, we might agree to take it up, and then let conference report on the basing-point bill come a little later.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Reserving the right to object, am I correct in my understanding that the request for unanimous consent contemplates a call of the calendar beginning at noon, Friday?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct, provided the consideration of the pending bill has been concluded by that time.

Mr. CORDON. The question I wanted to ask is, Is the request conditioned upon the conclusion of the pending bill?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct in his understanding.

Mr. CORDON. I have no objection, so long as we may continue to final conclusion the consideration of the unfinished business before the intervention of any unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois, that the Senate, when it meets on Fri-

day next, proceed to the call of the calendar for the consideration of unobjectioned-to bills?

Mr. LUCAS. Beginning where the previous call ended on February 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request provides that the call of the calendar shall begin where the last call of the calendar ended, and is conditioned upon the disposition of the unfinished business now before the Senate, which is the House bill 5472.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the date of February 1 should be inserted as the date on which the last call was made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The calendar was last called on February 1. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Washington for permitting me to have this time.

FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to House bill 5422. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I held the floor yesterday for a considerable length of time. I did not intend to consume so much time of the Senate on this matter. I had prepared a speech, since we were to discuss a very technical amendment. I wanted to present the speech so that the RECORD might be clear on the facts leading up to the proposing of this amendment. It turned out, however, that I did not have an opportunity to read a line of the speech because of the colloquies engaged in by myself with several other Senators interested in the problem of western reclamation and irrigation. I think, however, despite the fact that we consumed the time of the Senate for an entire day, the time was well taken, because we arrived at a better understanding of the great problems involved in western irrigation, reclamation, and power.

Although the pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which merely strikes from the amendment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs one of the projects suggested, namely, the Mountain Home project in southern Idaho, I do not feel it to be out of order for me to discuss the entire amendment because the Douglas amendment only affects one of the projects involved.

On Monday, March 6, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved, by a vote of 8 to 4, the amendment which

is now before the Senate. The amendment proposes to authorize projects with an ultimate estimated cost of \$600,000,000. I use the word "ultimate" with relation to the projected period of years, but all the projects are self-liquidating. The report shows the amount of funds reimbursable to the Government by all the projects. The figure is not so startling as it appears upon its face. The amendment, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], merely proposes to authorize a portion of the \$600,000,000 in connection with self-liquidating projects to be constructed within a short period of time, namely, from 3½ to 4 years.

Furthermore—and this was the subject of most of the discussion yesterday—the amendment provides a technique for the basin-wide pooling of costs allocated to power and the revenues returned by power. The amendment is a part of what has come to be known as the comprehensive plan for Columbia Basin development, a plan similar to the plan for the development of the Tennessee Valley, similar to the plan for the development of the Rio Grande Valley, and similar to the plan for the development of the Missouri Valley Basin, all of which have been approved by the Congress.

For many years, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers have been operating in the Columbia Basin. They developed separately what each considered to be an over-all plan for utilizing the water resources of the great river system. Since neither agency has complete jurisdiction in the basin, the plans developed separately were not truly comprehensive. The primary responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation is, as its name implies, irrigation and reclamation of lands. The primary responsibility of the Corps of Engineers is flood-control and navigation. Over-all plans developed separately by these two great agencies, therefore, lack unity and integration, without which no plan can be comprehensive.

In July 1948, the President of the United States, after discussions had continued for years in the basin, instructed the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior to "bury the hatchet," as it were, to pool their knowledge, and to bring forward an integrated plan for development of the Columbia River Basin. Acting through the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, the respective secretaries did as the President directed. On April 11, 1949, after many conferences and discussions, and after the expenditure of almost \$6,000,000, they presented to the President, to the Congress, and to the public, particularly the people of the Pacific Northwest in the Columbia River Basin, a joint agreement, which, through the basic principles it incorporates, coordinates and integrates the separate plans each had developed for the development of this great river system.

In the long 5-hour debate yesterday I tried to point out to the Senate how difficult it is for us to separate our projects in the Columbia River Basin. They are not single projects, for, although the degree of power, irrigation, flood control,

and navigation may vary, all of them include some feature of the multiple-purpose development which is contemplated for that area.

I emphasize this point, Mr. President, because it has a direct bearing upon the proposition which we are now discussing. I ask Senators to keep in mind as the debate progresses that the Army Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation, in consultation with local interests throughout the basin, labored and brought forth not two plans for utilizing the basin's water resources, but one plan—a unified plan—a comprehensive plan.

Yesterday I asked a question of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who had suggested that this is not a matter primarily for the Committee on Public Works, and also of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who had suggested that it is not a matter peculiarly for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico said that the amendment should not be in this bill. I asked both Senators to what committee it would be referred if we submitted a new bill. It would have to go to both committees, because the reorganization of the Senate requires that reclamation and irrigation matters go to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and that rivers and harbors matters go to the Committee on Public Works. This is a comprehensive plan which involves all those features, and it cannot be separated. That is why the amendment has been offered. It has been discussed since last July. Hearings were held by the House committee in May. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has had the question before it for 4 or 5 months and has made a report. That is why we find ourselves in this situation. I can see no harm in the adoption of the amendment or in a discussion of its merits.

There has been some suggestion that if the amendment is attached to the bill the House may not agree to it, or that perhaps the conference would not agree.

Let me read a statement made by Representative WILLIAM WHITTINGTON, chairman of the House committee which has jurisdiction of all these matters in the House. In a speech which he delivered to the thirty-first annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, held at St. Louis, Mo., on February 6, 1950, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7, at page A884, Representative WHITTINGTON made this statement:

There is pending in Congress today a coordinated plan for the Columbia Basin. With the projects named and with careful studies covering the economic and engineering problems involved, the coordinated report with the definition of authority between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation should be accepted.

Surely the chairman of the House committee could not be saying that on February 6 and objecting to adding this amendment to the rivers and harbors bill when it also includes—and I am grateful to the committee for it—the rivers and harbors projects in the present plan. If the bill should pass in its

present form, the projects which cannot be separated would go off on a tangent.

The so-called initial phase of this plan contemplates construction by the Army engineers of projects which will ultimately cost an estimated \$1,500,000,000. Included are such great dams as Albeni Falls in Idaho, Libby Dam in Montana, Priest Rapids, John Day, and the Dalles Dams in Washington and Oregon. In addition, this initial phase of the comprehensive plan calls for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of projects estimated to cost \$619,000,000.

Mr. President, this is a projection of a plan for many years, and the pending amendment projects the plan only for approximately 3 years. It has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, the President of the United States, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Board of Army Engineers, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior, the governors of the five States involved, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, and, I think, by all Senators from the Pacific Northwest, whether they be Republicans or Democrats. It offers a complete unanimity of opinion. The only exception is that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORBON] has suggested a different means of handling the so-called basin account.

I cannot see any objection to attaching to the pending bill an amendment such as this, because, although it may not technically belong, it must of necessity belong on the rivers and harbors bill, not only because of the comprehensive plan, but because it is the only way the valley can be developed.

Included are the great Hells Canyon Dam and the Mountain Home project, both in the State of Idaho.

Last session the Public Works Committees of both House and Senate held extensive hearings on the rivers and harbors and flood-control projects. The House of Representatives included, in the bill it sent to the Senate, Columbia Basin projects estimated to cost \$108,000,000. With the exception of Albeni Falls and Detroit Dams, these projects were chiefly levies and other flood-control works on the lower Columbia and the Willamette Rivers. Each and every one of these projects is included in the over-all comprehensive plan to which I have already alluded.

What the House did, in essence, was to pick out of the comprehensive plan a few isolated projects for immediate authorization. True, these projects are of vital importance, each in its own right, but this action on the part of the House can in no way be regarded as the kind of comprehensive action the plans developed by the Bureau and Army require.

I do not want to be misunderstood on this point. I am not criticizing the House of Representatives. At the time the House committee acted, neither the Bureau nor the Corps had officially submitted its basin report to the Bureau of the Budget, although unofficially copies had been made available to House and Senate committees.

On June 30 of last year I introduced Senate bill 2180, calling for congress-

sional authorization of the projects and operating plan represented by the integrated basin-wide Bureau and Corps reports. That bill was referred to the Senate Public Works Committee.

On July 12 the Senate Public Works Committee began hearings on rivers and harbors and flood-control projects. During the course of those hearings, testimony was taken on Senate bill 2180 and on the comprehensive plan it sought to authorize.

On October 7, Senate Public Works Committee reported the rivers and harbors bill, House bill 5472. The bill, as reported, contained, in addition to the House approved projects, others drawn from the so-called initial phase of the comprehensive Columbia Basin plan, estimated to cost about \$1,000,000,000. These projects were drawn solely from the list of works incorporated in the Corps of Engineers report. No Bureau of Reclamation projects were included in the bill, and none of the features essential to a unified comprehensive development were authorized.

This came about for a variety of reasons. First, the Public Works Committee decided it should not transgress upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Reclamation is a prerogative of the latter. Second, the Bureau of the Budget had not yet cleared a report, either on my bill, Senate bill 2180, or on the projects and basin-wide financial arrangements recommended in the Army Engineer-Bureau of Reclamation reports. Had the rivers and harbors bill been enacted as reported by the Public Works Committee, the Pacific Northwest and the country would have lost the opportunity of authorizing a truly comprehensive program.

True, we would have had authority to proceed with construction of \$1,500,000,000 worth of vital projects. In the process, however, we would have jeopardized future irrigation developments without which we cannot achieve a balanced economy in the Pacific Northwest.

The chairman and members of the Public Works Committee recognized this. The senior Senator from New Mexico acceded to the request of myself and others that final action on the bill be postponed until such time as the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee should have had an opportunity to study the other half of the unified program. As part of this arrangement I agreed to take responsibility for obtaining the earliest possible report on the comprehensive plan from the Bureau of the Budget, because I knew I would be faced with the dilemma of being between two committees and trying to get them together.

During the intervening months I have maintained constant contact with the Bureau of the Budget and on February 3 the Bureau, through the Secretary of the Interior, transmitted the administration's views to the Congress, including a special message from the President, urging adoption of the amendment and authorization of the comprehensive plan.

With relatively minor exceptions, the amendment we now have before us is the amendment recommended by the administration.

By adding this amendment to the Corps of Engineers' projects already contained in H. R. 5472, we restore the unity, coordination, and integration achieved by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation when they fused their separate plans. Unless this amendment is adopted, the benefits of coordination, which the President had in mind when he directed the Corps and the Bureau to present one comprehensive plan, will be lost to the Pacific Northwest and to the Nation. This must not happen. There is no reason why it should happen. It must not happen because of a legislative dispute between two committees.

Up to this point in my remarks, I have attempted to give the Senate the procedural and legislative story behind the committee amendment. Let me now explain what the amendment contains.

First, it authorizes 13 projects in the States of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, Montana, and Wyoming. As I have said before, the total cost is \$619,000,000. Second, it provides a technique or device for basin-wide pooling of costs allocated to power and basin-wide pooling of revenues coming from power. This device, as provided in the amendment, is called the Columbia Basin account. The Columbia Basin account, as its name implies, is established for bookkeeping or accounting purposes. The account will be kept, and the bookkeeping will be done, by the Bonneville Power Administration. On one side of the ledger will be entered all the costs to be repaid by power on all Columbia Basin projects. On one side of the ledger will be entered the costs allocated for repayment by power on Bonneville Dam, on Grand Coulee Dam, Chief Joseph Dam, McNary Dam, Hungry Horse Dam, on the dams authorized in this bill to be constructed by the Army Engineers, and on dams to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. So far as the bookkeeping is concerned, it will make no difference to the Columbia Basin account whether the Army builds the dam, or whether the Bureau builds the dam. Costs assigned for return by power on all projects, both actual and estimated, will be consolidated in the account.

On the other side of the ledger will be entered all power revenues coming from these great projects, from Bonneville, Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, McNary, Hungry Horse, and other dams in the basin, those authorized in this amendment, and in H. R. 5472 as it now stands on the calendar. Any project which produces power and, therefore, any project which has costs allocated to it for repayment from power revenues, will be placed in the account for bookkeeping purposes.

Now the question arises: "Why should all power costs and all power revenues be pooled?" There are two very important reasons. First, we will soon have in the Federal system in the Columbia Basin, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, McNary, Hungry Horse, and Chief Joseph Dams, all producing power. Within the next 20 years, we hope to add to this list most or all of the following: Albeni Falls, Libby, two Scriver Creek plants, Hell's Canyon, Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose, Lower Granite on the Snake

River, and Priest Rapids, John Day, and The Dalles on the Columbia. The cost of producing a kilowatt of electricity at each of these dams will vary. This stems from the fact that Bonneville, for example, was built during a period when costs were lower than they are today. Chief Joseph Dam will be one of the most efficient hydroelectric plants in the world, yet the cost per kilowatt will be higher than at Grand Coulee because construction costs are higher today than they were when Grand Coulee was built. If the basin account is not achieved, it will mean that the Director of the Bonneville Power Authority will have to charge one price for the power derived from Chief Joseph Dam, another price for the power at Grand Coulee, and still another price for the power from Bonneville. Of course, the people in the Portland area, who are in a position to take power from Bonneville, will get their power a little cheaper at Bonneville, because Bonneville was built first. It was built first because it was down on the lower part of the river and all of us pitched in and decided that it should be built first. It was built at much cheaper cost than structures can be built for at the present time.

The same situation prevails with reference to all the dams I have enumerated. As new dams are added to the Federal power system in the Columbia Basin, they will be interconnected to form one basin-wide transmission system, which has always been planned by all planners of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers.

The kilowatts generated at Chief Joseph will be intermingled with kilowatts generated at Grand Coulee. Just as it is impossible to identify, at Portland, Oreg., that part of the water in the Columbia River which came from Idaho, and that part which came from Washington, so, too, it is impossible in the Bonneville transmission system to differentiate those kilowatts generated at Hungry Horse from those generated at Bonneville.

This being the case, we must have a technique for averaging the costs of all of these dams, for rate-making purposes. Otherwise, the Pacific Northwest would be afflicted with a crazy-quilt pattern of varying power rates which would militate against industrial, agricultural, and residential development, and therefore would militate against the conclusions reached by the best minds which have for many years studied the problems of the Columbia River.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is speaking about the best minds. When did the best minds make up their minds that the suggestion which is now being discussed by the Senator from Washington was best for the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator was not in the Chamber when I led up to that point in the beginning of my address. However, these studies have been going on for a long time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Whose minds are the best minds?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Engineers who have studied the problem: The engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation, who are all fine, intelligent engineers; the Bonneville Power Authority, which is clothed with the responsibility of distributing the power; the best lay and engineering minds in the Pacific Northwest who have studied the problem. As a matter of fact, I will say to the Senator from New Mexico, although I do not like to repeat the statement, I know of no objection in the Pacific Northwest to the proposal. I have heard of no objections from any of the governors of the States involved, from any of the resident Army engineers, from any of the resident engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation, or from the Columbia River Basin Commission, which was established in our State. Neither have I heard any objection expressed by any of the engineers of the Bonneville Authority, or by Dr. Raver. I know of no opposition to the basin account.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly not in that particular area, and there is a reason for that. Why should there be the objection, in the area that is going to be benefited, say, for instance, so far as irrigation and reclamation are concerned, by the development of power at the cost of the people of the entire United States, when the money received may be used by irrigation districts which can now pay out, under our present irrigation laws?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course there is no objection.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course there is no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But let me answer the Senator's question. Those who are responsible for power, those who buy almost 70 percent of the power developed in our State, namely, the public utility districts, which in our area are created countywise—those who are responsible for power rates, the private utilities who buy the power, of course, all want as cheap a rate as they can get. They say that the only way to keep rates low in the Pacific Northwest is by pooling, so that for rate-making purposes there may be a uniform rate. It is impossible to bring that about without the basin account.

The people in our area are not fearful of power revenues. I do not know of anyone from the Pacific Northwest who has testified against the proposal, in all the hearings and all the discussions. Those who might be benefited, the public utility districts, or the Bonneville Authority, which deals only in power, and Dr. Raver stated that power revenues might be taken, perhaps subsidies, which was the term used yesterday—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is not that a correct term?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not so interpret it. A subsidy is something one gets out of the Government and does not pay back. We are going to pay back.

These interests have no fear at all because they realize that comprehensive development is the best insurance to keep a uniform and low rate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Suppose that is correct—

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the testimony.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the testimony so far as those are concerned who would get the benefits only.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Who else talks about these things except those who would get the benefit from the power?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There was testimony of many witnesses. I can bring in files 2 feet high—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course the Senator can.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of people who deal only with power, and have no interest whatsoever in reclamation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is now discussing what would be the results of a general plan, but he is not discussing the benefits which would be derived by a particular, limited number of people who would get the benefits if the amendment the Senator has in mind should prevail.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think a limited number of people would get the benefit at all; and they are not fearful, for the reason that all the irrigation projects, even those included in the proposal, must be approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course they have to be approved by the Congress.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The parties interested show their possibilities.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, they can show their possibilities. But they will not show that they are capable of paying off, under the old reclamation laws. The only reason for the basin account is to make it possible for them to be subsidized by the power revenues. Is not that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The theory of the basin account is to credit the revenue—

Mr. CHAVEZ. If it—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me finish. The Senator posed a question to me, assuming that the only people who want this development are those who would be benefited reclamation- or irrigation-wise. I say that those who are interested in power rates are interested in the project, and I can read the testimony showing that to be so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why is the power to be limited to only two particular States in the area?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The power?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would not the Senator say that the Columbia River is of national interest?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If power is developed on that river, why should it be limited to only a couple of States in the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not limited.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, yes, it is.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. There are five States involved. I know what the Senator is speaking about. We had a discussion about that. I am not a mem-

ber of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but the amendment was suggested to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Irrespective of who suggested the amendment, the amendment would have the effect I have stated, would it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. So far as I am concerned, if I were a member of the committee, I would agree to eliminate that feature of it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What would the Senator do as a Senator?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should be glad to eliminate it. But the amendment is before the Senate because the Senator from Utah said that he wanted to restrict the sale of Columbia Basin power to the five States involved. The Senator from Utah is now present, and perhaps he can explain it. He said it was because it was not desired that the power come down into Utah. I ask the Senator from Utah if that is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President—

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I am not correct, I hope I will be corrected.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from Utah did not want Columbia River power to come into Utah because we have power developments in Utah, on the upper Colorado, which will supply the entire area with all the power needed. We do not want cheaper power to come in from the Columbia and make it impossible for us to develop the upper Colorado. If that cheaper power were brought in, our projects would not be possible, because we must have the overall income from all the projects.

Mr. CHAVEZ. According to that theory, all the millions and billions of dollars which will be spent by the American people—which eventually will be paid back by power revenues, I admit—will not be for the benefit of the people of the United States as a whole, but, for the reasons given by the Senator from Utah, or other reasons, those expenditures will be made for the benefit of only a limited area.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from New Mexico, I repeat that I was not a member of the committee, but the amendment discussed in the committee, the basin-account proposal, never contained this suggestion. I want to see the power sold as far as it can be transmitted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Now we are getting somewhere.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In this particular case I do not think the Senator need worry too much, because this matter involves a great area of the United States, five States being concerned. The distance covered is just about as far as power can be transmitted today. Some new methods may come into use, but it is about as far as power can be transmitted and still be worth while.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The same thing used to be said about gas, but I notice there is no limit on the people of the District of Columbia getting gas from the southwestern area of the United States. If

this is to be a national development—and I submit it is, and I am for the general idea—why limit the benefits to only one particular area, if the entire people of the United States are going to pay for it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The benefits naturally are limited to one area as of today, whether we want them to be limited or not. Five States in the Pacific Northwest I think are of great national interest.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no question about that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The fact that our people had the hydroelectric power developed had a great effect during wartime. The war plants in that area could not have been operated without that power.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator answer a question along another line now?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation in connection with the questions of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not want to have any limit imposed. I would like to have the users get some cheap power.

Mr. WATKINS. Under the reclamation program, as it was originally intended, according to the provisions of the first reclamation act, the landowners and the water users were required to sign contracts to repay the costs of construction, and then they were to operate and eventually own the projects.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have been impressing that upon the Senator from Washington.

Mr. WATKINS. That is true. I think that principle should be preserved. We developed small projects on our one local stream, the easy-to-build projects. The farmers finally agreed to have one entity represent them in contracting with the United States, rather than to have separate contracts. That entity, that association, signed a contract with the United States to pay the cost and eventually to operate the project. Then after the project was finished, the association, or the entity representing all the numerous farmers, actually took over and operated the project. That was done for the benefit of the farmers.

Such action is in the national interest, in that it increases income, provides additional national taxes, and brings prosperity. But it has a local interest, and that is based on the idea that the United States is in effect loaning the money to the farmers to be repaid by them. If the money loaned to build the project is repaid, then the project belongs to the local people.

Mr. CHAVEZ. After the people have paid back the money loaned for constructing the project, after the contract has been paid out, the project belongs to the people.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. I am in full accord with the idea of having a comprehensive form of development. Instead of taking a little piece of a river and developing it, I am in favor of developing the whole river system as a big project. If it is self-liquidating, if sufficient in-

come can be obtained from the entire river development, with all its projects, power, irrigation, and all, to repay the cost, it will then be owned and operated by the local people. The United States will get its money back. The United States is, in effect, loaning the money, advancing sums of money as the project goes ahead, and the money is eventually paid back.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was the idea behind the reclamation project loans and the reclamation loans. One of the reasons the Public Works Committee is opposed at this time to the provisions which are contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming on behalf of his committee, and the suggestions of the Senator from Washington is that the loan will not be repaid. I know in this particular instance that there are probably eight or nine irrigation projects pure and simple that have nothing to do with power, that will be unable to make repayment.

Mr. WATKINS. That is true.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Using street parlance, they are sour at this particular time.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from New Mexico will probably remember, since he has lived on irrigation projects, and near irrigation canals, that the farmer who lived at the head of the canal where the water was taken out of the river would have very cheap water, when he took it out and put it on his land. But in order for farmers all the way down the river to have water, the various projects were combined into one. The farmer at the bottom would be completely sour so far as obtaining any water is concerned, if the other did not help him by joining in and combining the projects into one.

Let us broaden our view respecting the situation, and take into consideration the big picture of the Columbia Basin, and see if the entire river, with the income from power and from irrigation, may not be sufficient to pay for the project. If the entire system will be self-liquidating as an over-all river unit, then it ought to be authorized and the Government ought to lend the money to the local people so the project can be built. The people will repay the loan, and eventually the people of the area will own the project after they have paid back the loan to the United States. Mind you, Mr. President, they are going to pay it back. That is why I say the National Government will eventually not have any interest in the actual ownership of it any more than the United States will have an interest in ownership of Great Britain, when it lends money to Great Britain under the ECA to develop the resources of Great Britain. We never expect to own a foot of Great Britain, although we will lend to Great Britain billions of dollars, a vastly greater sum than will be loaned for the development of the Columbia Basin. It will be seen that as this program is expended it will be necessary to consider the river system as one unit.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Washington for permitting the Senator from Utah and me to discuss the matter on his time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is all right.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Committee on Public Works was led to understand that what was wanted was a full and complete development of the Columbia River Basin.

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was even suggested that so far as the Columbia River Basin Authority is concerned, which would be part of the ramification of the whole scheme of things, the question might be one of administration. Nevertheless it would affect the whole picture.

Mr. WATKINS. The Army engineer projects as well as reclamation projects.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Army engineer projects as well as reclamation projects, yes. We were given to understand that the comprehensive plan was to be considered, that we should look into it as faithfully and as well as we possibly could. We were begged and urged to hurry to the Northwest and hold hearings. So far as the comprehensive plan is concerned the Committee on Public Works has obtained some information. I feel as the Senator from Utah feels respecting this matter. I am sympathetic also with the idea presented by the Senator from Washington. With respect to the comprehensive plan, the complete basin needs and requirements and necessities and what not, neither the committee nor the Congress has sufficient information. The project is so large, of such great importance not only to the Northwest but to the country as a whole, that it does not belong in this particular bill. No matter how sympathetic one may be toward development of the entire basin, it is wrong and it is unsound to have the project acted upon in the form of an amendment adopted by another committee, on the basis of reports which were delayed until the bill now under consideration had been taken up by the United States Senate. It is wrong to have come to us now an amendment whose sponsors say, "You must take it. It is good." It may be good, Mr. President. I think the general idea is fine.

I do not believe we should develop a basin piecemeal, by developing one tributary and then another and then still another. We ought to study the whole system. We will cooperate with the Senator from Washington and other Senators who wish to develop the basin. We will help in such development. We want to develop the Northwest. We want to look at the picture of the entire river system, the entire Columbia Basin, as it affects irrigation, flood control, navigation or whatever it may affect.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the interest of the Senator from New Mexico in this matter. As was said several times yesterday, I know of no better friend of western development since I have been in the Senate, than the Senator from New Mexico. I know his record respecting western development was the same prior to that time, during the long service of the Senate. But I

think the suggestion should not be made that the subject has not been properly considered. We began considering the matter last May. What the Senator from New Mexico is talking about is the Columbia Valley administration, with respect to which he and his committee have kindly agreed to hold hearings. That deals with the problem of management.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope that some day soon we will be able to go into the problem of management. Whether we go into it soon, or next year, or the year after, however, it becomes more pressing all the time as to how we are going to manage these projects, how they are going to be administered. What we are talking about now is merely the bricks and mortar. Both streets are parallel. One has nothing directly to do with the other, however. They both "lead to Rome," and I hope they will come together some time.

I see the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is smiling. He and I do not disagree on too many things. He contends that when we pass the basing account we deal with management. I say we are not dealing with management. We are dealing with a system of bookkeeping. If we adopt the Columbia Valley administration, or some such form of management, if they want to take over the basin-account bookkeeping in their administration, that is one thing. Perhaps they will not. But in the meantime we want to go ahead and build our structures. Management is one thing and building is another.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that management is one thing and that construction is another. We are now dealing with easily identified projects the Senator from Washington wants constructed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That have nothing to do with management at all.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They have nothing to do with management, but they have to do with conditions as they are now. With all due regard for the laudable desires and ambitions of the Senator from Washington—and I think he is going along the right way—I am afraid he is a little too ambitious at this particular time. All the structures the Senator desires in the Northwest cannot be constructed within 2 or 3 years.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator will admit that the Committee on Public Works was extremely liberal in this particular respect. We said to the Senator from Washington and to all other Senators from the Northwest and to the Senators who were interested in the project, as well as to the Senate, "Notwithstanding that the House allowed you only \$107,000,000 for the next 3 years, we will increase that on the Senate side by \$142,000,000, and only ask that we be given a little opportunity actually to study the proposal affecting the entire river basin. The Senator's committee may have the rest.

In the meantime, we have agreed to increase by \$142,000,000 the amount allowed by the House of Representatives.

However, all of a sudden, after the committee did that and after the Senate adopted that amendment, we are confronted with a report which has been delayed for years; and now the Committee on Public Works is expected to accept that report and the proposal for the complete river basin, as such, without making a study of it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement and the Senator's position. I wish the Senator had available a statement of the chronological history of the matter, to show how long it has been pending.

In 1948 the President told the two agencies to get together, and they submitted the report in May 1949. When the matter got before the Senate a few weeks later, the formal 308 report was before the Senate as a public document. The omnibus rivers and harbors bill was introduced and referred by the Vice President to the Committee on Public Works. At that time the bill had all of these items in it, because it was a comprehensive bill.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from New Mexico, and I know he wishes to be helpful.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I certainly do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to ask him a question. Suppose the amendment were withdrawn. Of course the comprehensive bill includes the basin account, but not the CVA.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Suppose I introduced that bill. It would include the basin account about which we are talking, for it is in the 308 report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And it would include the irrigation and reclamation projects. To what committee would that bill be referred? We would be in the same shape that we are in now, would we not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Suppose it were referred to the Public Works Committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then the Senator from Utah again would suggest that the irrigation features of the bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. WATKINS. I am not so sure that I would, this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the Senator from Washington, this is the situation: We have received the comprehensive report, agreed to by the two agencies. However, does the Senator think that because we have received the report from the two agencies, our committee, a standing committee of the Senate, should take the contents of the report for granted?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no. My point is that the reason the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has this matter referred to it was because the Senator from Utah suggested it, since the measure includes some irrigation-project provisions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me ask this question: If the Senator from New Mexico were in my shoes, how would he proceed? How would he handle this matter?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If I were in the Senator's shoes, under all the circumstances, I might be doing the same thing that he is doing. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to make an observation at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEAHY in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. It seems to me that we have here elements which, of necessity, under the Reorganization Act, would have to be considered by two committees. We have the work of the Corps of Army Engineers, which is a part of the comprehensive plan; and we have the irrigation projects, which likewise are a part of it. I happen to be on both committees; and I am in the middle, between the two contending forces.

I have been thinking about this entire proposition since it came from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in the nature of a report. I am in full accord with the committee in respect to the idea of the over-all development of the river system and the use in it of the entire revenues. If the entire river project is feasible—in other words, if it is self-liquidating and if it can pay back the costs—then the individual units in it, even if not individually feasible, will be made so by means of the over-all development.

One thing bothers me about the so-called bookkeeping account, namely, who is going to operate the river system or the account?

I always come back to the fact that a Federal agency is involved. If the proposal is enacted in its present form, the Federal agency which would operate the river system or the account would be the Bonneville Administration or the Army Engineers or the Department of the Interior.

In the study I have made of the situation, I have introduced Senate bill 3376, which provides for the organization of interstate water and power users' associations, to be incorporated by the States, and to act as the agents and to repay the costs of the projects. It seems there had better be someone able to act in those matters.

Although I agreed in regard to the report coming from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I now think that the wise plan would be to send this message back to the two committees. We had better unify the two committees in Congress, as well as the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then I am back where I started.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the Senator is not back where he started. To the contrary, he is better off to the extent of \$142,000,000. Is not that correct?

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct. I was on the committee, and I think that is what was voted to be added to what had already been provided by the House of Representatives.

Mr. MAGNUSON. However, my point is that we cannot separate these things in my section of the country.

Mr. WATKINS. By the time we get around to the construction, we can have this matter worked out, if the measure is referred to the two committees jointly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is why I opposed doing anything about the basing account at this particular time. Evidence was adduced before the Committee on Public Works to the effect that there is no understanding as between the State of Oregon, the State of Washington, the State of Idaho, the State of Montana, the State of Wyoming, or the State of Nevada—the river-basin States—as to the division of the water or the potentials which could be developed from it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I say to the Senator that there need never be any understanding, because we have plenty of water.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly there is plenty of water.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We would like to be able to take some surplus water which we have and dump it down into New Mexico and Arizona.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is why we think, too, that all the electric power should not be kept in the upper area.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We do not want to keep all of it. The Senator from Utah does not want cheap electric power to come into his State.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not want it to ruin all our people.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Nevertheless, even if this measure would result in making cheap power available to the State of New Mexico at this particular moment, I still would not be in favor of it, for the reason that the matter has not been studied in the way that it should be studied if we really wish to develop a comprehensive plan and to make an honest effort for the benefit of society as a whole—for the benefit of all the people, regardless of their political affiliations; for the benefit of the farmer, the merchant, the salesman, the school districts, the university, all the institutions of the State. I want to see an orderly development.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It has been studied for years by the two agencies, and I repeat that the governors of all five of the States feel that the basin account should be put into effect. The President has sent to Congress a strong message in favor of it. The farm organizations and all the power people favor it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well; but what about the ones who really present such measures to this body? What about a standing committee which has jurisdiction of the matter? What study has been made, aside from a study of the irrigation features?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator refer to a study of the basin account?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. What kind of study has the Committee on Public Works made?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then, I wish to ask a question of the Senator. Let us leave out of consideration, for the time being, the irrigation projects. Then we have the problem of the basin account. Suppose the Senator from Washington were to introduce a bill which provided for the basin account, but without projects—in other words, a method of cost allocation. That cost-allocation method, namely, the basin account, would apply, of course, to power projects and to reclamation projects, in that event. To what committee would that measure be referred?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would be referred to the Committee on Public Works; and after we studied it, we might agree with the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Why would it not be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was for the reason that we had not studied the situation, that the Public Works Committee turned down the basin account the last time. The Senator knows it was not approved by the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. I appreciate that.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I may suggest we have been urging unification of the plans of the Corps of Engineers and of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I could have some assurance that I would not again be whipsawed between two committees, as I was, after obtaining what I thought was an agreement that one would accept what the other agreed upon as to its responsibility in the matter—if I could get an agreement of that kind, I am sure I would be very glad to let the rivers and harbors bill go on its way, and be very grateful for the courtesy I have received in the consideration of our projects, and would then introduce the basin-account feature in a bill providing for the comprehensive plan, such a bill as that which the CVA has caused to be introduced and which is before the Senator's committee. That is another thing. I should like, however, to be assured that I would not be whipsawed, because of two committees being again involved in the matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator would only take the course he has suggested, I can assure him there would be no opposition whatever from the Committee on Public Works, and that he would not be whipsawed. We will cooperate with him, probably to the extent of recommending \$142,000,000 more.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate that very much. I would want the committee to decide the question on its merits.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want the committee to do so, and we have been proceeding in that manner. The only reason for referring the matter to another committee was because of its relation to irrigation. The Committee on Public Works said, "We have nothing to do with that feature; let the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs take it."

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Utah has just promised me that if this

situation arises again, he does not think he will be in that mood.

Mr. WATKINS. I might not make any recommendation the next time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But is it not true that the proposals suggested to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate along these lines, with the exception of the basin account, were actually adopted by the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes; all the rivers and harbors projects were adopted. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the only subject of which the Committee on Public Works have jurisdiction.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But we faced a problem because we did not feel that the projects could be separated. It is necessary to have the over-all development of which the Senator from Utah speaks.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator can get his committee to stay away from us and let us get down to business, we can probably separate them.

Mr. WATKINS and Mr. TAYLOR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield first to the Senator from Utah, after which I will yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WATKINS. As I have already said, I happen to be on both the committees. I can see that each committee has a vital interest in the subject matter of the present discussion. The Public Works Committee is concerned with the building of the Army engineers' projects on the same river, the Columbia, and with other vast projects. They have already a large development there. The Department of the Interior is interested of course in the reclamation end of the matter. But it seems to me there must be a consideration of the over-all features of the river, including the projects of the Army engineers and of the Bureau of Reclamation. I do not think we can separate them. We have a reorganization plan under the Hoover Commission report, which recommends to the Congress and to the country that we combine the work of the Bureau of Reclamation and of the Corps of Army Engineers, to the end that we may not have duplicating organizations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The recommendation almost follows the comprehensive plan.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me point out that, because of the jurisdictional difficulty in the Senate, perhaps for the purpose of considering this question there should be held joint hearings of the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It seems to me that is the way to proceed. That is one reason why I am going to join with my friend from New Mexico in opposing action on this amendment at the moment, although I agree 100 percent with the idea of an over-all development of the Columbia River and other western rivers. I have introduced a bill, which should be considered in connection with the Senator's program, and in connection with the over-all development. Perhaps the bill

came too late. I admit it was introduced as a result of thinking and of studying this project in both committees. I should like to have my bill considered, so that ultimately we shall not only have a plan but someone to operate it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would hope that the Columbia Valley Administration would operate it.

Mr. WATKINS. I would hope the Interstate Water Users and Power Association, owned and operated by the people of that area, would operate it, rather than the Government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to say to the Senator from New Mexico that, while I cannot speak for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I myself cannot accept anything or do anything, yet I know the members of that committee realize the position we are in regarding the comprehensive development. But, in view of the discussion which has taken place, unless the Senator from Idaho has something to add to it, I should feel constrained at this time to finish the few formal remarks I have, in order to keep the record clear. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] would then be the pending question, and I suspect the two Senators from Idaho will have something to say about it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I hope to have something to say about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It will require some time. I should like to be able to confer with the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. Perhaps we can come to some sort of agreement.

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

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief comment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We all agree that a comprehensive plan, if agreed to, should be developed and should be carried out if it is sound. I may ask whether the Senator from Washington attended the hearings of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, I attended most of them, but not all of them. For about a week, I was there almost every morning.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that about the only topics of discussion and consideration at that time were matters of power and irrigation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. The basin account took up most of the time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was involved. It has to do mainly with irrigation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It has mainly to do with bookkeeping.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well, with bookkeeping, let us say. A comprehensive plan would involve not only the production of power but possibly the irrigation of more lands—and I am for that—but it would also include navigation, and it would also include soil conservation, would it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would also include flood control.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would also include flood control, and probably the conservation of our national forests. Fisheries

possibly would also be involved in this particular basin, is not that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That would be, under the management of the CVA.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But that also has to do with a study of the comprehensive plan, does it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. None of those things were given any consideration whatever. That is another reason why the Senator from New Mexico thinks further study should be given to it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They would not be included in the building of structures.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They could be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They would be included in provisions regarding management, if the structures were built and if the comprehensive plan were well on its way.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to make one suggestion. I will quit, then.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Washington that, as one member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I think this matter could come before the committee again for a more comprehensive study. I should be very willing to go to work on it at once, and undertake to secure hearings—probably joint hearings of the two committees—to consider the over-all program. While we are at it, instead of doing it piecemeal, let us do a good job and reach a decision as to whether we are going to have a piecemeal development, or whether we are to have the over-all basin development. I shall be glad to cooperate in every way, as a member of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the Senator's offer of cooperation. I do not want it to be understood, however, as saying that of the proposals report No. 308 and the basin account should be combined with the so-called Columbia Valley Administration. They are two similar subjects, but they can be separated. I am a staunch supporter of the Columbia Valley Administration; I introduced the bill, and was the author of it; but there has been a great deal of controversy in my State about whether we should have this type of management in the Columbia Valley. The Senator from Idaho is one of the cosponsors with me of that bill, and there is a great deal of controversy about it. But report No. 308, covering the comprehensive plan of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, relates, we may say, only to the bricks and mortar, and has nothing to do with management. The only reason the basin account is contained in that plan is that it was considered necessary to have some way of allocating costs. That might indirectly bear on management, but not on over-all management.

While we are discussing the matter of management, as to whether it should be the Tennessee Valley Authority type, the Columbia Valley Administration type, or the type suggested by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], there is a great deal of argument going on in the Northwestern area. There is no opposition to the general principles of the compre-

hensive report, the material development of the valley—the bricks and the mortar, as it were. I do not want the two questions to be confused. They are parallel roads to the ultimate, and I hope they will lead to Rome.

What I want to discuss, if the Senator from Utah will listen a moment, is not so much the question of management as between the two committees, with reference to developing the river, because that will go on, regardless of how long we argue about management.

I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if he is not certain that the Committee on Public Works held adequate hearings to determine the feasibility and the advisability of constructing flood control and other projects on the Columbia River. Is he not confident that the committee held adequate hearings?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought it did. The record is quite filled with testimony.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator does not think the Public Works Committee would report these projects without adequate study, does he?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It reported the projects, but it seems to me it wants to limit itself to rivers and harbors. It reported those features of the initial phase of the comprehensive plan.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Washington was interested in those hearings, and was present at a number of them, I believe.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was not the Senator also present at a great many hearings held by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does not the Senator think the committee considered equally thoroughly those portions of the development program dealing with reclamation questions?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it did.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can the Senator make sense, then, of the objections of the Senator from New Mexico that the subject has not had adequate consideration?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not agree with the Senator from New Mexico on that point. I think it has received adequate consideration. It may be that the Senator from New Mexico honestly believes it has not had adequate consideration, particularly the basin account matter. That may be his opinion about it.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. For the information of the Senator from Idaho, I suggest that the United States Senate will determine the question as to whether adequate hearings have been held.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was saying I was sure adequate hearings had been held. I certainly did not ask to have the reclamation features referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I want to assure the Senator from New Mexico that we held long hearings—too long to suit the Senator from New Mexico, I believe. He was after us to hurry up, but we heard practically all the witnesses.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Most of the witnesses were from the Interior Department, were they not?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They were mainly from the Reclamation Bureau, were they not?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; I would not say that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Who has been lobbying around the Senate and the Senate Office Building, outside the personnel of the Reclamation Bureau?

Mr. TAYLOR. I know the idea of the bill is endorsed, as the Senator from Washington has pointed out, by the Governors of all the Northwestern States. Practically everyone in that area is in favor of the 308 report. There is some controversy relative to the CVA, but there is none with reference to this proposal.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is none over this proposal at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. If we cannot get action because of jurisdictional disputes between committees, it seems to me we must have the CVA proceed with it. Does not the Senator from Washington think that is correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator from Idaho would have a very good point in favor of the CVA.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should think so.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Idaho.

Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that he was under the impression that the basin account had been considered by the Public Works Committee?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; I did not say that. I referred to those features of the development of the Northwest which were referred to the Public Works Committee, and I am sure they were adequately considered. I think those which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were equally thoroughly considered.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to make it clear for the record that the O'Mahoney basin account proposal has never been considered in any way, shape, or form by the Public Works Committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. That may be correct; but, on the other hand, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs did not consider the same things the Public Works Committee considered. Someone divided them up and handed the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs one part and the Committee on Public Works another part.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Much of the debate has been with reference to the basin account. Supposing the distinguished chairman of the committee says that this amendment does not belong in the bill. Everyone in the Northwest is anxious to have it at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At this time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. If there should be a bill introduced relating to the basin account, we would again be in the same position. Does the junior Senator from Washington think it would have to be referred to both committees because the basin account involves power

dams, rivers and harbors, reclamation, and irrigation, and would we not be back in the same situation unless joint hearings should be held?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That would have to be by agreement. Under the Reorganization Act, the Committee on Public Works has jurisdiction over certain questions. It does not have jurisdiction over irrigation—

Mr. MAGNUSON. The projects themselves.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The projects themselves—except where irrigation is part of a multiple-purpose project. The committee which would have jurisdiction would be the committee which would have the most interest. In this instance, if a bill were to be introduced individually by the Senator from Washington, power, navigation, and flood control would supersede irrigation, or irrigation would be incidental to the other features.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The junior Senator from Washington and I have a similar bill in the Committee on Public Works. It would have to be changed with reference to the basin-account features, but it includes the basic features of the 308 report. It has nothing to do with CVA. That is involved in another bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand that. The committee is sympathetic to the two Senators from Washington. I congratulate both of them on the fact that when it comes to a question of developing the area, the basin, I have never seen any difference of opinion as between the two Senators. They might have had a little difference of opinion as to the method of approach. But the senior Senator from Washington will agree with me that the committee has not had an opportunity to hold any hearings on those two bills.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will my colleague permit me to answer, as best I can, the question recently posed to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. As I understand the basin account proposal which was submitted in the form of an amendment by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], it would change the hydroelectric power policies of this Nation and would necessarily change some of the existing reclamation laws.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. CAIN. I am answering the question as best I can. At least, I think my answer is correct. If my premise is correct, the Committee on Public Works is charged with and has responsibility for considering any proposed change in our hydroelectric power policies, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is charged with the responsibility of considering proposed changes in the field of reclamation law; which is to say, in answer to the question submitted by my senior colleague, that if a clean bill were reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which would include the so-called O'Mahoney basin account proposal, someone could very logically say that it ought to be thoroughly considered by the Committee on Public Works before it was approved by the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank my colleague. Although I do not agree with his interpretation of the basin account, I am sure that what he has said is correct. That is why I said that he and I would be in the same position, and that I hoped debate would develop a distinct understanding—not the kind we had last fall—so that we could have some prompt action, as I am sure it will be prompt, with cooperation between the two committees, and thus get somewhere. It is hoped that the committees will at least agree on the merits of the proposal, and not create a situation under which one committee will not take the other committee's recommendations, and vice versa. It is impossible to separate the question of jurisdiction between the two committees. In the development of the Columbia River Basin, the comprehensive plan must embrace both committees.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague tell me why he thinks my interpretation of the so-called O'Mahoney basin-account proposal is wrong? I ask the question because I want to be correct in thinking I am right, and I wish to be corrected by my senior colleague if I am wrong.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought the Senator said that, in his opinion, the amendment would make some change in basic reclamation law.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not believe the amendment would make a change in basic reclamation law.

Mr. CAIN. But the Senator agrees that it makes some change?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It makes some change in power cost.

Mr. CAIN. It makes some change in the hydroelectric power policy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the allocation of power levies. It does make a change in the allocation.

Mr. CAIN. If that be so, my senior colleague and I are in agreement that the basin account has been the responsibility of the Committee on Public Works from the very beginning.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; that is correct. Furthermore the Committee on Public Works discussed the basin account at great length in its hearings.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, so that we may come to an agreement on terms, may I suggest that the Committee on Public Works discussed the basin account as put forward by the comprehensive plan? Am I quite correct in saying that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is quite correct.

Mr. CAIN. But there was no consideration given by the Committee on Public Works to the use of the interest component as an additional aid in the furtherance of reclamation throughout the Pacific Northwest; nor was any such suggestion ever included, so far as I know, in the comprehensive report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not attend all the hearings held by the Committee on

Public Works, but I am sure that my colleague is correct. If it was discussed, it was discussed only casually.

Mr. CAIN. It was discussed only casually. I think it is fair and proper to say that it was discussed only casually, if it was discussed at all, because at that time it seemed to be the impression of everyone that the basin account, if it was to become a serious matter for consideration, should first go to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; that is correct. The 308 report, which included the so-called basin account feature, was discussed by the Committee on Public Works. What the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee discussed was a portion of the 308 report dealing with irrigation and reclamation.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to make one further observation, if my colleague will permit me to do so. I think it is correct to state that the basin account, as recommended by the comprehensive plan, and as considered casually by the Committee on Public Works, was merely a proposal that power revenues from all dams now existing or to be built would be pooled, in order that out of that pooling of power revenues the Federal Government could be repaid both capital and interest for the advances which it had made in years gone by.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct. So that the record will be clear, I wish to read an excerpt from the so-called 308 report with reference to the policy of financial pooling. The portion I have reference to reads as follows:

Financial assistance from all power revenue-producing projects in the Pacific Northwest (Columbia Basin and coastal areas) should be pooled and extended to aid irrigation under principles consistent with those embodied in reclamation law. Secretary of Interior to be responsible for the basin account and for recommending projects to the President and the Congress to be covered into the account.

Mr. CAIN. However, the proposal which the Committee on Public Works considered had no reference to using an interest component as a further subsidy to reclamation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct. However, the suggestion which was made, and which is a very broad one, did not preclude a discussion of the interest component, or any phase of it.

Mr. CORDON and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I merely wanted to suggest to the Senator from Washington that the Senator from Oregon would like to see this matter go back to the committee for a thorough study.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to ask which committee he has in mind?

Mr. CORDON. I was about to reach that point in my remarks, if the Senator will permit me to make a short statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well.

Mr. CORDON. I feel that to follow such a course would be helpful. I should

like to preface my statement by saying that the Senator from Oregon feels that ultimately there must be a Columbia Basin account, into which all proceeds from power dams in the Columbia Basin will go, and from which there will be allocated to the several projects such portions of it which those projects need for repayment of interest and principal, as well as for the creation of a single, level, and uniform rate for the sale of power. Factors which exist in that area will require such procedure. The Senator from Oregon is in entire agreement with the Senator from Washington on that point. Where the Senator from Oregon differs with the Senator from Washington is with respect to the provision in the committee's amendment which brings in the question of applying reclamation law to flood control and navigation law in the field of application of interest. That is the only place. If the matter could be returned to committee, and the two committees could go thoroughly into all the factors involved, which we must do sometime, it would be a consummation devoutly to be wished.

As the Senator knows, many of the factors were incorporated in what was known as House bill 1770, the house-keeping bill for Interior Department, to which the President has made numerous objections, and with reference to which he will have his Commission on Water Resources Policy report to him. I can see no reason why two committees, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works, should not follow the precedent which was established last year when consideration was given to the Atlantic Pact. At that time the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations sat in joint session to discuss that major legislative policy. I can see no reason why we should not do that in this case, because the decision is vital to the program and to the substantive law under which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works operate. I should be very glad to do all I can to bring about such a consummation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to say to the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Oregon that so far as the chairman of the Committee on Public Works is concerned, it is my opinion the sooner we work out the problem, the better it will be for all concerned. However, in order to carry out what I understand to be my duty, I must object to accepting an amendment at this time. However, I should be willing to get together with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and try to work out the problem. I believe it to be too vital to be brought about by means of a committee amendment at this time.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if the very able senior Senator from Washington would give an interpretation of the authorization which is contained in the O'Mahoney amendment concerning the

Mountain Home project, which will be found in lines 3 to 15, inclusive, on page 2 of the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand the Senator is referring to the provision which lists the projects and says:

Until the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, has submitted to the Congress a supplemental report and finding of feasibility under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, taking into consideration the participation of this project in the Columbia Basin account.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. May I address a question to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Suppose the O'Mahoney amendment as it now stands should be agreed to, and then suppose the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, should submit to the Congress a supplemental report showing that the irrigation and reclamation features of the Mountain Home project are feasible. Is it the Senator's understanding that this appropriation would then be authorized without further action by the Congress?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would seem to me that, under the language, that would be the situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that if we authorize the Mountain Home project in the language now contained in the O'Mahoney amendment, no further action by Congress is needed to authorize the reclamation features of the project?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. But I think I should qualify my flat answer to the Senator from Illinois by saying that the distinct understanding with all those involved was that if and when the so-called Water Resources Commission, which has been mentioned—the President is referred to, because they report to him—examined the matter and then resolved on the feasibility of the project, and in turn transmitted their report to the President and he agreed with them, he could O. K. the authorization.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, there would be automatic authorization of the reclamation features of the Mountain Home project, without further action by the Congress?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That would be my interpretation.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. It goes without saying that my colleague and I are very much concerned about the status of this debate, because the passage of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill is important to both of us—

Mr. MAGNUSON. And projects other than those already discussed.

Mr. CAIN. The bill is important to the West, and to the whole country as well. If as the debate continued it became obvious that there could be no reconciliation of views, that misunderstanding would continue to prevail and could not be cleared up, what is the opinion of my colleague as to the adverse effect on the Pacific Northwest over the next 2 or 3 years, if the O'Mahoney basin-account proposal were eliminated

for the time being, but presumably the reclamation authorizations within the O'Mahoney amendment would be agreed to, become a part of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, and that bill would become the law?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think there would be no serious effect if we could have some real hope that we could clear up this matter of the basin account, or these other features, before this session of Congress was ended. I think it would have a disastrous effect upon our program if it should go over to the next session of Congress with some of the projects, even irrigation projects, out, because there is included the very important Hells Canyon Dam, which must be started, and the lower Snake Dams, to keep up with the conservative demand for increase in power. I agree with my colleague that if we can work this matter out jointly at this session of Congress it will not have any serious effect on our situation, because we do not expect to get too many appropriations at this session of Congress for any project we now have authorized, unless it is of an emergency nature.

Mr. CAIN. I know my colleague will realize that my question is merely predicated on the fact that behind this basin account there is an omnibus rivers and harbors bill which includes projects of importance not only to us in the Northwest, but to almost every State in the Union.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure that if my colleague from Washington and I, and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], who sits before me, and all of us in the Pacific Northwest, get the same enthusiastic cooperation we have heard here today on the floor of the Senate, we can accomplish our purpose at this session of the Congress.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the amendment shall be rejected in its entirety at this time, considering the crowded calendar before the Senate, and the drive for an early adjournment, for the benefit of those of us who are up for reelection, does the Senator think there would be any real hope of getting action on a separate bill embodying the provisions of the amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, I am speaking only for the Senate, but I am sure, based on my legislative experience, that if we could get the committee matter ironed out, and get a bill on the calendar, we would have no trouble passing it in the Senate at this session. I assume the House would also pass the bill. While the Senator from New Mexico was out of the Chamber I quoted a very fine speech made by Representative WHITTINGTON in St. Louis, in which he said that the comprehensive report should be adopted. So I know that Representative WHITTINGTON is for it, and the Senator from New Mexico is for it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct, but irrespective of the speech the Representative from Mississippi might have made in St. Louis, I know that we are going

to have a hard time with the same Representative, and the conferees on the House side, holding in the bill the \$142,000,000, which the Senate committee allowed the Northwest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I can appreciate the problem.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So, when the Senator says he is for it, I am worried about holding the \$142,000,000 in the bill, holding in everything the committee has done up to the present time.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I have the indulgence of my colleague for a minute?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to say to my colleague in all seriousness that if circumstances develop which result in eliminating the O'Mahoney basin-account proposal, as the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Public Works I would obviously like to join with my colleague from Washington in giving serious consideration immediately, within that committee, to getting an answer to the shortage of financial assistance now existent in the Pacific Northwest. My colleague would not expect me to say that I could guarantee the committee would agree on action between now and the taking of the summer recess, but the important point is that we would work together in seeking a solution if that portion of the O'Mahoney amendment were eliminated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was called from the Chamber for the last half hour, and I do not know whether the Senator has yet discussed the provision found on page 8 of the O'Mahoney amendment, from lines 5 to 12, inclusive, under which a limitation upon the marketing of power is prescribed. Has that particular provision of the amendment been discussed by the Senator?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That has not been discussed. I am not a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I hope the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] will not leave the floor, because a matter in which he is interested has just been brought up by the Senator from Florida. The provision was not put in the amendment at the insistence of any of us from the Pacific Northwest, or suggested by us. It was suggested by the Senator from Utah, and I am sure he can tell the Senator from Florida, as I have told him heretofore, the effect of it and as to whether the Senator from Florida is correct in his assumption. Apparently, the people in Utah, who have their own power systems, do not desire to have the Columbia Valley power to come into their area for competitive purposes.

I yield to the Senator from Utah to answer the question. I have told the Senator from Florida why the provision is in the amendment. I would rather that it were not in the amendment, so far as I am personally concerned.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield so that I may incor-

porate the provisions I referred to in my question, I should like to incorporate them at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. The so-called O'Mahoney amendment contains, among other things, the following provisions, and I read lines 5 to 11, inclusive, on page 8:

(e) In marketing power and energy from Federal power plants, the revenues from which are credited to the Columbia Basin account pursuant to this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall not enter into contracts for deliveries of firm power outside the area comprising the States of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington and those portions of the Pacific Northwest not within said States.

That provision seems to apply, with certain minor distinctions laid down in a later sentence relative to the delivery of surplus energy at nonpeak times and to the delivery of power on emergency and temporary bases to all the delivery of firm power to all the power plants, whether constructed by the Corps of Engineers or by the Bureau of Reclamation, within the whole Columbia Basin.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the Senator's understanding that that provision would prevent the Secretary of the Interior from entering into contracts for deliveries of firm power outside that region? For instance, to a city in Montana lying 10 miles across the Divide but outside the Basin of the Columbia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would not in States in the basin. It would do what the Senator suggests outside the basin.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, outside the part of Montana that is in the basin, according to the definition of the bill, a city or a community or an REA association lying just a few miles outside the Columbia Basin would be precluded by the provision of the so-called O'Mahoney amendment which I have quoted from purchasing firm power from all the power plants within the basin? Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would the Senator mind stating what is the justification for the inclusion of a provision of that kind?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not include the provision. I told the Senator that the Senator who suggested the amendment, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], a member of the committee, is present and can answer the question. The provision is in the bill. I have not sought to defend it or deny its existence. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs submitted the amendment. But I can say to the Senator from Florida that its practical effect amounts to little or nothing, because the whole area is geographically so large that there can be no transmission or sale of firm power outside the area anyway. It does not even reach all portions of the area. It does not preclude the sale of off-peak power, of which there is plenty for any groups that are on the fringes. It is too bad the map at the rear of the Chamber does not show the mountains. If they were shown it could be seen that there would be no chance of transmitting any firm

power under present techniques outside the basin, with one exception, which is in the territory of the Senator from Utah, and I wish he would answer the Senator's question.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Before leaving my question I should like to ask an additional question of the Senator from Washington. Is it not true that under the provision of the O'Mahoney amendment firm power which has been manufactured within the basin could be sold to cities in the States of Oregon and Washington lying 100 miles or more outside the basin, but would not be permitted to be sold to cities or rural electrification organizations lying immediately outside the basin in the States of Montana, Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The map at which we are looking is an old one, I am sorry to say. Sale is permitted in Nevada, Wyoming, and Utah, and the cities of Washington and Oregon on the coast now receive power and will continue to receive it.

Mr. HOLLAND. In order that the answer of the Senator may be clear in the RECORD, I ask if the Senator is now saying that the question which I asked him is a correct statement of the situation, namely, that under the so-called O'Mahoney amendment, as now drawn, cities lying just outside the basin in that part of the State of Montana which is outside the basin, in that part of the State of Wyoming which is outside the basin, in that part of the State of Utah which is outside the basin, and in that part of the State of Nevada which is outside the basin, would be precluded from obtaining the power, whereas the cities and communities and industries lying within that very large area of the State of Oregon which is outside the basin, and that considerable area of the State of Washington which is outside the basin, would be allowed under this same provision to purchase and obtain power from the power plants within the basin?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Just a minute. The Senator has posed several questions which I think ought to be explained.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am perfectly willing that they should be explained.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator's words were left in the way he uttered them, they would leave the impression that we are trying to create some monopoly for the development of power for cities in Washington and Oregon outside the basin. The territory outside the basin in Washington and Oregon furnishes a great deal of power in the big basin power pool even though it is not geographically in the basin. Some of the largest units in the basin power pool and the Bonneville pool are Seattle City Light, Tacoma City Light, the Cowlitz plant, and smaller plants down through southern Oregon, such as that at Klamath Falls. All of them are in the basin pool. No cities in Wyoming are involved. The land I indicate on the map is all wild land, except a little place I indicate which is in the basin. There is no power in

Nevada. We are talking now about firm power.

Mr. President, I do not have any particular objection to the amendment. For a practical reason I could not object. I am not a member of the committee. But the Senator from Utah wanted the amendment for a completely different purpose. Not that the people of his State wanted the power. He says they do not want the power.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. One more question. The Senator is not stating, is he, for the RECORD, that there is no user, either a municipal user or a rural electrification association, lying just outside the bounds of the basin in the States of Montana, Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada, who would want power from the Columbia Basin?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; so far as we know there is no potential user. The area I now indicate on the map is all mountainous. I indicate other areas which are all mountainous. Now I indicate land that is a national park. I would say that not a thousand people in all live in that area. Montana is filled with municipal power plants. If the people there want to buy power they can take it off the peak loads. Power can be taken from Kalispell. No persons have asked for or even suggested that they want that power. There is no chance of transmitting power to the population beyond the mountainous area. There is a great chance of selling that power in the area outside the basin. There is little or no population in the region to the south and southeast. Therefore, the Senators from Utah are interested in this matter.

We have no intention of restricting the sale of power in any way whatever as regards its sale to anyone who can get it. As the Senator knows, the farther power is transmitted, the greater is the loss of energy, and that increases the cost of the power.

The Senator from Utah will explain why he, a member of the committee, proposed the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to ask a further question, then I think my point will be made; and then the Senator from Utah will be free to make any approach to the matter he may wish to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has mentioned Yellowstone National Park. Is it not true that substantially three-fourths of the area of Yellowstone National Park lies outside the basin and is contiguous to it, and would constitute a user, but certainly not an objectionable user, of the power manufactured in the basin?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It could be used there now.

Mr. HOLLAND. Not under the terms of this amendment, it seems to me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes. It could be used there.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator explain how that could be?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are talking about a contract for the delivery of power. The Senator from Florida does not quite understand. The map which is displayed in the Senate Chamber is an older map, one which was displayed before the committee at its proceedings last year. The lines shown on this map as the boundaries of the basin may not show exactly the present boundaries of the basin, for the boundaries of the basin have been determined on the basis of drainage. At least, that was our attempt. In other words, the eastern part of the Yellowstone National Park drains to the Missouri River Valley, and the western or northwestern part drains to the Columbia River Valley. In between is what is called the Great Divide. However, power could be delivered to Yellowstone National Park, and then could be distributed anywhere that such distribution might be desired. It is delivered at the bus bar.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me say to the Senator from Florida that the main reason for submitting an amendment of this kind was to protect the developments of a reclamation nature and of a flood-control nature in other river basins. South of the Columbia Basin, in Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico, we have what are known as the upper Colorado Basin projects, which will consist of 9 or 10 immense reservoirs and will develop a great deal of power. The building of those dams on the upper Colorado is necessary because under a compact which we have with the lower-basin States, we must furnish water to the lower Colorado Basin. In order to furnish that water, we have to create these large reservoirs, which will hold water over from year to year. It would be tremendously expensive to build those reservoirs merely for the purpose of storing water, to be held for a time, and subsequently to be delivered to the lower basin States. Of course, each of the dams has immense power possibilities. However, the power is of no use to us unless there is a market for it. In that area there are lands which can be irrigated by means of feasible engineering projects, but standing alone they will not be economically feasible; they must have support from the revenues from the power which will be developed from the entire river system. We simply do not want Columbia power to come down into our basin in competition with the power produced in our basin, and thus make it impossible for us to build our projects. That is the purpose of this amendment.

Utah, Nevada, and the other States outside the Columbia Basin have similar situations. There is the Missouri Valley development, which will take care of portions of Montana and of Wyoming, among other States. Of course, Wyoming will be taken care of from the upper Colorado development. However, the main places where the power developed on the upper Colorado is expected to be sold is in Utah. We now have in Utah

a large steel plant; and we hope to have fabricating plants developed to use the steel produced at that giant steel plant, and those fabricating plants will require immense amounts of electric power. They will constitute the principal market for the electric power. At the present time, by means of one exchange or another, we now are getting power from the Colorado Basin. It is coming from Colorado Power, which is selling or exchanging power to Utah Power.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we have exchanges now with the Montana State Power, and even on occasion with the British Columbia Power Co. By means of such exchanges, we give them power for a certain time, and later they give us power. No money is involved in the transaction; the exchange of power is all that is involved.

Mr. WATKINS. What I have stated is the principal purpose of an amendment of this kind.

If the Senator from Florida is familiar with the topography of the Columbia River Basin and with the vast quantity of water available there, he knows that it is possible to construct in that area power projects which will produce power much cheaper than power can be produced at projects on the Colorado. Our dams will produce power which will cost considerably more than the power produced at the dams in the Columbia Basin area.

For that reason, we want to develop our own power. We are required to put to beneficial, consumptive use a certain amount of the water of the Colorado. We have millions of acres of arid land which will produce abundant crops if water is made available. Our last water hole, so to speak, is the Colorado River. Unless we irrigate those lands, we cannot develop them at all. Unless we produce power in that area, so as to have the revenues from the power, we shall not have the means of developing the irrigation projects.

In the Columbia Basin there are immense power possibilities; the possibilities are scarcely dreamed of as yet. However, if that power were sent into our area, it would mean that we would not have a market for the power developed at our projects. The same situation is true to a certain extent in the Missouri system and in other systems.

The objective I had in mind, in connection with my amendment, was to make possible the development of our system, and to do so by making it impossible for the power from the Columbia Basin to compete with the power developed in our system. I have been assured by the engineers and by others who are connected with the engineering phases of the Columbia Basin development and the sale of power developed in the Columbia Basin that the Columbia Basin itself will consume all the power produced there, and none will be available for export. I do not know whether that is true, but we wish to be sure that we shall be protected so that we can build our projects, likewise. We favor a comprehensive development. We favor the application of the comprehensive development principle to our own area, as well as to the Columbia Basin.

Of course, close to the boundary, there may be areas where there may have to be exceptions. In order to protect a town which is on the fringe, so to speak, we may have to prepare a further amendment in order to make it possible for that town to receive power from either basin.

However, I think the amendment which I submitted is clear, and is justified, and the committee unanimously accepted it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Any town on the fringe could make a contract for firm power, or there could be an exchange of power.

Mr. WATKINS. This amendment does not prevent exchanges. There may be times when, as between the two systems, both of which would be financed with Federal funds, it would be very advantageous to both river systems to make exchanges of power. This amendment does not preclude the sending out of dump power which is produced only at certain times of the year. Under the amendment, such dump power may be sent out. However, the amendment would prevent competition by a large system, such as the Columbia, with the surrounding river systems to such an extent as to make their development impossible. Within a certain period of time we have to put to use the waters of the Colorado which are allotted to Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico; and the other States have the same problem. In that respect an agreement has been reached by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], representing Colorado; the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], representing Wyoming; and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], representing New Mexico. We are certainly willing to have the Senate adopt an amendment which will take care of the minor situations on the fringes or the borders.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand, there can be an exchange of power with Montana State Power Co. which furnishes the few cities in that area. Of course, the cities in western Washington and Oregon furnish a great part of the power now in the pool.

Mr. WATKINS. It was also my intention, in connection with the amendment—and I think it will be found that the amendment will carry this intention into effect—to confine the power to the river system. Even in Washington and Oregon it would not be permissible to send out the power; but as the Senator from Washington has already stated, a great deal of power is contributed from other sections to the cities within the Columbia system.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator is mistaken in his last statement, because the amendment is very clear in stating that it permits the making of firm contracts for the delivery of power produced in the basin to all parts of Oregon and Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. But only to the portions of the other States which themselves are in the basin. It seems to me that provision will prevent nearby areas from having the advantage and protec-

tion of low-cost power developed in or coming from the Columbia Basin.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida does not understand. The people in the other river basins do not want that low-cost power; and we in Washington and Oregon, who are contributing a great percentage of power to the power pool, are merely making contracts to buy our own power. The city of Seattle does not have to buy power from the Bonneville power pool. We produce our own power, and we sell our surplus to the Bonneville pool; and so do the cities in Oregon.

Mr. HOLLAND. If that area is rejecting the possibility of having cheap power, it will be the first one to take that position that I have ever heard of.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the Senator's statement. If they reject it, they have their own reasons for doing so.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida lived in an arid region where it is absolutely necessary to put certain waters to beneficial, consumptive use, and if he could not do so in any other way than by developing certain power projects, he would be with us in endeavoring to develop them; because we cannot live without water for domestic and agricultural use, the water must come from irrigation and reclamation projects, and it is impossible to build many of those irrigation and reclamation projects unless we have the revenues coming from the power projects. Moreover, so far as industrial development is concerned, we are through unless we can develop power projects along with the reclamation and irrigation projects.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would say to the Senator from Utah, I am perfectly content for him to make the decision for his people in accordance with what he thinks is their interest, but I am deeply concerned with the policy which would here be engrafted on the law, and which would seem to establish for the first time that I know of, a policy in the Federal law that, in order to have available the cheap power which comes from Federal development of hydroelectric resources, a community must lie within the basin in which the power is produced. Certainly no such principle operates in any other area with which I am familiar.

Mr. WATKINS. No other area, outside the arid West, has such a circumstance that must be protected. That is the reason for it. We are trying to be realistic about this. In Utah we want development of our projects, and, if power is sent there, we never can develop and use our water as we want to use it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for another question—

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. In an exchange yesterday on the floor, I understood the Senator from Washington to say there was nothing in this proposed amendment which at all entered into the same field as that which was covered by the

proposed Columbia Valley Authority legislation, which has been subjected already to long hearings before the Public Works Committee, and which is still in hearing. I understood the Senator to say the Columbia Valley Administration legislation had to do wholly with administration and operation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder whether the Senator has read, on page 22 of the committee report, the words which I shall quote into the Record. In describing section 206 of the so-called O'Mahoney amendment, the committee stated as follows:

The provisions establishing the Columbia Basin account—

That is in the O'Mahoney amendment—

and the related pooling, rate-making, and pay-out provisions constitute the legal basis for the administrative, operating, and accounting procedures to meet the needs of the area described earlier in this report.

It seems to me that that part of the report makes it very clear that the committee understood its amendment, and so stated in the report, to cover at least in large part, the very field of operation and administration which the Senator from Washington stated yesterday to be reserved to the Columbia Valley Administration legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Florida must appreciate that there is no Columbia Valley Administration, and that this merely deals with a bookkeeping arrangement. The Senator may call it "bookkeeping" administration. It is part of the administrative duties. If and when the Columbia Valley Administration comes into being, it could accept this bookkeeping plan. If it were the law of the land, and not repealed by the Columbia Valley Administration Act, it would have to accept it. I am the author of the CVA bill. There is nothing in it which would interfere in any way with the system here attempted to be written into the law. It is purely a matter of management, and the Columbia Valley Administration, if it came into being, would administer it. It would keep the books of the basin account, and therefore this proposed amendment does not interfere with the CVA, or with the bill as introduced.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I remind him that one of the principle titles in the proposed Columbia Valley Administration bill has to do with the planning of the development.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The authority would not then be retained in Congress, but would be given to the CVA.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am calling the Senator's attention to the fact that if this amendment is adopted, one of the most important planning questions will have been forever and irrevocably settled and taken out of the hands of the CVA, namely, the question of whether they could take power revenue and use it for a reclamation development many miles away, not related geographically and, as a reclamation project, not sound on its

own bottom, and that decision, if it came by the adoption of this amendment, would almost take the heart out of the planning of the so-called Columbia Valley Administration which would be set up under the Senator's other bill. Is not that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, I cannot agree with the Senator. It might have that indirect, roundabout effect. But the Senator's question yesterday was whether this amendment affects the Columbia Valley Administration. It might have an effect on what the CVA could or could not do. If there is established a policy as to power revenues being used for reclamation, it may open the door for the CVA to plan more irrigation projects than it would ordinarily plan without the basin account. But it is an indirect effect or result, which may or may not occur. It need not be taken advantage of. There is nothing in the Columbia Valley Administration bill which says they must do so. Whatever the plan, the Columbia Valley Administration must come to Congress on each project, anyway.

Mr. President, I should like to finish my prepared statement on this matter, in order that the Record may be clear; after which I hope the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] will be in the Senate Chamber, so we may take some action on his amendment, which is pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to House bill 5422.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I may be repeating myself, but about an hour ago I was discussing the necessity of the basin account for a very important purpose, namely, uniform rate-making. I pointed out that kilowatts generated at the various dams on the Columbia River are so intermingled that it is most difficult to say for instance, at Portland, Oreg., whether the kilowatt that is used there comes from Grand Coulee, or Bonneville, or Seattle City Light, or any other dam. It is just as difficult as saying what portion of the river at Bonneville turns the generators to create the kilowatts, whether it comes from Idaho and belongs to my friend and his constituents in that area, or whether it comes from the State of Washington. Therefore, the necessity in the Columbia River Basin of uniformity of rates is very apparent.

This being the case, we must have a technique for averaging the costs of all the dams, if for no other purpose, for the purpose of rate-making; otherwise, the Pacific Northwest would be afflicted with a crazy-quilt pattern of varying power rates, which would militate against industrial, agricultural, and residential development.

At the present time we have a so-called postage stamp rate of \$17.50 per kilowatt. Because construction and operating costs have gone up, this rate will probably have to be raised but, irrespective of that fact, there must be, for practical reasons as well as for the more im-

portant other reasons I have mentioned, a uniform rate throughout the Columbia Basin. The testimony concerning the basin account is that, without it, there is a definite possibility that it may be necessary to raise the rate in the Pacific Northwest from the low postage-stamp rate of \$17.50 per kilowatt hour a year, while on the other hand, there is a strong possibility, if the basin account can be achieved and a uniform rate spread out for the area, the rate may not have to go above \$17.50. The Columbia Basin account authorized in this amendment provides, of course, as has been mentioned here many times, for the bookkeeping or accounting technique to be used in computing and maintaining a uniform rate.

There is a second compelling reason for establishing a basin account. We are dealing with a single river system, namely, the Columbia and its tributaries. The basin thus formed is really a series of plateaus and valleys, drained by the Flathead, Kootenai, Salmon, Snake, Willamette, and other tributaries, all flowing into the Columbia and on to the sea.

For many years, extending clear back to 1908, the Congress and the public have recognized the validity of using dollars earned by power to assist the irrigator in meeting those costs of reclaiming land beyond his reasonable ability to pay, were he to rely solely upon the income of his crops. The Congress and the country have likewise recognized that it is sound public policy to permit investment of Federal funds in irrigation features of a reclamation project, on an interest-free basis. Congress and the country also have recognized the validity of investing Federal funds in flood control projects on the Ohio, Mississippi, and other great rivers, not only on an interest-free but on a nonreimbursable basis.

In the case of irrigators, the Congress has said: "We will invest Federal funds in your project interest free, but you must pay back the principal. However, you may use power revenues, in the event you have power features connected with your project, to help pay these irrigation costs." Also, the Congress has said, "You must pay interest on funds we invest in the power features of your project, plus reimbursing the Treasury for the principal."

In other words, Congress has differentiated between funds invested in the land and funds invested in the power features. In the one case the money is reimbursable but interest free; in the other it is reimbursable with interest over a reasonable period of years.

There is one additional element we should have in mind. Reclamation law as it stands today permits the Secretary of the Interior to use the interest he collects on the power investment, through the power rate, to help repay those costs attributable to irrigation features, but assigned for repayment by power.

I can best illustrate by using a concrete example. As originally estimated, the total reimbursable construction cost of the Grand Coulee project was approximately \$486,000,000. Of this amount about \$315,000,000 is attributable to irrigation features. It was deter-

mined, however, that irrigators could reasonably be expected to pay only approximately \$87,000,000. The difference—about \$230,000,000—was assigned for repayment out of power revenues. The entire \$315,000,000 to be invested in irrigation features is interest free, but completely reimbursable—\$230,000,000 from power revenues.

Power features of this great project were estimated to cost about \$114,000,000. This investment is both reimbursable and interest bearing. The interest rate is 3 percent on unamortized balances.

The interest on this \$114,000,000, over the repayment period, was estimated at approximately \$70,000,000. Reclamation law, as it stands today, authorizes the Secretary of Interior to use that \$70,000,000 of interest, which he collects through the power rate, to apply against the \$230,000,000 of irrigation costs which were assigned to be repaid from power revenues.

Senators have heard much discussion about the so-called interest component. In the example I have just cited, the \$70,000,000 is the interest component. The \$70,000,000 is the interest collected through the power rate. The \$70,000,000 is the interest, over the pay-out period, on the \$114,000,000 invested in power features at Grand Coulee, and, as I said before, under present reclamation law, it can be applied as a credit against the \$255,000,000 of irrigation costs beyond the ability of water users to pay.

Let us go back now to the basin account. As I have already stated, all power revenues from all power-producing projects in the entire basin would be credited to this account. These revenues are produced by the sale of power at a rate fixed by the Secretary of the Interior sufficiently high to pay all reimbursable costs. Reimbursable costs include interest on the power investment. A small part of the rate charged by Bonneville Power Administration for the kilowatts it sells represents the interest component. Over the pay-out period, the \$70,000,000 I have mentioned will be collected in this manner and credited to the basin account.

The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that in the next 50 years—to the year 2000—the interest component, that is, the interest collected on power investments for existing and authorized projects in the Columbia Basin, will total \$716,000,000. The interest on the Federal investment in related transmission facilities will amount to an additional \$409,000,000. This produces a grand total by the year 2000 of \$1,125,000,000. This amount represents the accumulated interest component over a 50-year period. It represents the interest at 3 percent on the basin-wide power investment, collected from power users as a part of the power rate.

The dollars themselves, of course, will go into the Treasury. The fact that those dollars have been paid to the Treasury will be recorded on the credit side of the ledger, which we have called the basin account.

Five hundred and seventy-seven million dollars of the \$1,125,000,000 I have mentioned represents the interest paid on the investment in power features of

the Bureau of Reclamation projects, plus the investment in all transmission facilities in the basin. Under present reclamation law, this amount can be used by the Secretary of Interior as an offset against the irrigation costs allocated for repayment by power. If we are considering only the \$577,000,000, therefore, there would be no departure in this amendment. There would be no departure in the basin-account principle from existing reclamation law.

The amendment, however, and the basin account it creates proposes to treat all basin projects alike for accounting purposes. It proposes to consolidate all of them in the one account. It also proposes to permit the use of the interest component on all projects, irrespective of who builds them, in the same manner as is now permitted under reclamation law for Bureau of Reclamation projects. Thus, the approximately \$550,000,000 which would accumulate in the basin account by the year 2000 from projects constructed by Army engineers would become available for assistance to irrigation. In this respect, therefore, the proposed amendment deviates from existing law. It does not, however, deviate from the principle Congress has already approved for the Central Valley project in California and for the Missouri Basin project in the Midwest.

Again, I emphasize: by the year 2000 there will not be 1,125,000,000 actual dollars physically accumulated in the basin account. That account will simply be a historical and projected record of the amount of interest paid and to be paid on power investments. No project other than those we are now authorizing can come into the basin account without specific approval of the Congress. This provides an airtight safety valve against raids on the account by ill-advised, non-feasible projects.

The only way the interest component can be used is upon specific authorization of the Congress. If future Congresses authorize no additional projects for participation in the account, the account will simply show a greater excess of revenues over cost than would otherwise be the case, and it will simply show a greater credit balance than would be the case when and if additional projects are authorized.

I mentioned earlier that the Columbia Basin is a region embracing 7 percent of the total area of the United States; that in it are patches of irrigable land having all the ingredients of high productivity except an adequate water supply. Some of these irrigable acres are close to an existing or potential power plant, some of them are isolated. If the full agricultural potential of the basin is to be developed, some reasonable means must be found to overcome this accident of location.

The basin account is the technique we have devised to permit each of these potential projects to be considered strictly on its own merits. The basin account is the technique we have devised to overcome the handicap a particular patch of irrigable acres may experience as a result of the accident of geographical location. The basin account permits us to treat the Columbia River, its

tributaries, and the irrigable land lying therein as one big unit.

We are dealing here with the greatest hydroelectric power-producing stream in the world. The Columbia and its tributaries drain all or part of five States. The snow that falls on the Rockies in western Montana ultimately turns the turbines at Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams. The produce raised on the Missoula, Mont., project will find its way to the table of the Portland or Seattle housewife. In turn, the aluminum kitchen cabinet built in Olympia, Wash., may be sold to the farmer's wife on the Missoula project.

If the gates at Hells Canyon Dam in Idaho were closed completely, at the wrong time of year, to fill its 4,400,000 acre-feet of storage capacity, the power generated at Bonneville Dam would be drastically reduced, and some of the turbines might have to be cut off altogether. Likewise, if that storage were emptied at the wrong time of year, millions of dollars of flood damage would occur along the lower reaches of the Columbia from Portland to the sea, 500 and 600 miles away.

This is a single-river basin. Its unity should not be destroyed legislatively. That unity can be preserved through adoption of this amendment. The projects the amendment contains, plus the basin account, plus projects already included in H. R. 5472, represent a comprehensive development plan.

The President, the Secretary of Interior, Secretary of Army, Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, governors of the States involved, most Senators and Congressmen from the region, and innumerable organizations from the basin have endorsed the integrated, coordinated, comprehensive plan, which the Bureau and the Corps have developed. This amendment is the legislative vehicle for implementing that plan.

With the committee amendment added, this year's rivers and harbors bill, H. R. 5472, will represent, the most important action taken by any Congress for development of Pacific Northwest water resources. Congress will be providing 5,000,000 kilowatts of additional power, positive control of floods, water for 200,000 thousand acres additional land, and supplemental water for 100,000 acres, plus a basic framework for further basin-wide reclamation development of justifiable projects.

What will 5,000,000 kilowatts of new power mean to the Northwest and the Nation? Competent studies have shown that for each 100,000 kilowatts of new electric energy we can expect \$65,000,000 of new industrial investment, sustaining 10,000 people in direct, and 20,000 in indirect, employment, who with their families constitute an additional population of about 90,000 people.

For the Pacific Northwest and the Nation, therefore, this Congress has the opportunity, by enactment of this bill, to create the potential for three and one-quarter billion dollars of new industrial investment and one and one-half million new jobs, with 500,000 directly employed, and 1,000,000 in secondary employment. I repeat, this year's rivers and harbors bill, with the committee

amendment added, will represent the most significant action taken by any Congress relating to development of the Pacific Northwest water resources.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to place in the RECORD certain pertinent facts which pertain to the amendment and to the whole problem. I have headed this compilation of facts "Why committee amendment on the Columbia Basin should be included in H. R. 5472."

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

WHY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT ON THE COLUMBIA BASIN SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN H. R. 5472

The committee amendment to H. R. 5472, proposing authorization of certain projects in the Columbia Basin is in a category separate and apart from all other pending amendments. Three factors distinguish the committee amendment from the others:

First, it is an integral part of projects already in the bill:

Second, there was mutual understanding between Public Works and Interior and Insular Affairs Committees last fall that this amendment would be considered; and

Third, there is a long line of precedents for including reclamation projects in the rivers and harbors bill.

I would like to elaborate on each of these points in turn. The Public Works Committee reported H. R. 5472 on October 7. Contained in the bill are projects in the Columbia Basin, proposed for construction by Army engineers, with an ultimate estimated cost of over \$1,000,000,000. These projects, such as Libby, John Day, Priest Rapids, and the Dalles Dams are an integral and inseparable part of the so-called comprehensive plan for development of the Columbia and its tributaries.

The comprehensive plan for development of the Columbia Basin was developed jointly by the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation. The corps has jurisdiction over certain sections of it—the Bureau over others. To be truly comprehensive, both parts must be held together. To authorize one portion of the plan without the other does violence to the entire concept of comprehensive development.

I contend, therefore, that since a portion of this plan is already in the bill, it is only logical and proper that the remaining portion—that portion represented by the committee amendment also be included.

The facts I have just recited constitute the first and, perhaps, the most compelling reason for immediate and favorable consideration of the committee amendment.

There is a second set of factors which distinguish this from other amendments. Those factors are clearly set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in colloquy between the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Wyoming, and others of us interested in the Columbia Basin. Let me quote from the RECORD. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 11, page 14121, there appears the following exchange of comment:

"Mr. O'MAHONEY. Earlier today the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], chairman of the Committee on Public Works, submitted a report on House bill 5472. As that bill was considered by the Committee on Public Works, it contained a provision dealing with the authorization of certain reclamation projects in the Columbia River Basin. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had no opportunity to pass upon those recommended reclamation authorizations. The chairman of the Committee on Public Works was kind enough to call in members of the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with respect to the drafting of the bill in its

relation to reclamation projects. One of the members of the Committee on Public Works, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], raised the question, in the proceedings yesterday in the Committee on Public Works, with respect to these reclamation projects.

"I have had a conference with the senior Senator from New Mexico, and I desire the RECORD to show that I understand the understanding between the Public Works Committee and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to be that although the bill as reported does not contain any provision at all with respect to these reclamation authorizations, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is recognized as having the right to offer, as necessary, as part of the report and as a committee amendment, provisions dealing with that authorization. The reason for that, of course, is that the development of the Columbia River Basin is a joint operation by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The report by the Committee on Public Works is, as I understand, not to be considered as excluding the consideration of reclamation authorizations.

"I am announcing to members of the committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that this matter will be laid before the committee at its regular session on Monday next, when the committee, if it so desires, may take action with respect to the reclamation authorization.

"I ask the Senator from New Mexico whether I have correctly stated the understanding.

"Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The Senator from Wyoming has correctly stated the understanding.

"Mr. President, the Committee on Public Works of the Senate wanted to include the items of the Reclamation Service, but it happened that one member of the committee also belonged to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and he had some doubt whether the latter committee would be willing; so, if they do not mind, it is all right with us.

"Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is all right, also, with us."

On October 17, the Senate considered the rivers and harbors bill, H. R. 5472, approved all committee amendments, plus some proposed from the floor. At the conclusion of this action, there was considerable discussion of procedure—discussion participated in by the senior Senator from Illinois, the junior Senator from Nevada, the senior Senator from Wyoming, the senior Senator from Georgia, and myself. That discussion will be found on page 14743 of the October 17, 1949, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 11. I will not quote all of that colloquy. The final statement by the senior Senator from Wyoming, however, is pertinent to the problem we are now discussing:

"Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am going to ask that the bill go over, but in doing so I want it clearly understood that I am not making any objection to the rivers and harbors items which are in the bill. The bill, as reported by the committee, contains provisions for certain Army engineer works in the Columbia River Basin. These works are part of a comprehensive plan worked out by the Bureau of Reclamation as well as the Army engineers. The plan ought to be maintained as a unit. It would be a great mistake, it seems to me, to divide it, and because of the desirability of preserving unity in the construction as well as in the consideration, and because of the impossibility at this time of going into the details of certain power construction as well as reclamation construction that is desirable, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has generally felt that the matter ought to go over. And so, Mr. President, with that explanatory remark, I ask that the bill go over."

It is eminently clear from the statements I have quoted that there was a gentleman's agreement between the senior Senator from Wyoming and the senior Senator from New Mexico, and myself and others that a Columbia Basin amendment would be considered before final passage of H. R. 5472. It is likewise clear that the Senate Public Works Committee recognized that jurisdiction over the reclamation phase of the so-called comprehensive plan lies in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. In effect, the Public Works Committee said: "The Department of Interior's proposal for development of the Columbia Basin is in your bailiwick; you go ahead and hold hearings, consider the proposition, and we will accept your best judgment as to an appropriate amendment."

Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has held hearings, an amendment has been reported, the committee amendment is substantially the same amendment recommended by Bureau of Budget. Its consideration at this time is completely consistent with the understanding we have had since last October. Incidentally it should be pointed out that the Senate Public Works Committee took considerable testimony on both phases of the comprehensive plan. The committee had before it several bills, including the Magnuson bill, S. 2189, calling for authorization of the comprehensive plan. I testified on this proposal, the junior Senator from Oregon testified, as did the junior Senator from Washington. A representative of the Corps of Engineers commented on the over-all plan. Similar procedure was followed in the House. This development program, embraced in this amendment, therefore, is not new or strange to the Public Works Committee.

I reiterate, because there was a gentleman's agreement on this subject and because the committee amendment now before us is consonant with that agreement, I hope the Senate will accept the committee language, thereby retaining unity of the comprehensive plan.

There is a third reason why this is an appropriate amendment to H. R. 5472. I thought it would be interesting to compile for the Senate a list of reclamation projects and related works which have been authorized in past rivers and harbors bills. The list goes back as far as 1925. I will be glad to place the list in the RECORD, or make it available to any interested Senator.

There are over 150 projects on the list—reclamation projects authorized in rivers and harbors bills. For example, Grand Coulee Dam itself was authorized in the 1935 rivers and harbors bill. Parker Dam in Colorado and Headgate lock dam in Arizona were authorized in the same bill. The Central Valley project was authorized as a Bureau of Reclamation project in the 1937 River and Harbor Act and reauthorized in the 1940 act. The great program for development of the Missouri Basin was given congressional stamp of approval in the 1944 Flood Control Act.

The first paragraph of the authorizing language is very interesting. It reads: "The general comprehensive plans set forth in House Document No. 475 and Senate Document No. 171, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as revised and coordinated by Senate Document No. 247, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, are hereby approved and the initial steps recommended are hereby authorized and shall be prosecuted by the War Department and the Department of the Interior, as speedily as may be consistent with budgetary requirements."

The important words in that language are "comprehensive plans" and the words "as revised and coordinated." That is precisely what we are talking about in this discussion on the committee amendment. We have a comprehensive plan, it has been revised and coordinated by the two agencies—now we

want it authorized as a unit, in the same manner as was the Missouri Basin program.

There is another project that deserves mention. The 1948 Flood Control Act authorized the Rio Grande project. Here again, is a comprehensive plan, developed and coordinated by the Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers, and here again the authorizing language recognizes the essential unity of the plan. The language reads: "The comprehensive plan of the Rio Grande Basin, as set forth in the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 5, 1948, and in the report of Bureau of Reclamation, dated November 21, 1947, all in substantial accord with the agreement approved by the Secretary of the Army and Acting Secretary of the Interior, on November 21, 1947, is hereby approved, etc."

In summary, there are three compelling reasons why the committee amendment should be added to the rivers and harbors and flood control bill. First, it is an inseparable part of a comprehensive plan—a portion of which is already included in the bill. Second, it is consistent with the general understanding that the committees and the Senate have had on the subject. Third, it is on all fours with other comprehensive plans I have just mentioned—plans authorized in rivers and harbors and flood control acts.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like also to place in the RECORD a letter from Dr. Paul J. Raver, the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, addressed to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], which explains in greater detail the so-called Watkins proposal in the amendment.

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

UNITED STATES

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Committee on Interior and Insular
Affairs, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This is in answer to your inquiry with regard to the intent, application, and meaning of the last sentence in subsection 206E, page 8, lines 22 through 25, and page 9, lines 1, 2, and 3, of the proposed amendments on H. R. 5472. This sentence states "Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preclude interconnections with power marketing areas adjacent to the above-described area, for the purpose of delivery of surplus energy on an off-peak, emergency, or temporary basis, or for the exchange of power and energy, including the exchange of power or energy for water or storage of water." Your inquiry relates particularly to the words "including the exchange of power or energy for water or storage of water."

This phrase can have no application to outside areas within the United States, such as eastern Montana, Utah, or California because of the physical difficulties involved in diverting such outside water into the Pacific Northwest area. However, the phrase does have a definite place in this bill because of its application to that portion of the Columbia Basin which lies in Canada. The marketing area as stated in subsection 206E excludes Canada, and the Bonneville Power Administration may find it profitable to exchange energy for water or storage of water in Canada, which water can be used to generate power at Columbia River plants in the United States. The Bonneville Power Administration is now exchanging energy with the Washington Water Power Co. for the storage of water in Canada by the Washington Water Power Co. and the release of that storage water for maximum energy of power at Grand Coulee and Bonneville. We do

construe the exchange authorization in the Bonneville Act as including authority for exchange of power for water or storage of water, but believe it desirable that this express authorization be included in the River and Harbor Act, to support that construction.

At the present time we have under consideration proposals for storage of water at Arrow Lakes in British Columbia which may well follow this same pattern, particularly if no power facilities are installed at the dam at the lower end of Arrow Lakes.

Since this particular situation has not been referred to in any previous testimony and does not appear anywhere in the record, may I respectfully suggest that the intent and application of this wording as outlined herein be made a part of the record for the purpose of clarification.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL J. RAVER,
Administrator.

By JOHN D. DAVIS,
Manager, Washington, D. C., Office.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has been trying to get the floor, and earlier in the day I was perfectly willing that he should have the floor. However, the pending question before the the Senate is the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, which strikes out one of the projects in the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; but the Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, after the amendment to the amendment is disposed of, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] expects to submit a substitute amendment. In the meantime I shall try to do what I suggested to the Senator from New Mexico.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KEM obtained the floor.

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

Mr. KEM. For what purpose?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. So that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

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

Cain	Graham	McKellar
Chapman	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Chavez	Holland	Martin
Cordon	Jenner	Schoeppel
Darby	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Donnell	Kem	Stennis
Douglas	Kerr	Watkins
Dworshak	Knowland	Wherry
Eaton	Lehman	
Ferguson	McClellan	

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw the call for a quorum.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am going to object to the request. I know it is presented in the very best of faith and from the best of motives, but I should

like to make two comments. First, I am very anxious that a quorum of Senators, if possible all Senators, be present to hear the address of my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri. In the second place, I think it is a decidedly bad practice that has grown up in the Senate, of a quorum call being instituted, and those of us who come to the Senate in order to respond to our names, possibly inconveniencing ourselves, perhaps interrupting other business, finding after we arrive that there is a failure to proceed with the quorum call. For these two reasons, Mr. President, I most respectfully object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NEELY, Mr. O'CONNOR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WITHERS answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Missouri may proceed.

DARKEST PAGE IN KANSAS CITY'S HISTORY

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, thus spoke the prophet Ezekiel 600 years before Christ:

The land is filled with blood, and the city is filled with perverseness.

Mr. President, I speak not in anger. I speak in sorrow. Today the words of the prophet may be applied to our beloved country, and with a truth and an accuracy which I solemnly deplore, to Kansas City, Mo., my home, and the home of my family for many years.

The wave of crime that is sweeping through many of the cities of the Nation is a cause for alarm. Our churches are aroused. Families are frightened—and for good cause. Members of the United States Senate have expressed grave concern. In Kansas City, Mo., 21 murders have gone unsolved, and their perpetrators unpunished—all in the past 3 years.

By reason of their number, their frequency, and their enormity, surely these crimes, Mr. President, have not become innocent and even respectable.

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

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I prefer to yield at the conclusion of my prepared remarks. I shall be glad to yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania, and I invite his inquiries at that time.

Mr. MARTIN. I simply wanted to verify the statement as to the number of unsolved crimes.

Mr. KEM. The statement I made, Mr. President, was that 21 murders have gone unsolved in Kansas City, Mo., in the past 3 years.

It has been said the greatest incitement to crime is the hope of escaping punishment. If this is so, the record shows that there has been plenty of incitement to crime in Kansas City during the past 3 years. The hope of escaping punishment has become a practical certainty.

In the catalog of wrongdoing in my home city, one crime stands out in its dreadful implications. This evil thing breeds other crimes galore. It is a starting point. Its portents for the future challenge our attention.

THE THEFT OF THE BALLOTS

In the primary election of 1946, President Truman undertook to purge the Democratic Representative then representing the Fifth Congressional District, the Honorable Roger C. Slaughter. The purge was successful according to the returns as reported. The defeat of Mr. Slaughter in the primary was accomplished. The Pendergast machine delivered solidly for the Truman-Pendergast backed candidate, Enos Axtell. It then developed that the defeat of Mr. Slaughter in the Democratic primary had been brought about through widespread vote frauds. The ballots were not counted as cast. For these crimes against society, 71 persons were indicted by the county grand jury. The ballots, the evidence in these cases, were then impounded in the office of the board of election commissioners. On the night of May 27, 1947, the safe containing this evidence was blown open. The evidence was hauled away, never to be seen again. The theft of the ballots on May 27, 1947, has been called the darkest page in Kansas City's history.

On Tuesday, April 4, last, I wrote to the Attorney General of the United States a letter asking him to be good enough to advise me what progress was being made in the investigation of the theft of the ballots. Yesterday I received from the Attorney General a letter which reads as follows. The letter is addressed to me.

APRIL 10, 1950.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of April 4, 1950, requesting information as to the status of the investigation of the theft of certain ballots cast in the 1946 primary election in Kansas City, Mo., which were taken in May 1947 from a vault in the Jackson County courthouse where they were being held in the custody of State officials.

As you know, the general subject of this primary election was intensively investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. From the standpoint of time, money, and manpower expended, it was an extremely large-scale investigation. It included an exhaustive inquiry into the ballot theft even though Federal jurisdiction over such a taking from State custody was doubtful.

The Government was unsuccessful, despite its concentrated efforts, in establishing the identity of those implicated in the theft of the ballots. The investigation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, however, has at all times remained on an active basis and

is still continuing. In the event that evidence establishing the commission of a Federal offense by any individuals is obtained, you may be assured that the Department will take immediate and appropriate action.

I can advise you that the Federal Bureau of Investigation was given complete authority to conduct a full investigation in this matter.

Sincerely,

J. HOWARD McGRATH,
Attorney General.

Mr. President, on Wednesday, April 5—the day following my letter to the Attorney General—I made a public statement. In the evening of the same day Charles Binaggio, dominant figure in Kansas City politics, and his companion, Charles Gargotta, were found dead in the First Ward Democratic Club with bullets through their heads.

Both Binaggio and Gargotta were formerly allied with the Pendergast machine. More recently Binaggio has operated his own political organization in opposition to that of Pendergast. However, in 1946, at the time of the Slaughter-Axtell primary election, Binaggio and Gargotta were part and parcel of the Pendergast organization. In the primary election of 1946 the so-called Binaggio wards delivered heavy majorities for the Truman-Pendergast backed candidate.

It is true that every unpunished murder takes away something from the security of every man's life. Then, surely, every conspiracy to deprive a fellow citizen of the right to vote takes away something from the security of the Republic.

On February 13, 1950, the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, in a speech to the Federal district attorneys said:

We hold one of the most sacred rights to be the right to vote according to one's convictions, and the corresponding right is the fair and honest counting of these votes.

I have nothing but utter contempt for a man who accepts a public office stolen at the ballot box.

Communism cannot survive where honest elections exist not only in this country but in any country.

I believe that every Member of the Senate will concur in this ringing declaration.

The theft of the ballots is a crime that strikes at the very foundation of law and order. It challenges the security of our way of life. Is this crime to go unwhipped of justice? Is it to go to the file marked unsolved?

On May 27 the statute of limitations will bar prosecution by the United States for this crime. After that date the President of the United States, the Attorney General, and the Department of Justice will be powerless to act. Do they wish this final date to transpire with nothing whatever accomplished by then?

It is an act of outrageous violence which strikes at the very roots of our free institutions. Why should it go unpunished?

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THE BALLOTS WERE
STOLEN

Mr. President, you will recall that Emerson once said:

Commit a crime, and it seems as if a coat of snow fell on the ground, such as reveals in

the woods the track of every partridge and fox and squirrel and mole.

Have conditions in America changed so greatly since Emerson's time that all the trained investigators of the Government, with the benefit of modern, scientific equipment, cannot discover the perpetrators of a crime committed under the unusual circumstances which I am about to relate?

Mr. President, the conditions under which the ballots constituting the evidence were stolen in Kansas City on May 27, 1947, are as follows:

First. A safe was blown open in a courthouse located in the downtown area of a large city.

Second. In that same courthouse was located the office of the sheriff, where a deputy is presumably on duty at all times.

Third. That courthouse was located across the street from the city police department.

Fourth. The sizable number of ballots stolen necessitated the use of a truck or some other large conveyance.

Fifth. The President of the United States was sleeping only five blocks away, and it is reasonable to assume that the downtown area was covered by the Secret Service.

Sixth. A large number of individuals, many of them members of the Pendergast machine with which the President of the United States is affiliated, were involved in the evidence that was carted away.

Mr. President, is this a perfect crime? If so, why?

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

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to yield until I conclude my remarks. At that time I shall invite the inquiries of the very able Senator from Michigan.

AN ALLIANCE OF POLITICS AND CRIME

Mr. President, if there is chicken stealing in a community beyond endurance, the people do not try to put a guard on every hen house. They do the simple thing: They hunt out the den of the fox.

The fox's den in Kansas City is an indescribably corrupt political system. It is an unholy alliance, a wicked combination of politics and crime.

In 1936, a similar situation existed in Kansas City. In the office of the United States district attorney there happened to be an honest, resolute, courageous man. His name was Maurice M. Milligan. He decided to do something for Kansas City. He decided to clean up the corrupt political situation. He was given the green light by the President of the United States, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. Attorney General Frank Murphy encouraged him. The Attorney General promised to him and delivered to him real cooperation. As a result, some 250 members of the Pendergast machine were convicted and were committed to penitentiaries, jails, and houses of correction throughout the land. Tom Pendergast, the big boss, entered the Leavenworth Penitentiary.

When the ballots were stolen in 1947 with impunity, this was widely interpreted as evidence of the development of a new efficient, working partnership

between crime and politics. The spectacular success of this major assault upon the rights of the people provided an incentive for more and more crime. Since the theft of the ballots in 1947, the crime wave in Kansas City has gained steadily. As has been said, 21 murders in the last 3 years are still unsolved. The recent bloody killing of Binaggio and Gargotta are not to be considered as an isolated crime. They are merely the most recent manifestation of the close liaison between politics and the underworld in Kansas City. The Federal authorities have been flouted. At the time they were killed, Binaggio and Gargotta were both under subpoena before a Federal grand jury. They had testified and were under subpoena to testify again. They were the latest addition to a group of five persons under subpoena of a Federal grand jury to meet violent death in Kansas City within the last 6 months. It is little wonder that we are told that respect and confidence of the people for the laws of the United States have dropped to an all-time low.

The present crime wave in Kansas City can be stopped. It is no different from its predecessor. It is due to the same obnoxious cause, the same mixture of politics and crime. The situation can be righted again, and in the same way.

The question is, Does the President, does the Attorney General, does the district attorney want the present situation in Kansas City to continue?

The theft of the ballots is a key case. Surely if an adequate effort is made, the perpetrators of this foul crime can be brought to justice. The performance of the Government in this key case will be considered as an indication of the willingness of the Truman administration to come to grips with the deplorable situation existing in Kansas City. It will show whether it is willing to hew to the line and let the chips fall where they may.

In accordance with the separation of powers created by the Constitution, the Congress has no power to enforce the laws of the United States. That is the duty and the responsibility of the President.

The people of the United States have a right to expect that the laws of the United States will be enforced, without fear or favor, in every part of the United States. Obviously this is not being done.

I may suggest to my fellow Members of the Senate that what has happened in my own city of Kansas City may, and can, happen in theirs. The blood-bath which Kansas City is now being forced to endure may spread to other cities, if indeed it has not already done so.

If the President, the Attorney General, and the district attorney really mean business, let them get busy and bring about the return of indictments in the theft of the ballots. Let them act before their power to do so is taken from them by limitations. By their works, and not by their words, we shall know them.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator mentioned the theft of ballots. I should like to preface my question with a brief statement. The statement the Senator makes about the unsolved murders in Kansas City presents an appalling situation, a situation which is a disgrace to the United States. But I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri whether the ballot thefts have been solved.

Mr. KEM. I have read into the Record a letter from the Attorney General of the United States, written to me under date of April 10, 1950, in which he says the Government, despite its concentrated efforts, has been unsuccessful in establishing the identity of those implicated in the theft of the ballots.

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

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MARTIN. The unsolved murders, as I stated a moment ago, are appalling, but the theft of ballots, under the circumstances, to me seems to be much more dangerous than even the murders. The Republic of America depends upon clean and fair elections. We have noted in the press within the past few days reports of elections in Europe in which men were elected almost by unanimous vote. That is dictatorship. But if we cannot have fair elections in America, it seems to me almost to mark the end of the Republic. While the distinguished Senator from Missouri and all other Members of the Congress of the United States are not charged with the enforcement of the law, does it not seem to the Senator, nevertheless, that we have an obligation to the Republic to start an investigation to ferret out the perpetrators of the ballot thefts, and likewise to ferret out the dishonest and awful things concerning the election?

Mr. KEM. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. But I think the responsibility is primarily that of the President of the United States. As Chief Magistrate of the Nation, he is charged with the duty of enforcing the laws of the United States throughout the land. He is equipped with a great Department of Justice and with a very large and able Bureau of Investigation. I have outlined the conditions under which the crime occurred, and it seems to me that under those circumstances it should be possible to bring to justice the persons responsible.

Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. KEM. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Missouri one question. He has mentioned the work which had been done by the former United States attorney, Milligan by name, I believe. In view of the outstanding record made by the United States attorney, who conducted the prosecutions under the circumstances outlined by the Senator, can the Senator

advise the Senate whether Mr. Milligan was commended for his work and promoted, whether the United States attorney is still functioning in the Government, and whether he was reappointed at the expiration of his term?

Mr. KEM. When his first term expired, his reappointment was opposed on the floor of the United States Senate by Mr. Truman, then a Senator from Missouri, now the President of the United States. Senator Truman's opposition to the reappointment of Mr. Milligan on that occasion was unsuccessful. Notwithstanding the opposition of Senator Truman, President Roosevelt reappointed Mr. Milligan for a second term. I am told that when his second term expired, he was a candidate for reappointment. At that time Mr. Truman had become Vice President of the United States. Mr. Milligan was not reappointed. He is now in private life.

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

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator if the crimes about which he has been speaking are violations of the State laws of Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I think they are. Many of them are also violations of the laws of the United States. Here in the Senate of the United States we are primarily concerned with the carrying out of the laws of the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. Have the State law enforcement agencies of the Senator's State broken down?

Mr. KEM. I shall read to the Senator a news report appearing in the Kansas City Star of April 6, 1950, which reads as follows:

Gov. Forrest Smith today called on four law-enforcement agencies to end gang killings in Kansas City.

The Governor issued his statement as a result of the slayings of Charles Binaggio and Charles Gargotta in that city early today.

The Governor sent telegrams to J. L. Milligan, president of the Kansas City Police Force, and to L. B. Boardman, special agent in charge of the FBI in Kansas City.

He also ordered Col. Davis Harrison, head of the highway patrol, to Kansas City, to take direct personal charge of the case under his, the Governor's direction.

In addition, he said he would ask, J. E. Taylor, attorney general, to assist in whatever way is necessary. Taylor said he would drive to Kansas City this afternoon.

Then the dispatch contains this significant statement:

(The Governor took identical action a year ago last month when Wolf Rimann was slain. Nothing happened.)

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

Mr. KEM. I want to answer the distinguished Senator from Arizona in a little more detail. The Senator may perhaps be interested in the fact that on the day after the murders the following Associated Press dispatch came from Jefferson City, the capital of the State of Missouri:

JEFFERSON CITY, April 6.—J. E. Taylor, attorney general, today called Gov. Forrest Smith a "damn liar."

It came about this way:

At his morning press conference, the Governor said he had not been able to get in touch with the attorney general regarding the slaying in Kansas City of Charles Binaggio and Charles Gargotta.

Taylor, discussing with newsmen the Governor's remark about his availability, said: "He's a damn liar, and you can quote me. 'I've been available since 7 a. m. this morning. I've been talking to my assistants, and the Governor could have reached me, too.'"

His remark was made after the Governor had sent a letter by messenger asking him to assist in the slaying investigation.

In a later dispatch in the Kansas City Star it is said:

J. E. Taylor, attorney general, issued a statement here last night to clarify a remark he made yesterday in Jefferson City regarding his availability when Gov. Forrest Smith sought to get in touch with him in connection with the slaying of Charles Binaggio and Charles Gargotta.

Taylor was quoted as calling the Governor a "damn liar." This had been misconstrued as referring to the Governor, he said, when in reality he had meant the report that he had not been available. The attorney general's statement last night:

"The Associated Press carried a story today (Thursday) quoting me as calling the Governor a 'damn liar.' This is not true. A newspaper correspondent told me that Governor Smith stated at his morning press conference that he had been trying to reach me all morning, but that I was not available.

"I made the unfortunate statement that that was a 'damn lie,' as I had been working and available since 7 o'clock in the morning. I later learned the Governor did not make the statement, but merely said he had not yet reached me. I regret the incident greatly."

Taylor said he also telegraphed Governor Smith this apology:

"Story in newspapers is not true. I am giving statement to newspapers to correct story. I sincerely regret this statement."

In other words, to be fair, the attorney general now says his statement was that it was a damned lie and that he did not say the Governor was a damned liar. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not particularly interested in what newspapers may report or editorialize about the crime situation in the State of the distinguished Senator. I am, however, interested in hearing the actual facts about crime in Missouri. The police powers are vested in the States by the Constitution of the United States, and the law-enforcement officials are elected by the States and the responsibility for executing the laws within the States is vested in them. I should like to know whether the distinguished Senator from Missouri is of the opinion that the laws of his State have been broken because of the lack of local enforcement?

Mr. KEM. Let me read to the Senator several—

Mr. McFARLAND. I would much rather have the Senator's opinion, if he will give it to the Senate.

Mr. KEM. I have not been in my native State for several months. I can quote to the Senator statements made by distinguished citizens who have been on the ground.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not interested in reports of others. I should like very much to have the Senator answer

my question. The Senator can read whatever he cares to, of course—

Mr. KEM. I shall. Whether the Senator from Arizona is interested or not, perhaps some other Senators may be interested.

Mr. McFARLAND. That may be; but I should appreciate it if the Senator would answer my question.

Mr. KEM. I should like to read what a noted rabbi, who is a great civic as well as religious leader in Kansas City, had to say a few days ago:

Dr. Samuel S. Mayerberg, rabbi of Congregation B'nai Jehudah, last night bitterly protested the laxity which has allowed Kansas City to be open to the shame of the Nation for its gambling and gangster affairs.

In an unscheduled talk just prior to the close of a youth service on the final night of Passover, the rabbi laid the blame at the door of the Governor. Scheduled to give the final prayer, Rabbi Mayerberg said:

"I cannot invoke a blessing for this festival of freedom for which the message is 'No freedom without law, without moral law,' without a comment on certain conditions."

THE LAW NOT UPHELD

"I feel it imperative to say an unmistakable word against violations of law. This week our community again was besmirched by those who turn liberty to license without law.

"We protest conditions allowing that, and the immunity which permits such gangster acts. Throughout the country and the world headlines proclaimed another story of the shame of Kansas City.

"We should say the shame of Jackson County, or more the shame of the State, because the law-enforcement agencies of Kansas City are governed by the State.

"If our courageous and nonpartisan city government had that authority, I believe it would not be a city in which such things could occur.

"I question the Governor, who in the face of this crime turned to the Federal Government, the attorney general, and the sheriff and demanded those who perpetrated it be caught and punished.

"It is too late after the crime. The Governor should before the crime keep the community free of such conditions."

Dr. Mayerberg commented that there has been one series of such crimes after another.

ACCUSES POLICE BOARD

"We should say to the police commissioners, 'You are at fault,'" he charged. "We want to know of the Governor who is tying the hands of the police chief so he cannot clean out his police force.

"Why is that denied and why are conditions allowed to exist that permit men to inform gamblers and gangsters when a raid is to be made?

"Then, too, there are officials of the county. What have they been doing? How can they answer questions when they cannot stop the theft of ballots in their own building?

"We challenge the officials of the county and State to make Kansas City a safe place for freedom. We call on them to break this alliance between forces of law and the underworld, to eradicate from the proud name of this community a blemish."

Youth members of the congregation were in charge of the religious service which preceded Dr. Mayerberg's charges.

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

Mr. KEM. I should prefer to continue answering the very pertinent question of the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Of course there is a primary obligation on the part of State authorities to en-

force the laws of the States, but there is a corresponding, complementary, and supplementary obligation on the part of the President of the United States to enforce the laws of the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KEM. In a moment. On several occasions, when crimes have occurred, officials of the Department of Justice have been very coy about moving in on the situation. They have stated in no uncertain terms that there was no Federal jurisdiction. That occurred at the time of the vote frauds in 1946. The Attorney General was called before a committee presided over by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], when the letter he had written to the FBI ordering that agency to make only a limited investigation was produced, notwithstanding the fact that the then Attorney General of the United States had stated that a full and complete investigation had been made. When that occurred, the then Attorney General announced that the Federal Government would pursue the matter and would enter the case, I think he said. As a result, we subsequently saw a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States arguing in court that there was Federal jurisdiction, against the contention of the same vote-fraud defendants that there was no Federal jurisdiction.

The United States district court held that there was Federal jurisdiction in those cases. The case of two of the convicted defendants was appealed to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. That court disposed of the matter very promptly and in no uncertain language. It held that the right to vote at a Missouri primary election for nomination of candidates for Congress, and to have such votes counted as cast, was secured by the Constitution within the criminal code, penalizing a conspiracy to injure any citizen in the free exercise of his rights.

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

Mr. KEM. Not yet, if the Senator will bear with me. The conviction of these vote-fraud defendants was affirmed. While the Attorney General of the United States was before the Ferguson committee, a telegram was brought into the committee room announcing that the ballots, the principal evidence in the vote-fraud cases, had been stolen. It stated that the safe in the office of the board of election commissioners had been broken open and the ballots had been stolen. Following that dramatic episode, the Attorney General of the United States announced that a full and complete investigation would be made by the United States of the theft of the ballots involving the election of a Member of Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. KEM. Not yet, please. Following that development, the FBI did make an investigation, and I have just read into the RECORD a recent letter from the present Attorney General of the United States to the effect that the investigation has been very detailed, and giving me,

and through me the Senate and the country at large, the assurance that in the event evidence establishing the commission of a Federal offense by any individual is obtained, "you may be assured the Department will take immediate and prompt action."

Mr. President, so much for the theft of the ballots. I should like to answer the Senator's question with reference to the case of the killings of Charles Binaggio and Charles Gargotta.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he gets to that question?

Mr. KEM. No; not yet, please.

I have before me a press dispatch from Key West, Fla., where the President of the United States was sojourning until recently. It makes some reference to the subject. I quote from an article which appeared in the Kansas City Star as a dispatch from Washington, dated April 7. It reads in part as follows:

In the seclusion of his Florida retreat, the President today side-stepped the Binaggio-Garotta killings by instructing a spokesman to say he had no concern in the case, that he was not in any way associated with Binaggio.

Let me state a portion again, Mr. President: He instructed "a spokesman to say that he had no concern in the case, that he was not in any way associated with Binaggio."

Is the inference to be drawn that the President would be interested only in the event that the person who was killed was his friend?

Let us see whether or not a Federal offense was committed in the slaying of Binaggio and Gargotta. As I have said, they were slain in the interval between two appearances as witnesses before a grand jury of the United States district court. They both had testified, and they were still under subpoena. They were excused and told to come back to give further testimony. Their death occurred in the interval. I suppose there is no lawyer who would think that the Government of the United States did not have a right to protect the safety and person of witnesses before a grand jury in a United States district court. If his legal instinct led him to that conclusion, he would be exactly right, because the matter is covered by statute.

I read from section 1503 of the United States Code, 1946 edition, supplement 3, chapter 73, under title 18, entitled, "Crimes and Criminal Procedure":

Influencing or injuring officer, juror, or witness generally.

Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, endeavors to influence, intimidate, or impede any witness, in any court of the United States or before any United States commissioner or other committing magistrate, or any grand or petit juror, or officer in or of any court of the United States, or officer who may be serving at any examination or other proceeding before any United States commissioner or other committing magistrate, in the discharge of his duty, or injures any party or witness in his person or property on account of his attending or having attended such court or examination before such officer, commissioner, or other committing magistrate, or on account of his testifying or having testified to any matter pending therein, or injures any such grand or petit

juror in his person or property on account of any verdict or indictment assented to by him, or on account of his being or having been such juror, or injures any such officer, commissioner, or other committing magistrate in his person or property on account of the performance of his official duties, or corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

I think the Senator from Arizona will agree with me that a witness who is killed is impeded. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that I have never convicted anyone on the basis of second-hand evidence such as may be found in newspaper stories. I do not know why the citizens in the Senator's State were killed. I have no evidence before me. On the basis of newspaper reports I would not want to say that they were killed because they were witnesses before a grand jury. But I do know that murder is an intrastate crime and that prosecution for murder lies with local enforcement officials. I cannot understand how it can be argued in law that Federal officials should step in, usurp the police powers of the State, and prosecute homicide. A Federal grand jury, the distinguished Senator himself says, is at this very moment sitting and I presume studying violations that may come properly within the purview of Federal powers.

Mr. KEM. Did the Senator—

Mr. McFARLAND. May I complete my statement?

Mr. KEM. May I interject a remark? The Senator may speak on his own time. I should like to be heard to say that I have failed to make myself clear if the Senator understood me to say that I thought Binaggio and Gargotta were killed because they were witnesses. I do not know whether they were killed for that reason, or for some other reason. I said they were killed when they were under subpoena as witnesses before a grand jury.

Mr. McFARLAND. The distinguished Senator will admit that that does not prove the reason for their being killed?

Mr. KEM. Certainly not. The reason they were killed is not a necessary jurisdictional fact.

Mr. McFARLAND. The point that I should like to make is that the Senator has freely admitted that his own State laws were violated. Perhaps Federal laws have been violated, too. I do not know. A Federal grand jury is studying that problem. The distinguished Senator from Missouri has not said anything about law enforcement in his State. If the distinguished Senator will say to the Senate of the United States—and this was the reason for my question—that the enforcement of laws in his State has broken down to the point that the State is unable to handle the police power given to them under the Constitution of the United States, it may be time that the

Federal law-enforcement officials be asked to aid. However, until the Senator does tell us clearly and unequivocally that State law enforcement has broken down I am inclined to think that there might be just a little bit of politics in his speech.

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

Mr. KEM. No, sir, not just yet; I prefer to answer the Senator from Arizona more fully. The Senator has been, let us say, unkind enough to suggest that there is some politics in what the Senator from Missouri has had to say. Let me say to the Senator from Arizona, and to the Senate, that if there is politics in insisting that ballots in an election be counted as they are cast, the Senator from Missouri has been guilty of politics. However, let me say further to the Senator from Arizona that, notwithstanding his animadversion, I do not recant a single word I have said.

Mr. CAIN and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. KEM. I yield first to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I thought I understood the distinguished Senator from Missouri earlier in the afternoon to say that Gov. Forrest Smith, of Missouri, has recently, in connection with these two murders, requested assistance from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I wonder if my understanding of what the Senator said was correct.

Mr. KEM. I do not recall.

Mr. CAIN. I thought the Senator from Missouri said that among those law enforcement agencies written to, or from whom help was sought, was the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Washington is probably correct. I notice in the dispatch from Jefferson City, under date of April 6, from the Kansas City Star, from which I read, it is said:

The Governor sent telegrams * * * to L. V. Boardman, special agent in charge of the FBI in Kansas City.

So I assume from that we may conclude that the Governor did request the assistance of the FBI.

Mr. CAIN. It comes to my mind, because of a comment made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona a few minutes ago, to inquire of the Senator what are the politics of the present Governor of Missouri? Is he a Republican or a Democrat?

Mr. KEM. The present Governor of Missouri is a Democrat.

Mr. CAIN. The present Governor of Missouri, a Democrat—and we assume a conscientious, patriotic, loyal American—has thought it proper to request the Federal Government to give assistance to Kansas City in its hour of need, which, as I have understood up to this moment, is precisely what the distinguished Senator from Missouri has been urging before the Senate of the United States.

Mr. KEM. Exactly. I am sorry that the Senator from Arizona has seen fit to inject a political note into the discussion, because, Mr. President, when bullets

are flying, it does not make any difference whether one is a Democrat or a Republican.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. DONNELL. First, I commend most highly my distinguished colleague for his able, illuminating and challenging address. Some of his language recalls the ringing declaration of the late lamented Herbert S. Hadley, the first Republican Governor elected for 40 years in the State of Missouri, elected, as he was, in 1908. He said:

Every voter, strong or weak, rich or poor, black or white, has the right to cast one ballot, and have that ballot counted as cast.

Mr. President, the Senator referred to one or two matters which cause me to ask him a question or two, if I may.

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator referred to the unholy combination of politics and crime in Kansas City, and also stated his view that the crime wave can be stopped in Kansas City. I ask the Senator, Does he not think it strongly advisable that there shall be not only prompt, but thorough and searching, investigation by the Senate of whether organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce in furtherance of transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the crimes occur.

Mr. KEM. I certainly do, and I think it is very timely for the Senate of the United States to direct its attention to such investigation. However, I feel that I should say that, regardless of the action the Senate takes, or of the action taken in either House of Congress, the President of the United States is not relieved of his sworn duty under the Constitution to enforce the laws of the United States throughout the United States.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I most unequivocally and thoroughly agree with the observations of the distinguished Senator.

I ask the Senator this further question: Does he know of any reason why the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of the United States should not be permitted promptly and vigorously and thoroughly to institute the searching investigation to which I have referred with respect to the utilization by organized crime of the facilities of interstate commerce?

Mr. KEM. I know of no reason.

Mr. DONNELL. Should the mere fact that such an investigation might involve Kansas City, or any other city of the United States, cause such investigation to be deferred?

Mr. KEM. I think not.

Mr. DONNELL. Has the Senator seen this afternoon's issue of the Evening Star, published in Washington, D. C.?

Mr. KEM. I have not had an opportunity to read it.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator permit the insertion, at the conclusion of his remarks, and of all colloquies which

may ensue with respect thereto, of an article by David Lawrence which appeared in this afternoon's Evening Star, entitled "Behind-Scene Moves Could Cause Political Crime Probe Scandal. Big City Machine Seen Trying To Delay Inquiry on Interstate Rackets"? One of the short paragraphs reads:

The maneuvering in Congress as to what kind of investigating committee should be appointed, who shall sit on it and what its scope shall be looks very suspicious.

Will the Senator permit that insertion to be made?

Mr. KEM. I am very glad to consent. I think it will be a pertinent insertion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

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

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that I highly applaud his statement of a few minutes ago that politics should not one way or another cut any figure in deciding on what should be done in connection with the crime conditions in Kansas City, or any other place in the United States, and I hope that all of us in the Senate can have a full agreement about that.

I also desire to say to the Senator that, while it would be entirely presumptuous for me to say anything about what any Senate committee might do, because no resolution has been adopted, and I do not know who the personnel of the committee would be, or what the program would be, so far as the junior Senator from Tennessee is concerned there are a number of cities in the United States where there are allegedly distressing situations. Certainly Kansas City is one of them, and in my opinion an investigation should be made as soon as possible of conditions in Kansas City, along, of course, with a number of other cities as to which there have been similar allegations. So far as I know, no Member of the Senate has expressed any different opinion about that. But I wanted to make my position clear in case I did have something to do with the committee which might be appointed.

I also desired to ask the distinguished Senator a question. I had understood that there was now in Kansas City, and had been for some time, one of the ablest men of the Department of Justice, who had been conducting a grand-jury investigation. I do not know the extent of the investigation or what has been accomplished, but I had understood that Max Goldschein had been helping with the problem in Kansas City. Is that correct?

Mr. KEM. I think that is true. I have not been in Kansas City since I came to Washington for the opening of the present session of Congress, but I have read in the newspapers that a grand jury was in session, and I think they referred to the fact that at the time of their deaths both Binaggio and Gargotta were under subpoena to come before a grand jury. I take it that this is the grand jury to which the able Senator from Tennessee has referred.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I said to the Senator, I do not know the number of Department of Justice agents who may be there, but I did understand that Max Goldschein had been spending a great deal of time in investigations and handling matters before the grand jury in Kansas City over a period of 2 or 3 years.

I wish to say, in deference to Mr. Goldschein, that he was special counsel for a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary which investigated a judicial racket, one of the most notorious ones the Nation has ever known, in Pennsylvania, which involved a Federal judge and a number of people connected with the courts, including lawyers. He did a very masterful job. I know he is a man of fine character and great determination, and I am certain that to whatever extent he has been working in Kansas City he has done the very best of which he was capable in getting at the roots of the problems he has been investigating.

Mr. KEM. I am certain of that. I am also certain that, as a lawyer of the Department of Justice, he has done what he was directed to do. Does the Senator know whether he was directed to investigate before the present grand jury in Kansas City the matter of the theft of the ballots in 1947?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that I really do not know. I merely knew that he had been in charge of the grand jury in Kansas City off and on, I believe, for 2 or 2½ years. I had understood from the district attorney, Mr. Wear, I believe is his name, whom I saw when he was in Washington some time ago, that Mr. Goldschein and Mr. Wear together had been successful in obtaining several convictions for some violation of the Federal law. I have forgotten what it was. But I did want to say that in my opinion Mr. Goldschein is a very conscientious capable man, and I know he has been doing the best he could with whatever assignment he had.

Mr. KEM. I think that is true. At the time of the theft of the ballots, 71 men and women were indicted by the grand jury. The Department of Justice moved in on the situation after the ballots had been stolen. In other words, they deferred action until it was no longer possible to secure the principal evidence. Notwithstanding the absence of the important evidence, at least two convictions were secured. Appeals were taken from the United States district court to the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Eighth Circuit. The Senator from Tennessee, who is a distinguished lawyer, will be interested in the discussion of the question of Federal jurisdiction in those cases. They are reported under *Klein v. United States* and *Burke v. United States* (176 Fed. 2d series, 184).

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am not certain whether Mr. Goldschein has made a statement about the matter publicly, but I have heard somewhere that one difficulty has been the number of murders that had happened during the investi-

gations, and the inability to secure certain witnesses because of the fact that they would be liquidated or murdered shortly before the trials would come up. Does the Senator know whether that is so?

Mr. KEM. Yes; the Senator from Tennessee is quite right. Five witnesses before a United States grand jury have met a violent death in Kansas City in the past 6 months.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I had understood that was the case.

Mr. KEM. This raises the pertinent question: What steps has the Government taken to protect the person and the safety of the witnesses before the grand jury?

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

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The last answer would indicate then that in all these murders a Federal question was involved, and that therefore the murders are subject to the jurisdiction of Federal laws, particularly the section which provides for making it a crime to obstruct justice in a Federal court.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator be good enough to define what he means by "all these murders"?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am speaking of the death of persons who were witnesses.

Mr. KEM. Yes, they were witnesses.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am talking about those who were witnesses.

Mr. KEM. Who met violent deaths.

Mr. FERGUSON. They were murdered to keep them from testifying, which seems to be the practice.

Mr. KEM. When I said five had met violent deaths I did not mean to say that all five had been murdered, because I do not assume that. I do not say that as to all of those who met violent deaths. Some cases may have been suicide.

Mr. FERGUSON. Were any of them murdered, in the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KEM. Yes, certainly. Gargotta was murdered. The bullets were put through his head.

Mr. FERGUSON. Binaggio was murdered.

Mr. KEM. Binaggio was murdered. The bullets were put through his head. There is no doubt about that. Furthermore, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Missouri there is no doubt about the Federal jurisdiction when they were witnesses before the grand jury in the interval between the two appearances. I do not believe there is a lawyer in the Senate who would not agree about that, notwithstanding the opinion expressed by the President of the United States that he was not concerned with the killings.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, as Chief Executive Officer he and his law-enforcement agencies would be concerned, as a matter of law and policy, with any Federal crime.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Missouri were both present when the President of the United States took a solemn oath to enforce the laws of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there any question in the distinguished Senator's mind that the Federal Government would have jurisdiction to look into the last two killings to which the Senator has referred, to ascertain if there is any evidence that the two persons were killed in order to obstruct justice, that is, to interfere with the procedure of a Federal grand jury now sitting under the Kansas City court?

Mr. KEM. I should like to defer to the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. He came to the Senate after a distinguished career as a lawyer and judge in Michigan. Since he has been here I think he has been continuously a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. I have read to the Senate the statute with which I know the Senator from Michigan is already familiar. Is there any doubt in the mind of the Senator from Michigan that a Federal offense has been committed?

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt in the mind of the Senator from Michigan that there is evidence, from what has been stated, that a Federal crime has been committed.

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

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator has stated that a grand jury is in session in Kansas City and that an able man is in charge of the grand jury. Has the Senator any evidence or any reason to believe that all possible evidence is not being presented to the grand jury?

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Missouri has been at some trouble to try to find out whether the present grand jury had inquired into the theft of the ballots on May 27, 1947. Of course, the proceedings of the grand jury are secret, I would not undertake to say.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator would not want to undertake to say at this time that there is not a grand jury in session and that no investigation is going on?

Mr. KEM. Obviously not. The Senator from Arizona might be in the confidence of the President of the United States and the Attorney General. Does the Senator from Arizona know what has happened?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Arizona is not in the law enforcement end of the Government. He is interested in laws being enforced. I would say to my distinguished friend from Missouri that obstructing justice is of course, a minor crime compared to murder. Murder, however, is a violation of State law. I say to my distinguished friend again, if his State enforcement officers have failed, and if local law enforcement has broken down, I think we may have to take some action. But until the Senator says that, I have no way of knowing what the facts are. I do not want to prejudice a matter on newspaper reports. I do not think we should try people on that basis.

Mr. KEM. I have risen in my place in the Senate of the United States to discuss the question whether the laws of the United States have been violated, and whether those guilty have been ar-

rested. It will be another time and another day if I decide to discuss the crime situation with reference to the State laws of my own State. If the Senator is interested in that I might do it some time. I have given some few high lights from which the Senator can draw his own conclusions as to what the situation is.

Let me say, so that there will be no misunderstanding, that what I am interested in primarily today is the laws of the United States. It has to do with the violation of the laws of the United States. It has to do with the prosecution by the President of the United States, the Department of Justice, the district attorney, of those guilty of violating the laws of the United States. If the Senator from Arizona considers that I have unwittingly gotten into any other field, I shall be glad to have him correct what I have said.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I was merely interested in the Senator's opinion as to whether the law-enforcement officers of his State were doing their duty, and whether the law-enforcement officers of his State were able to exercise properly the constitutional powers vested in them. It seems to me that is the real question at issue. If Missouri law-enforcement officials are handling their job, it is meaningless to talk of Federal enforcement being necessary, because so far all that we have been told about are violations of State laws, the enforcement of which lies directly with local and State officials.

Mr. KEM. I have not directed my attention to that today. I have, however, supplied the Senate with a few facts from which those who wish to do so may draw their own conclusions.

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

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the senior colleague of the distinguished Senator from Missouri who has been speaking has placed in the RECORD a portion of a recent editorial by David Lawrence.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that I had the entire editorial printed in the RECORD.

Mr. STENNIS. In any event, the editorial inferred that some effort had been made to suppress or delay the investigation. In that connection, my attention was called to an editorial which appeared yesterday in one of the Washington newspapers. I have not read the editorial, but I understand that it was to the effect that the Senate Committee on Rules acted to reduce to \$50,000 the amount available for the investigation and to set the date of termination of the investigation as July 31, 1950, and that those two facts were proof that there was an effort unreasonably to limit the investigation, both as to the time available for it and as to the amount of funds provided, to such an extent that it was proof that no investigation was desired.

So, Mr. President, I think it is pertinent to state for the RECORD the facts regarding how that matter was handled.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if it would be agreeable to the Senator from Mississippi. I should prefer to have him make

that statement in his own time. If the Senator from Mississippi will be kind enough to defer his statement until he has the floor in his own right, I would appreciate it.

Mr. STENNIS. I did not have the advantage of hearing all the speech the Senator from Missouri made, but from the part I have heard, I have understood that the inference which was sought to be drawn was that no genuine, full investigation was contemplated. Therefore, I thought it was pertinent to state the facts in that connection.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, evidently I have failed to make myself clear. In my remarks I made no reference whatever to any of my colleagues in the Senate or to anything they are endeavoring to do. What I had to say was entirely confined to the enforcement of the laws of the United States by the executive branch of the Government. I think it may fairly be said that what I have said has been highly critical in that respect, but no reference has been made to the Senate or to any Member of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. I wished to make remarks more in the nature of a statement, rather than to ask a question.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if there are no other questions to be asked of me, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Star, April 12, 1950]
BEHIND-SCENE MOVES COULD CAUSE POLITICAL CRIME PROBE SCANDAL—BIG CITY MACHINES SEEN TRYING TO DELAY INQUIRY ON INTERSTATE RACKETS

(By David Lawrence)

Strange things are happening behind the scenes in the Democratic Party in Congress which may have a bearing on what could prove to be the worst political scandal in a generation.

Who is trying to squelch the congressional investigation of gambling and interstate rackets? What are the Democratic machines in the big cities trying to do to limit the inquiry, to delay it, and possibly to frustrate a thorough investigation of the tie-up between party politics in America and the worst vice rings that this country has encountered since the black days of the prohibition era?

The maneuvering in Congress as to what kind of investigating committee should be appointed, who shall sit on it, and what its scope shall be looks very suspicious.

Why, for instance, has the Democratic Party, in a formal conference of its policy members, decided to violate the precedent which was established when the La Follette-Monroney law was passed specifying that, when investigations are voted, they must be conducted not by special committees but by the regular committees charged with drafting legislation developed by an inquiry?

POSITION REVERSED

For many months now the Democratic leaders in Congress have fought against special committees and argued that the regular committees must do the investigating. Now this position has been reversed. Ignoring the demands of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which logically should conduct the investigation of crime, a resolution has been decided on by the administration leaders which would limit the committee to only five members. Three of these would be Democrats. They would not necessarily be selected from the Judiciary Committee but would be appointed by Vice President BARKLEY, which means that the appointments are bound to be political.

The test will be what Republicans will be permitted to sit on the special committee if it is ever appointed—for it looks as if there is a concerted movement afoot to delay the inquiry's start so that it cannot gather much information prior to the congressional elections this autumn.

Why is it that, in a matter of crime and law violation, anybody in the Senate should try to fix so early a date as July 31 as the day on which the investigation must be concluded? What are the Democratic leaders afraid of? Do they fear that the investigation will probe too deeply into the big rackets in New York, Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and the major centers of crime in America today?

WHO IS BACK OF DRIVE?

It is well known on Capitol Hill that Senators DONNELL, of Missouri, and FERGUSON, of Michigan, Republicans, have been active on the Judiciary Committee and already know a lot about the rackets and underworld crimes. Why is such a determined effort being made to keep these two Senators off the special committee—and who is back of this drive?

It has been said that many hundreds of thousands of dollars of contributions from gambling interests went into the political campaign chests of both major parties in various States last year. Why shouldn't the country have a comprehensive inquiry on all this, letting the chips fall where they may?

The administration Democrats, of course, expect the Republicans to make political capital out of the crime wave. This, however, does not justify playing into the hands of the gamblers and the underworld syndicates whose boldness of control of city and county governments has reached a serious point in American life—and who want the investigation hamstrung.

The people in the States which are being victimized by the rackets are waiting to see what Congress does. If the Senate leaders try to kill off the investigation by selecting a hand-picked group who will not work at the job and who will not permit the informed Republicans in the Senate to have a voice in the work of investigation which must be done to expose the disgraceful power wielded by the racketeers, it will certainly prove the prize political blunder of all time for the Democrats.

DEFECTS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on March 14 and on April 4, I read into the RECORD the facts of how America was being sold out on the international scene.

Every passing hour produces additional proof of how Secretary Acheson is continuing to double talk us ever deeper into Communist booby traps all over the world.

Again I charge, Mr. President, that the bipartisan foreign policy which the President now is trying to revive is a gigantic fraud, for it has become perfectly obvious that the President needs the bipartisan foreign policy, not to defeat the Communists, but to keep Republicans quiet.

As the consequences of our international schemes are uncovered, it becomes only too clear that the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, and the North Atlantic Pact have been nothing but propaganda fronts to cover up our sell-out in Asia.

The question, Mr. President, is whether the American people are to be forced to wait until it is too late, before they learn that the collapse in Asia has

become a cover-up for their sell-out in Europe, as well.

On April 4, I brought to the attention of my colleagues proof of how imminent is such a grim prospect, and I demanded that the testimony of our High Commissioner in Germany, which was given to the Senate Appropriations Committee on March 10 in executive session, be made public. Mr. President, this testimony is still an administration secret; it is still withheld from the American people.

Yet, on last Friday, April 7, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, sent to the chairman of the ECA "watchdog committee," the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], a letter calling for an immediate investigation of what continues to go on in Germany.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, exhibit A, which contains that letter.

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

EXHIBIT A

Text of a letter to United States Senator PAT McCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, chairman of the ECA "watchdog committee," from United States Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican of New Hampshire, regarding American policy in Europe. This letter is released by Senator BRIDGES and it is self-explanatory:

UNITED STATES SENATE,

April 6, 1950.

The Honorable PAT McCARRAN,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In March Mr. John J. McCloy testified before the Senate Committee on Appropriations in executive session in support of the State Department's 1951 budget request for administration in occupied territories. Although I was unable to be present at the time, I have read the testimony presented at that time.

I am disturbed by this testimony. I bring this matter to your attention to urge that you call a meeting of the ECA "watchdog committee" immediately to investigate its implications.

I want to present eight reasons why, in my opinion, these matters come clearly within the jurisdiction of the "watchdog committee" and why an investigation is imperative and urgent.

First. Although it is only 4 weeks since Mr. McCloy testified, during that time informed interpreters of international affairs such as William Henry Chamberlin, Walter Lippmann, Dorothy Thompson, Joseph Alsop, Anne O'Hare McCormick, and the United States News have become so alarmed over the deterioration of our position that the United States News of March 24 says no one expects the present German Government to last more than a few months. Dorothy Thompson warns of a new east-west agreement, in which Berlin will be given to the Russians.

Second. The indications of wanton destruction of Germany's industrial peacetime potential and attempts to excuse it are shocking. They constitute a complete repudiation of all the guarantees that have been given to us that this industrial potential would be allocated only for the purpose of assuring its maximum contribution to Europe's over-all economic recovery. I have seen some of the evidence, which does not conform to the information given to the

Appropriation Committee. Certainly the fact that General Robertson, British high commissioner, was forced to resign proves this senseless policy of destruction continues to go on, financed by the American taxpayers' dollars.

Third, I have been furnished an eyewitness account of how, in the Bergische-Stahlwerke in Remscheid, in the British zone, at this very moment, the British are loading machinery on railroad cars to be shipped behind the iron curtain; even into Albania, where the Russians have built their tremendous submarine base, that is such a threat to the Mediterranean.

Fourth, On January 26, 1950, Mr. McCloy told a Boston audience that the most serious economic problems in Germany were "growing unemployment, the influx of refugees from the East, and inadequate housing." Yet the information I have can lead only to the conclusion that Germany's economy is being paralyzed by British fear of competition, thus playing directly into the hands of the Communists. This economic paralysis is further aggravated by the efforts of the British to socialize the Ruhr coal and steel industries; by the limitations on synthetic oil and rubber industries which force the Germans to buy raw materials from British interests with the American taxpayers' dollars; by the new drive for decartelization which has so confused responsibilities both in ownership and control of German industry as to destroy incentive and confidence. Yet I am informed the directive to Mr. McCloy for carrying out this policy is, according to the State Department, "a classified document which has not been released."

Fifth, Germany, I am informed, is still denied fishing rights under the International Fishing Convention, and, meanwhile, we are continuing to pay out millions of dollars as we did last year to import whale and herring oil into Germany.

Sixth, Germany, I am informed, is denied the right to compete with the world's merchant marine being limited to ships of 12½ knots. Mr. McCloy has conceded that unless these shipping restrictions are removed, there will be a revival of communism in the great shipping ports of Hamburg and Bremen. Meanwhile, although the Germans could save the American taxpayers millions of dollars by operating their own merchant marine, this policy has been carried to the point where the British announced on March 17 that they were planning to blow up one of the largest dry docks in Hamburg harbor.

Seventh, On March 12 we learned that our Government interfered with new British-German trade talks because we were afraid that England was forcing Germany into the sterling bloc area. I have now been informed that although we are underwriting all the British deficits in their zone of occupation, neither the State Department nor the ECA know what the true value of British sterling is or how they keep their books.

Eighth, On March 16 I was informed of a development in the field of radio communications. It appears that last summer an international communications conference was held in Copenhagen. Since Germany is not a sovereign state, her interests were not represented, even by our own State Department. As a result, wave lengths which had previously been used in western Germany were taken away and assigned to Russia and Soviet-controlled radio stations behind the iron curtain. We are spending millions of dollars under ECA and State Department appropriations to finance Voice of America activities, yet on March 24, 1950, the New York Times revealed that the Munich transmitter, which has been one of the most effective relay points for Voice of America programs to eastern Germany and central Europe, has been affected by the powerful Russian station in Riga, which was assigned the same frequency.

I am confident that you will be anxious for our committee to investigate this situation at the earliest possible moment.

Sincerely yours,

STYLES BRIDGES.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was shocked by Mr. McCloy's testimony, and the facts contained in his letter merely confirmed my charge that we are being sold out in Europe.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] also was so disturbed that, according to the New York Times of April 8, he agreed to call the ECA watchdog committee into session immediately upon the reconvening of the House of Representatives, to launch a full-scale inquiry into this matter.

Mr. President, again I want to warn my colleagues in the Senate that the President's belated attempt to revive the bipartisan fraud is only another last-ditch effort to cover up the outrageous betrayals of American interests, principles, and security, which continue to underlie the basic policies we have pursued both in Asia and Europe.

Mr. President, I want to call the particular attention of the Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to how I believe they have been and continue to be used as pawns by the master architect of our over-all foreign policy, Mr. Acheson.

Mr. Acheson has wiped his hands of the Asiatic debacle, about which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has never been consulted.

As the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, lamented in a recent letter to Mr. Acheson, so far as our far-eastern policy is concerned—

I felt like an unwelcome meddler in policies that had already been determined upon.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee can take no credit for the one bright spot in our Foreign Relations in the Pacific, namely, Japan, for General MacArthur has fought Mr. Acheson to a showdown on every issue in which the State Department sought to undermine his prestige and his power; and to sell the Japanese into the hands of the Communists, as well.

Mr. President, when those who have been selling us down the river tried to remove General MacArthur, and when General MacArthur fought back, who was it who slapped his face and told him he would take orders from the State Department? It was none other than Mr. Acheson.

Who was it, Mr. President, but the State Department who drafted the program for the destruction of Japan's industrial potential? Who was it who defied the State Department, and ordered the end of dismantling in Japan? It was General MacArthur.

Who was it who drafted the outrageous document, FEC-230, providing for the communication or socialization of Japan's economic life? It was none other than our own State Department.

Who was it who prevented the State Department from getting away with that outrage? It was General MacArthur.

Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that this document is still a classified secret?

Mr. President, who has fought to prevent the Communists from removing the Japanese Emperor and delivering him up as a war criminal, thus destroying the whole social and political fabric of Japan? It was General MacArthur.

However, Mr. President, so far as concerns the participation of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the formulation of our international hand-out programs in Europe, that committee has been unanimous in its support of Mr. Acheson's master-minding of what now is rapidly becoming a tragic debacle.

As proof, Mr. President, of how the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been used to cover up the tragic betrayal of our vital interest and security, I want to call to the attention of the entire Senate and of the American people the following facts:

The record clearly shows, Mr. President, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee supported every plea for unity with Russia so long as that outrageous propaganda was in political fashion.

We learned, to our dismay, how wrong we had been, when on April 15, 1946, Mr. Elmer Davis, head of the OWI, and the main pipe line for that vicious propaganda, admitted:

A year or so ago, most of us supposed that Russian objectives were the same as ours; and extensive concessions were made to them on that hypothesis.

We now seem to have been mistaken.

It is all the more tragic, Mr. President, that the record also shows that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, almost without exception, has unanimously supported the so-called myth of our unity of purpose with the Allies, a unity which is supposed to have undergirded our international relations ever since the alleged break of the Western World with Russia.

At the heart of this new propaganda lies the administration's continued insistence that we share the identical aims and purposes of our so-called European allies toward Germany.

So, Mr. President, for 5 years we have been following the lead of a Senate Foreign Relations Committee in pouring out billions of dollars to carry out so-called recovery and defense programs in Europe, which we were told would lead to the integration of the economic, financial, political, and military affairs of the continent as a whole.

Yet, the record shows also that time and again we have been warned of what was happening in Germany. Time and again we have been confronted with mounting evidence of the insanity that was involved in our policies toward those vanquished people. Time and again irrefutable proof has been produced to show how our so-called peace-loving allies were using our billions, not to bring about the recovery and the reunification of Europe, but to divide and destroy it. Yet, every time these charges were made, these facts produced, and our demands for investigations presented, the leaders of our bipartisan foreign policy, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee,

echoed the prevailing propaganda line and postponed the day of reckoning. Again I say, nowhere is this more clearly revealed than in the case of Germany.

Mr. Dulles, who, by the way, was recently appointed again as an adviser, to assist in revising the bipartisan foreign policy, has admitted that the basic program advanced for the treatment of Germany was so outrageous that he knew of no other nation in history which had suggested "an act of comparable folly."

On December 19, 1947, when the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] tried to amend an appropriation bill that would prohibit payment to any personnel engaged in the senseless destruction of Germany's peacetime industrial potential, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] objected, although he hastened to assure the Senate:

I do not wish to see Germany destroyed. I do not wish to see her plants dismantled; I wish to see the German economy rebuilt, because the heart of European economic life centers right in Germany and in German industries.

And on the same day, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] strenuously objected to such an amendment because, as he said:

I was advised this morning, in response to a categorical inquiry that it is the policy of the Department of State from here out to make no further shipments of dismantled plants eastward and that if any shipments are made, they will be made to the West.

The Senator from Michigan also assured the Senate that this program of insane destruction would not threaten Germany's economic future, for, as he said:

The new level of industry which has been set up for Germany still leaves ample margin above and beyond the maximum peacetime German economy of the future.

It was 2½ years ago that the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Texas took such a position. The record now clearly shows that they never have been more gravely mistaken in their lives, and that in spite of their professed desire to stop the shipment of arms to the east, to guarantee an adequate industrial potential of Germany's economic future and to preserve the alleged unity of purpose of our western allies, for the rebuilding of European economy, they have been lied to, double-talked to, and completely duped by the master mind of our State Department policy.

In the first place, Germany's peacetime industrial potential continues to be dismantled and shipped behind the iron curtain, with Soviet satellites sitting as members of the Inter-Allied Reparations Agency in Brussels.

In the second place, the situation in Germany has deteriorated so fast that I want to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Western Crisis in Germany," contained in the foreign letter of the International Statistical Bureau of April 6, 1950.

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

Mr. JENNER. I should rather not yield at this time. I am trying to make a train.

Mr. LANGER. Reserving the right to object, I should much rather the distinguished Senator would read the article.

Mr. JENNER. I simply do not have the time. I am trying to make a train, and I have about five more minutes. I therefore ask that the article be inserted in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

EXHIBIT B
WESTERN CRISIS IN GERMANY

After having won the war, the United States is in serious danger of finally losing the peace in strategic Germany. This is a real danger, unless quick and drastic changes of conditions in Germany and of Germany's international status are made.

The following points, which confirm our former warning concerning the basic weakness of the western position in Germany, may give important clues concerning developments in central Europe in the near future.

1. Feelings of desperation and disillusionment are growing among all sectors of the western German population, not only among the unemployed and the 10,000,000 deportees, but also among the industrialists. The latter lack liquid funds with which to refinance their enterprises. They are profoundly disappointed about the barriers which have been erected against their entrance into the competitive markets of the west, about taxes which far exceed the tax burdens of their western competitors, and about the general prohibitions on production. They are eager to resume trade with the east, where the goods they make are in great demand.

2. Most Germans are well aware that American and British policies are not identical, and that rifts and rivalries are increasing. The British in the past have often followed independent aims and methods in their zone of occupation. But they did not challenge American policies in Germany openly. This is now beginning to take place. A well-informed observer, after a personal visit, advised us about a recent meeting with a high British military authority in Germany. The latter said frankly: "We British shall be able to make peace with Moscow and to agree with Moscow on German policies. It is only America that prevents us from coming to terms with Moscow."

3. An important symptom for the new political trend now appears in the western German economic press, which pays much attention to the future relationship to the United States on the one hand, and to Russia on the other hand. One of the most influential economic journals, *Der Volkswirt* (No. 5, 1950), writes:

"America cannot guarantee security to the Germans. It simply turned out to be a fact that the American policy conflicts with vital German interests. The Americans cannot return unity to the Germans or pave the way for the vital Austrian markets. The Germans must range themselves accordingly. They will do it. They are already doing it today. The Germans will have to insist that their only hope for security and the only chance of peace for the world relies on Germany to be the buffer state between the big powers instead of being a mere strategic area or frontier area or a satellite."

Unemployment in western Berlin—Number of unemployed (officially registered)

	Number	In percent of employees
June 1948 (cold war).....	46,900	5.1
January 1949.....	129,700	14.2
June 1949.....	177,900	18.9
December 1949.....	278,700	28.2
January 1950.....	302,800	30.5

Mr. JENNER. In the third place, Mr. President, I want to bring home to my colleagues and to the American people, the warnings of Mr. John J. McCloy, himself, which followed immediately upon the heels of my own charges here in the United States Senate on April 4.

For, on the same day, according to a United Press dispatch from London, "Mr. McCloy called on western Europe to take western Germany into full partnership at once, and thus keep Russia from making all of Germany a satellite state tomorrow. Tomorrow may be too late."

The grim warning of Mr. McCloy's words makes an investigation by the ECA watchdog committee imperative, because this warning was not directed at eastern Germany; it was a belated admission that all the talk about the unity of purpose of our western allies toward the integration of Europe as a bulwark against communism has been the most frightful hypocrisy.

The urgency which confronts the ECA watchdog committee is further revealed by the fact that Mr. McCloy's testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee, March 10, dealt with this crucial development. I have now learned, that his statements were so shocking, and constituted such an indictment of the way we continue to be bulldozed and blackmailed by our so-called western peace-loving allies in their treatment of western Germany, that he asked that this part of the testimony be stricken from the record.

As I have said before, this matter is so serious, I do not intend to let it rest, and I congratulate my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] for their announced determination to launch an exhaustive investigation that will put an end once and for all to the continued senseless sell-out of American vital interests both in Germany and in Europe.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator recall that in the last Congress a determined effort was made, through the offering of a resolution, to have a moratorium declared on all dismantling, until a review could be had, which if it had been done at that time, might have averted all the difficulty which the Senator so forcibly depicts this afternoon?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; I recall that.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator object to my introducing at this point in his remarks a resolution which was presented in the last session? It will be found on page 14712 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 11, Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. JENNER. I have no objection. I think it should go into the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to read the resolution and ask the Senator if he does not think it should be made a part of his remarks. It reads as follows:

Whereas there is abundant evidence that the dismantling of manufacturing establishments in western Germany has exceeded prudent requirements for the prevention of rearmament of Germany; and

Whereas the economic and spiritual recovery of western Germany under a republican form of government is necessary in the interest of the industrial and agricultural recovery of all Europe; and

Whereas handicapping western Germany by the excessive dismantling of its industries and depriving it of the tools and establishments necessary for productivity is reflected in an additional tax burden upon the people of the United States for the support of German people deprived of their means of livelihood: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should cause to be convened at the earliest convenient time, preferably before the beginning of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, a conference among representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and France to review in the light of the declarations in this resolution the entire policy of dismantling German industrial establishments; and it is the further sense of the Senate that, pending completion of such conference and the official announcement of its findings, the President should request the Governments of the United Kingdom and France to join the United States of America in declaring a moratorium upon further dismantling, destruction, or removal of industrial establishments in the zones of Germany presently occupied by the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and France.

Does the Senator remember that resolution?

Mr. JENNER. I remember it very well.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was one of the cosponsors of it, was he not?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator recall that 44 Senators sponsored that resolution?

Mr. JENNER. I do.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator recall a colloquy between the senior Senator from Texas and the junior Senator from Nebraska at the time the resolution was brought up on the floor of the Senate for consideration?

Mr. JENNER. I do.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD the debate appearing on pages 14712, 14713, 14714, and 14717 be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. WHERRY. The resolution is a very simple one. Many Senators have expressed a desire that a review of the dismantling problem be

had by the proper agency of our Government. In fact, on September 15 a group of Senators sent a memorandum to the Secretary of State which I shall read at this point into the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 15, 1949.
The Honorable DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We, the undersigned Senators of the United States, beg to call to your attention the fact that on August 5 of this year we approved by unanimous vote an amendment to the 1949 ECA appropriations bill, which would make available to the ECA Administrator a certain sum of money for carrying out a new review of the German plant dismantlings.

We think that in all good faith the British Government should have ceased its program of dismantling German industry until the matter could have been reexamined, as requested by the Congress of the United States. Instead, we understand that there has been an increase in the dismantlings in the British occupation zone of Germany, as well as an increasing amount of scrapping of valuable equipment.

The solution of the dismantling question is vital to our future commitments regarding the European recovery program. We respectfully urge you to use your good offices to induce the British Government to order an immediate cessation in their occupation zone of all dismantlings of German plants, including the so-called forbidden industries, until the question can be satisfactorily reexamined, and a report of the findings made available to this Government, including Congress.

Respectfully yours,

The signers of this petition number approximately 44, and include the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCALTY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HYE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the late Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS].

Other Senators would like to have signed the petition if they had had an opportunity. The petition went to the Secretary of State some time after September 15. All in the world the petition does is to ask for a review of what has already been done, and request that a report be submitted to the Congress at the next session.

Mr. President, I do not care to detain the Senate any longer.

The resolution is a very simple one. I hope and pray that we can get, here on the floor of the Senate, a decision that there is need to have this review made promptly.

I should like to have the yeas and nays ordered on the motion to refer the resolution to the committee. I hope that motion is rejected because, if it is rejected, the resolution itself will be before the Senate, and then I hope and pray that the resolution will be adopted. Certainly it should be adopted, because if it is defeated, the very purpose of sending the resolution to the President will be defeated.

Mr. President, in this matter I am not attempting to bypass any committee. This question has been thoroughly debated on the floor of the Senate. If time were not of the essence in this situation, I would not be so earnest in urging that this action be taken. But I am satisfied that those in authority will tell all Senators that it will be too late if this matter is postponed until the next session of Congress.

So I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President, on the motion to refer the resolution to the committee.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not adopt the resolution, after considering it on its merits. It would be an unnecessary affront to the President of the United States, by having the Senate direct him—that is what the resolution amounts to—in regard to our relations with the United Kingdom and with France in connection with this matter. Why should the Senate again pass on this question? The Senate and the House of Representatives have already placed in the ECA bill a provision looking to an examination of the entire question, and have made an appropriation for that purpose. Why should we not await that review by the ECA Administrator, under the direction of the President of the United States? What assurance have we that if the President calls into conference the United Kingdom and France, the results will be any more satisfactory to those who have signed this petition than the present situation is? I assume that unanimous action by all three of the nations would be required. Suppose the President called a conference of the three nations; but suppose that instead of securing unanimous agreement, there was a division of opinion, and that the conference broke up at that point. Such a situation would only accentuate the difficulty.

Mr. President, this question is a complex one. It is not so simple as the mere signing of a petition.

The method of proceeding by way of petition, as is proposed in this case, is a new method of legislating. Those who have signed the petition would have the Senate proceed to legislate by way of petition. However, the place for Senators to express their views in regard to legislation is here on the floor of the Senate. They should not be committed or bound, by some preliminary signing of a petition, to do so-and-so and so-and-so.

First of all, Mr. President, this resolution is an invasion of the rights of the President of the United States and is an affront to him, for he has jurisdiction of this matter. Mr. McCloy, our High Commissioner in Germany, is already studying this question. Already we have put into law an expression of our

desire that the ECA Administrator review this problem. We have given him funds with which to do it. Why should we now interrupt those processes? Why should the Congress step in now and say, "You do not know what you are doing; the President does not know what he is doing; Mr. McCloy does not know what he is doing; Mr. Hoffman, the ECA Administrator, does not know what he is doing. We know all about it."

Mr. President, let us remember that very few of us know much about it. This proposition is not a simple one. It relates to the three different zones in Germany. Our action would not be effective in the other zones.

So I appeal to the Senate to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee meets tomorrow. In the committee we can take it up at that time and can make such investigation as is possible under the circumstances.

So, Mr. President, I appeal for the orderly procedure, and I ask the Senate to maintain the sanctity and integrity of the system of referring matters to the appropriate committees, rather than to have the Senate proceed by means of a signed petition.

In the case of many petitions, on many occasions the terms of the bill to which the petition relates are not known by those who sign the petition. Certainly the petitioners have no right to commit Senators by the process of having them sign a petition.

So, Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations which will give it prompt attention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a few moments more.

Let me say that I hate to have to disagree with my friend the Senator from Texas; but the action proposed in this case will not be in opposition to the President at all. The resolution says that it is the sense of the Senate that the President shall see whether he can have a review made of the dismantling program. That is all there is to the resolution. We propose to proceed absolutely in accord with the President; he is the one who will see that the purpose is carried out. All the Senate will do will be to go on record, in view of the fact that the situation has become so acute, as expressing its judgment that the matter should not be delayed while Mr. Hoffman is deciding whether he wishes to do so-and-so, but that the situation should be immediately reviewed. The review is to be made by Mr. McCloy and the other agencies and governments concerned.

That is all there is to the resolution. I do not see why it should be opposed.

Mr. President, those who believe that the review should be made no doubt will agree that it is possible that the resolution should be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee under normal circumstances. But my own feeling is that in view of the late date in the session, the procedure we now suggest is the best one for the Senate to adopt in this matter. The subject has previously been before the committees, and has been debated.

At the present moment we are faced with the necessity of moving promptly because of the emergency. I should like to say to my colleagues who believe in the purpose of the resolution and what it would do that they should vote against the motion of the Senator from Texas to refer the resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee. If that motion is defeated, then the Senate will be able to take up and adopt the resolution. If Senators still believe a review should be made, the method I suggest is the best way to have that done.

Mr. DONNELL. I respectfully ask the Senator from Texas this question: At the conclusion of his remarks he stated that the Committee on Foreign Relations is to be in session tomorrow. Can the Senator enlighten us as to whether or not the Committee on Foreign Relations can give the Senate, in time to vote on the resolution before we adjourn, within the next few days, information on which we could base intelligent judgment as to whether we should vote in favor of the resolution or not?

Mr. CONNALLY. We will get all the information that is available. We may not be able to go into all the details, as the resolution does, when it says that "abundant evidence" has been adduced. We may not be able to do that, but we will have all that is available. We can hear from Mr. Hoffman, we can hear from the Secretary of State, we can hear from all others who have possession of information with respect to the matter. Which brings me to the point of saying that they are not asleep in this matter. They are investigating it, reviewing it, all the time.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator from Indiana permit me, by unanimous consent, to address another question to the Senator from Texas, without his losing the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. I infer from the statement of the Senator from Texas that the Committee on Foreign Relations will be in session tomorrow, and that the Senate might reasonably expect some advice from that committee on which to base its judgment as to whether this resolution should or should not be passed. Of course, I realize that it will not be possible for the Committee on Foreign Relations to make an indefinite, detailed, lengthy study of this question within the next 24 hours or so, but I ask the Senator from Texas whether or not, if we shall refer this resolution today to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, we may have his assurance that in his judgment the committee will report back to us the facts it finds in sufficient time for us then, before we adjourn—this week, I trust—to vote the resolution either up or down, in the light of the information given us by the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that we shall endeavor to obtain all the information available, and promptly report it to the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. And will the Senator from Texas assure me that according to his best judgment it will be reported to the Senate in sufficient time for the Senate to take a vote on the resolution before the Senate adjourns?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Missouri uses the words "in sufficient time." I do not know when the Senate will adjourn. I will say, however, that the Senate committee will obtain all the information available promptly, and as soon as we have the facts before us, we will report them to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to point out that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee definitely made a commitment to the Senate that the resolution would receive consideration. His plea at that time was that the Senate should vote it down because it had not been considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that if the Senate would send it to the Foreign Relations Committee, the committee would act upon it and return it to the Senate. The committee has not yet returned it to the Senate. Is not that correct?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Many pleas have been made that it be returned to the Senate and that action be taken on it.

Mr. President, I now call upon the senior Senator from Texas to report the resolution from the committee, in view of the report of Mr. McCloy and other observers in Europe that 125 or 130 very important plants may be dismantled or removed, causing not only a loss to the taxpayers, but a loss in morale of the German people. I make that demand on the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, to report that resolution or some similar resolution to the Senate.

LEWIS S. STRAUSS

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I must be absent from the Senate tomorrow and Friday. I have a very brief statement to make regarding a very distinguished American, and if the Senator from New York will yield, I shall appreciate the courtesy.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Iowa has to catch a plane and will be absent from the Senate tomorrow and Friday, and with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed with his statement.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on next Saturday, April 15, a distinguished and patriotic American citizen will leave Government service and retire to private life. I want to take this occasion to express not only my appreciation of his past contributions to the welfare of his country, but also express deep regret that the Government is losing his unusual administrative ability and services.

Lewis L. Strauss, one of the original members of the Atomic Energy Commission, who has resigned that post effective on April 15, has generously contributed to the public welfare in private and public capacities. His business success as a young man was earned on sheer ability, and his record of and reputation for personal integrity has long since been firmly established.

In the middle thirties he was a successful man of means and was devoting large amounts of his own money for educational and research purposes, most of which have never been publicized. Among other things he contributed substantial sums before World War II for the construction of atomic research tools and especially at Berkeley to aid in cancer research and in the fields of other human ailments.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor, he entered active duty in the Navy under a Reserve commission and served throughout the war, eventually becoming a rear admiral. His contribution in this field in getting things done during a time of confusion has been testified to by those with whom he served. His unusual capacity for administration and his executive ability enabled him to render service which earned him various decorations not only from our own Government but from our allies.

He became a member of the Atomic Energy Commission and brought to it

his high degree of practical administrative ability as well as the strongest sense of patriotic responsibility and he has discharged his duties faithfully and well.

In his almost 4 years of service on this vital Commission he has contended for his positions with the security of his country as first consideration and while he met with disagreement on occasions, nevertheless, he has served to see his major policies eventually adopted.

I am sure that he established complete confidence on the part of the members of the joint committee not only in his integrity but also in the demonstrated logic of his judgment on many occasions.

As a Member of the Senate and of the joint committee, I had hoped that he could see fit to continue in public life, but he has elected to resign. His reasons, of course, are his own, but regardless of his voluntary retirement he has left a mark of definite contribution in our atomic-energy program as well as in the other public fields in which he has discharged his responsibilities so ably.

I salute him upon his retirement as a zealous patriot, an outstanding citizen, and a fine gentleman.

TRIBUTE TO FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, 5 years ago today, and almost at this exact hour, this Nation and the world suffered a grievous loss in the death of our beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Mr. Roosevelt was my friend for more than a quarter of a century. We had worked together closely in many civic, political, and charitable activities. We both worked in that historic campaign of 1928 when we supported a great Governor of New York and a great American, Alfred E. Smith, for President of the United States. At the request of Governor Smith, Franklin Delano Roosevelt accepted the nomination as Governor of New York, and I accepted the nomination as Lieutenant Governor of New York. We were both elected, and for 4 years I had the honor and the privilege, which I value beyond any description, of an intimate association with Franklin Roosevelt.

I sat at his right hand every day in the 4 years that he was Governor. I helped him in every way it was possible for me to help him. During those 4 years, Mr. President, I came to know of his greatness of heart, soul, character, and ability. The subsequent years served only to deepen my respect and admiration for these traits. He was a tremendously hard worker as Governor. He fought to advance the interests of all the people in the State of New York, without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin. During the years that he was Governor, he developed a successful and progressive policy of public ownership of the water resources of our State, a policy which was maintained during the 10 years that I was Governor.

When Franklin Roosevelt became President of the United States on March 4, 1933, I was Governor of the State of New York. He undertook responsibilities which have few parallels in the history of our Nation. The banks in New

York State and almost in all other States of the Union were closed. There were between 12,000,000 and 15,000,000 people unemployed. Business was at a standstill in every State of the Union. Farm and home mortgages were being foreclosed by the hundreds, and led to riot and even to bloodshed on the part of people who felt it was unreasonable, unfair, and cruel to take away homes and farms which were painstakingly acquired by years of labor and thrift. The chimneys of our factories belched no smoke. They were shut down and deserted. The relief rolls were growing and burgeoning. These were the conditions when Franklin Delano Roosevelt became President of the United States. With the support of a sympathetic and imaginative Congress, President Roosevelt took charge of the affairs of the Nation. He brought order out of chaos. He strove day and night to develop opportunities for employment. He made certain that no man, woman, or child starved. Presently business revived, factories again opened their gates, relief rolls went down, and the United States was once more on the road to increased production and prosperity.

Yes, Mr. President, he improvised the New Deal, and I am proud that I was one of his lieutenants. I backed him up in my State, of which I was Governor for a great part of the time that he was President, with all the strength and force of my heart and mind and body. He was a man of boundless courage. Who would have had the imagination and the bravery, in the face of a hostile public opinion, to see that we had to help our allies to survive and to overcome the scourge of Nazi bestiality and totalitarian greed? Who else would have had the courage to transfer 50 destroyers and other arms to England in her dark hours of need, when, after Dunkirk, it looked as if Britain could survive for only a very short while? He was the guiding spirit during the days of defense and preparedness, and he was the inspiration, the guiding spirit, and the driving force during the years of war. The fact that the war ended in victory was in major measure due to his great work. And then, on the eve of victory, with success in our grasp, his body refused further to bear the burdens he had imposed upon it. The valiant spirit, the great leader died.

I have never ceased to mourn the death of a man who was a dear and precious friend, but also a great American and a great leader of mankind. The world had long looked to him for leadership and inspiration. He was the embodiment of courage, of vision, and of progress. I believe that in his passing the world suffered an irreplaceable loss, a loss which I believe we feel more and more each day, because the people of the world not only admired him, but they loved and trusted him, and were willing and anxious to follow him. His place in history is secure beyond challenge. He was great not only in his talents but in his capacity for inspiring love, devotion, and loyalty. And the reason for that is simple: He loved people. He loved mankind. And they loved him.

Five years have passed, but I feel there is no man on the world scene today who

holds the affection and respect of his fellow citizens to the extent that Franklin Delano Roosevelt did—and still does. There is no man in history who has earned and held for so long a period, or in a greater degree, the loyalty and devotion of his fellow men. I know that I speak for the great majority of the American people, and I believe I speak for the great majority of the Members of this great body, when I say that he is remembered, and will always be remembered, as a leader without peer. He is dead, but his spirit guides us today, and will continue to guide us for years and generations to come.

AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD GERMANY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in corroboration of some statements made by my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. I hold in my hand an article which appeared in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune on Easter Sunday. It is entitled "United States Reverses Reich Policy. Morgenthau Plan Goes Into Ash Can." The article was written by Richard Wilson, the chief of the Minneapolis Tribune Washington bureau. I should like to quote a portion of the article because it substantiates what Senator after Senator on this side of the aisle have said during the past 4 years about the policy of the Democratic Party on the treatment of Germany. I repeat the title of the article: "United States Reverses Reich Policy. Morgenthau Plan Goes Into Ash Can." I remember very well, Mr. President, when I was perhaps the first Senator to criticize the Morgenthau plan, that one of the leading newspapers in the country wrote a bitter editorial because I dared to criticize the policy. The article says:

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Under force of necessity—

Every Senator on the floor knows what that necessity is, Mr. President. It is the youth of east Germany marching into west Germany.

Under force of necessity, American policy toward Germany has undergone a complete flip-flop in 5 years.

We now are trying to put her back on the map politically. She is being invited into the western community of nations. Manpower and productive power are needed to stop Russia.

Yet, Mr. President, when we tried for the past 4 years to stop dismantling, when we produced the pictures, when we produced the proof, we were met on the other side of the aisle, and by a few so-called Republican leaders of the bipartisan policy, with scorn, and with sneering remarks. Yet today who is proved to have been right?

It is agreed among the western Allies that there is no Europe without Germany.

The subhead says:

Morgenthau plans out—Denazification has stopped.

How well I remember, Mr. President, when we tried to stop the denazification courts when they were going to denazify millions of German people. How well I remember the ridicule at the idea of stopping denazification. But it was

finally stopped, millions of Germans not having been called before any court at all.

Under that program a man could be denazified and have a trial, and a few days later the officials would have him back and give him a second trial, and a few days later they would give him a third trial. They would take the German people and put them in camps. They would say to a school teacher, "The only kind of work you can do is common labor, not teaching."

Now, at last, after 5 years or more, that has been stopped.

Dismantling of industrial facilities has stopped.

Mr. President, it has not stopped. It is still going on. Those in charge tore down the fertilizer plants. There was put into the RECORD information showing that one concern in New York City got over \$3,000,000 to ship more fertilizer to Germany. That is the Democratic record. So long as I am a Member of this body the Democratic Party is never going to escape that noose around its neck.

Everything urged by the group headed by former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau is in the ashcan.

We said 5 years ago that that was where they belonged. Finally they have been put there.

These anti-Nazis originally proposed a policy—and it was adopted, in part—to reduce Germany to a nation of small farmers, shopkeepers and makers of consumers goods. Events have proved that was a misguided policy. It was apparently destined to fail from the first.

Every report that has come from Germany in recent months emphasizes the success of the Russian policy in the eastern zone in contrast to our own.

Who says this? Richard Wilson, chief of the Minneapolis Tribune Washington bureau. The article continues:

The change has been progressive in the past 3 years of the occupation. It began with revival of the idea by the State Department that Germany should become the work shop of Europe.

When the Nuremberg trials ended and the denazification courts were disbanded, another step was taken. Still another step was the slow-down in dismantling plants. Still another was an effort to increase steel production.

Formation of the Bonn government was a political peg for a new departure in policy. Secretary of State Dean Acheson, United States Commissioner John McCloy and Winston Churchill have been the heralds in the past week of a new strengthened Germany.

That was just this past week. It took them 5 years to catch up with some of us on the Republican side who have been telling the truth to the people of America about what was going on. But a week ago, thank God, Dean Acheson and Winston Churchill finally caught up.

The Labor government in England has been silent, or hesitant.

Now what does Winston Churchill say at last?

In a little-noticed speech, Churchill warned: "Woe be it to anyone in the free world who, by lack of understanding or by lack of good will or lack of world hope, or any more flagrant fault or blunder, obstructs

or delays this essential combination" of England, France and Germany.

Mr. President, may I have order? Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator pretty well has the Senate to himself. If it is not in order, I think he could get it in order very easily.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the distinguished acting majority leader was discussing some topic with the distinguished Senator from Utah. The distinguished occupant of the Chair was discussing another matter, apparently with some of the staff at the desk. I am very anxious to have the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Florida, listen to what I am saying. Because of his great importance in the Democratic Party, I am satisfied he can help even now to straighten out this terrible and distressing situation.

I continue to quote what Winston Churchill said a few days ago:

The strong German race, which, during the last 40 years we and our allies twice fought and defeated, have now the opportunity of rendering an immense service to mankind.

Having submitted to internal tyranny and brought measureless suffering upon us all, and especially themselves, they now have a chance of redeeming the German name by helping to redeem what has happened in the past and by playing their part—and it might be a great one—in lifting the civilization of Europe to a level where its old glories may revive, and where the various forms of tolerant freedom and resulting happiness and culture may be restored.

I particularly ask my distinguished colleagues to mark these words of Winston Churchill:

EQUAL RANK

France and Britain, both sorely distressed, can combine together and thus joined have the superior power to raise Germany, even more shattered, to an equal rank and to lasting association with them.

Then these three countries, helping each other, conscious of their future united greatness, forgetting ancient feuds and the horrible deeds and tragedies of the past, can make the core or the nucleus on which all the other civilized democracies of Europe, bond or free, can one day rally and combine.

Mr. President, those are remarkable words, coming from a man who has held the many exalted positions Winston Churchill has filled.

This approach, which would have been so distasteful to the anti-Nazis a few years ago, is taken now because the western nations have agreed that Germany must be held against the powerful attraction from Moscow.

The strongest argument against the new approach is that it means the rearmament of Germany. The United States is committed against that, and Churchill said he is not asking rearmament.

He is urging greater British interest in a unified Europe including Germany and the eventual use of German manpower in the western European defense plan. This would require what the London Economist calls abandoning Britain's "petulant isolationism of recent years."

I mention this, Mr. President, for the reason that it bears out the prophecies made by so many of us—or rather by so few of us on this side of the aisle—who have repeated and reiterated, and repeated and reiterated, that the sort of

treatment Germany was receiving after the war was helping Russia and was not helping the United States of America. At last, Mr. President, we are going to find who were the true prophets.

DEATH OF CHIEF JUSTICE GEORGE W. MAXEY AND JUSTICE MARION D. PATTERSON, OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, with deep regret I announce to the Senate the loss to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to the Nation of two distinguished justices of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania—Chief Justice George W. Maxey and Justice Marion D. Patterson.

Chief Justice Maxey was stricken on March 21 at Pittsburgh, Pa., an hour after he had delivered in court an eloquent eulogy of the late Justice Patterson, who died January 6 at Philadelphia.

Each of these men was a brilliant leader of jurisprudence, and a forceful and courageous patriot.

They were fearless and impartial advocates of justice and righteousness.

They were men of unselfish dedication to the ideals of Americanism.

Pennsylvania was most fortunate to have had the benefit of their outstanding public service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement which I issued on the death of Chief Justice Maxey. The same attributes of greatness were possessed by Justice Patterson, whose career began as a teacher in the schools of his native Blair County.

I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial of appreciation of Chief Justice Maxey, which appeared in the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune, and an editorial tribute to Justice Patterson, which was published in the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the passing of Chief Justice Maxey the Nation has lost an outstanding American. His career and his distinguished achievements, rising from an humble miner to eminence as head of the judicial system of our Commonwealth, exemplifies the American way of life at its best.

His profound knowledge of the law, his broad and comprehensive scholarship, and his thorough understanding of the history of the United States made his opinions and statements sought by all real students of our country. His life has added so much to the greatness of his community, his State, and the Nation.

[From the Scranton Tribune of March 21, 1950]

GEORGE W. MAXEY—OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

The sudden death of George W. Maxey, chief justice of the supreme court of Pennsylvania, will come as a severe shock to the thousands in all walks of life who knew him, respected him, and admired him.

His death brings to an end a varied and illustrious career which had its origin in the little town of Forest City and which saw his first occupational endeavors in the anthracite coal mines of that area.

From that humble start George Maxey lifted himself by his ability, energy, and intelligence to the very top ranks of his beloved profession—the law. Just as he worked his way through school and college, he worked his way up the ladder of professional and public esteem, displaying the fine qualities attributed to all American self-made men, toil, perseverance, study, integrity of character, love of his fellow man, and devotion to the principles of right and justice.

His early days as a worker in the mines and later as a struggling young lawyer insured for his entire career the comforting characteristic of the human touch. His friendliness and neighborliness as much as his ability and talent won him the respect and the support of his fellow citizens in the many political campaigns in which he participated throughout his life, the last just as recently as 1948 when he was elected delegate to the Republican National Convention. And his same knowledge of people and understanding of their problems enabled him in his splendid judicial career to apply his decisions in law to the realities of life. A gifted orator, a brilliant legalist, a scholar of history, a fearless, courageous fighter for justice and the right, George W. Maxey carved for himself a permanent place in the archives of jurisprudence and the annals of Pennsylvania's and the Nation's outstanding men.

In the course of his public career Justice Maxey served as Lackawanna's district attorney from 1914 to 1920; as common pleas judge for the following 10 years, and as a justice of the supreme court from November 24, 1930, to January 4, 1943, when he was elevated to the post of chief justice. During that career he was frequently espoused for further honors, Governor, Senator, Vice President of the United States, but he held faithful to the profession of law which he loved so dearly.

In his death Pennsylvania has lost one of its foremost citizens, Scranton and Lackawanna County will mourn the passing of a splendid and exemplary neighbor and friend; his family, the loss of a devoted husband and father.

[From the Altoona Mirror of January 9, 1950]

JUSTICE PATTERSON

Blair County is in deep mourning through the loss of its most distinguished native son, Judge Marion D. Patterson of the State supreme court, whose unexpected death last Friday in Philadelphia came as a distinct shock to friends and acquaintances in this county and throughout the State.

For 46 years Marion Dean Patterson followed the legal profession, attaining prominence not only in his home community, but in the entire State. He was outstanding as a lawyer, prosecuting attorney, judge, and justice. He likewise was successful as a farmer, businessman, and as a community leader. His civic, political, and fraternal affiliations were many.

Blair County long has taken considerable pride in Justice Patterson's accomplishments and in his prominence. A forceful speaker, a capable orator, a learned jurist, he added dignity to his profession. He dispensed justice without fear or favor. He made friendships and distinguished himself for his human kindness, his fairness, his deep understanding of the problems of his fellow men and associates.

Justice Patterson never shirked a duty and he filled every responsibility. Affectionately known to all Blair residents as "The Judge," "Mr. Justice," or as the more desired "Marion," his greetings were always warm and friendly, his smile sincere, and his remarks timely and inspired. His presence at various gatherings was an inspiration to all.

While the law was his main ambition, Justice Patterson was successful in other

enterprises. He never lost his interest in farming, which he followed as a boy in Tiny Creek, and for many years he owned and operated a dairy farm in Clover Creek, near his birthplace. Many happy hours were spent there and he ever was aware of the problems of the tillers of the soil. Mr. Patterson was one of the first to seek good roads in the State and he was Blair County's first chairman of the good-roads committee. He directed the annual Pennsylvania State YMCA Father and Son Week activities as chairman. For the past 15 years he had been a member of the William S. Gable department-store firm. He served as the head of many associations and groups in the professional and the civic and lodge circles. His association and diligence of work contributed to the success of these activities. His career as an attorney was brilliant, his rise rapid. Graduated in 1904, Mr. Patterson affiliated with the Blair bar the same year. In 1911 he was elected district attorney, and served continuously for 16 years, establishing an excellent record. His administration of that office attracted State-wide attention.

Justice Patterson was elevated to the judgeship in his home county in 1927 and was reelected 10 years later. He resigned, however, following his elevation to the supreme court, assuming his duties in 1940. Death ended his brilliant career, as he was engaged in the duties of this court, last Friday.

At home and from all over the State, condolences have been received and deepest sympathies are extended to the widow, the children, and grandson and three surviving brothers. The family, the legal profession, and the community are sorrowed in the passing of a distinguished citizen.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

James K. Knudson, of Utah, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1953, vice Carroll Miller, deceased;

Raymond J. Mauerman and Alfred C. Richmond, for promotion in the United States Coast Guard;

Chester M. Anderson, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the United States Coast Guard;

Robert Kennedy Adams, and sundry other cadets, to be ensigns in the Coast Guard; and John Laskowski, to be commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

RECESS

Mr. HOLLAND. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 13, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, April 12 (legislative day of March 29), 1950):

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Donald S. Albright, Jr.	Richard C. Doan
James A. Allen	Charles Dobony
Louis A. Ammann, Jr.	Richard E. Dollinger
William W. Anderson, William F. Dombrowski, Jr.	
Ronald N. Andresen	Gerard F. Dooley
Cornell C. Angleman	Richard F. Drake
Neil A. Armstrong III	Frederick F. Duggan, Jr.
Henry D. Arnold	
Julian M. Arnold	Richard W. Duggan II
Fuller A. Austin	Gene T. Dunaway
John R. Axe	Charles C. Dunn, Jr.
William H. Ayres, Jr.	Thomas R. Eagye II
Robert E. Babcock	George W. East
Herbert R. Babington, Jr.	Frederick A. Edwards, Jr.
Lee Baggett, Jr.	James D. Elliott
Ralph F. Bagley, Jr.	David F. Emerson
Charles R. Bardes	Raymond E. Engle
Curtis L. Barnette	Robert F. Engler, Jr.
Frederic E. Beck, Jr.	Hubert "T" Evans
Thomas J. Bigley	Rodney E. Eyster
John H. Billings	Frank R. Fahland
Robert C. Binnion, Jr.	Raymond Z. Fahs, Jr.
William M. Birkel	Donald F. Fant
Peter F. Block	William B. Farnsworth, Jr.
Lewis J. N. Blyde, Jr.	John B. Farrell
Paisley Boney III	Frederick K. Feagin
Richard M. Bossert	Donald G. Fears
George A. Bottom III	Frank H. Featherston
David S. Boyd	Joseph Fenier
Bernard R. Boylan	George D. Ferguson III
Gene P. Brady	Harry R. Flory, Jr.
John J. Branson, Jr.	Vivester R. Foley, Jr.
Morton Brett	Donald K. Forbes
John H. Brick	Paul W. Forehand
Bonner B. Brown, Jr.	George A. Fox, Jr.
Roger L. Buck	Richard T. Fox
Ellis H. Buckley	Donald G. Fraasa
Carl J. Burnett, Jr.	Elias C. Frank
Alexander R. Burt, Jr.	Montgomery L. Frazier
Bernard L. Buteau	Norman M. French, Jr.
John P. Cady, Jr.	Robert D. French
Andrew J. Callahan, Jr.	John S. Frerichs
Allan K. Cameron, Jr.	William W. Fritz
James M. Cameron	Robert C. Frosio
Jess L. Cariker, Jr.	Mark P. Frudden
Edward W. Carr	Charles R. Galloway, Jr.
William K. Carr	Thomas M. Gardiner III
Frank R. Carter	Kendall C. Gedney
Frank R. Cassilly	Thomas B. George, Jr.
John P. Cavanaugh	David T. Gochenour
Neil D. Chaitin	Lewis H. Goldbeck, Jr.
John J. Chambers	Robert L. Goldman
Eugene N. Chipman	Richard E. Goodspeed
Clifford E. Church, Jr.	Rockwell M. Gray, Jr.
Walter L. Clarke, Jr.	Leonard B. Greene
Gerard G. Coleman	Charles L. Greenwood
John E. Colleary, Jr.	Wiley W. Greer
George E. Conatore	Joseph L. Grier, Jr.
Maurice J. Condit	Ellegood V. Griffin, Jr.
Walter R. Congdon	William H. Grigg
Charles M. Conlon, Jr.	William F. Grimm
David H. Cooke	Morgan K. Groover, Jr.
William M. Cossaboom	Alexander G. B. Grosvenor
John T. Coughlin	Michael M. Grove
Frank Cramblet	Edward A. Grunwald
Russell P. Cunningham, Jr.	Erik A. Gude
George H. Darius	Gilbert N. Hain
Jerome A. Davi	Donald P. Hall
Allen B. Davis	Robert R. Hamer, Jr.
Robert L. Davis	Virgil R. Hancock
Walter E. Davis, Jr.	Carl T. Hanson
William H. DeMers II	Martin E. Hardy
George T. Denmark	Richard E. Harkness
William F. Diehl	Robert D. Harris
Earl K. Dille	Robert D. Harris, Jr.
Samuel L. Doak	Silas C. Hart, Jr.

- Ralf L. Hartwell, Jr.
John W. Harvey
Larry L. Hawkins
Ronald J. Hays
Houston C. Hayward
David D. Heerwagen
John C. Henning III
Harold G. Herring
Henry G. Hiatt, Jr.
Roy W. Highberg
Robert D. Hoffman
Samuel D. Hoffman
Kenneth G. Hoge, Jr.
Rockwell Holman
John S. Holmes
Charles S. Hooper, Jr.
Howell P. Hoover, Jr.
Clifford D. Hopkins
William H. P. Hopkins
Joseph B. Howard
James A. Hudson
Mahlon S. Huff
Ray S. Hughes
Donald B. Hunt, Jr.
Harry "L" Hussmann
III
George E. Irish
Jacob H. Jacobson, Jr.
Beverly G. Jakimier
Donald L. Jarrell
Robert R. Jefferson
Claude E. Jeffries, Jr.
Thomas E. Jenike
Wayne LeR. Jensen
George E. Jensen
Phillip T. Johnson
Robert LeR. Jones
James E. Kaune
Robert J. Keevers
Ronald T. Kelly
William P. Kelly, Jr.
Cecil J. Kempf
James R. Kennedy, Jr.
Charles T. Kessing
Lewis H. Kessler, Jr.
Joseph H. Kibbey II
William A. Kiehl
Robert A. King
Robert M. King
Thomas R. King
James W. Kinnear 3d
James P. Kittler
Alexander L. Klivlen
Joseph F. Klingensmith
Edward P. Knox
Creighton R. Knutson
Tom I. Kolstad
John D. Kost, Jr.
Robert L. Krag
Robert P. Kramer
Harry M. Krantzman
Stanley W. Krohn
Donald A. Kuhlman
Howard I. Laniado
Max H. Lasell
William W. Lasley
James S. Lassing
Thomas A. LeDew
Byron A. Lee
Robert McG. Lee
Myron E. Leslie
Donald C. Lind
Charles B. Lindley
James W. Lisanby
James G. Little
Harold R. Lockwood
George R. Loftis
Donald C. Long
Jack N. Lyman
Osmar W. Lynch
James D. Lyttle
William A. McBroom
Stephen W. McClaran
Ambrose P. McCoy, Jr.
Frank M. McCraw, Jr.
Albert D. McFall
William E. McGarran, Jr.
Thomas H. McGlaughlin
- Thomas C. McGrath, Jr.
John P. McNabney
John J. McNally
Willard C. Macfarland
John D. Mackenzie
Harry P. Madera
George C. Mahoney
Rex E. Maire
John E. Malloy
Robert C. Mandeville, Jr.
Richard W. Martin
William K. Martin
John H. Mathews
Willis A. Matson II
Frank T. Maynard
Daniel K. Mayo
Donald B. Meek
Frank G. Meyer
Richard A. Miller
Thomas G. Miller, Jr.
William A. Miller
Beverly T. Mills
Marion L. Minnis, Jr.
Richard O. Moberly, Jr.
Kendall D. Moll
Robert R. Monroe
Thomas L. Moore
Gene D. Morin
John N. Morrissey
Floyd R. Muck
Charles L. Mull II
Leonard A. Muller
Norman K. Mullin
Floyd N. Munson
Garrison E. Murphy
John A. Murphy
George W. Myer
Delbert L. Nall
Stanley B. Neander
George G. Nelson
Arthur D. Neustel
John E. Niesse
Robert V. Ninnis
Henry J. Nix
James K. Noble, Jr.
Thomas I. Noble
John MacN. Noonan
James P. Oberholtzer
Francis E. O'Connor
Robert P. Oliver
Thomas F. O'Neill, Jr.
James P. O'Reilly, Jr.
Charles A. Orem
Harlan D. Parode
George W. Patterson
III
Joseph J. Pausner, Jr.
Frank M. Perry, Jr.
Riddell T. Perry
Thomas A. Peterson
Royce E. Pettit, Jr.
William G. Petty
King W. Pfeiffer
Pharo A. Phelps, Jr.
Emanuel F. Pine
Arthur L. Pleasants
III
John B. Pleasants
Howard R. Portnoy
Norman S. Potter
Samuel F. Powel III
James R. Powell, Jr.
Richard J. Prescott
Samuel D. Preston, Jr.
Alfred M. Pride
Gordon A. Prince
Andrew Pullar, Jr.
Elvis E. Purvis
Frank H. Raab
Louis P. Raay
Roderick T. Radcliffe
Chris G. Rallis
Gerald L. Rasmussen
John H. Reagan
Sherman C. Reed
Bernard J. Regenauer
- Albert L. Register III
Charles J. Reichl
William J. Ricci
George P. Ritchie, Jr.
Donald K. Robbins
Charles G. Robertson, Jr.
James A. Robinson
Thomas W. Robinson, Jr.
John T. Rogers
Nelson K. Rogers
Thomas S. Rogers, Jr.
Thomas H. Ross
Franklin H. Roth
Bruce W. Rowe
Lee R. Royal
Byron C. Ruble
Adrian O. Rule III
John J. Ryan, Jr.
Phillip J. Ryan
Robert S. Satre
Donald C. Sattler
Joe Sax
Marvin L. Schenker
Joseph N. Schettino
Jesse Z. Schultz
Milton J. Schultz, Jr.
Henry I. Scribner, Jr.
George H. Seelye
Russell M. Seipp
Rickard W. Shannon
William K. Sharpe
Howard A. Shartel
Thomas H. Sherman, Jr.
George B. Shick, Jr.
Robert T. Shultz
Robert Siegmelster
Homer R. Skelton
Clifford A. Skinner, Jr.
Edgar M. Smith, Jr.
Floyd A. Smith
Leon W. Smith
Philip W. Smith
Robert E. Smith
Robert McL. Smith, Jr.
William N. Smoot
Collins Snyder
John C. Snyder
Richard E. Snyder
Roy D. Snyder, Jr.
Jerome E. Solomon, Jr.
Roy S. Somogye
David J. Space
Keith C. Spayde, Jr.
- The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:
Harry LaV. Anderson
George K. Armstrong
Ray C. Barber
Spencer A. Barrow
Robert F. Bauer
George J. Bowen
Walter L. Bown
Norman E. Carpenter
Guy C. Cheatham, Jr.
Charles A. Clark III
Wilfred B. Curley
James B. Davis
William B. Droge, Jr.
Carl M. Dughi
Donald J. Dunham, Jr.
William B. Ely, Jr.
William C. Fillmore
Gilbert H. Gordon, Jr.
Edwin G. Greenberg
George B. Halperin
John M. Henderson
William D. Hoggard II
- The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 2d day of June 1950:
George E. Beattie
Lee R. Bendell
Frank R. Bonner
Edward J. Bronars
Thomas E. Bulger
- John H. Spiller, Jr.
Roy M. Springer, Jr.
Howard E. Sproull, Jr.
Aron L. Stapp
Edward C. Stella
John B. Stetson
Richard P. Stimler
Bruce G. Stone
Douglas D. Stone, Jr.
Donald Stull
Anthony F. Suracl
Francis C. Taylor
Fred W. Terrell, Jr.
Norman R. Thom
Theodore O. Thompson
William B. Thompson, Jr.
Dick W. Thurston
Jacques F. Trevillyan
Robert J. Trotter
Justin L. VanKleeck
Thomas E. Vines
Adrian DeW. Vining
James B. Vosseller
Nicholas Vytlacil, Jr.
Walter R. Wagner
Alexander E. Waller, Jr.
Richard C. Webb III
Richard W. Welsh
Burton R. Weymouth
William S. Whaley
Caryll R. Whipple
Robert J. White
Richard T. Whitehead
Robert Whitelaw
Walter J. Whitley
William B. Whittle
James R. Wilkins, Jr.
Daniel D. M. Willard
James W. Wills, Jr.
James I. Wilson
Keith C. Wilson
William W. Wilson
Robert E. Wise
Richard F. Wiseman
Eugene M. Wisenbaker
Peter W. Wood
Gordon P. Woodman
Edmund T. Wooldridge, Jr.
William B. Wright
William H. Wulfstange
Edward R. P. Wunch
Robert Wunderlich
Casanave H. Young, Jr.
- Harrison G. Frasier
Carlton D. Goodiel, Jr.
Fredric A. Green
John E. Greenwood
William F. Hawkins
Stanley A. Herman
Sanford P. Holcomb
Robert E. Hunter, Jr.
Jack F. Ingalls III
Kenneth J. Ivanson
Frederick D. Leder
Joseph V. McLernan
Paul G. McMahon
James W. Marsh
Donald C. Miller
Ross L. Mulford
Robert J. Murphy, Jr.
John E. Nolan, Jr.
Robert W. Oliver
- The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:
Robert H. Alexander
Jerome D. Ambelang
Jack B. Andrews
John D. Anthony, Jr.
Ralph D. Ashworth
Albert R. Ashworth, Jr.
David E. Atkins
Chester C. Bach
Charles S. Balles
Jack L. Baker
William A. Baker, Jr.
Clarence L. Baldwin
Jr.
Lynn M. Barker
Edwin Barrineau
Harold J. Bartleson
Dale R. Bauer
Joseph H. Bauernfeind
Emil F. Beck
Joseph W. Benn, Jr.
Thomas C. Biesterveld
Robert O. Blackington
Eddie R. Blair
William C. Blaney, Jr.
William R. Boyce
Richard F. Bradberry
Lowell R. Brewer
Charles "D" Brown
Joseph L. Brown
Richard A. Cantrell
James P. Carberry, Jr.
Edmond G. Carley, Jr.
William W. Carlson
Charles V. Choyce
Donald R. Contant
Robert V. Cooley
Kenneth C. Coston
Ralph Cross
Dayl E. Crow
Leonard Czernicki
William D. Dayton
Donald B. Dellinger
Jack R. Denning
Jerome M. Driscoll
Earl D. Dryfoose, Jr.
Richard M. Ebelacker
Earl J. Eckert, Jr.
Richard H. Ellis
Ernest C. English, Jr.
Gus W. Epenter, Jr.
Ronald L. Farrar
John R. Farrell
David E. Ferrucci
Robert R. Foley
Richard R. Franzel
Edwin "J" Friesen
Donald E. Fry
John G. Galbreath
Joseph W. Gardiner
Clyde W. Gardner
John C. Garland
Richard A. Geist
Richard A. Gregory
George M. Griffin, Jr.
Kenneth E. Grim
Robert L. Gully
Thomas E. Haddock
- Stanley H. Olson
John J. Oltermann
Grover J. Rees, Jr.
David M. Ridderhof
Presley M. Rixey
William K. Rockey
George V. Ruos, Jr.
Donald B. Saunders
William G. Schwefel
Charles B. P. Sellar
Richard B. Sheridan
John A. Sivright
Richard L. Still
Clinton J. Thro, Jr.
James A. Todd
Marshall J. Treado
Hal W. Vincent
Edward R. Watson
Robert D. Whitesell
- William W. Hagan
Henry L. Halleland
Lelan E. Haller
John A. Hansen
Walter J. Hanzo, Jr.
Richard D. Harris
Stuart E. Hartman
Robert H. Hartzell
Hugh K. Henderson, Jr.
Henry L. Hendrick, Jr.
John M. Herbst
Charles I. Hickman
Richard A. Holbert
Homer A. Hollingshead
James L. Hoyt
Leland J. Hosemann
Mark F. Hoyer, Jr.
John R. Hoyt
James W. Huber
Wayne LaV. Hughes
Stuart McK. Hutchison
Marshall P. Hydorn
John C. Imhoff
Billy G. Ingram
Robert D. Jackson
Arlo J. Jensen
Faye C. Johnson
James M. Johnson, Jr.
Merlin L. Johnson
Cecil B. Jones, Jr.
Huby A. Jones, Jr.
Robert D. Kaiser
Donald C. C. Kembitskey
Max F. Klinger
Robert M. Koch
John L. Kremer
Robert Križner
Wayne L. Kuckkahn
Harold A. Laque
Harry E. Lennon, Jr.
Ralph A. Lennon
Richard W. Lintner
Harrison F. Longstreth
Richard C. Loomer
Joseph R. Loper
Robert H. Lovelace
Robert M. Lynch
Claude E. Lytton, Jr.
Malcolm McAlpin
Joseph S. McClelland, Jr.
Harold A. McDonnel
Jesse E. McKnight, Jr.
Robert F. McMullen, Jr.
Ralph E. McQueen
Richard A. Mackell
Richard E. Maegli
Paul V. Magee, Jr.
Vernon C. Malander
Paul J. Mathis
William O. Mayfield
Frank D. Melton
Alfred E. Miller
Jay M. Miller
Robert D. Miller
Edward D. Millpointer
Joseph E. Mills

Frank J. Moran, Jr.
 Robert Moss
 Raymond W. Murphy
 Marvin D. Nelson, Jr.
 Emile W. Nigels
 William D. Noonan
 John H. Norris, Jr.
 Robert C. Notz
 Walter E. Ohlrich, Jr.
 Richard J. O'Toole
 Charles K. Owen
 Thomas H. Parsons
 Joseph B. Paschal, Jr.
 Clarence A. Payne, Jr.
 Joseph M. Perry
 Donald B. Perryman
 Ralph C. Peters, Jr.
 James C. Petersen
 Cyril M. Pipkin
 William A. Platte
 Louis C. Poindexter
 Cadesman Pope, Jr.
 Thomas Porter
 Frank W. Preston
 Joseph M. Preston, Jr.
 Allen B. Price
 Marvin M. Quaid, Jr.
 William F. Rau
 James M. Ray
 Alan E. Reed
 Edward J. Richter
 John L. Rieker
 Kenneth B. Roberts
 Norris A. Roberts
 James C. Robinson
 John W. Roche
 Louis P. Rolf
 Robert B. Roseberry
 Robert D. Roth
 Richard M. Ruppenthal
 Harvey Sager
 Robert J. Sample
 Albert L. Schuck, Jr.
 Robert W. Schwab

John B. Seal
 Donald H. Shaner
 William F. Sheehy
 Charles H. Simes
 Floyd R. Singleton
 Ralph Sluis
 Keith A. Smith
 Richard T. Somerville
 Harold A. Sparks
 Frank E. Specht
 Paul H. Speer
 Richard A. Stack
 Robert E. Stanton
 Allan M. Stave
 Harold Stevens
 Glen W. Stinnett, Jr.
 John A. Strand, Jr.
 Alfred E. Strickland
 Joseph E. Suberg
 Donald G. Sutherland
 John R. Swadener
 Kenneth L. Templeton
 Charles F. Thill
 Robert E. Tostberg
 Dan M. Trimble
 Kenneth R. Wallace
 Peter J. Weiland
 James B. West
 Ted G. West
 Don R. R. Whitmer
 Maurice C. Willis
 Alexander B. Wilson
 Robert LaV. Wilson
 Jack Wolda
 Kenneth G. Wolfel
 Jacob R. Wolfersberger
 Richard D. Wood
 Thomas E. Woolcock
 George A. Yanovitch
 Arthur Zimmerly III

Robert L. Christensen
 Robert S. Clough
 Donald L. Cochran
 Stanley Cohen
 Marvin Cohn
 Charles F. Cole
 Charles W. Cole
 John D. Colgan
 Dudley T. Colton, Jr.
 James J. Connell
 Jerald L. Connelly
 Byron W. Conrad
 Edouard V. Cooksey
 David L. Cooper
 Martin Cooper
 Warren P. Cooper
 Rex G. Corbin
 Robert S. Cortner
 Daniel J. Costello
 Thomas A. Costen
 Lloyd E. Cotsen
 Hewitt H. Covington
 William J. Cowhill
 Clifford M. Cowles III
 Billy J. Cox
 Richard A. Cox
 Richard G. Cox, Jr.
 Stephen D. Cragon
 Francis J. Cranston
 Allen E. Crum
 William A. Crump
 William C. Crutcher
 Benjamin C. Cabbage, Jr.
 James C. Curran
 Don J. Cushing
 James C. Custer
 George I. Dague
 John D. Damuth
 John M. Dancy
 Thomas E. Dannemiller
 Robert F. Danziger
 Donald P. Darnell
 Jack W. Davis
 Jerome R. Davis
 Orrin H. Davison, Jr.
 Henri duPr. deCompiègne, Jr.
 John T. DeGraff, Jr.
 Charles D. DeLaitre
 Douglas Delaney, Jr.
 Eddie J. DeLay
 Donald W. DeMott
 Clarke D. Denney
 Joseph P. Desmond, Jr.
 Donald J. Dessart
 Jose L. deVictoria, Jr.
 Edward Dewey
 Eddie J. Dickert, Jr.
 Robert C. Dixon
 Thomas J. Dixon
 David F. Dobbins
 Charles S. Dolk
 John J. Donahoe, Jr.
 Timothy J. Donovan
 Robert H. Dougherty
 Robert A. Downing
 John M. Draddy
 Duane W. Dresser
 Robert C. Driscoll
 Harold W. Durrett
 Martin E. Dyer
 Samuel C. Dysart, Jr.
 Robert J. J. Eck
 Clay B. Eddy, Jr.
 David M. Egan
 Jared Elliot
 Robert C. Elliott
 Leland H. Emery, Jr.
 Joseph A. English, Jr.
 Arthur E. Erickson, Jr.
 Stanton D. Ericson
 Bernard A. Everett
 Philip B. Ezell
 Richard S. Fahey
 John P. Fajnor
 Virgil T. Faulkenberry
 John K. Fauver

Daniel F. Featherston, Jr.
 Carlisle W. Fiers, Jr.
 Don A. Finstrom
 Timothy Fiske
 Richard D. Flynn
 George E. Foreman
 Richard J. Forest
 Douglas T. Foster
 John F. Fowler III
 Robert A. Fowler
 Duane C. Fox
 George H. Francis
 Richard H. Frank, Jr.
 Robert F. Frantz
 Robert G. Franz
 Keith E. Fredlund
 John M. Frey
 Shirley C. Friend, Jr.
 James W. Fry
 Winfield P. Fuller, Jr.
 Theodore J. Fussell
 Donlon H. Gabrielseu
 Walter J. Gallagher Jr.
 Thomas E. Galles
 Lewis E. Gary
 John D. McI. Gass
 Thomas D. Gay
 Arthur V. Gelnow
 August T. Gentiluocci, Jr.
 Charles J. Gerhardt, Jr.
 Harold L. Gerhart, Jr.
 Frank T. Giangioffe
 Elmer W. Gielow
 Morton Gilbert
 Thomas H. Gildersleeve
 David G. Glascock
 Jack H. Glazer
 Robert C. Goetz
 William L. Goffe
 Matthew E. Gormly, Jr.
 Jack E. Gove
 William H. Graham
 Allen M. Granda
 Erwin S. Grask, Jr.
 James W. Gray, Jr.
 Samuel G. Green, Jr.
 Thomas M. Green III
 John C. Greer
 Randolph P. Griffin
 Norman C. Grisewood
 Peter M. Gross
 Otto H. Gruner III
 Joseph S. Haas
 Robert W. Hackbart
 Robert H. Hackney
 Robert L. Hadley
 William S. Hahn
 George E. Hale
 Donald C. Hall
 Henry I. Hall
 James W. Hall
 Jack T. Hamilton
 Charles V. Handy
 Edward D. Harkin
 Vinton O. Harkness, Jr.
 Edgar S. Harris, Jr.
 George B. Harris III
 Walter P. Harris, Jr.
 John I. Harrison
 David H. Hartnett
 Thomas H. Hartzell
 Howard W. Hastings
 John L. Hayes
 Frank J. Hawley, Jr.
 Richard P. Healy
 Robert J. Heinecamp
 William W. Helman
 William A. Henshaw
 Lucy B. Herrmann
 Frederick H. Herzog
 Victor L. Hesse
 James K. Hickok
 Norman W. Hicks
 John G. Hiles

Joseph V. Hill
 David K. Hills
 Ewan M. Hinkle
 John W. Hinton
 Carroll D. Hobson
 Calvin L. Hockema
 Nell E. Hoesel
 Paul Hoffund
 Robert L. Holliday
 Frank M. Hollister
 Harry D. Holmgren
 Edward E. Horton
 Eugene Hotchkiss III
 James K. Hotchkiss
 George W. Hottinger
 Edward Howard
 Philip B. Howard
 John P. Hudson, Jr.
 Arter F. Hughes
 Helge R. Hukari
 Albert M. Hunt
 James D. Hutchinson
 William R. Hutchinson
 Howard S. Irons
 William M. Jameson
 Arthur L. Johnson
 Bruce M. Johnson
 Clyde "L" Johnson, Jr.
 Harvey LaS. Johnson
 Ian J. Johnson
 Lyle K. Johnson
 Raymond D. Johnson
 Roy T. Johnson
 Willard E. Johnson
 Burton H. Jones
 Webster F. Jones
 Watt W. Jordan, Jr.
 Warren R. Jorve
 Jerome A. Joseph
 Bruce L. Joslow
 Edward R. Joyce, Jr.
 Edward R. Judy
 Edward F. Jurgielewicz
 Melvin L. Kaufman
 Lloyd R. Kavanagh
 James W. Keeling
 James N. Keith
 Paul L. Kellogg
 Christopher J. Kelly
 Edward J. Kelly
 Paul F. Kent
 Allen S. Kerr
 John H. Kessel
 Kenneth J. Killgore
 Edwin D. Kimball
 Charles B. Kirkpatrick
 Peter D. Kjeldgaard
 Albert H. Klime, Jr.
 John R. Klippstein
 Donald J. Knapp
 Jeff P. Knight
 Quintus J. H. Koth
 Robert A. Kresse
 Frank C. Kretschman
 Paul E. Kueser
 Kenneth E. Kulzick
 Albert W. Kunberger
 Delmer L. Kuns
 James B. Kurtz
 Jerome E. Labaw
 Vaden M. Lackey, Jr.
 Edward F. LaCroix
 Robert G. Lalicker
 Philip J. Lamoureux, Jr.
 Frederick P. Landau
 Robert K. Landon
 Samuel C. Lang
 Richard M. Larsen
 Hewlett W. Latimer
 Robert E. Laube
 Donald Lawson
 Donald J. Leeman
 Dick McC. Lester
 John T. Lewis
 John L. Light
 Douglas K. Lilly
 Frank K. Little

Harry M. Little, Jr.
 Marshall A. Lochridge, Jr.
 Thomas F. Lodato
 Curt T. Lohrey
 Arthur C. Lonborg
 Aubrey K. Loomis
 Willis M. Losey
 Rupert H. Loyd
 Robert E. Lueders
 William DuP. Lyles
 James H. Lytle
 Sidney Y. McAden, Jr.
 John C. McArthur
 Richard L. McArthur
 George S. McCain
 William T. McCarty
 William D. McCarty
 Bain McChntock
 Walter R. McCormack
 Thomas F. McCormick
 Samuel P. McCutchen, Jr.
 James N. McCutcheon
 Charles A. McDonald, Jr.
 Richard M. McElvery
 John W. McEan, Jr.
 John J. McKenna
 Melvin J. McKinley, Jr.
 Walker McKinney
 George M. McKown
 Duer McLanahan, Jr.
 Daniel H. McLaughlin
 William H. McLeod, Jr.
 Lewis L. McMasters, Jr.
 Earl C. McMinn
 Stuart D. McNamara
 Roy D. McPhee
 DeWitt K. MacDonald, Jr.
 Thomas E. Macfie
 Charles C. Madigan
 James J. Maher, Jr.
 Thomas W. Mapp
 Leonard M. Marangi
 Richard D. Marchant
 John W. Marcus
 William E. Maritz
 Alexander Marshall
 Roger T. Martin
 William J. Martz
 Paul H. Massey
 Daryle C. May
 Carlton J. Meade, Jr.
 James C. Meetze
 James C. Meekle
 Paul A. Meyer
 Alan H. Miller
 Allan S. Miller
 Byron K. Miller
 Charles J. Miller, Jr.
 Nelson D. Miller, Jr.
 Thomas B. Miller
 Alan R. Mitchell
 Charles J. Mitchell
 Ralph M. Moberly, Jr.
 Roy M. Moe
 John H. Moeller
 Russell G. Moffett
 Edgar B. Montague, Jr.
 John D. Montgomery
 Henry J. Moore II
 James W. Moore
 Hugh J. Morgan, Jr.
 Max R. Moritz
 Melvyn C. Morris III
 John W. Morton II
 Richard W. Moshier
 Roddey B. Moss
 Richard N. Motsinger
 Nils L. Muench
 John G. Munsell
 Frank "M" Murphy, Jr.
 Robert G. Myers, Jr.
 Thomas R. Mylott
 Theodore B. Neeley
 Edward R. Neely, Jr.
 James V. Neely
 Arno H. Nehrling, Jr.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Richard D. Alcock
 Alfred H. Allen
 Donald A. Anderson
 Jack E. Andrews, Jr.
 Sherwin C. Badger, Jr.
 Milton B. Badt, Jr.
 Donald J. Bailey
 Carlos P. Baker, Jr.
 Joseph S. Bakula
 Richard H. Ballarian
 Francis J. Bartram, Jr.
 Harmon B. Bassett
 James C. Bassett
 William M. Batchelor
 Henry C. Bate, Jr.
 George W. Bates, Jr.
 James V. Baumgartner
 William A. Bayreuther, Jr.
 Clyde R. Beamer
 Chapman H. Belew, Jr.
 Lee D. Bellmer
 Henry J. Bender
 John T. Bennett, Jr.
 Joseph F. Bennett
 Harold D. Bergen
 Glade "S" Bigler
 Thomas M. Birdwell, Jr.
 Lisle J. Blackburn
 Robert H. Blake
 William R. Blanc
 Zane S. Blanchard
 Robert W. Blodgett
 John S. Blonsick, Jr.
 Robert A. Blumenthal
 Charles D. Bobo
 Arnold H. Bockstruck
 Robert L. Boonstra
 Henry O. Booth, Jr.
 Roger J. Boulay

Daniel J. Bouquet
 Robert E. Bowe
 Donald C. Bowen
 Hamilton B. Bowman
 Llewellyn Boyd
 William B. Bradley
 Dwight A. Bradshaw
 Charles E. Brady
 Kenneth W. Bray
 Sante Breda
 Edward R. Bristol, Jr.
 William E. Brook
 Theodore L. Brown
 Charles C. Burch
 Wayne I. Burnett
 Roger B. Burrus
 Harry R. Burton
 Christopher N. Busby
 James E. Butler
 Earl L. Caldwell, Jr.
 David D. S. Cameron, Jr.
 Charles W. Cammack III
 Douglas W. Campbell
 Ronald J. Campbell
 Walter E. Capper
 Paul A. Carlson
 Robert C. Carmichael
 Alan P. Carpenter
 George C. Carpenter III
 William C. Cartmell
 Lewis D. Cassell
 Thomas H. Cave
 Donald E. Chapman
 John B. Chapman
 Robert W. Chapman
 Eugene E. Cheek
 Blair Childs, Jr.
 Lawrence W. Chisolm
 George Chizinsky

- Stanley J. Neitling
Robert H. Nelson
James F. Newman
William M. Newman, Jr.
Jack R. Newton
John T. Newton, Jr.
Theodore J. Newton, Jr.
John T. Nicholas, Jr.
Howard F. Nichols
Thomas M. Nilon
William C. Nissen, Jr.
Loren A. Norden
Thomas G. North, Jr.
George R. Nugent
James H. O'Donel
George J. O'Donnell, Jr.
James J. O'Donnell
Micaiah L. Oglesby
Robert M. Oliver, Jr.
Thomas N. Oliver
Joel Ollendorf
John T. O'Neill, Jr.
James C. Osborne
James B. Osbourn
Donald F. Owen
Richard L. Owen, Jr.
Robert MacA Park
Alan Parsons
Herbert Patterson
Gordon L. Pauley
William H. Payne
George W. Peake, Jr.
Gene S. Peterson
Joseph W. Petrucci
Robert J. Pfister
James L. Phillips, Jr.
Henry G. Plaster, Jr.
Stephen J. Pollak
Walter S. Pomeroy, Jr.
George W. Porter
Stephen L. Post
Matthew E. Potash
Hamilton F. Potter, Jr.
Joseph A. Pugliese
Edward W. Purnell
John A. Purvis
Charles D. Quarles, Jr.
Donovan B. Quigley
Francis X. Quinlan
John C. Ramberg
John H. Ramsden
Jack H. Ramsey
Rufus W. Rauch, Jr.
Gordan A. Reed
Charles L. Reese III
Warren P. Reese
Garrett M. Reeves
David N. Reid, Jr.
Eugene L. Reid
Richard J. Reynolds
Robert B. Rhoades
Richard S. Ribble
Francis J. Richards
Gustavo V. Rico
Richard H. Rish
George Ritner
Harvey F. Robbins
Charles H. Robinson
James H. Rogers
Norman T. Rogers, Jr.
Palmer Rogers
Ralph R. Rogers
Wald Rogers
Robert D. Roller III
Peter W. Rooney
Henry L. Ross, Jr.
Gustave A. Roth
Alvah L. Rowe, Jr.
Kenneth B. Roy, Jr.
William Rubin
James A. Ruff
Homer P. Rush, Jr.
James F. Ryan
John J. Ryan, Jr.
Leonard P. Rychlik
Ronald J. Sanford
William W. Sant
- Chris Saros
Raymond A. Schakel
James F. Schell
Lawrence Scherr
Orvil D. Scherrer
Walter L. Schiffelbein
Norbert A. Schlei
George M. Schultz
Robert J. Schuster
Roger M. Scott
Jack W. Seawell
Ralph H. Seifert
Donald H. Sellers
Bruce M. Senior
Walter R. Shafer
Edward L. Shank
Royal G. Shannon-house III
Benjamin H. Shattuck
Albert E. Shaw, Jr.
Douglas G. Shaw
Donald R. Shearer
James D. Sheppard
Robert L. Sheppard, Jr.
William R. Sheridan
Edward J. Shimon
Alan R. Shoolman
Thomas C. Simons
Kenneth F. Simpson, Jr.
Robert J. Sisk
Robert D. Skorheim
Frederick M. Smith
Leland N. Smith
Melbourne LeR. Smith
Thomas W. Smith
Thomas W. D. Smith
Roberto E. Socas
Carl L. Sorlie
Robert S. Springmier
Henry C. Stambaugh
David M. Staples
James F. Statia
Albert L. Stecker
Zach R. Stewart
John A. Stewman III
Jack H. Still
Charles J. Stockman, Jr.
Arthur J. Stockslager
Victor C. Stolle
David R. Stott, Jr.
Robert D. Stratton
John F. Straubel
Raymond F. Strecker
Samuel T. Stumbo
John T. Subak
Joel D. Sugg
Francis W. Sullivan
John L. Sullivan, Jr.
Ralph V. Summy, Jr.
Jerome D. Swalen
James R. Sweeney
Philip W. K. Swett, Jr.
Hugh G. Swift, Jr.
Robert E. Swingley
Warren C. Talbot
Charles B. Tanc
George S. Tanner
Thomas E. Taylor
Ballard W. Tebo
William W. Tennis
William R. Terrill
Charles H. Thibault
William L. Thoen
Carl H. Thomas, Jr.
Ruben C. Thomas
Raphael P. Thompson
John W. Thornton
Robert C. Thyberg
Donald C. Tinker, Jr.
Theodore W. Tober
Lew Todes, Jr.
Owen J. Toland, Jr.
Edwin A. Toll, Jr.
Frank R. Tomlinson
William T. Towles
James D. Tregurtha, Jr.
- Mark E. Trivison
Glenn E. Troutman
Charles J. Truax
Edward Truck II
Paul J. Uhlig
Eugene T. Ulbert
Earl A. Ullman
William R. Upthegrove
Clark C. Upton III
Louis A. VanHouten
David M. Vea
Charles H. Vejvoda
George K. Vincent
Eugene M. Voda
James L. Wait, Jr.
Marvin P. Watkins
Robert T. Weatherly, Jr.
Bernard L. Weigand
Leonard T. Weinstein
Rylan C. Weisner
John F. Weidon
Alfred T. Wells, Jr.
John L. Wells, Jr.
George R. Wentz
Richard E. Werner
John C. Westervelt
Don Wharton
Robert W. White
Richard T. Whitlock
William R. Wibbenhorst
Ned E. Wick
Harry O. Wiedmaier
Emmett C. Wiginton, Jr.
John G. Wigmore
- The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:
- Leon M. Adair
Joseph J. Angner
Donald R. Ansel
Charles W. Arnason
Richard L. Baker
Richard T. Barker
Wilbur C. Besemann
Douglas C. Billian
Robert G. Bleck
Stanley C. Bohl
Robert E. Boyd
Paul W. Brosman, Jr.
Thomas E. Burnetta
Paul Colen
Richard J. Cross
William E. Curran, Jr.
Wayne D. Dewey
Harold C. Donley, Jr.
Frederick J. Eckfeld
Alan R. Ecklund
James S. Ely
Richard M. Flanagan
Evans J. Francis
Robert C. Fulton
John H. Gallion
Alvin R. Garchow
Merrill A. Geiger
Richard A. Hall
Gerald H. Hanratty
Lloyd E. Hawkinson
Robert H. Hile
John E. Hogan
Clyde V. House
Donald S. Howard
Richard S. Hudson
Robert L. Hughes
George M. Hunter, Jr.
Robert L. Isaacson
Dean S. Johnson
John D. Jolliffe
Philip E. Kepple
Thomas E. Killebrew
- James G. Wilcox
Robert M. Wilkins
James E. Wille
Franklin E. Williams
George N. Williams
Jesse G. Williams
Lewis L. Williams
Roy E. Williams
William A. Williams III
Carlton D. Wilson
Joseph W. Wilson
Richard F. Wilson
Wayne R. Wilson, Jr.
Richard I. Winneg
Harold G. Wise
Donald F. Winslow
Robert E. Wiss
James L. Wood
James F. Woodall
Ernest R. Woodman-see, Jr.
John A. Woodside
George M. Woodwell
John McC. Woolf
Thomas K. Worcester
Richard L. Wright
Russell A. Wright
Frederic L. Wyckoff
John L. McK. Yardley, Jr.
Frank M. Yasaitis
John S. Youtcheff
George F. Zeller
Thomas A. Ziebarth
Milton C. Zillis
Donald B. Zook
- Frederick W. Kirby, Jr.
Walter E. Knowles III
Frank W. Krone
John R. Krueger
William G. LaCombe
John D. Lewis
Norman H. Liedtke
Kenneth J. Lisy
Robert W. Manire
Charles C. Martin
Harry C. McClintock
Lloyd W. McCormick
Richard D. McGoldrick
Donald W. Miller
Charles M. Mouch, Jr.
Paul W. Neff, Jr.
Douglas J. Olson
James A. Parker
Frank Pickard, Jr.
James R. Pratt
Eugene E. Reynolds, Jr.
Robert L. Rice
Donald J. Rippert
Clayton P. Roche
Merritt "J." Schumann
Claude R. Sowle III
Ralph W. Stegner
Robert L. Strickland
John R. Strobel
Floyd O. Stroup
Richard A. Traskowsky
Reynold C. Tveita
Carl G. Uchtmann
George L. Walker
Jerome T. Walmsley, Jr.
Richard W. Morrison
Thomas R. McNabb
- The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:
- Robert G. Adams
Lawson I. Ainsworth
Eldon D. Aldred
- Bruce G. Austin
Emory D. Ayers
Edward McC. Baty
Gerald L. Bearer
Robert L. Berg
Robert T. Billington
William H. Boden, Jr.
Stephen R. Caliento
Carrol A. Carr
Edgar S. Carr, Jr.
Billy R. Catherwood
Victor Chacho
Eugene Chesson, Jr.
Stanley L. Clewett
James W. Deardorff
Paul G. Eppes
Norton H. Falls
Richard W. Ferris
John W. Ferry
Harold L. Goyette
Alfred G. Granieri
Elmer D. Hamann
Carl C. Hanke, Jr.
Kenneth E. Heidelbers
John P. Henson
Richard W. Huston
Louis Huszar, Jr.
John P. Jaso, Jr.
Seward R. Keim
Addison H. Kermath
Kenneth E. Klotz
Walter S. Fmak
Norman F. Lattin
- The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:
- Charles Arnold
George C. Bingham
Leo D. Ward
Howard E. Waters
Walter E. Ralls (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy.
- The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:
- James B. Peachey
Victor H. Silberstein
Roland C. Smith
- The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:
- Walter E. Beam, Jr.
Lynn W. Brawner, Jr.
Noel L. Freeman
Godfrey S. Huber
Calman Levich
Francis E. McGuire
John A. Moody
Edgar G. Waggoner
- Barbara J. Whiteman (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.
- The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:
- Martha L. Edens
Rosalyn L. Keay
Doris N. Snell
- IN THE COAST GUARD
- The following-named persons to be chief boatswains in the United States Coast Guard:
- Herman F. Rogall
Charles J. Wood
Cullen W. Edwards
Kurt F. Czybora
William P. Williams
- The following-named persons to be chief machinists in the United States Coast Guard:
- Hoyt J. Caple
Herman Pedersen
George D. King
- The following-named person to be a chief pay clerk in the United States Coast Guard:
- Mack J. Snowden
- The following-named person to be a chief pharmacist in the United States Coast Guard:
- Floyd J. Coulter
- The following-named person to be a chief radio electrician in the United States Coast Guard:
- Robert W. Young