

Robert B. Houghton, of Massachusetts.
 John M. Howison, of Texas.
 Richard M. Hughes, of Ohio.
 John D. Iams, of Oklahoma.
 Robert L. James, of California.
 Miss Dorothy M. Jester, of California.
 Alexander C. Johnpoll, of New Mexico.
 John Keppel, of the District of Columbia.
 David Klein, of Illinois.
 Max V. Krebs, of California.
 Bruce M. Lancaster, of Mississippi.
 Donald S. Macdonald, of Massachusetts.
 David S. McMorris, of Alabama.
 Charles P. McVicker, Jr., of New Jersey.
 Robert J. Mautner, of California.
 James A. May, of California.
 Everett K. Melby, of Illinois.
 Miss Susannah Mirick, of Massachusetts.
 Edward W. Mulcahy, of Massachusetts.
 Joseph W. Neubert, of Washington.
 David D. Newsom, of California.
 William F. Penniman, Jr., of Georgia.
 Sandy MacGregor Pringle, of New York.
 Herbert F. Propps, of Wisconsin.
 Ellwood M. Rabenold, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
 Thomas M. Recknagel, of New York.
 Lowell G. Richardson, of Wisconsin.
 Jordan T. Rogers, of South Carolina.
 John W. Rozier, of Georgia.
 Peter Rutter, of Massachusetts.
 Sidney Sober, of New York.
 Ernest L. Stanger, of Utah.
 William Perry Stedman, Jr., of Maryland.
 Richard W. Sterling, of New York.
 Robert A. Stevenson, of Florida.
 William N. Stokes, of New York.
 Galen L. Stone, of Massachusetts.
 Kenneth P. T. Sullivan, of Massachusetts.
 Kingdon W. Swayne, of Pennsylvania.
 Charles R. Tanguy, of Maryland.
 Nicholas G. Thacher, of New York.
 Malcolm Toon, of Massachusetts.
 Charles M. Urruela, of Ohio.
 Raymond A. Valliere, of New Hampshire.
 Hendrik van Oss, of New Jersey.
 Wayland B. Waters, of Michigan.
 Robert W. Weise, Jr., of Minnesota.
 Richard R. Wilford, of Wisconsin.
 Robert M. Winfree, of the District of Columbia.

Stephen Winship, of Massachusetts.
 Parker D. Wyman, of Illinois.
 Joseph O. Zurhellen, Jr., of New York.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

David C. Walls, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 20, 1950.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named cadets to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 2d day of June 1950:

Robert Kennedy Adams
 William Joseph Baldau
 John Gilbert Beebe-Center, Jr.
 Lysle Irving Benjamin
 Alfred August Binder
 George Walter Bond, Jr.
 Douglas Rae Burke
 Alva Lamont Carbonette
 Thomas Akroyd Clingan, Jr.
 Eugene Augustine Delaney
 Cort Raynor DeVoe
 Clifford Frederick DeWolf.
 William George Dick
 Leopold Anthony Dombrowski
 Leo Vincent Donohoe
 Harry Albert Feigleson, Jr.
 James Lee Fleishell
 Robert Edward Fletcher
 David Bentley Fountain
 Robert James Friedhoff
 John Charles Fuechsel
 Charles Joseph Glass
 Royal Edward Grover, Jr.
 Jaime Cathcart Gruger
 John Chester Guthrie

Harry Joseph Hayes
 Clarence Chester Hobby, Jr.
 Horace Gilbert Holmgren
 Walter Chamberlain Ilgenfritz, Jr.
 Thomas Richard Jordan
 Charles Francis Juechter, Jr.
 Norval Stanley Julnes
 Lynden Underwood Kibler
 David Charles Klingensmith
 John Louis Knabenschuh
 Arthur William Korfage
 Gilbert Louis Kreisberg
 William Robert Lamb, Jr.
 Adrian Lorence Lonsdale
 James Hawley Crabbe Lowe
 James Philip Marsh
 Ferny Marvin McKibben
 Berry Lee Meaux
 John Pearson Mihlbauer
 Richard Meredith Morse
 William Robert Nodell
 John Maurice O'Connell
 Joseph James O'Rourke
 Lawrence Joseph Otto
 Robert Louis Palmer
 Harold Waldemar Parker, Jr.
 Richard Allen Phillips
 Rudolph Peter Ralbovsky II
 Arnold Rytter Reynolds
 Allan Bruce Rose
 Hubert Edward Russell
 Robert Allen Seufert
 Jack Leonard Smith
 Benedict Louis Stabile
 Robert Claude Stancliff
 Donald George Teifer
 Claude Richard Thompson
 Sidney Boyd Vaughn, Jr.
 Norman Charles Venzke
 Warren Withers Waggett
 William Louis Webster
 Roderick MacLeod White
 Raymond Harland Wood

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 5 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

POSTMASTER

Mrs. Helen M. Backer to be postmaster at Brightwaters, N. Y.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

God of all grace, whose amazing love we cannot fathom, we rejoice that when there was no eye to pity and no arm to save, then, in the fullness of time, Thou didst send the Christ to be the Saviour of the world.

Grant that in this week of solemn and sacred memory we may be filled with penitence and humility as we turn to the cross to mediate upon the sufferings and sacrifice of the great captain of our salvation.

May Holy Week be for all of us not only a time of commemoration but of consecration. May we understand more clearly that the kingdom of righteousness for which we are hoping and praying can never be established except through the power of sacrificial love.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

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

TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, there will be a further set of tariff negotiations at Torquay in England in September. I understand that an announcement will shortly be made identifying the countries with which the United States will then negotiate and the products that may be considered for possible tariff concessions. This announcement may be made even before the House returns from its recess.

I think it is very important that Members of the House should understand exactly what the procedures are which are followed in preparation for these negotiations and exactly what the significance of the forthcoming announcement will be. Members will doubtless be receiving inquiries from constituents about it.

The announcement that will shortly be made will contain three parts. First, it will identify the countries with which the United States will be negotiating. Second, it will contain a list of all the products which will be considered by the administration for possible tariff concessions. Third, it will announce the closing date for filing of written briefs and the time and place of public hearings at which any person or group which is interested in any of the products included in the list or in securing any concession from any foreign country with which the United States will be negotiating can make his views known to the interdepartmental trade-agreements organization which is responsible for advising the President as to the concessions he may offer and should ask in the negotiations.

The fact that an item is included in the public list does not necessarily mean that the tariff is going to be reduced. It simply means that the product is among those which will be considered, either because it is an important item in the trade with the other country or because the other country has asked us specifically to consider it. No decision is made as to whether a tariff concession will be offered on any product until after the public hearings have been concluded and the views of all interested persons have been received and considered. Concessions offered by the United States are, of course, dependent on receiving satisfactory concessions from the other country.

The concessions may consist either of a reduction in the rate, or of an agreement not to increase the present rate, commonly known as a binding, or it may be a reduction in the rate which applies only to a particular season of the year, or it may be a reduction in the rate which applies only to a certain quantity or value of imports, leaving the rest of the imports at the present rate.

These procedures are familiar to many Members of the House, but there are new Members who may not be aware of them.

I bring these points to the attention of the House also because many Members will doubtless be receiving communications from constituents about articles which may appear on the public list or which they think may be included in the negotiations; and I think Members should fully understand the procedures which are followed so that they can tell their constituents that this first announcement simply identifies the products which are under consideration and that they will have a full opportunity to be heard as to whether a concession should or should not be given before any decision about making the concession is reached. Moreover, inquirers can be assured that we will not negotiate with any country or on any product which does not appear on the list. There may be a supplemental list of countries or products, but no product is considered or included in any trade agreement and we negotiate with no country without the procedures and hearings which I have described.

EXTENSION OF TERM OF CERTAIN PATENTS

Mr. BRYSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4692) to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II. THE LATE HONORABLE SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the memory of a beloved friend of ours who passed away a few weeks ago remains very strong in the hearts of those of us who were closest to him. I am thinking of the gentleman from Virginia, the late Schuyler Otis Bland. That our recollection of him is shared by all who knew him is attested in the touching manner by a prayer which was offered by the Reverend J. M. Dameron, minister of the Reedville, Va., Methodist Church, on March 28 on the occasion of the annual meeting of the Virginia Fishermen's Association.

I hope that you will take time to read this touching prayer, which follows:

Almighty God, our Father, we pause with bowed heads and closed eyes, holding dear the memory of Schuyler Otis Bland. We seek not to speak to You of him, because Thou didst know him. Rather, we pause to give thanks to Thee for permitting him to render unselfishly a great service to this district and to all mankind. May his ideals and the memory of his service long live among us and be to each of us a great guide. In the Master's name. Amen.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include an article.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. YATES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WAVE CHIEF YEOMAN CITED FOR BATTLE REPORT WORK

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include an editorial from the Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Elvina J. Sudol, chief yeoman, United States Navy WAVES, of Lowell, Mass., today received a Secretary of the Navy letter of commendation with ribbon "for outstanding performance of duty" in connection with the preparation of Battle Report, five-volume authorized history of the United States Navy in World War II.

Vice Adm. John D. Price, Acting Chief of Naval Operations, presented the citation to Chief Sudol at a ceremony in his office shortly after noon today. Capt. Joy B. Hancock, Assistant for Women to the Chief of Naval Personnel, was represented at the ceremony by Commander Louise K. Wilde, her assistant.

The text of the citation follows:

For outstanding performance of duty in connection with the preparation of Battle Report, the five-volume authorized history of the United States Navy in World War II, from January 1944 to December 1949. Serving in the offices of the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations, Sudol carried out her assigned duties in the office of public relations with efficiency and thoroughness while performing additional secretarial work in the preparation of this official history. Volunteering to assume a laborious task which entailed typing and proofreading the more than 1,000,000 words of text, and verifying the names and service records of the thousands of individuals cited in the five volumes, she handled this great amount of exacting detail to a large extent after completing regular office duties, by sacrificing her limited free time and hours of much-needed recreation. Only her exceptional initiative, enthusiasm, and loyalty to the Navy enabled her to continue her regularly assigned mission in the prosecution of the war at the same high level of performance and simultaneously to fulfill this additional arduous task with remarkable skill and accuracy. By her distinctive success in this dual capacity, Sudol rendered service of permanent value to the Navy and upheld the highest traditions of the United States Naval service.

Chief Sudol entered the Navy in September 1943, from Lowell, Mass., where her parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Sudol, reside. She has been on duty in the Department of the Navy since January 1944, and is currently assigned to the office of the special assistant to the Chief of Naval Operations.

The Battle Report series was prepared by Capt. Walter Karig, special assistant to the Chief of Naval Operations, with the aid of six other Regular Navy and Naval Reserve officers who collaborated on various volumes.

Chief Sudol is my constituent. I am extremely proud of her. She has set a wonderful example to all who serve in the national defense and to all who serve in Government.

THE BRANNAN PLAN

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to secure positive and definite information from Secretary Brannan as to exactly what the so-called Brannan plan is, I directed a series of letters and questions to him which he answered in a letter dated April 3, 1950. The concluding sentence in his letter states:

It is a fair statement to say that if enacted, S. 1971 would put into effect the farm income support legislation that the President and I have recommended.

Thus, for those who are interested in getting complete basic facts with respect to the Brannan plan, I suggest that they secure a copy of S. 1971, which consists of 86 pages. A study of this bill will clearly indicate that the attempts of many people to oversimplify the Brannan plan are entirely misleading. Every Member of Congress and the general public should study this 86-page document before pretending to tell the Congress or the people what the Brannan plan is.

THE ONION MARKET

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, now that the aroma of oil and natural gas has been wafted out of the House Chamber and down to Key West, Fla., it might be well to give members of the House a quick smell of the onion situation.

While some Iowa producers have been dumping onions in their fields rather than sell them for 44 to 60 cents per 50-pound bag, minus 25 cents per bag to ship them to Chicago and 16 cents for the bag itself, onions of the same grade were selling in Washington, D. C., for \$1.50 per 50-pound bag wholesale and at the rate of 2 pounds for 15 cents or \$3.75 per 50-pound bag at retail.

If the farmer paid the shipping charge of 25 cents a bag, plus 16 cents for the bag, a total of 41 cents, he would net just 3 cents per 50-pound bag, on the basis of a 44-cent market.

This appears to substantiate the charge of the Michigan Onion Growers' Association, as relayed by the Iowa Vegetable Growers' Association, that onion farmers are the victims of one of the most flagrant cases of manipulation in the recent history of any commodity on any exchange.

Following are statements by the above-named organizations: 85,000 cars traded

in 1949 on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, but only 2,500 cars actually delivered.

Fees: \$20 per car from outsiders; \$10 from members, plus other fees to brokers in some instances.

While the exchange was doing a \$1,000,000,000 business in onions, in 1949, onion farmers were losing millions of dollars even with a short crop.

Exchange employed practices of hedging, short-selling, and scalping to drive down the price of onions from about \$5 a bag to 44 cents.

And consumers in Washington, D. C., and other metropolitan centers are being scalped to the tune of 2 pounds for 15 cents retail, while farmers receive as little as 3 cents for 50 pounds.

MONUMENT TO CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, I introduced a bill to provide for the erection of a monument at the grave of Constantino Brumidi. This was a companion resolution to that introduced by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], which I understand is to be brought up today for action. I want to bespeak your very great understanding of, and favorable action for, Mr. MURDOCK's bill.

Mr. Brumidi, as you know, was an artist who spent his life painting and decorating this Capitol. The painting of the Surrender of Cornwallis, now in this Chamber, is an excellent example of his work. Unfortunately the changes that are to be made during the summer recess anticipate the destruction of this particular painting which is painted on the plaster. I have been informed by the Architect that there are methods by which the painting could be removed, backed with canvas, and placed in some other part of the Capitol. The cost—some \$2,500 to \$3,000—of such procedure was given as the reason for its destruction. We have had all too little recognition of him through the years. It is my earnest hope that the resolution will be passed unanimously.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'SULLIVAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SEEDS OF TREASON

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my great fortune in the last 24 hours to read a new book called Seeds of Treason, which has just been written by Ralph de Toledano and Victor Lasky. The book concerns itself exclusively with the Hiss-Chambers case, and I want to commend it to this House and to the public as one of the most fascinating books that I have ever read and one of the most important that has been published in recent years. It is an objective appraisal of the case of Alger Hiss, and no one can read it without realizing what dupes we Americans have been to ever believe that anything good could come of the Soviet experiment or communism.

I thought I knew a good deal about the Hiss-Chambers case, but until I read this book I now know that I never really understood just how damning the evidence was against Alger Hiss and what a sucker he made of our State Department in his traitorous activities. Nobody can read this book without realizing that our loyalty checks are worthless when it comes to ferreting out real Soviet spies in our Government. You realize that a clever operator like Alger Hiss—and spies are clever or they are not spies very long—could pass our present loyalty test with flying colors, and of course, the actual fact is that he did pass that so-called test.

This book, Seeds of Treason, is a testament on the gullibility of left-wingers and do-gooders who even to this day are still defending Alger Hiss. I hope this book sells a million copies, and I think if each Member of this House will take the trouble to obtain a copy and read it, he will be a better American for having done so and a wiser Congressman, regardless of how much he or she may already know about the Hiss case.

APPOMATTOX

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, April 9, is the anniversary of one of the significant dates in the history of our great country. I know of no event of more importance to us since our Constitution was adopted than the meeting of General Lee and General Grant at Appomattox on Palm Sunday 85 years ago. It represents the reuniting of a war-torn nation, the welding together of a mighty people, the healing of a wide breach. It has had a significant effect upon the history of the entire world. Had there been no peace between the two warring sections of our country, who knows whether the World War I or II either would have been won by freedom-loving people or whether or not this great land of ours would have been cut

up into many small countries with small influence upon international affairs.

The peace that was made between Generals Grant and Lee at Appomattox has been a lasting one. It has stood the test of time, and on April 16, 1950, there will be a great meeting at old Appomattox Court House when the Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument and the rebuilt McLean home, where the peace terms were written up, negotiated, and signed, will be dedicated as one of our national shrines, and as a monument to a lasting peace between the two warring sections of our great country.

On behalf of the people of Appomattox particularly, and Virginia in general, I extend to my colleagues in the House of Representatives a cordial invitation to attend these dedication exercises as our guests and to visit this great national shrine which stands as an emblem of peace between our people and in memory of those great warriors who fought, bled, and died for principles they believed in and were willing to sacrifice their all in defense of same.

The high lights of the exercises will be the marching of the two bands. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III, a grandson of Gen. U. S. Grant, will march in front of the Quantico Marine Band along the route taken by his great ancestor. Young Robert E. Lee IV, a great-grandson of Gen. Robert E. Lee, will march in front of the VMI Cadet Band along the route taken by his noble ancestor. The two groups will meet in front of the restored McLean house to start the proceedings, the Marine Band playing "Yankee Doodle" and the VMI Band playing "Dixie."

We are hopeful that each and every one of you will be our guest on this notable occasion, realizing that many of you are descendants of those noble warriors who met at Appomattox on Palm Sunday, April 9, 1865.

SEEDS OF TREASON

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to praise the statement just made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] concerning the book on the Alger Hiss case called Seeds of Treason. I wish to say that I agree completely with his views, and I want to commend him for appraising the book for what it is—a warning not to Democrats or to Republicans but to Americans.

The Communist conspiracy is the greatest threat to freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of thought, and freedom of assembly ever to be visited on this earth. It is a threat to our very existence, and the gentleman from Mississippi, who has already demonstrated his valiant patriotism by a war record matched by few, is correct in his estimate that this book should be read by every Member of Congress and should be found in the home of every American.

I contrast the attitude of the gentleman from Mississippi with that of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER]. I respect the views of the gentleman from New York, but I believe that the book *Seeds of Treason* has proved something far more important than the fact that Democrats played a part in bringing about the conviction of one Alger Hiss. On a partisan basis, I would be tempted to prove to the gentleman from New York that the Hiss case came into being through the efforts of many people other than those cited by him, but I will forego that obvious fact and urge the gentleman from New York to reread *Seeds of Treason* from the viewpoint of what it means to America and the world.

HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I hope we do not burn our bridges before us this time, but that the bridge will be long enough to reach from America to Australia to take Harry Bridges, who was convicted of perjury, back to where he belongs, his homeland, Australia. We had a former President and his wife who interceded to keep him here after he was ordered deported. A great mistake. We have spent a long time and a lot of money to let the people of this country know through a jury trial that Bridges was a Communist. He was tried for perjury and convicted.

He was permitted to become a citizen of the United States of America after he betrayed our land—your land and mine.

In the trial just ended, the third, the defense was given extraordinary latitude and every opportunity to offer testimony. The trial lasted 81 days, and the jury deliberated 31 hours. We cannot recall any defendant who has received fuller or better treatment under American justice.

It seems to me that the President of the United States and those in authority should have learned their lesson and send Bridges back to Australia, take his American citizenship away from him, and allow us to be free from these Communists. Whenever we find them in our midst we ought to get rid of them, and the way to do that job is to send them back where they came from. In this instance it is Australia.

We spend billions to rid other countries of communism. Now we have the verdict. Let us act, Mr. President. Mr. President, do not do the same as your predecessor. That should be unjust to our own people in America, who are good, sound American citizens.

Deport Bridges.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and from statements he made before a Senate committee.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to report here a wire I have just sent to the President in Key West:

APRIL 5, 1950.

The PRESIDENT,
Winter White House,
Key West, Fla.:

In accordance with estimate March 20 issue Life and department figures for inventory February 28, we have sufficient prunes to give 1,000 people a dish for breakfast until year 3111. I trust this will impress upon you the necessity of prompt remedial action.

JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

Next, I want to include a copy of a letter I sent to the President today. I felt it might be helpful if he could know the full situation surrounding my search for dried eggs:

APRIL 5, 1950.

The PRESIDENT,
Winter White House,
Key West, Fla.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to respectfully advise you that my messages with reference to the disposition of surplus foods have been in the nature of pleas to you to take action which I am convinced the American people are demanding in daily increased numbers. I am enclosing a copy of the RECORD of yesterday because I want you to have the benefit of a letter written to me by Mr. Don A. Tuttle, farm director of Station WHAI, Greenfield, Mass. This outlines graphically the entirely successful effort to distribute potatoes to needy people in that town. I am sure you agree with me, in spite of the views widely held here by certain Government officials, that we can rely on the intelligence, the initiative, and the integrity of our fine public-spirited Americans in all of our communities to handle these problems if we permit them to do so.

Next, I want to tell you something about the eggs I sent to you, which did not come to my attention until today. I paid \$1.25 for them. I am sure your chef can advise you that they constitute the equivalent of a dozen and a half eggs. This is at the rate of 83 cents a dozen. The current price on a dozen eggs is 61 cents a dozen, so that you can see that the taking off the market of these 79,000,000 pounds of dried eggs has not only had the effect of depriving thousands of needy Americans of them, with the daily increasing threat of spoilage, but has actually resulted in making this commodity a scarcity. These eggs were purchased at Magruder's, which I am told is a store concentrating in selling specialty foods. I am sure that this, too, will give you food for additional thought as to the consequences of this indefensible situation. I am convinced that as soon as the full facts become known to sufficient American citizens and taxpayers you will receive an overwhelming demand for action. I am further convinced that when the facts become known, particularly as to the extent of dumping and spoilage, someone in the executive department is going to pay for it and pay dearly. The American people are intelligent and I know that they resent being considered as, or treated as suckers.

I do hope and trust that you will do me the courtesy of at least acknowledging receipt of this and my previous communica-

tions and that you will take the remedial action under existing law which you have the power to take.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN W. HESELTON.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have until midnight Thursday to file a report on Reorganization Plan No. 6, House Resolution 522, and that the same permission be granted to any Member or Members who may decide to file a minority report.

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

There was no objection.

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES DURING RECESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 18, 1950, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

CLERK AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 18, 1950, the clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE INVESTIGATION AND STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 22

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 436) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 22, not to exceed \$75,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$50,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING A SURVEY OF THE FEASIBILITY OF CONSTRUCTING A CONVEYOR BELT BETWEEN THE HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS AND THE CAPITOL

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 461) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House Office Building Commission make a study and survey necessary for the purchase and installation of a conveyor belt to be placed in use for the Members of the House going to and from the Capitol and the House Office Buildings.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out "conveyor belt" and insert "transportation system".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. J. Res. 418) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this resolution?

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration has received many requests for funds with which to purchase electric typewriting equipment. The committee has had under consideration House Joint Resolution 418 and has favorably reported the resolution to the House with amendments. It provides that a Member, at his request and with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, may direct the Clerk of the House of Representatives to purchase electric typewriting equipment, but not more than two sets for any one Member. The electrical equipment consists of, as the resolution provides, an electric typewriter, and automatic typing equipment that may be attached, a dictating machine, and a transcribing machine. All of these are permissible to be purchased under the bill, with the following provision:

Automatic typing equipment furnished under this joint resolution shall be registered in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and shall remain the property of the House of Representatives.

The cost of this electrical equipment which is purchased will be taken from the fund allocated for clerk hire that has already been made available to the Members, and Members who already own such equipment, by making request to the chairman of the Committee on

House Administration, will direct the Clerk of the House to reimburse them out of the funds appropriated to them for clerk hire.

The amount of such portion of those funds shall be determined by the computation of basic amounts; that is, if you want to purchase an electric typewriter with the mechanical equipment that goes with it, you would need to take from your basic appropriation the amount of \$550. If you wanted a sufficient amount to purchase all of the equipment that would be available to you for one set, you would need to take from your basic clerk hire the sum of \$880.

Under the resolution you may purchase this equipment as soon as the request is made, provided the resolution passes, and deductions may be made for a period of 12 months, provided it does not go beyond the term of office that the Members are elected for.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. As far as I have been able to determine, the average Member of the House has as much need for or desire for an electric typewriter as a hog has for a side-saddle. However, I have been paying my telegraph and telephone charges out of my pocket for a month now on necessary congressional business. I wish the gentleman's committee would do something about that.

Mr. STANLEY. I will say to the gentleman that the committee did something about it the first session of this Congress.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This resolution is not such a small matter after all. It provides for the purchase of a complete outfit at a cost of something like \$1,800, with not to exceed two such outfits to one office. If you multiply that by 400, you will get something over a million dollars.

I have seen these machines operate. They amaze you. They are really magic machines. It seems to me they are almost human. But in the end, it seems to me, this would cost the Government a considerable sum of money. Moreover, those of the House who are at the present time using up all of their allowance for clerk hire have no way of obtaining one of these machines, and those who do not need all their clerk hire or are not expending all of it would be in a position to obtain these machines, but they are evidently not the ones that need them the worst.

Of course, I am not advising the chairman of the committee, but it seems to me that this is a matter of considerable importance and it could very well be withdrawn and laid over until after the Easter recess. The country at the present time is economy-minded. I am not certain in my own mind by any means that the country will look with favor on the House providing itself with a million dollars more of equipment for sending out more mail and material, and yet

talking about economy in other branches of the Government. I am wondering if this resolution should not lay over and be considered after the recess.

I realize it was voted out for consideration by the committee, although I and one or two others opposed it, but it does seem to me this is of enough importance that we could let it go over until after the recess.

Mr. STANLEY. The gentleman attended the committee meeting at which this resolution was reported out. The chairman has had no request from him up to this time to delay the matter.

Mr. LECOMPTE. No, I did not make such a request, but I did oppose the resolution.

Mr. STANLEY. I would say further that this is a permissive resolution. It does not appropriate any additional funds. If the Members desire to use some funds that are already made available to them now, they have that privilege.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the equipment remain the property of the Government?

Mr. STANLEY. Yes, it is the permanent property of the Government.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It might be possible for Members to get along with one less clerk in the office if they had this type of machine.

Mr. STANLEY. I should think that would be determined by the Member. It is possible.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I think it is only fair to keep the record straight here in regard to the question raised by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. It is true that the committee did make available more funds for telephone charges and for stationery last year, but the fact remains that in regard to telephone allowances they should be apportioned according to the distance from Washington a Member may live. A Member who lives near Washington can get by on the allowance that is made, but the Members who live farther away, and there are many who live much farther away than I, run out of their telephone allowances in the first 2 or 3 months. There is no reason why a Member living in Oregon or California should not be able to get in touch with his constituents just the same as a Member who lives nearby. I think that is sound principle.

May I say also in regard to the stationery allowance that my stationery cost me \$489 more than the allowance last year.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course I had no knowledge that this resolution was coming up today. I have not looked into it, but I would first like to ask the gentleman from Virginia what his own personal view is about it.

Mr. STANLEY. As I just stated, the gentleman from Virginia thinks it is permissive legislation. It does not appropriate any more funds or make any more funds available to the Members, but it permits them to take funds now appropriated to them for clerk hire and use it for this kind of equipment, which will become the property of the Government if and when it is purchased.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman. But would the gentleman from Virginia care to express his personal view on the matter?

Mr. STANLEY. Personally I have not found a great deal of need for these machines, but the committee has had many, many requests and this was considered at the request of the membership.

Mr. McCORMACK. In view of the suggestion made by the ranking member of the committee, whom we all admire and for whom we have a very high regard, who is a distinguished gentleman, would it not be possible to let the matter lay over? We all know the courteous manner in which the gentleman, when he was chairman always treated all Members, both then and now, in his associations with us.

Mr. STANLEY. I certainly concur in the sentiments expressed by the distinguished majority leader as to our respect and admiration for the gentleman from Iowa. I would have no objection to letting the matter lay over, but the request had not been made until the resolution was brought up this morning. If it had been made before, of course the matter would not even have been called up.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the resolution.

STUDY OF MONOPOLY POWER

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 125), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 copies of the hearings, held before said committee, on the resolutions entitled "Study of Monopoly Power."

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, after the word "thousand", insert "additional".

Line 6, after the word "of", insert "parts 1 and 2 of".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MONUMENT FOR CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5943) to

provide for the erection of a monument at the grave of Constantino Brumidi.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to accept on behalf of, and without cost to the United States, title to site numbered 6, lot number 170, in Glenwood Cemetery, District of Columbia, such site being the grave of Constantino Brumidi, the artist who spent 25 years decorating the Capitol Building of the United States and died as the result of a fall from the Rotunda frieze during his last assignment in the Capitol.

(b) Upon acquisition by the United States of title to such site, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to erect, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, a suitable monument to mark the grave of the said Constantino Brumidi.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$200 to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the bill just passed authorizes a very modest sum to provide a marker for the grave of Constantino Brumidi as a belated recognition for the splendid work he did in decorating this Capitol Building. I listened to the words of praise of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], who introduced an identical bill, with deep appreciation. To those Members like myself who have little knowledge of art, I feel that the lady Members of Congress are in a better position to appreciate the 25 years of effort which the Italian-born artist took in this patriotic and artistic work. And I recall too that these were 25 of the mature years of his life, for he was already on the sunset slope of life when he came to America. Therefore, his frescoes in the Capitol represent the best of his artistic ability and the culmination of his patriotism for this America—the land of his adoption.

Many times I have looked at the painting in the corner of this Chamber to the left of the Speaker and never passed by it without studying the signature in the lower right-hand corner. It says, "C. Brumidi, artist, citizen of the United States." That is a unique and unusual signature, but we understand the reason for it when we discover that this artist applied for citizenship almost the very day he landed on Ellis Island and received his citizenship papers within a minimum of time after his arrival in this country. How significant is that fact as to his patriotism and love of this new country.

If further proof were needed of Brumidi's love of America and her institutions, it could easily be found in the paintings that decorate this structure,

especially at the top of the dome itself and in the frieze circling the dome and more especially in the decoration of the President's room off the Senate Chamber. There he has portrayed for all times the great men who founded the Republic. This man should be more properly honored.

BRIGHAM YOUNG STATUE COMMISSION

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 186) authorizing a statue of the late Brigham Young, of Utah, to be placed in Statuary Hall.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Brigham Young Statue Commission of Utah is hereby authorized to place in Statuary Hall a statue of the late Brigham Young, of Utah, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on June 1; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5: strike out the words "between the statues of Ethan Allen and Alexander Hamilton Stephens".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELIZABETH BOWERS LAWRENCE HEBARD

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 535) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Elizabeth Bowers Lawrence Hebard, mother of Josephine Hebard, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death and an additional amount not to exceed \$350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Josephine Hebard.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING HEARINGS ON REVENUE REVISION

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 192) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized

and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of each part of the hearings relative to revenue revision held before said committee during the current session, including an index.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show that on yesterday and the day before when quorum calls were made I was absent from the District of Columbia on an official assignment by the House Armed Services Committee, and therefore was not present on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will stand.

THE LATE HONORABLE E. B. HOWARD

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. GILMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD with reference to the death of a former predecessor of his.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved to announce to the membership of the House of Representatives that Hon. E. B. Howard passed away on April 3. Mr. Howard was an illustrious predecessor of mine, having served the First District of Oklahoma in the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-ninth, and Seventieth Congresses. There are quite a few among you who served with Mr. E. B. Howard, and will remember him well.

He was born in Morgantown, Ky., and was 76 years of age at the time of his death. He was not only a Member of Congress for three terms, but also served as a member of the city council of Tulsa, Okla., and purchased the city's first waterworks. Mr. Howard also served with distinction as secretary of the State Board of Affairs of Oklahoma from 1911 to 1915, when he became State Auditor of Oklahoma where he remained until 1919.

Mr. E. B. Howard was my personal friend, and was also the very good friend of my father. The First Congressional District and the State of Oklahoma, in his passing, suffer the loss of one of the fine pioneers who helped create for our great State of Oklahoma the place of eminence which it now occupies.

AMENDING TITLE VIII OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7846) to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill and

the need for the urgent action at this time?

Mr. SPENCE. I will be glad to explain the bill.

The bill simply implements the military housing bill which was passed some time ago. The Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Corps are all very anxious for the immediate passage of the bill. It permits the employment of architects and engineers to draw plans and specifications for the projects.

No money is required; we do not contemplate any appropriation, for the sponsors of the project will assume all costs of the operation of this bill. At the present time the sponsors of the projects have their own architects and engineers, but there is no uniformity in the plans and specifications. Therefore, there can be no truly competitive bids.

This resolution authorizes the Secretary of Defense to have uniform plans and specifications prepared that will be submitted to the sponsors so that there may be competitive bidding. There will be standard plans for all to bid upon and, therefore, it will make possible true competition.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. All it does is to expedite the procurement of bids and also to harmonize plans and specifications.

Mr. SPENCE. The gentleman is correct. It will expedite the procurement of bids, and it will also expedite the construction of these buildings which are so necessary to house the members of our armed forces. At the present time, I understand, the housing in many instances is so bad that it is difficult to get men to reenlist, and they leave the armed forces at a time when they are needed most. Under this provision they feel that they can immediately proceed with the construction of this much-needed housing, and we find that it is absolutely necessary to have a measure of this kind to implement the housing bill which passed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say also that the Secretaries of Defense, of the Army, and of the Navy, and of the Air Force consider the passage of this bill now very important. They are anxious to have it enacted into law as soon as possible.

Mr. SPENCE. They have done everything they could to bring about its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"Sec. 809. Whenever the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or his duly designated representative, determines that it is desirable in order to effectuate the purposes of this title, the Secretary is authorized, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, to procure, by negotiation or otherwise, the services of architects and engineers, or organizations thereof, under such arrangements as he deems desirable. Such

services may include the development of plans, drawings, and specifications for rental housing under this title and other services in connection therewith. Such arrangements may include provision for advance or progress payments, for payment by third parties, for payment by the Government of any such compensation as is not paid for by third parties, for reimbursement by third parties to the Government of any compensation or other expenses paid by the Government pursuant to this section, or other provisions for compensation. The Secretary is further authorized to advance or pay to the Federal Housing Administration its 'Appraisal and Eligibility Statement' fees in connection with such rental housing. The Secretary is further authorized to procure options from private parties for the acquisition by third parties of off-installation sites intended for such rental housing, and to enter into arrangements by contract or otherwise for eventual acquisition, without cost to the Government, of all right, title, and interest in such sites and improvements thereon by the Government. Any public-works appropriations now or hereafter available to the Departments of the Army, Navy, or Air Force may be obligated by the respective departments for these purposes. Reimbursements to the Government on account of payments made pursuant to this section shall be made to appropriations against which such payments were charged."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: On page 2, line 6, change the period to a colon and insert "Provided, That such plans, drawings, and specifications may include the use on any project to be constructed under this title of alternate materials or alternate types of construction, including prefabrication, that provide substantially equal value and conform to the standards established by the Federal Housing Administration."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 22, insert a comma after the word "thereon".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in one to include a resolution from the Hibernians of Massachusetts, and in another a resolution from the Massachusetts General Court.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Decatur (Ala.) Daily.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MAGEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made by the Honorable PHIL J. WELCH at the ninetieth anniversary of the start of the Pony Express, which was printed in the St. Joseph News-Press on April 3, 1950.

Mr. HEDRICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Charleston Gazette entitled "Low Brand of Politics."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Chattanooga Times.

Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a report of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and in the other to include an address by Gen. Lewis A. Pick.

Mrs. BOSONE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FERNOS-ISERN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to include certain excerpts and tables in the remarks which he expects to make in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain answers from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HERTER (at the request of Mr. HESELTON) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] at the Republican State Convention.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech he made at a communion breakfast last Sunday.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include certain excerpts.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 132]

Anderson, Calif.	Herlong	O'Toole
Angell	Herter	Pace
Barden	Hoffman, Ill.	Patman
Barrett, Pa.	Hollifield	Pfeifer,
Battle	Holmes	Joseph L.
Beall	Hull	Pfeiffer,
Bennett, Fla.	Jackson, Calif.	William L.
Bentsen	Jenkins	Plumley
Blackney	Jones, Mo.	Poage
Blatnik	Karst	Poulson
Bonner	Kean	Powell
Brooks	Kearney	Rains
Buchanan	Kee	Redden
Buckley, Ill.	Kelly, N. Y.	Reed, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Kennedy	Reed, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Kilburn	Ribicoff
Carlyle	Klein	Sabath
Celler	Kunkel	Sadowski
Chatham	Lanham	Scott, Hardie
Chesney	Larcade	Shelley
Chiperfield	Lichtenwalter	Short
Chudoff	Linehan	Smathers
Combs	Lynch	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	McCulloch	Sutton
Cox	McDonough	Tackett
Davis, Tenn.	McGregor	Taylor
Dawson	McMillen, Ill.	Thornberry
Dingell	Madden	Towe
Dollinger	Mason	Vinson
Douglas	Miles	Wadsworth
Fellows	Mills	Welch
Fulton	Monroney	Werdel
Gilmer	Morgan	Wheeler
Gordon	Morrison	Whitaker
Grant	Murphy	Wier
Green	Murray, Tenn.	Willis
Gregory	Nicholson	Wilson, Okla.
Hall,	Nixon	Wilson, Tex.
Leonard W.	Norton	Withrow
Harvey	O'Brien, Ill.	Wood
Heffernan	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodhouse
Heller	O'Konski	Young

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 307 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

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

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year end-

ing June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had consumed 2 hours and 52 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had consumed 3 hours and 28 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss a few questions in connection with chapter 9 of the general appropriation bill and to express my concern over a threat which seems to be developing in our handling of flood-control projects.

I notice from the report on the general appropriation bill that the budget request for the Corps of Engineers was reduced by the Appropriations Committee by approximately 25 percent. This cut applied to flood-control projects as well as rivers and harbors. I also find that a much less drastic cut has been applied by the committee to the funds requested for the Department of the Interior. These latter funds include the items for construction and rehabilitation carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation. To be specific, the general flood-control estimates for 1951 were \$478,447,000. The committee has reduced this item to \$341,055,000. In the case of the construction and rehabilitation funds for the Bureau of Reclamation, the reduction was from \$320,000 to \$297,000—less than 7½ percent. Since flood control is involved in both funds, I cannot understand the logic for the discrepancy in the reductions. It seems to me that the Appropriations Committee has discriminated against those communities in the eastern part of the country whose flood-control problems are, for the most part, handled by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. Conversely, the committee action seems to give special favor to the western communities where most of the work is done by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior.

The city of Louisville, Ky., suffered the worst flood in its history in 1937. Shortly thereafter plans were developed for flood protection, and such protection was authorized by the Congress. The city of Louisville and Jefferson County assumed certain obligations to provide rights-of-way and to rearrange the sewage system so as to fit into the flood-protection plan. Bonds were sold and other local funds made available so that the city and county could meet their respective obligations. The war years intervened, and both appropriations and construction were understandably suspended. In 1945 another disastrous flood hit Louisville. In both of these floods property damage was far in excess of the total cost of flood protection. Income losses to the workers of Louisville, through the suspension of industrial and commercial operations, were staggering. There is also the very human element; namely, the thousands of men, women, and children who live in homes annually subject to the threat of flood.

The Corps of Engineers estimates that the reduction suggested by the committee in funds available for the Louisville flood-wall project will delay its completion until 1955. It is my opinion that the project can be completed at an earlier date if appropriations for fiscal 1952 and 1953 are made adequate.

I am concerned over the vast number of projects on which construction is begun and the relatively small number being completed.

In many projects, including the Louisville flood wall, the slow rate of progress may prove uneconomical in final analysis. The longer the delay in completion of these projects the greater the total costs will be to the American taxpayer.

The Congress has approved many public-works projects. In so doing it was never contemplated that all would be immediately begun. It was clearly pointed out that we must have a backlog of projects so that if at any time the economy of the Nation required Government stimulation of employment, certain of these projects could be set in motion. Without such a procedure the Congress might take very hasty action in the authorization of projects in time of economic stress. This would not be in the best interests of the taxpayers in the long run. As the committee report points out, the administration, through the Department of the Army, has encouraged local municipalities to provide funds for the local responsibilities of certain authorized projects when there was no intention of requesting Federal funds to commence work. This results in an understandable demand from the local government unit for Federal funds. The Congress, in order to meet this, has appropriated money in the past and taken it from those projects already under way.

I was happy to find the following on page 247 of the report:

Reductions in appropriations made by the Congress may, at times, make for uneconomical construction because of the fact that the money must of necessity be applied to a great number of construction projects. It would seem to the committee that a better approach is to limit construction to fewer projects and complete or nearly complete those projects in order that the anticipated benefits may be derived therefrom prior to embarking on construction of additional projects. With this in mind the committee is recommending no funds for planning for the fiscal year 1951. It is felt that it is time for the Congress and the Corps of Engineers to take stock of the current obligations with the view of developing a more logical construction plan which will better serve the needs of the country and better fit into the current budgetary situation. Corollary with this thought is the recommendation that the Corps of Engineers discourage expenditures by local municipalities on the basis of surveys and recommendations made by the Corps of Engineers. It has come to the attention of the committee that, in some instances, local funds have been uneconomically employed because anticipated Federal appropriations were subsequently not made.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that in the future our appropriations for flood control and similar projects will be at a rate which makes for economy. It is my further hope that any projects will be undertaken only when

the economy of the Nation and the Federal budget justify the expenditures involved. Unless we follow this plan, it seems to me that we will end up in a very costly hodgepodge. We will be spending hundreds of millions of dollars each year without providing flood protection for any sizable group of American citizens. Let us complete those items now in process before encouraging local entities to expect the immediate construction of their own new projects even though authorized.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, the single package appropriation bill now before us presents to each and every Member of this House one of the major issues of our day. This measure constitutes the Federal Government's fiscal policy for the coming fiscal year. In my considered judgment, no more important issue can be raised in any one bill than is raised by this pending measure.

The decisions we make in connection with this over-all appropriation program will directly affect every section of the country and every segment of our population. Our final decision may determine the future of this great, free Republic. I do not accept this responsibility lightly.

The bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations proposes a spending program of over \$41,000,000,000 for the coming year. This may be less than the budget estimates and it may be less than the expenditures this year, and I am grateful for every penny that may be saved. But we are faced with the ominous fact that the spending proposed is between four and five billion dollars more than the estimated revenue.

It is my prediction that the deficit resulting from this extravagant spending program will be even larger than that estimated by the committee. In the first place, the bill before us makes no provision for authorization programs which may subsequently be enacted. It includes no appropriations for foreign aid or other purposes now pending in legislative committees. And before the conclusion of this session we may be called upon to make certain additional deficiency appropriations. I sincerely hope not.

While we are faced with the prospect of still additional appropriations, we are also faced with the disturbing indication that the revenue receipts will be less than estimated. It now appears that the estimated income tax receipts themselves will be between a billion and a billion and a half less than the President estimated in his budget message.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the administration's program as embodied in this bill will add between \$5,000,000,000 and \$6,000,000,000 to our already dangerously high national debt of around \$258,000,000,000. The interest on our national debt is now around \$5,625,000,000, and is one of the three largest items in the entire budget.

In another year of peace and a period of high prosperity, it seems to me to be indefensible not to bring the budget into balance, so that the burden of debt and

taxes can be progressively lightened from the backs of our people. To say that the large sum carried in this bill is proof that Government spending is out of hand is to put it mildly. It would be even more accurate to say that the deficit spending policy advocated by the President in his budget message, and advanced by the funds provided in this bill, will inevitably lead us to national bankruptcy.

When I refer to the prospects of complete national bankruptcy as the inevitable result of this reckless deficit spending policy, I do so with the utmost sincerity and gravest concern for our system of free representative government. I again remind you that the deficit is being created in a period of relatively high prosperity, when the revenue is relatively high. A slight business recession will cause a revenue loss. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation estimated that even a 10-percent recession in the aggregate personal income would result in a loss of \$5,000,000,000 in tax revenue. Should that situation develop, which is definitely a possibility, this Nation will face one of the most serious financial crises ever known.

In his opening statement the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] frankly told us that there was a time when appropriation bills were drafted on the basis of the amount of available revenue, but the committee has long since ceased to consider expenditures from that point of view. It now follows the policy of spending the money, whether we have it or not, and leaving it up to the Committee on Ways and Means to find the tax revenue.

To this policy I do not subscribe. It is my conviction that the only way to economize is to economize. It requires the highest order of statesmanship. It requires political courage. It requires constant vigilance and careful scrutiny of every item of expenditure. The question always is, both with the running of your own homes and with the operation of the Federal Government, not what we would like to have but what we can afford.

As we go through this bill, chapter by chapter, I earnestly appeal to the Members, on both sides of the aisle, to view each item in the light of what we can afford. I suppose a justification can be made for every proposed expenditure. The question is not necessarily whether a particular thing has value or whether it is desirable. The question is whether we can afford it.

It is my firm conviction that this proposed spending program can and should be substantially reduced. As we seek to achieve that objective, I believe it would be helpful in our thinking if we divide the various items of appropriation into three general categories: First, the necessities; second, the desirables, and third, the unnecessary.

The unnecessary can be completely eliminated. Those items that may be desirable can be reduced or at least postponed. That leaves us with the necessities and also with sufficient revenue available to meet those necessities.

I recognize that it is not easy to draw the line between these different categories. But I honestly believe that it can be done if we have the determination and the courage to put aside all special appeals and make the national interest paramount. That is the procedure I intend to follow as we proceed to consider each chapter of this bill, giving my support to the various efforts that will be made to reduce the proposed appropriations.

The proponents of this spending program take the position that these large expenditures are necessary, that they have been made necessary by the costs resulting from the past war and the costs involved in averting a future war. To be sure, there are some of these expenditures that are necessary. No one recommends their elimination. But it is my opinion, which I am sure is shared by the vast majority of the American people, that the costs of administering these programs is excessive, filled with duplications, overlappings, and extravagance.

Civilian employment in the Federal Government is more than double the prewar emergency peak. The civilian pay roll and administrative costs are around \$7,500,000,000. Everyone knows that there is an excess of personnel in practically every department and agency of the Government.

Let me present an example. In the March issue of the Country Gentleman, Mr. John Strohm wrote an article concerning a survey he made in De Kalb County, Ill., on the operations of the Federal Government in that county. In that single county of my home State, Mr. Strohm found 123 Federal employees and their wages and expenses from Federal funds amounted to \$86,065.60. This was just the administrative cost of bringing the Federal Government's services to a county of 2,500 farmers. I am not passing judgment on the programs involved. I am emphasizing how much waste there is in the administration of programs. The farmers could, I am sure, receive exactly the same benefits, exactly the same assistance, and probably much more efficiently, at a fraction of the number of people and cost.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, by a careful scrutiny of every proposed item of expenditure substantial savings can be made for the American taxpayers simply in the administrative costs. This is one of the matters to which the Hoover Commission directed its attention; but, I regret to say, it has not been carried out with the speed and determination that the reorganization program should be.

It is time we call a halt. It is time we reduce these needless expenditures, bring our Federal budget into balance, reduce the national debt, and accumulate a surplus so that our people may have relief from the tax burden that is destroying individual initiative and robbing our economy of productivity.

I have taken this time to urge Members of this House to join with me in a real, honest, courageous effort to cut the cost of Government. If we fail in this responsibility I fear for the future of our free country.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

And pending recognition by the chair, I am certain I express the sentiment of the entire House when I say it is a matter of general regret to the Congress that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has announced his purpose to retire from the House at the close of the Eighty-first Congress.

I trust he will reconsider that decision. May I say, Mr. Chairman, there is no more valuable Member in the House today. In all of my recollection there has been no one who has served in either House who has had a more detailed and comprehensive knowledge of river and harbor and flood-control affairs than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. His services have been invaluable, and I trust that he can be prevailed upon to remain with us in the next Congress.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in what he says about my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. There is no more able, conscientious, patriotic Member of this Congress than WILL WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi.

He could be reelected if he wanted to return. Like the gentleman from Missouri, I sincerely trust that he will reconsider and come back and help to carry on the great battle that he has been waging for 10, these many years.

His retirement will be a great loss to his country.

If he is determined to retire, I want to assure him that he will carry with him the admiration and affections of his colleagues in this the greatest legislative body in the world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In this connection too, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that having served in the House for a number of years with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], I want to add my word of appreciation for the services he has rendered to the country. In particular, I want to mention his very great contribution in sponsorship of the Government Corporations Control Act. It was my privilege to be associated with him somewhat in the introduction of companion bills on that subject here in the House, but Mr. WHITTINGTON carried the burden of handling the bill before the committee. There has been no measure passed, in my recollection, which has done more to bring the extra-governmental financial operations of the Government into control than the Government Corporations Control Act which was sponsored in the other body by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Senator BYRD, and the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, Senator BUTLER, and in the House by Mr. WHITTINGTON and myself. Mr. WHITTINGTON is the one

who deserves the major credit for its passage in the House. It will remain as one of the permanent memorials to his outstanding service in the Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have now served in this Congress approaching 12 years. When I first came to the Congress I was attracted to the outstanding character and ability of the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WILL WHITTINGTON, and during my service in the Congress I have continued to observe the high standards that he has employed as a Member of this House. I sincerely regret that he has deemed it necessary to announce his retirement from this Congress, because the Congress and the Nation are going to lose the services of one of the most distinguished men it has been my privilege to know in the 12 years that I have been a Member of this body.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, it is with deep regret that I learn that my colleague across the Mississippi River, the Honorable WILL M. WHITTINGTON, will voluntarily retire at the end of this session. I know of no man who has served his district, State, and Nation better than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. The House of Representatives is a better legislative body because he has graced these Halls. The people of the Mississippi Valley and throughout America are happier, safer, and more prosperous because of his leadership and efforts in sponsoring all worth-while flood-control legislation that has been enacted by this Congress for more than two decades. His consideration and helpful assistance to younger Members of the House will long be remembered and cherished. He is the best-informed man in America on matters of flood control and rivers and harbors improvements. Let me say further that he has been an inspiration to me from the time I entered this House. I shall surely miss him since he has decided not to seek reelection and instead cast aside the cares of public service to return to his beloved Mississippi. He has well earned the solitude and contentment afforded him by being among his lifelong friends in his home city of Greenwood, Miss. I wish for him health, continued happiness, and a life filled with gladness as the years come and go.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, unless the Members of the House can prevail upon Mr. WHITTINGTON to reconsider his determination to retire, not only shall we lose one of the outstanding Members of this House, but also one of the most experienced and capable and courteous chairman of committee that it has ever been my pleasure to appear before or confer with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has long been a great favorite in the House of Representatives and those who have worked the closest with him have the greatest admiration for him. He has an intimate knowledge of the affairs of the Government and a remarkable capacity for public service. He has made a great contribution to the welfare of the United States.

I was pleased to hear the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] speak a word in regard to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], myself, and others who served as members of the Appropriations Subcommittee having to do with civil functions for a number of years worked very closely with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]; and we know of the excellent job which he did and is doing. I wish to pay tribute to this extraordinary and distinguished American at this moment as he appears to address the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, we undoubtedly shall lose one of our ablest and most valuable Members when WILL WHITTINGTON leaves. His has been a fine record of service which will live on for many years in the annals of American Government. His store of information on flood control is probably unsurpassed by that of any other person. We shall indeed miss him.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I join with my good friends in paying tribute to a great legislator and a distinguished American. It was my privilege to come to the House with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] 26 years ago. I know the tremendously able service he has rendered to his State and to the country. We all regret his leaving us because we know that his services have been so valuable it would be very difficult to find someone to fill his position in this particular period of our country's history.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. Not only is the State of Mississippi going to lose a great Representative but all of the States in the Mississippi Valley will lose one of their most ardent champions. We have looked to Mr. WHITTINGTON to lead us in the field of flood control.

Since I became a Member of this House I have called upon Mr. WHITTINGTON many times for advice and help. I sincerely hope that his constituents will prevail upon the gentleman to change his mind and that he will return to this House and help us continue a program that has not as yet been completed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that all the water that ever rushed down the Mississippi River could never wash away the devoted record that WILL WHITTINGTON has made in the defense of the father of waters.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Congress one of the committees to which I was assigned was the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I have always been grateful that part of my apprenticeship in this body was served in a committee on which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] was a senior member. I was impressed and instructed by his extraordinary ability to go at once to the heart of a problem and to see the full import of legal language which I as a non-lawyer oftentimes had the greatest difficulty in understanding. He had an uncanny knack of cutting through double-talk and the fog sometimes thrown up by witnesses, by asking blunt questions which would penetrate to the crux of the matter. He is more skillful at that sort of questioning in committee than anyone with whom I have been privileged to serve.

I remember particularly his invaluable work in connection with the Surplus Property Disposal Act, the Government Corporation Control Act, and, the full employment bill which our committee worked over for many weeks, and then scrapped as unsound and inadvisable, drawing up and getting enacted instead the present employment act the provisions of which were designed to stimulate and encourage maximum economic activity in our country and prevent excessive fluctuations between booms and busts in our country. The contributions of the gentleman from Mississippi can never be adequately measured or even adequately described. He may be sure he has the gratitude of a country that owes him a great debt and the affection and friendship of every one of his colleagues in this House. I wish him Godspeed in his well-deserved retirement, but I still hope that he may see fit to change his mind and stay with us because the Congress and the country can ill afford to lose the services of a man with his exceptional knowledge and ability, his forthrightness and integrity and his irreplaceable experience.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON].

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Chairman, while I am a new Member of the House, it has been my great pleasure to have become acquainted with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. It is with extreme regret that I learn he is leaving this body. He exemplifies all the characteristics that make a committee chairman of great value to the House. He is one who has a keen comprehension, alert understanding, and efficiency in dispatching the problems presented to us. I wish to extend to him my best wishes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply touched by the tributes of my colleagues respecting my services as a Member of the House. I value the good opinion of the Members of the committees on which I have served, and I appreciate more than I can tell the praise accorded me by Members who have spoken with respect to my legislative work. I will always treasure the approval of the Members with whom I have served through the years on committees and in the House.

I know of no place where there is greater opportunity for constructive work than in the House of Representatives. I had rather do anything else than disappoint a friend or disappoint the Members with whom I have served. I am most appreciative and grateful for your expressions of approval. You have honored me beyond anything that I deserve. I will carry with me to the end your commendation of the work I have undertaken to render as a Member of the House for more than a quarter of a century.

Mr. Chairman, in the pending bill for the first time the House is considering a general or composite appropriation bill for the support of all of the departments of the Government. Hearings were conducted by the subcommittees as heretofore. These subcommittees were contacted by a central or subcommittee on review before the reports were submitted. However, the pending bill embraces the combination of all the bills and the pending report embraces the combination of all of the reports as heretofore submitted. The practical difference before the bill is finally passed is that the conferees on the general bill will not be separate conferees on each separate chapter or subcommittee bill but will be members of the subcommittees handling the separate bills, together with members of the central subcommittee.

I have advocated the principle of the general bill. The House has before it the appropriations for all of the departments of Government. Comparisons in the estimates and in the appropriations for comparable agencies can be more readily and efficiently made. While the general bill is an experiment I trust that the experiment will be successful.

COMPARISON OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have generally acted for the best interests of the areas they serve. The same general costs obtain in both agencies. They have employed similar types of personnel and they have constructed similar projects. This last statement applies especially to dams. It also applies to obligated and unobligated funds and to increased estimates in the costs of construction, as well as to the modification of adopted projects in the course of construction. The composite bill enables the House to compare the reports of the two subcommittees handling appropriations for these two comparable agencies.

The Bureau of Reclamation generally operates in the so-called arid States, while the Corps of Engineers operates in all of the 48 States. Flood-control works aggregating hundreds of millions of dollars have been constructed in California, Oregon, Washington, and other arid States in which the Bureau of Reclamation operates. Sometimes the sponsors of reclamation have indicated that in the costs of irrigation there is discrimination between general flood control and reclamation works. Quite the contrary is true. The same local contribution for flood-control works obtains in the 12 arid States that obtains in all of the other 36 States of the Union. If it should develop that reclamation should be extended to other States, the same local contribution that is required for reclamation would be required in the other States. There is no discrimination. The same yardstick in both general flood control and reclamation obtains.

APPROPRIATIONS

The budget estimates for reclamation were reduced in the pending bill by 8.1 percent, while the estimates for general flood control and rivers and harbors were reduced by 24.8 percent. The appropriation for rivers and harbors is \$187,678,000; for general flood control, \$341,055,000. With the appropriation of \$65,000,000 for the Mississippi River and tributaries, the appropriation for rivers and harbors, general flood control, the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, and Sacramento River, Calif., aggregate \$600,933,000, while the appropriations for reclamation aggregate \$297,467,000.

The report of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions states that no amount is included for planning for rivers and harbors and flood control, while the report of the subcommittee on the Interior Department, handling appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation, shows that \$5,150,000 is included for planning. Both the bill and the report indicate that planning funds are included for the Mississippi River and tributaries and for the Sacramento River.

UNOBLIGATED FUNDS

The report on civil functions states that appropriations for general flood control and rivers and harbors were reduced, among other reasons, because of unobligated funds. Funds have been obligated to December 31 to cover 53 percent of the appropriation for rivers and harbors and general flood control, while 45 percent of the appropriation for reclamation have been obligated. There is no argument for a reduction of reclamation appropriations because of unobligated funds, as is the case in the report covering appropriations for general flood control and rivers and harbors. The fact is that the unobligated funds in both agencies are substantially normal. In 1948, up to March 31, 70 percent of available funds had been obligated by the Corps of Engineers; on March 31, 1949, 67 percent of appropriations had been obligated; and on February 28, 1950, 60 percent had been obligated. These trends show that the obligations of 1950 for a comparable date will be in excess of obligations for 1948 and 1949, and

by the end of the fiscal year all work programed will be under way.

MODIFICATIONS

The report on civil functions criticizes the Chief of Engineers for increased estimated costs of authorized projects, especially for modifications in the projects. While increased costs in the Bureau of Reclamation are much larger, the report of the Subcommittee on the Interior Department makes no such criticism.

The report of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions criticizes the Chief of Engineers for including a project on the Arkansas River on the ground that bank stabilization would be completed for the current year and that the committee of conference so provided. My understanding was that there was nothing in the conference report to notify the engineers that the previous appropriation had been made with that provision.

The Bureau of the Budget declined to approve a modification of the Yakima project in Washington, a Bureau of Reclamation project. The Subcommittee on the Interior Department, however, overruled the Budget Bureau and made an appropriation for the modification, stating that the project is not new but is part of the Yakima project originally authorized.

The report of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions is very critical of the Corps of Engineers for modifications of projects with increased estimates, although the Corps of Engineers maintain that the modifications are authorized by existing law. There is no such criticism in the report of the Subcommittee on the Interior covering the modification of reclamation projects. On the contrary, the modifications, as shown by the Yakima project, were proved by the Subcommittee on Interior appropriations to be within the law and necessary to the public interest.

The report of the Civil Functions Subcommittee contains criticism of the Chief of Engineers with respect to the initiation of new projects and with respect to increased costs of adopted projects that, in my opinion, is undeserved. There is no such criticism of the Bureau of Reclamation. It is fair to say, however, that while the Chief of Engineers was not charged with deception or misrepresentation, the report of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations does contain language that is certainly not complimentary to the Bureau of Reclamation. The subcommittee charges that the Bureau of Reclamation has, to use the wording in the report, a "propensity for subterfuge." These words were used in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

ECONOMY

I must not be misunderstood. I know the tendency of all departments of the Government is to spend. Where not justified that tendency is properly subject to criticism, but the criticism should be deserved. If the increased costs of a particular project are not justified the remedy would be to deny the request for the increased appropriation. If, however, the Chief of Engineers requests a

modification to protect lives and property, even though the costs be increased, it is my belief that the public interest is served by granting such increased appropriation. The engineers, or the Bureau of Reclamation, as the case may be, have discharged their obligation when they recommend such modifications. If damage or injury result because of a denial of funds to carry out the modification then the appropriating subcommittee is at fault.

I favor the reduction of all appropriations where justified. I believe that similar treatment, however, should be accorded rivers and harbors and flood-control works and reclamation. I want to emphasize that rivers and harbors and flood-control works affect all of the 48 States whereas reclamation, important as it is, affects only the 12 arid States. In the public interest, if budget recommendations are to be reduced for one agency it occurs to me that comparable treatment should be accorded to the other agency.

Personally, I advocate strengthening both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. They are established agencies. They have both done efficient work. I oppose the substitution of authorities which would deprive these agencies of their functions. I have generally supported the subcommittees in their appropriations for rivers and harbors, for flood control, and for reclamation. I feel, however, that I would be remiss if I did not urge that we eliminate the discrimination between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation set forth in this composite bill which carries appropriations for both agencies. In all fairness, I do not believe that the Chief of Engineers deserves the condemnation contained in the report.

REDUCTION IN FLOOD-CONTROL AND RIVER-AND-HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS

The Subcommittee on Civil Functions states that the reduction in the budget estimates for civil works is based on two major premises.

First. The delay in appropriations until October 1949 for the current fiscal year is given as one major reason for reducing the appropriations now under consideration. It is stated that substantial unobligated balances are available and support the reduction. I have already referred to the matter of unobligated funds. There was much discussion respecting unobligated balances in the last session, with the result that the contention of the Committee on Civil Functions was finally rejected. This argument for reduction fails because continuing resolutions were adopted a number of times and these resolutions provided for continuing construction of previously authorized works.

Second. Another argument for reduction was that in most instances, where possible and feasible, construction should be spread out. Instead of justifying a reduction this contention really supports an increase. The argument contradicts itself. The Chief of Engineers is criticized for recommending too many projects, on the one hand, and on the other

hand, is criticized for failure to spread construction activities.

Third. A third objection in behalf of reducing appropriations is the tendency of the Chief of Engineers to request funds for initiation and construction of too many projects. The hearing discloses that the Chief of Engineers was restricted by the Director of the Budget largely to projects that were under construction. The Chief of Engineers recommended for the last three fiscal years only the following new projects:

	<i>New projects</i>
1949-----	19
1950-----	6
1951-----	None

Again the contention of the committee is contradictory. In one paragraph it advocates spreading out which can only result from new projects. In another paragraph it insists that only projects under consideration shall be considered for appropriations.

Fourth. Finally, the committee states that the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Functions Subcommittee, and the Congress should insist that adequate plans and designs be prepared in detail before construction of any project is initiated. This is a correct contention but the subcommittee completely contradicts itself by denying funds to accomplish the planning which it constructively recommends.

I believe that the criticism of the subcommittee with respect to increased costs of projects is not justified. Many projects were authorized several years ago. Some were authorized before World War II, others following World War II. The cost of construction have increased, no matter what index is used. The cost of highway construction, for instance, between 1941 and 1949 increased 123.6 percent. This covers materials and labor. Moreover, the cost of projects involving steel, because of the increased cost of steel, have been materially increased. The Corps of Engineers should be commended for the construction of dams that are strong and will withstand major floods. The country always has the Johnstown disaster in mind. The Corps of Engineers should be commended for building flood walls that are adequate to withstand major floods. Many lives and much property would be destroyed without these safeguards.

Whatever may be said with respect to the proper index with regard to increased costs and estimates, I am inclined to believe that the Engineering News Record Index is probably more applicable to river and harbor and flood-control improvements than that of the Department of Commerce, for instance, or the Public Buildings Service. At all events, whatever may be said with respect to increased estimates, it is well to keep in mind that the work of the Corps of Engineers is awarded by competitive bidding. The low bidder gets the work, and if the estimates are too high, competition will protect the Federal Treasury.

In support of its criticism as to increased estimates, the Subcommittee on Civil Functions, under general flood control, refers to the Hoosick Falls, N. Y.,

project. It was modified. The modification will increase the cost, as I recall from \$925,400 to \$1,300,000. A major flood occurred after the project was authorized and after construction was begun. I believe, in the public interest, the project should be modified, to prevent a recurrence of a major flood.

Another project with respect to increased estimates is the project at Portville, N. Y., in which the estimates were increased from \$1,900,000 to \$2,366,800. After its construction was originally planned, there was an unprecedented development on account of World War II. The population largely increased. Many new homes were erected. It strikes me that the increased estimates are justified. It is certainly in line with the contention of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations in justifying increased costs of the Yakima, Wash., project.

INCREASED COSTS IN RECLAMATION

There is no criticism in the pending bill of the increased estimates in the cost of projects undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation although the increase in costs of these projects largely exceed the cost of the two projects I have referred to under general flood control. I mention only a few of the increased estimates under the Bureau of Reclamation which are not, and should not be, condemned by the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations. The Gila, Ariz., project, for instance, has increased from \$32,000,000 to \$53,000,000. Likewise, the All-American Canal project of the Bureau of Reclamation has increased from \$38,000,000 to \$76,000,000, in round figures.

Other Bureau of Reclamation projects show similar increases, as follows: Boulder Canyon, \$126,000,000 to \$173,000,000; Colorado-Big Thompson, Colo., \$44,000,000 to \$150,000,000; Central Valley, Calif., \$170,000,000 to \$581,000,000; Davis Dam, \$41,000,000 to \$114,000,000; Hungry Horse, Mont., \$38,000,000 to \$108,000,000; Missouri River Basin, \$529,000,000 to more than \$2,000,000,000. I could mention many more reclamation projects where the estimated costs of construction have been increased. I have mentioned enough to show, however, that estimated costs have been increased not only in flood control and river and harbor improvements, but in reclamation as well. It will be remembered, however, that the Subcommittee on Interior made no criticism of these increased estimates while on the other hand, the Subcommittee on Civil Functions criticized the Chief of Engineers for increased estimates in connection with general flood-control projects, although many of the increased estimates in both general flood control and reclamation occur in the same river basin.

If a project is modified to protect lives and property the Chief of Engineers is to be commended for recommending modification, if authorized, for if there should be death and destruction the responsibility would be with the Civil Functions Subcommittee and not with the Chief of Engineers.

Yet, in the bill we have under consideration, the general bill, the composite bill, the Corps of Engineers is criticized because they have come forward and given

us the facts and given us increased estimates, and there is no criticism of the Bureau of Reclamation.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman, in his very interesting and very able discussion, has referred to the original estimates and increases since the original estimates were made; but he has gone clear back in some cases, for instance, in the case of Boulder Dam, 20 or 25 years, away back into antediluvian days, which would not apply to the criticism contained in this report. This report refers exclusively to criticism of estimates which were made last year as compared with this year, and they covered, as I recall, only last year's estimates. The gentleman's reference to very ancient estimates I am certain is not apropos.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I mentioned the reclamation projects because many of them were authorized years ago. So were many flood-control projects. I mentioned Boulder Canyon, but the last project I mentioned a few moments ago was in the Missouri River Basin. That project was authorized in 1944, and there were not any appropriations made during the war as I recall; it is rather recent. The one before that is the Hungry Horse, one of the projects recently authorized, and that was increased from \$38,000,000 to \$138,000,000. I am aware of what the gentleman says about estimates, and I am about to get to that as to 1949 and 1951. But the Missouri River Basin is not antediluvian; that Missouri River Basin is recent, and the cost, for instance, of Garrison Dam in the Missouri River Basin has been increased by millions and millions of dollars in the last few years.

Mr. CANNON. I trust that the strictures in the report which were very carefully considered before they were adopted by the committee, will be considered in connection with the fact that the estimates which were submitted to us last year as compared with those for this year show an unconscionable increase in estimated total cost.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Which I am going to get to.

Mr. CANNON. They can be explained only by incompetence or by intention to mislead the committee when they initiated the project, because the cost indexes do not bear out the increases in 1950 over 1949. The committee did not criticize 1949.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am very glad to have the gentleman's statement, and I can understand that he was misled. I know about the statement in the report of the committee. The Corps of Engineers were criticized for using the Engineering News Index for the increase of cost. I think the Engineering News Index is a better index than that of the Department of Commerce, for the Department of Commerce index has to do with the building of all types of construction. The Engineering News Index has to do with the building of dams and the building of roads; and I think that index is preferable, for instance, to the index of the Public Building Service.

They gave you the facts, but the engineers gave you the facts not only on increased costs of construction, but on other items. I want to call attention in just a few moments to the increase that was caused by engineering cost increases and the increased costs of construction. I am glad for us to air this matter and to get the thing fully before us, but I would say that in the construction of highways, the index shows that there was an increased cost of construction from 1941 to 1949 of 123.8 percent. There has been an enormous increase in the cost of construction. These works were not built during the war, and there has been a large increase in the cost of construction from 1945 to 1948. The increase particularly applies to the increased cost of steel, and steel is used in the building of dams and reservoirs. So, in my judgment and with all due deference to the gentleman, these increases in costs are not attributable only to the price index, not attributable only to the increased cost of construction in the last year or two; and my judgment is, with the information at my command, that the costs of construction have actually decreased since the gentleman conducted his hearings. I think the findings in the Committee on Public Works show that lower bids are now being received for public road construction and for this type of construction than were being submitted a few months ago and at the time the budget estimates were made.

With respect now to the chairman's statement, and I am very glad to have him bring it out, as to the difference in the cost in 1949, 1948, and 1951, there were 63 projects submitted as disclosed by the hearings, and the amount of those increased costs, some of them were authorized in 1936—and some in other years—was in the neighborhood of \$503,000,000. According to the facts that were submitted those increased costs in construction as shown by an analysis are as follows:

An analysis of the increase shows that 34 percent are due to increased construction costs, 25 percent to enlargements and expansions authorized by specific or general legislation, 8 percent to conditions that could not be foreseen, 11 percent to the increased cost of land and right-of-way.

I think, whatever my opinion may be worth, I did right in calling your attention to the projects that were authorized in 1928, Boulder Canyon, and in 1936, as well as later, because there has been a tremendous increase in the cost of land and therefore the rights-of-way costs have been tremendously increased before they get to construction. And, finally, in an analysis of this increase in these 63 projects, 22 percent are attributable to engineering and construction modifications.

The committee states that no funds are to be allowed for planning and in the appropriation for rivers and harbors the word "planning" is omitted and no funds are provided. In the language on page 339 of the bill, while the report states that no funds are provided for planning for general flood control and while that statement is supported by the break-down, nevertheless on page 339

of the bill as reported there is provision for planning. Now, one or the other of those contentions is wrong. In other words, this committee now has reported that no funds are to be used for planning, yet on page 339 of the bill it is stated: "detailed surveys, and prepare plans and specifications."

I think in all candor, a mistake was made and that mistake should be corrected. It does strike me that if the Congress is to be asked to appropriate substantially \$600,000,000 with not 1 cent for planning, when the investigation and the facts submitted show that planning funds have been exhausted, the committee should amend the bill to provide a reasonable appropriation for planning funds.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. That is due to a decision to start no new projects in compliance with the recommendation made in connection with the Hoover Commission report that all projects now under operation be completed or, at least, be continued at a minimum rate but that no new ones be started. What appears to the gentleman to be a discrepancy there is that the planning referred to in the second place is planning of details of projects already approved, and not on new projects which have not yet been initiated.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have this to say in reply. I have a copy of the appropriations act for the current fiscal year before me and the language is identical. It is the language that has heretofore been carried in appropriation bills, which have always provided for advance planning, and not used for planning projects under construction.

Now, with respect to the contention that the budget in the first instance restricted the Corps of Engineers to reporting on projects that were under construction, the committee in line with that asked the Corps of Engineers to emphasize the projects that were under way, I have this to say, and I speak by the record: In the United States in 1949 the Corps of Engineers reported on 19 new projects, in 1950 on 6 new projects and in 1951, the pending bill, none.

I have this further to say, that the committee in the report criticizes the Chief of Engineers in very severe terms on the one hand for recommending and submitting estimates on other projects, and yet in another paragraph says that instead of concentrating on the few projects the work should be spread out in all parts of the country. Now, those two contentions or arguments in the report are contradictory. They should be corrected, or clarified.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman understands that this version was from the standpoint of time and not from the standpoint of projects.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Well, I was just replying to the gentleman's contention about new projects.

Mr. CANNON. To the best of my recollection the Hoover Commission recommended in their printed report that we continue work on projects in progress but that we start no new projects.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think I understand the gentleman. Generally, I think the projects under way ought to be completed, but the report criticizes the engineers for not spreading the work out.

Mr. CANNON. That reference is to time and not projects.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Well, I do not see how on earth you can spread out work unless you spread the projects, and I submit the matter with that statement.

I know that there is a tendency of all agencies of the Government to spend and ask for increased appropriations. Personally I believe in a balanced budget, and I believe that all agencies of the Government ought to be treated in a similar fashion, and in an effort to balance the budget, if funds for planning should be eliminated for rivers and harbors, why I cannot see why those funds in the sum of \$5,150,000 for planning in the same bill should obtain for a comparable agency. For that reason I am drawing the matter to the attention of the Committee of the Whole. The desire of the committee to economize is understandable, but I submit this matter to you. Heretofore there have been, I think, four or five million dollars for planning for rivers and harbors and general flood control. Yet it takes a lot to build \$600,000,000 worth of work, and the basis and the foundation is planning, and adequate planning. It just cannot be that all previous Congresses were in error in appropriating annually for planning. I submit now that if the \$2,000,000 recommended by the budget for planning for rivers and harbors is rejected, as this committee has rejected it, and if the \$4,000,000 recommended for planning for general flood control by the Director of the Budget is rejected, as this committee has rejected it, then you have got an agency composed of trained engineers and trained personnel that will have to be eliminated, and in my thought it will cost the Government more money next year or the year that follows to reinstate and reestablish that agency than it would be to carry it on with a reasonable appropriation for planning.

Now, I said that the work of the two agencies is comparable. I would like to be helpful; I would like to be constructive. I think that Congress has a responsibility in the matter of eliminating any discriminations that obtain between these two agencies.

DISCRIMINATION IN LAWS

Both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers are on a solid foundation. Their construction and their planning methods have been tested. The Corps of Engineers improve our rivers and protect our valleys. The Bureau of Reclamation reclaims our arid lands. Both develop power where it is

necessary. I have advocated that Congress has the responsibility to eliminate discriminations that now obtain with respect to power projects constructed by these two agencies. The same rate of interest in the evaluation of benefits should obtain. The same charge for the disposal of power should obtain. I believe Congress should promptly pass legislation eliminating discriminations in existing laws in evaluating benefits and disposition of power in projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Public Treasury will be protected. Rivalry between the two agencies will be eliminated. Undesirable competition will be avoided.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO PROVIDE FOR
PLANNING FUNDS

I believe that the Subcommittee on Civil Functions, on reflection, will submit an amendment to provide for adequate planning funds for river and harbor and flood-control improvements. It is unthinkable to me that \$5,150,000 should be provided in connection with appropriations for reclamation amounting to \$297,467,000, while no planning funds are provided for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects aggregating \$535,000,000. I have already referred to the inconsistencies and contradictions in respect to the arguments for eliminating planning funds. The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$2,000,000 for river and harbor planning. The amount is justified. Harbors should be planned along the Atlantic and other coasts to provide for safety to human life. Modern vessels require deeper channels. Funds should be appropriated and I believe that the \$2,000,000 recommended should be provided for planning for river and harbor projects. Although the report and the bill eliminate such funds, every previous bill passed by the Congress for river and harbor appropriations contained such planning funds. With the multiplying populations and the progress of our Nation the need now is greater than ever before. If \$5,150,000 should be provided for reclamation projects aggregating \$297,467,000, surely \$2,000,000 is justified for river and harbor projects aggregating \$187,678,000.

But even more essential are planning funds for general flood control. The appropriation is \$341,055,000. The inconsistencies and contradictions are accentuated by the fact that in the pending bill, page 339, as I have pointed out, a statement is contained that the funds appropriated may be used for planning, while the report states that no planning funds are included. The matter should be clarified and I believe the committee should submit an amendment to provide \$4,000,000 for planning of general flood-control improvements as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Planning funds have been carried, I repeat, in every other appropriation for flood control.

The elimination of planning funds instead of providing for economy would promote extravagance. To use the language of the subcommittee respecting the Chief of Engineers, it might properly be termed "promotion of profligacy." A competent staff with experience for planning cannot be recruited overnight.

If planning funds are eliminated, the staff would have to be eliminated. Costs of future planning would be increased instead of reduced.

I trust that the committee will offer an amendment to provide planning funds for general flood control for at least \$4,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

In this connection, as I have stated, the subcommittee refers to the increased costs from 1948, 1949, and 1950 to 1951 of 63 projects aggregating \$503,116,000. An analysis of the increase shows that 34 percent are due to increased construction costs, 25 percent to enlargements and expansions authorized by specific and general legislation, 8 percent to changes in conditions that could not have been foreseen, 11 percent to lands, rights-of-way, and so forth, and 22 percent on account of engineering and construction modifications. I emphasize that construction modifications obtain in the larger dams primarily as the result of the installation of units for power involving steel where the price of material has increased. It would be most unwise, because of increased estimates, to deny any planning funds whatsoever.

As a further illustration of the inconsistencies and contradictions with respect to planning, H. R. 5472, the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bill already passed by the House, provides that the Corps of Engineers should make plans respecting the water resources of Alaska. Despite this fact, and against existing statutory authority, the Interior Subcommittee approved \$250,000 for Alaska planning and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation. I could cite further needs in behalf of planning, but I believe the reasons given here for adequate appropriations for planning funds will justify the committee in submitting an amendment for such funds.

I personally think both of these agencies ought to be retained. They have done splendid work. But the fact remains now that under laws passed by the Congress, for which this committee is not responsible, there are some discriminations between the works done by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. In estimating the benefits, one agency uses a certain rate of interest and the other another rate of interest. In providing for the disposition of power, one rate is fixed for one agency and another rate is fixed for the other agency.

In my judgment, the work of these two excellent agencies can be promoted by the Congress of the United States passing laws that will eliminate the discrepancies and discriminations that occur.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with what my colleague from Mississippi says about the Army engineers. I served on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for many years. I never found a more accurate, more reliable, and more conscientious group of men to deal with in my life than the Army engineers. They gave us the

facts. I deplore this criticism in this report. From my viewpoint, it is thoroughly unjustified.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would like to say in response to the question of the chairman with respect to surveys and studies, that the funds for surveys and studies in all of the bills that we have ever passed are different from funds for planning. The surveys and studies have to do among other things with the resolutions that are adopted by the Committee on Public Works every week with respect to study of projects which have never been conducted. Heretofore there has been one break-down in the report of the committee for an appropriation for these studies and another for planning, or they have been included and mentioned in the break-down. In your break-down you do not include the word "planning" with the word "studies" in this bill this year.

Mr. Chairman, my thought was to call attention to the fact that there was no criticism in the Bureau of Reclamation because of unobligated funds, no criticism of that Bureau because of extension and increase of estimates, no criticism because of increased costs; money is provided, \$5,000,000 for planning; whereas, on the other hand, with respect to civil functions, the unobligated funds were used as an argument for reducing 24.8 percent the budget estimates. While the reduction of only 8.1 occurs in the Bureau of Reclamation estimates. The extension was criticized, and finally with no funds provided for planning for flood control, for rivers and harbors, the committee concludes its report by saying:

The Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Functions Subcommittee, and the Congress should insist that adequate plans and designs be prepared in detail before the construction of any project is initiated.

I think that is fundamentally sound, but I know of no way to prepare plans unless you appropriate money for the preparation of those plans. I was in Congress during the great depression; I remember that under the act of 1936, when there was widespread unemployment there were few plans. I trust we are not going to have any unemployment, but the matter of plans was never more important than it is today. I know of no way for this constructive recommendation of the committee to be carried out unless this bill is amended to provide reasonable amounts for planning.

I conclude by saying, Mr. Chairman, that I appeared before the subcommittee together with Representatives from the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries. That committee gave us with a full attendance most patient hearings. I am grateful. With two exceptions through all the years I have never offered any amendments on the floor of the House to appropriations for flood control or rivers and harbors. In the case of those two exceptions it happens that the House agreed and adopted the amendments that I proposed.

Personally, I wish that the appropriation for the lower Mississippi Valley had been as recommended by the President, and I am talking about the recommen-

dation of president Truman in his budget. I have gone along with the committee generally in the past and I want to go along now. I am sympathetic with all efforts to reduce and to economize, but we must not reduce where it is absolutely necessary that we carry on. I have no project that is involved in planning, not one in my district, under general flood control but I think that the general public interest of all river basins in the United States would be promoted by this committee making it clear, removing any doubt, that you mean for an appropriation to be made to plan not only fundamentally before the projects are adopted but as the units are constructed and for the completion of the projects and for rivers and harbors as well as planning for new projects. I do trust that provisions for reasonable amounts for planning for general flood control will be provided. When I ask for that or suggest it I am suggesting that to the committee itself, in whom I have every confidence because like you I would like to see the budget balanced, but with unemployment in the offing, for whatever my humble view may be worth, I respectfully urge that the committee make no mistake by amending the bill definitely to provide for planning.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. As always, the Members of the House derive great profit and knowledge from what the gentleman says when he takes the floor. I am very happy that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has explained this matter, because there is no man in Congress or no man who has ever been a Member of this Congress better qualified, who has more knowledge and a more clear conception of the rivers and harbors and flood control problems of America than does the gentleman who is now addressing the House.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman has worked in committee and has worked with the Army engineers and possibly knows better than anyone in this country the good work that the Army engineers have done. Would not the gentleman say that they are efficient, that they do a wonderful work, that they do it without the thought of politics in any way, shape, or form and that they must have an opportunity to carry forward the engineering which the gentleman has just indicated?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I say that the Army engineers are not perfect, but I believe they should be supported just as I believe the Bureau of Reclamation should be supported. They are the most efficient flood control and river and harbor engineers in this or any other country. They enjoy the confidence of the country and the Congress. I recall during the great depression when one WPA civilian administrator after the other in various sections of our country had failed, that finally the members of the Corps of Engineers were called on to

do that job. Whatever you say about them, they are appointees to West Point, they are servants of the people, and of the Congress. I cannot conclude without saying that while the Committee on the Interior did not criticize the Bureau of Reclamation as the Committee on Civil Functions criticized the Chief of Engineers, I will say again that they used some language that was not altogether complimentary when they said that the Bureau of Reclamation had "a propensity for subterfuge," and that more than equals the language of the Committee on Civil Functions when they referred to the "profligacy" of the Corps of Engineers.

I believe in equal treatment for the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. I urge the committee to submit a committee amendment to amend the pending bill to provide reasonable appropriations for adequate planning for rivers and harbors and for general flood control in accordance with the appropriations that have been made previously annually for planning.

No agency of the Government has ever wrought better than the Corps of Engineers. They are honest. They may make mistakes, but their record is without stain or blemish. Their works are their monuments.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED].

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the time he has yielded to me today. I know the Appropriations Committee has put in many days, weeks, and months of work and study on the bill now before us. They are trying to economize without stopping all progress in this country, especially with reference to defense projects. They have done a fine job in the preparation of this bill, but a bill of this proportion, regardless of the amount of work that may be devoted to it by all of the various subcommittees, needs a full discussion and debate on the floor of the House. Sometimes I wish it were possible for all the Members of the House to serve on each important standing committee for a while, because if we were able to do that, I believe we would become impressed with the idea that members of the committee know so much more about a particular bill which comes from their committee than some of us do, that we would feel slow about challenging the merits of the bill which has received so much study. I have observed, and you have observed that when the ECA bill comes up for discussion, the distinguished members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, from both sides of the aisle, are for the bill, and this situation is true of almost all important bills that come from an important standing committee of the House.

With reference to this bill, some of the members of the committee want more economy than others, some feel that we cannot balance the budget at the present time, but that it must be done slowly and that we cannot balance the budget at the sacrifice of the proper defense of

our country and proper efforts to maintain the peace.

The people of the Nation are economy minded, but I believe, in spite of that fact, they want peace at almost any price as long as it is an honorable peace. This is true because we have all suffered the horrors of war, and without relating the experiences which have come to each one of our families, we know this is true. Our first objective then is to maintain the peace, and our second objective is to be ready for war in the event it comes.

In order to be ready for war we must have our Army prepared, our Navy prepared, and our Air Force prepared, and we cannot stop all progress in this country, especially as far as defense and security projects are concerned.

I may not be able to be present when an amendment will probably later be offered to this bill to restore a greater portion of the funds to what I consider a security and defense project which was recommended by the President and approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and practically eliminated by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. I want to say that I concur in everything that he said in the well of this House today.

As a new Member I wish to say that it has been an inspiration to me to have known the gentleman from Mississippi since I have been in the House, and to have been associated with him to some extent. I appeared before a subcommittee of the gentleman's committee yesterday and I wish to say again how much I appreciated the courteous and the patient hearing that subcommittee gave to us.

One thing that the gentleman from Mississippi said especially impressed me; that was his statement to the effect that he was for economy; that he realized we had to reduce the expenditures of Government in all lines in order to eventually have any hope of balancing the budget, but at the same time he said that there were certain projects in chapter 9, that deal with rivers and harbors, that had to be carried on in spite of the necessity of reducing expenditures.

I want to talk to you just a moment about one of those projects which has been left out of this bill almost completely, and which I consider an essential project, a necessary project, a project that is necessary for the proper defense and security of this Nation.

I refer to the Demopolis lock and dam project in Alabama.

The River and Harbor Act, approved March 2, 1945, authorized the modification of the project by the construction of a new lock and dam in the vicinity of Demopolis to replace the existing structures, 4, 5, 6, and 7. Funds for the initiation of construction work in the amount of \$1,000,000 were provided in the Civil Functions Appropriations Act for 1950. About the 19th of last December, General Pick went to Alabama. We had groundbreaking ceremonies at Demopolis. The ceremonies

were attended by most of the Members of the Alabama delegation, including one of the Senators from Alabama. The other Senator from Alabama was unavoidably absent. It was impossible for him to be there at the time.

Thousands of people attended the ceremonies. I wish you could have been there to hear the magnificent address by General Pick on that occasion.

All of us assumed that because the \$1,000,000 had been appropriated for the commencement of construction of that important project, that it would be gone ahead with.

The Warrior River system has been improved by the construction of 15 locks and dams to provide slack-water navigation between Mobile and Birmingham, Ala., a distance of about 450 miles. The older structures were completed during the period 1902 to 1915. Due to the age of these structures and the increased tonnage on the stream, three of the structures, 10, 11, and 12, were replaced by a modern lock and dam at Tuscaloosa, this lock being placed in operation in 1940.

The River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, authorized the modification of the project by the construction of a new lock and dam in the vicinity of Demopolis to replace existing structures 4, 5, 6, and 7. Funds for initiation of construction work in the amount of \$1,000,000 were provided in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act for 1950. The total estimated cost of the Demopolis Lock and Dam is \$20,843,000, of which \$1,342,500 has been provided to date leaving a balance of \$19,500,500 remaining to complete. The funds provided in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act for 1950 are being applied to access road construction, clearing the site, and common excavation and cofferdike construction for the lock. The approved budget estimate for 1951 is \$4,000,000 and was scheduled for application to land acquisition in the amount of \$360,000 and the remaining funds to the initiation of a continuing contract for construction of the lock and spillway. The amount allowed by the House committee was \$358,000 which would, of course, preclude the commencement of construction work on the lock and spillway.

Demopolis lock and dam at the junction of the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers is a link in one established major transportation system and will also be a link in another upon completion of the authorized Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway. It will replace four obsolete locks with a modern 600-foot lock capable of handling more traffic in less time.

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

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What is the traffic density on the Warrior system at the present time?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I will give you that right now, sir.

Traffic on the Warrior system has increased considerably during recent years due to the importation of ore from Sweden and Brazil to the Birmingham area. Increased movement of oil is also expected from surrounding oil fields.

The tonnage handled on the waterway was about 1,974,000 tons during the calendar year 1948, an increase of 150,000 tons over 1947. While we do not have the complete figures for the year 1949, the tonnage will well exceed 2,000,000 tons and would have been far greater had not the towage had to be broken down at many of these ancient and dilapidated locks along the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers.

The Warrior system connects Mobile, ranked by the Department of Commerce as the sixth most important port in the Nation with Birmingham, a city of industrial importance and the second largest producer of steel in the United States.

I wish to read a letter from the Warrior & Gulf Navigation Co., Chickasaw, Ala., dated March 27, 1950:

WARRIOR & GULF NAVIGATION CO.,
Chickasaw, Ala., March 27, 1950.
HON. EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DEGRAFFENRIED: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 24 relative to the drastic reduction made by the Committee on Appropriations for the construction of the new lock and dam at Demopolis on the Tombigbee River. The news of this reduction was indeed a blow to our hopes that the improvement program to the Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers which was interrupted by World War II would again get under way. It is very difficult for us to understand a decrease in the appropriation for this particular project of 91 percent as compared to a reduction of slightly less than 30 percent in the over-all appropriation bill covering the other authorized projects over the country. Such a reduction is to say the least discriminatory and inequitable. Failure to construct the Demopolis lock would endanger the continued use of this important artery of commerce in view of the deplorable condition of locks 4, 5, 6, and 7 which the new lock will replace.

Construction of the proposed Demopolis lock will provide a standard Ohio River size lock chamber 600 feet long by 110 feet wide and will replace four small locks now in use, Nos. 4, 5, 6, and 7 above it. These existing obsolete locks have very small lock chambers, 286 feet long by 52 feet wide. The savings to water carriers and operators from the replacement of the existing obsolete locks, 4, 5, 6, and 7, are very important, especially when it is realized that these locks are badly in need of repair and that any one of them could easily be put out of commission at any time, thus blocking all traffic on the Tombigbee-Warrior River system. The average tow now in use on this system has to be broken up at each of these locks and three separate lockage operations are required to pass the tow through each lock. A standard 8-barge tow passing through the four locks referred to requires 12 hours each way, or a total of 24 hours per round trip. The proposed new lock would eliminate the existing locks and require only one lockage for the standard eight-barge tow. In addition, the deeper water which would be provided by the new lock and dam in the three pools above it would enable an increase in speed of the tow to more than double the present speed and afford an additional saving of time of approximately 7 hours. The above figures are based on a study made by this company on the actual performance of tows under present conditions in the pools above lock 4 as compared to the speed of tows in the deep pool which exists above lock 17 on the Black Warrior River above Tuscaloosa, Ala. The total saving in time which would be afforded by the proposed new lock at Demopolis in reducing the present 21 lockages in each di-

rection to a single lockage plus the saving in towing speed, we estimate would save \$750 per trip on present-day operating costs. On the basis of an existing schedule of 24 trips per year per vessel, the monetary savings would amount to approximately \$18,000 per year per vessel. This saving multiplied by the four vessels which we now have in service will result in a total annual saving of \$72,000.

In addition to the savings outlined above, the decrease in the number of days required for each trip will be the equivalent of three extra round trips per year, or an estimated additional 24,000 tons of revenue freight. The only cost involved in moving this additional tonnage is the actual fuel, lubricating oils, and miscellaneous deck supplies consumed while making the three extra trips. Vessel expense, such as wages of crew, depreciation, taxes, insurance, etc., is an annual expense continuing throughout the year and naturally if additional trips can be made, this cost will be spread over a greater tonnage, thereby resulting in further savings.

I am enclosing a savings chart which was prepared by the district engineer at Mobile showing the annual savings to be realized by the construction of the proposed lock. Please note that the annual savings in operation and maintenance costs to the United States Engineer Department plus the savings to users makes a total saving of \$476,100 annually which is in excess of the 358,000 appropriated by the committee for construction work on the new lock in 1951. In other words, for each year that the construction of this lock is delayed, the Government and users of the River are losing \$476,100 and this figure will be increased in direct proportion to the increased use of the facilities which is now taking place.

It is now public knowledge that the production of high-grade iron ores from the Mesabi Range in Minnesota will almost disappear within the next 20 to 25 years. Realizing the seriousness of this situation, the U. S. Steel Corp., after spending millions of dollars in exploration of world ore reserves, located vast deposits of high-grade iron ore in Venezuela. Plans are already under way to commence shipment of some two million tons annually from this field to the Birmingham district, all of which is scheduled to move through the port of Mobile. The rich Venezuelan ore (over 60 percent iron) will be mixed with native low-grade ores and based on experiments made by the steel mills of the Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co. in Birmingham will result in an increased steel production of 15 percent with the existing facilities. Obviously, the movement of such a large volume of bulk ore must be done as cheaply as possible in order to make its use economical in Birmingham. This cannot be accomplished with locks built more than 40 years ago whose narrow and obsolete size require multiple lockages of tows, restricts the passage of larger tows that are in use today and will further restrict the still larger units and tows that will be employed with increasing movement of huge quantities of raw materials. A reduction in the number of dams and enlargement of lock chambers as proposed in connection with the new Demopolis lock and dam so as to permit the passing of tows intact will result in lowered transportation costs and assure the continued movement of this commodity over the river.

The value of the new iron ore discoveries in Venezuela and its movement by water to the steel mills in Birmingham cannot be over-emphasized from the standpoint of national defense as well as peacetime production. Should this country be faced with another war of similar proportions to the last, our ability to produce a war machine capable of defending the country is open to question in view of our present depleted iron ore reserve. The movement to the mills of a large volume of foreign iron ore by the use of a

modern waterway will supplement our diminishing ore reserves and provide a margin of safety in time of war. We have information that the U. S. Steel Corp. by 1955 will be shipping upward to 2,000,000 tons of ore annually to its Birmingham mills. It is urgent that construction of a new lock at Demopolis proceed at once in order that it will be completed by the time this large volume of ore commences to move.

The above has been hurriedly and poorly written in view of the urgency of this matter. However, I hope that it will be of some assistance in acquainting you with the situation. For your further information, I am attaching photographs showing the condition of locks 6 and 8 and a typical tow of iron ore moving upstream. Also enclosed is the story of the Venezuelan ore discovery which I trust you will find interesting reading. I sincerely hope that it will be possible to salvage part of this appropriation in view of its vital importance to all of us in this area.

Looking forward to seeing you in Washington on the third, I remain

Yours very truly,

W. I. McELROY,
Superintendent of Operations.

The continuation of the construction of this lock and dam is necessary at the present time. It will facilitate the taking of iron ore brought from Brazil, Venezuela, Sweden, and other places from the port of Mobile to Birmingham, Ala., a major steel-production center. By using a great portion of this iron ore now, we can salvage our own iron-ore deposits in this country for use during any war which may come. When war comes, we may be cut off from bringing this ore from other countries to the United States, and, if so, it will then be necessary for us to use our own iron-ore deposits in great measure and they may be speedily exhausted. Therefore, they should be conserved now, and the only way to conserve them is by using the ore brought in from these other countries. Also, in the event of war, we can bring in iron ore from Brazil and Venezuela, until we are cut off from getting it, by using the Caribbean Sea and receive the protection of Cuba and Puerto Rico and other islands until we get it into the Gulf of Mexico and thence to Mobile. It will be almost like using an inland water route instead of hazarding conveying ships to the submarine menace which will probably be present in the Atlantic Ocean. Knowing that all of the Members of the House have the welfare of our country at heart, I cannot help but feel that they will want a major portion of these funds restored to this project so that it will not have to be abandoned at the present time. The proper defense of our country and the security of our Nation demand that this be done.

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

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What is the character of dams that the new dam proposes to replace?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. They are old wooden structures, very small and dilapidated. Some of the locks along the river are hand operated. Some of them were built as long as 40 years ago. They have had several breakdowns at those locks.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What is their present condition?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. They are in very, very bad condition; they are in very much need of repair.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. If one of the dams were to deteriorate to the extent that it could not be used, would it impair the whole river system?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. It could not be used. It would stop the whole transportation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The entire river system, then, depends upon the replacement of these inadequate and dangerous dams that are in the river at the present time?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. The gentleman's observation is correct.

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

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree most heartily with what the gentleman from Alabama says regarding the importance of the inland waterway in connection with our steel industry. I wish to call attention to the fact also that in case of war, unless this inland waterway is provided, the chances are that Pittsburgh, Pa., would be shut off from the Venezuelan iron mines where she is now getting her iron ore.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his contribution.

I am sure that the members of the Appropriations Committee want to be fair and surely they do not want to cut this project 91 percent when other projects under construction are being cut only from about 10 to 30 percent throughout the Nation. I ask the members of the Appropriations Committee and the Members of the House to give the amendment dealing with this project careful consideration when it is presented for your consideration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is more than an appropriation bill. It is the symbol of 18 years of irresponsible political philosophy in our Government. It is the symbol of a dangerous political theory that has fastened itself on one government after another down through the centuries and ended in the fall of every one of them.

One of the banes of civilization is the fact that in every generation there are men in public life who will gamble with the public welfare and the safety of the economy to gain their own political ends. The callous recklessness of such leaders has undermined the economic security and happiness of scores of nations down through history. The tragedy has always been made more grim by the fact that economic quackery has always had a wide appeal until disaster struck.

As governments have fallen, others have arisen in their place, usually with safeguards designed to prevent recurrence of the ailments. The founders of our own United States labored long and hard in their efforts to write safeguards into the Constitution that would prevent economic catastrophe from over-

taking the American people. They very wisely placed the power of originating appropriations and the levying of taxes in that branch of the Government which most closely represented the people—the House of Representatives. They did not vest that power in the Senate, in the judiciary, or the executive—they specifically limited it to the House of Representatives. They were fresh from the realization that the power to tax is the power to destroy, and they were determined that if America must ever die, it would be by suicide, not homicide.

The founding fathers envisioned the President of the United States as no more than an administrator, an official of limited powers who would do no more than carry out the instructions of the elected representatives of the people. For 157 years—until 1933—the great American form of government which they had designed withstood the onslaughts of the economic witch doctors who at numerous times during that period attempted to gain power by advocating their quackeries.

It is particularly important to note that the Presidents who had occupied the White House during those 157 years had respected the safeguards which had been cemented into the Constitution for the highest purposes. For example, no President in that time ever so much as considered vetoing a tax bill, as Presidents Roosevelt and Truman have both done in recent years. No President in that time would have dreamed of threatening to veto a tax bill if it did not meet his specifications, as President Truman did in his 1950 state of the Union message. Those Presidents respected the fundamental thesis that only the elected representatives to Congress should exercise the power of taxation with all its inherent dangers.

The year 1933 undoubtedly will go down in history as the turning point in America's political and economic progress. It will go down in history as the beginning of a period in which men endowed with more recklessness than wisdom tried every economic panacea that they could find, and having tried them decided to weave them into the permanent fiber of government. Easy money, easy credit, easy debt, and a whole flock of other easy-come easy-go schemes became the backbone of government as it was operated by those in power.

For six long peacetime years deficit, Government hand-outs, and easy credit were the dominating policies. Glib phrases filled the air. "Pump-priming," "compensatory spending," and "we owe it to ourselves" were the catchwords of the day, and what was solved?

When the New Deal took office in 1933, there were 13,000,000 unemployed. Six years later, before national-defense spending began, there were still 11,000,000 unemployed. All the fabulous economic panaceas and political quackeries had not solved the problem. The national debt had more than doubled, the tax burden had tripled, and we still had almost the same number of unemployed as 6 years earlier.

Today it is a recognized fact that a world war and only a world war relieved

the New Deal of its most colossal embarrassment, specifically the fact that it had failed to solve the problem of unemployment, in the name of which it foisted all its economic theories and panaceas on the American people. What the economic medicinemen, and the socialist planners had failed to do, a devastating war did for them.

With the nations of Europe needing war materials, we supplied them and thus provided our own people with jobs. Unemployment figures at last began to drop. With the coming of Pearl Harbor and our own entrance into the conflict, our problem became not one of unemployment but of actual shortage of manpower.

So the war was waged at enormous cost, the debt was increased almost 500 percent, and the tax burden was raised to perilous heights—seven times higher than it had ever been in history. Of course the overwhelming majority of the American people paid the price willingly and accepted the attendant sacrifices without complaint. They expected, and they were entitled to expect that once the conflict was over, there would be a period of adjustment and that within a few years a substantial return to more normal peacetime conditions would be achieved. They expected, and they were entitled to expect, that taxes would be lowered, that payments on the debt would begin, that rationing and controls would end, and that the enormous shortages resulting from 5 years of war would provide the economy with sufficient momentum to cause the wheels of industry to hum and jobs to be plentiful. That is what they expected and, I repeat, that is what they were entitled to expect.

But their expectations were based on miscalculation. They had forgotten, under the terrible stress of war, that there were still in power the same economic witch doctors and the same disciples of socialism, who had failed to solve the problem of unemployment in a half-dozen long years of fruitless and costly frittering with economic theories that had been proved, a hundred times over, down through history to be false and disastrous to any government that embraced them. They had forgotten that the history of these men was that once a tax was enacted it was never repealed, that once a power was gained it was never willingly given up, that once a control had been imposed it was never relinquished if these men could help it.

It simply did not occur to most Americans that the schemers in Washington would employ the terrible machinery of war, the terrible burden of taxes, controls, and emergency powers to achieve political ends that could never be won at the polls, that would never be willingly voted by the American people.

So what happened?

Did they want to give up the controls?

No. President Truman demanded their retention. The left-wing trumpets let loose in full blast against Republican efforts to force the Government to keep faith with the American people and the American way of life.

Did they want to cut back taxes?

No. President Truman demanded more taxes. The left-wing trumpets

blared in a fanfare against Republican demands for tax reductions.

Did they want to cut spending?

No. President Truman rushed to Congress with a score of new spending schemes. The left-wing trumpets rent the air with demands for spending schemes that were fantastic, for nostrums that were costly beyond belief.

What happened is a matter of record. Shortages mounted disastrously, people lined up in front of stores simply to obtain food, and business stagnated while the President and the left wing stubbornly insisted on retention of controls. It was Congress, with the Republicans leading the fight, throughout the entire summer of 1946, which finally forced an end to rationing.

It was the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress which passed the first tax-reduction bill in a generation, and it did so over three vetoes by President Truman.

It was the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress which forced a balanced budget and a reduction of the national debt for the first time in a generation. The reckless spending measures proposed by the President and the left wing were effectively blocked, and the American economy at last was going full speed ahead. There was virtually no unemployment, shortages had disappeared to a large extent, and the economic future looked hopeful for the first time in years.

With the reelection of President Truman and the return of the Democratic Party to control of Congress in 1948, the spenders and the princes of planning were in full cry once again. The President sent a program to Congress that called for huge outlays of public moneys, a \$4,000,000,000 increase in taxes, and socialization of credit, agriculture, medicine, and our natural resources. Efforts by the Republicans to continue their tax-reduction program, which had given the economy a fresh stimulus, were bitterly opposed by those in power, and an excise-tax-repeal bill which I introduced in February of 1949 lay in a convenient pigeonhole in the House Ways and Means Committee.

Unemployment started to mount. Business, threatened with new and ever-heavier taxes, slowed down to a walk, and the situation by midsummer became so threatening that the President was forced to say he would not press immediately for his tax-increase proposals. But he steadfastly adhered to the balance of his reckless program, and the American public was treated to the economic spectacle of a government which had already run the public debt up to a quarter of a trillion dollars, start deficit spending once more, not as a temporary policy, but virtually as a permanent step.

Think of it, in less than 2 years, the President has outlined deficit-spending programs blanketing the fiscal years of 1949, 1950, and 1951, that will run up a total deficit of \$13,000,000,000.

That figure is \$4,000,000,000 more than the entire cost of the Federal Government in 1939 when Government was also operating on a deficit basis.

In January of this year, the President sent to Congress a state of the Union message, an economic report, and a budget message; and those three messages charted a future course of ever-rising taxes and ever-rising spending that no government in the history of this earth ever attempted before. If ever a blueprint for socialism was laid down, these three messages were it.

The American people, already carrying a tax burden in excess of one quarter of the national income, were being told in effect, that their tax bill eventually would be doubled, that Government spending, already at the back-breaking level of \$43,300,000,000, would eventually be increased 100 percent, and that the Federal Government would become the overseer of the family, the sickbed, the schools, our natural resources, and the private credit of our economy.

I say to you that if this program is carried out, America as we know it is gone. I say to you that the pump primers are now priming the pumps for disaster. America's leadership role among the nations of the world will vanish much as Great Britain's has, as we borrow the socialistic schemes which have brought that great nation to its knees.

The awful impact of this irresponsible, reckless program is already becoming tragically apparent. Unemployment is rising and today we have approximately 4,500,000 unemployed in the United States. Men with families are out of work, veterans and young people are finding it increasingly hard to obtain employment, and with the graduation from our schools and colleges this spring, another half million people will be added to our labor force with little hope of obtaining jobs.

It is time that America woke up. It is time we realized that the same architects of disaster, the same specious theories and economic quackeries, the same socialist schemers, dominate our Government today just as they did throughout the thirties. They never solved the problem of unemployment in the thirties and their continued use of the very same fallacious economic philosophy which they employed then is now causing unemployment and raising once more the dreaded possibility of an economic crisis.

It is appalling to realize that if this country must face economic or military hardship in the future, it must do so with the national debt at an already impossible level, with the tax burden at a point where it depresses our economy, and with Government spending already going on a rate which cannot be increased without compounding an economic malady it attempts to cure. The very security of America is at stake, but irresponsible men and irresponsible leaders insist on gambling with that security to achieve their own political ends.

I repeat—the bill before us today calling in all for almost \$39,000,000,000 of Government money, credit, and contractual authorizations, lies like a giant boulder on the American economy. The American economy has withstood the depressive acts of Government time and again, but inevitably the breaking point must come.

We in Congress have a responsibility that is far more than political. We must answer at all times for the very security of America, and where the security of America begins, partisanship should end.

I talk to you not as Democrats or Republicans but as Americans. Every one of us knows deep in our hearts that this pump-priming for disaster must stop. These economic quackeries must end.

These socialistic schemers and political medicine men who now infect the executive branch of the Government must be run out of Washington. We also know that if this is to be done, only Congress can be depended upon to do it.

Let us face the facts—the tide of unemployment is rising steadily in the United States.

In February, the number of jobless increased by 204,000, making the total 4,684,000—the highest in 9 years.

In March, there were 561,000 less unemployed, but this was regarded as seasonal.

Forty-three areas throughout the country were classified by the Department of Labor in February as critical areas, which means that 12 or more out of every 100 workers were pounding the streets looking for jobs.

At this moment, unemployment-insurance payments are at record levels, and more than 2,000,000 people have exhausted the benefits to which they are entitled. All reports indicate that people over the age of 45 are having great difficulty in finding work.

Unemployment usually grows like a snowball rolling downhill. Government agencies, although they expect a slight seasonal pick-up this spring, have predicted more than 5,000,000 unemployed by June.

Leon H. Keyserling, acting chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, recently said there are circumstances that might lead to 12,000,000 jobless by 1954. Mr. Keyserling needs no identification before this House. Mr. Keyserling is one of the medicine men whom I have been discussing, one of the doleful defeatists who regard unemployment as permanent, one of those who say that we must continue to have a large segment of our labor force unemployed and that there is nothing much that can be done about it.

Such talk is tommyrot.

The time to check unemployment is now; before it gets worse. The longer we wait, the more difficult the task will be. The way to check unemployment is to go to the root of the trouble—to cure the conditions that are causing it.

Fortunately, there are five basic steps that President Truman and Congress can take immediately that would go far toward reversing the tide. Here are the five main steps in a nonpartisan prosperity program:

First. Remove the wartime excise taxes.

These taxes were levied during the war to discourage purchase of goods and services that were in short supply, and they have continued to have the same effect in peacetime. The American Fed-

eration of Labor has said the excise taxes are strangling business and employment. In luggage, furs, jewelry, cosmetics, transportation, amusements, telephone, telegraph, and scores of other industries, the story is the same—depressed sales and jobless workers because of the staggering excise taxes. Many communities in New England, for example, have said that repeal of the wartime excises would be the strongest possible shot in the arm for their areas.

Second. Create tax incentives for small business.

At present the small-business man is shackled by severe taxes, which prevent him from accumulating the capital he needs to launch a new enterprise or to expand an existing business. Yet this kind of growth is essential if we are to have an expanding economy. In order to create jobs for our growing population, new firms must be springing up constantly. Our tax system should be designed to give the small risk taker every encouragement. We must stop hamstringing him.

I am confident that, if small business were given additional tax incentives and if the wartime excises were repealed, business would receive such a hefty stimulus that there would soon be an increase in tax revenue that would more than offset the initial reduction.

Third. Balance the budget and begin retirement of the national debt.

A balanced budget is the surest guaranty of our economic strength. A solvent Federal Government is a bulwark against excessive ups and downs in the business cycle, and it sets a tone of stability and responsibility for our entire business life. A businessman who can count on the value of tomorrow's dollar is able to do the long-range planning that means jobs—steady jobs. A worker who can count on the value of tomorrow's dollar is able to save with confidence that his bank deposits, his insurance, and his old-age pension will be worth what he put into them.

The most direct way to balance the budget is to cut spending. This would open the way to reducing the national debt and eventually to lowering taxes, which would free billions of dollars in purchasing power that are now being shunted up the dead-end road of Government spending.

Fourth. Administer the tariff program more carefully.

While world trade should be encouraged, the reciprocal trade program should be managed in such a way that no particular areas or industries will be crippled. This is not the case at present. Too often the benefits of our tariff reductions are not reciprocal. Too often the benefits flow only to foreign producers and foreign workers, while American workers see their markets disappear.

In New England, and in other States as well, there is widespread unemployment from the flood of cheap goods from abroad—watches, pottery, hats, shoes, rubber wear, fishing products, and many others. For instance, Marx Lewis, general secretary of the United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers, AFL, has said

that a wave of imports from Czechoslovakia threatens to reduce the hat-making city of Danbury, Conn., to a ghost town. On the Pacific coast, the story is much the same in lumber, fishing, fruit, nuts, and many other industries that are the mainstays of employment.

Fifth. Remove the threat of socialization that hangs over the country.

As long as the United States is pushed down a course that parallels Britain, there will be a damper on the enthusiasm and daring that are the cornerstones of lasting prosperity. No one can plan confidently for a future that may be so ominous. One possible symptom of fear was in the Securities and Exchange Commission's report of Friday, which said that American business in 1950 will spend about 11 percent less on new plant and equipment than in 1949.

Now is the time for leadership to show its mettle. Almost 5,000,000 jobless Americans are crying for action. There is no reason why President Truman and the leaders of Congress cannot carry out a program like the one I have outlined. There are 5,000,000 reasons why they should. If they do not, the country will know where to place the responsibility.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the tremendous appropriation bill now before the House for approximately \$28,000,000,000 should cause every Member of Congress and every citizen of the United States to stop, look, and listen. It is estimated that if this bill is passed together with other bills for foreign aid and so forth, it will mean a deficit at the end of the fiscal year of approximately \$5,000,000,000. How long can this Nation of ours continue to spend, year after year, more than we take in and remain solvent? No individual nor any businessman can continue to spend more than he receives without facing a condition of bankruptcy. This is equally true of a nation. Therefore, I repeat, we must stop, look, and listen before it is too late.

In 1932 Franklin D. Roosevelt, then a presidential candidate, had this to say about Government spending:

Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse.

Those words are equally true today and have even greater significance than at the time they were spoken. They deserve to be emphasized because in every year since 1932 with the exception of the 2 years of Republican control our Federal Government has spent more than it has collected.

In 1932 our Federal expenditures amounted to only \$4,500,000,000. Today, it is estimated that our expenditure for the fiscal year 1950 will amount to \$45,000,000,000. That is 10 times the amount expended 17 years ago. And we must not overlook the fact that this is a peacetime expenditure. There has never been any similar expenditure in a time of peace.

The Reader's Digest of January 1950 has set forth in an article a vivid explanation of what this means. In part it reads as follows:

To give you an idea of just how much money this is, consider these facts:

1. If everyone in the United States cashed in all his life-insurance policies, the total would amount to \$44,000,000,000. This would not be enough money to run the Government for 1 year.

2. If every urban home owner in this country sold his home, the total would amount to \$30,000,000,000. That's just enough to run the Government for 8 months.

3. If every farmer in this country sold his farm, farm equipment, and livestock, the total would amount to \$25,000,000,000. The Government could not run for 7 months on that amount of money.

These facts put a new light on the staggering size of our Federal Government's planned \$45,000,000,000 expenditure for the fiscal year 1950. And remember, this excessive spending is in the face of a national debt of more than \$250,000,000,000.

Isn't it as true today as it was in 1932 that a continuance of that habit means the poor-house?

Increased spending means either an increased deficit or increased taxes. The tax burden on the people of this Nation in direct and indirect taxes for Federal, State, and local purposes approximates one-third of the national income. And, yet, notwithstanding this heavy take from the income of every worker the President advocates and has asked Congress to provide additional taxes. There is no justification for such a course. Taxes should be decreased and not increased.

The most sensible way to meet the situation that now confronts us, as a result of insufficient Federal revenue to meet expenditures, is to reduce expenditures. It can be done if waste and extravagance in our Federal Government is eliminated, and, this can be done without in any way adversely affecting the necessary functions of government.

In the consideration of this appropriation bill it is my intention and purpose to support the effort that will be made to bring the amount to be expended in conformity with the expected revenues of the Government. A balanced budget is necessary to the financial stability of this country. Our ability to help our people and fulfill our obligations at home and abroad demands that we be financially sound.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the 1951 general appropriations bill, as reported to the House, has brought Congress face to face with a series of policy decisions that have importance and implications far beyond what at first sight might appear to be justifiable action.

A special severe blow is meted out to the important flood-control project in eastern Kentucky, made up of the Dewey Reservoir and its appurtenances. The project is almost complete and there is required only \$600,000 to acquire the remaining lands. I wish to state that all construction is already complete. I know that there is not a man in this body that believes in permitting his own dwelling house to deteriorate by reason

of nonoccupancy after construction has been completed, simply because he does not have an entrance. American citizens are simply against this type of false economy.

The reasons given for this unprecedented action is not that the project is unwise or even that it is contrary in any way to policies long established and supported by Congress. It is wholly that the costs of completing the remaining phases of this and for other projects are now found to be in excess of earlier estimates submitted by the great engineering agency which develops the plans, makes the recommendations and carries on all of the activities connected with the construction, maintenance, and operations of many important and useful projects in nearly every State in the Union.

In all of these, the agency recommendations are discussed and approved by Congress under an atmosphere of high mutual trust that is unusual in the dealings between Congress and the executive agencies.

The amount required for the completion of this important flood-control project is denied and the project must go uncompleted.

If nature will just stage its floods somewhere else, the cost of the delay will be progressive disintegration of the project facilities that will set in at once from nonuse of costly works on account of lack of funds for completion.

The project is designed to prevent a disaster that has many times been considered real and threatening by Congress.

At this point I would like to make available to the entire Congress information furnished me by the Corps of Engineers in response to my direct questions, which clearly point out the reasons for the underestimate in the 1950 budget, as well as the discrepancy in the amount of funds now necessary to complete the project in relation to the amount provided for in the 1951 budget:

INFORMATION FURNISHED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS IN MY OFFICE MARCH 24, 1950

Question (Mr. PERKINS). Will you briefly describe the Dewey Reservoir—I mean whether it is flood control, recreational, or both?

Answer. The Dewey Reservoir project was authorized as a flood-control reservoir by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938. It is a unit of comprehensive flood-control plan for the Ohio River Basin. No other reservoirs have been constructed or are under construction in the Big Sandy Basin.

The project is located on Johns Creek about 7 miles southeast of Paintsville, Ky., and 5.4 miles above the confluence of Johns Creek with Levisa Fork, which, together with Tug Fork, forms the Big Sandy River. The dam is a rolled-earth fill structure having a maximum height of 118 feet and a crest length of 920 feet. It creates a reservoir having a total capacity of 88,000 acre-feet, of which 77,000 acre-feet are reserved for flood control, and the remainder of 11,000 acre-feet are reserved for a conservation pool which can be utilized for increasing low-water flow, pollution abatement, and recreation.

In addition to constructing the dam, together with the spillway, outlet works, and a dike, it was necessary to acquire title to, or flowage easements over, approximately 15,000 acres of land, and relocate approximately 8.3 miles of highway, 17.6 miles of

pipe lines, and 56 cemeteries involving 718 graves.

Question (Mr. PERKINS). I notice the Corps of Engineers estimate on the total cost of Dewey Reservoir as made last year was \$6,246,800. This year the Corps of Engineers estimated before the House Appropriations Committee the total cost to be \$7,456,500. Can you explain at this time why the Corps of Engineers underestimated the cost of the reservoir when they were testifying last year, and if so, what you now estimate the total cost of Dewey Reservoir to be?

Answer. A comparison of the 1950 and 1951 estimates of costs follows:

1950:	Construction.....	\$3,434,800
	Relocations.....	1,126,700
	Lands.....	1,685,300
	Total.....	6,246,800
1951:	Construction.....	3,474,800
	Relocations.....	1,126,700
	Lands.....	2,855,000
	Total.....	7,456,500

It is of note that there is little difference in the estimated construction costs for the 2 years, that there is no difference in the relocation estimated costs, and that the increase in the total cost of the project is almost entirely due to the increased estimated cost of the lands in the reservoir approximately \$1,169,700. The reason for this increase is as follows:

The estimate of \$1,685,300 was based on a gross appraisal of the lands required for the reservoir. During the process of acquiring these lands, it was necessary to make individual tract appraisals and, later, it was necessary to resort to condemnation to acquire some of the tracts. The individual tract appraisals revealed that land values were approximately 25 to 30 percent in excess of those used as a basis for the gross appraisal. Condemnation suits resulted in awards by three commissioners appointed by the Federal court approximately 115 percent in excess of the Government appraisals. In the light of the above, it became definitely apparent that the original gross estimate for land acquisition was too low, and after a thorough analysis was made, it was determined that the lands would cost approximately 70 percent more than originally estimated, and that the total estimated cost of the project would necessarily be increased by the addition of \$40,000 for construction and \$1,169,700 for lands, or a total of \$1,209,700. The total estimated cost of the project was, therefore, revised to \$7,456,500. As a total of \$6,116,000 had previously been allotted to the project, it became necessary to request an additional \$1,340,500 for fiscal year 1951, in order to complete the project.

All agreements covering the relocation of utilities and highways have only recently been executed, with the result that they total approximately \$826,000 in lieu of the estimated total of \$1,126,200, thereby effecting a saving of approximately \$300,000. Furthermore, the land-acquisition program has advanced sufficiently to such a stage, that it has been possible to effect further savings for the following reasons:

1. Recent decisions of the court in condemnation suits have been much more favorable to the Government as a result of changes made by the Department of Justice in the handling of condemnation suits.

2. Property owners have agreed to retain certain portions of their properties lying outside of the reservoir area proper, thereby reducing the lands or easements to be acquired from 15,500 acres to 14,500 acres.

3. Property owners in the upper reaches of the reservoir where infrequent inundation will occur, have agreed to sell flowage easements over their properties rather than sell them in fee.

As a result of the above economies, savings approximating \$440,000 in land costs will be effected.

As a result of the savings of approximately \$300,000 in relocation costs and approximately \$440,000 in land costs, the amount required for completion of the project is reduced to approximately \$600,000.

Question. (Mr. PERKINS). You are in a better position at this time to make an accurate statement on the total estimated cost of this reservoir than the Corps of Engineers were last fall. Am I correct in that statement?

Answer. That is right. The estimates supporting the 1951 appropriation were made in August 1949. A good deal of the work has been performed since then to indicate to us more closely what the actual costs would be. All the agreements in connection with relocations have been executed so we have a definite figure rather than an estimated one as to the total cost. We have completed the appraisals of all the individual tracts of land which we have to acquire, and in that case too we have a definite figure rather than an estimated figure.

Question (Mr. PERKINS). Assuming that the Appropriations Committee failed to grant the \$600,000 which you state is necessary for the completion of Dewey Reservoir, what effect, if any, will that have on being able to utilize the project to its fullest extent, and getting a return on the money already invested?

Answer. Unless the amount of \$600,000 is made available for fiscal year 1951, completion of the project will necessarily be deferred. Construction of the dam is now complete, and the relocations will be completed before the end of fiscal year 1950, leaving only acquisition of the remaining lands to complete the project. Until such time as all the lands or easements are acquired, it will not be possible to utilize the reservoir to its fullest extent for flood control. Should a major storm occur and it becomes necessary to use the reservoir to its fullest extent, unacquired lands will be affected, with the result that it will be necessary to pay damages to the owners of such land. To obtain the maximum use of the reservoir area for flood control, it may be necessary to lower the conservation pool during the flood season to obtain more storage of floodwaters. Furthermore, a complete return on an investment of over \$6,000,000 cannot be obtained until the reservoir project is completed.

Every Member of this House knows that the estimates submitted on these projects are sometimes above and sometimes below the amounts that Congress first approves.

The committee action if permitted to stand would simply cost more money and delay the benefits to the people. I can see no economy or justification for such action and trust that such errors in this bill will be corrected.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED] follow in the RECORD immediately after the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, the estimated cost of this project is \$1,233,-

000 to the Federal Government and \$490,000 to the local people.

The following are the estimated flood damages to Pineville for the period between January 1918 and June 1947:

Date of flood	Stage in feet	Estimated damages
January-February 1918.....	47.3	\$806,000
November 1928.....	(1)	409,500
March 1929.....	47.3	806,000
January 1932.....	(1)	325,000
February 1939.....	44.3	58,500
February 1940.....	41.8	15,600
January 1946.....	49.3	1,451,500
June 1947.....	42.5	19,900
Total for floods of record.....		3,892,000
Estimated average annual damages, 30-year period.....		129,730

¹ From damage survey.

The 1946 flood was the most devastating and destructive of any flood on record for Pineville, and the estimated flood damages for that year are broken down as follows:

Item	Units	Damages
Residential property damaged.....	563	-----
Residential property destroyed.....	100	\$723,900
Commercial and industrial property damaged.....	121	614,800
Institutional property damaged.....	18	99,800
Streets and miscellaneous property.....	-----	13,900
Total.....	-----	1,451,500
Loss in taxes, Federal, State, county, and city, on account of 1946 flood amounted to.....	-----	450,000

The city of Pineville lies on the Cumberland River in southeastern Kentucky. The Cumberland River rises and has its source in the county above where Pineville is located. The business and greater part of the residential sections of Pineville are located on the comparatively level flood plain and lie in an area roughly semicircular in shape about three-eighths mile wide and three-quarters mile long. The last official census of Pineville is 3,900 and it possibly has 4,000 now.

We have frequent and recurring floods, some of which are small ones, and we have had four tremendously large ones. The last large flood was in 1946. The damage done in this one flood, according to officials estimates of the Army Corps of Engineers is practically sufficient to pay the entire cost to the Government and to the citizens for complete protection. The water in 1946 was from 6 to 8 feet deep in the homes, public buildings, schools, and business places in the town. Frequently in the past we have had from 3 to 5 feet of water in our homes and business places, and the plan of the Corps of Engineers, which has been completely worked out, will give us complete protection from these devastating and almost annual floods. It presents a serious health problem each time we have a flood. There has been practically no building and no expansion in the last 20 years on account of the floods, and it is the center for the coal fields.

The citizens of Pineville, through their city council, passed an ordinance, called an election and voted to issue bonds for

\$490,000 to cover the full amount recommended by the Army Corps of Engineers for their share of the cost of the proposed flood protection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] made the constructive speech which he did a few moments ago.

I agree with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] in his high estimate of the integrity and ability of the gentleman from Mississippi. I have been a member of the House Committee on Public Works for 3 years. As a member of that committee I have served under the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. It is my opinion that he knows more about the rivers and harbors and flood-control problems and needs of this country than any man in the Congress or in the United States.

The average American now works 61 days a year to earn the money to pay his annual Federal, State, and local taxes. Think of it. The average American must work more than twelve 5-day weeks just to pay his tax bill. Yet, with from one-fourth to one-third of all the earnings of all Americans being confiscated by tax collectors the Government still is spending money faster than it collects it. We will have a deficit of \$5,000,000,000 or \$6,000,000,000 this year.

It is time that the Congress and the country stopped and pondered the question, "Where are we going?"

History is replete with examples of countries that pursued to their financial and economic destruction the same loose fiscal policies our leaders now follow. France is an example. The average French laborer in 1920 received an annual wage of 6,240 francs. At the 1920 exchange value of the franc his earnings of 6,240 French francs were the equivalent of an annual wage of \$1,248 in American dollars.

Today, as the result of devaluation and inflation the French worker receives not 6,240 francs as he did in 1920 but his average annual wage is now 250,238 francs or 40 times what it was 30 years ago. If the franc was still valued at 20 cents the Frenchman, today, would have an annual wage equivalent to \$50,048. But the French franc is not worth what it was. Its value is only a tiny fraction of what it once was. The 250,238 francs the Frenchman gets this year will buy little more than did his 6,240 francs in 1920. That is what devaluation can do to a people.

Something very similar to this may happen to us, the American people, unless our Government spends more wisely and economically than it is now doing, unless it balances the budget and lives within its income.

TOO MUCH SPENDING

A brief 3 years ago, our Federal Government was spending about \$34,000,000,000 a year. Now, 3 years later, it is spending \$42,000,000,000 annually. This

is an increase of \$8,000,000,000 in the annual cost of Government within a period of 3 years.

Whereas the Republican Eightieth Congress balanced the budget and had a surplus of more than \$8,000,000,000 in a single year, the Eighty-first Democratic Congress will have a deficit of five to six billion dollars this year.

The President says the present unbalanced state of the budget is due to the \$5,000,000,000 tax reduction voted by the Eightieth Congress. Even if the Republicans had never given the people that \$5,000,000,000 tax reduction, the present budget would still be unbalanced as compared to the \$8,000,000,000 surplus shown in the last year of the Eightieth Republican Congress.

No; tax reduction by the Republicans did not cause the present unbalanced budget. That unbalanced budget is the direct result that this Congress is now spending \$8,000,000,000 more than did the Eightieth Congress.

If the tax reduction voted by the Eightieth Congress was bad, why has not some responsible Democrat proposed to repeal that tax reduction. None has.

ROAD TO RUIN

A continuing unbalanced budget is the road to ruin, to socialism, and to every citizen becoming the servant of the state.

An unbalanced budget inevitably leads to the necessity for more taxes. The higher the citizen's taxes, the less he has to spend on himself and his own family. Eventually, taxes become so high there remains no incentive for investment or for thrift.

When taxes become too high the savers say, "Why save if the purchasing power of my savings constantly shrinks?" The investors say, "Why risk our capital when the Government makes us assume all losses and confiscates most of our profits, if we make any?" When the will to dare and do vanishes, a country ceases to go forward.

The spirit of venture built this country into the richest and most productive in the world. We must keep that spirit alive and not kill it by burdensome and oppressive tax rates.

Yet, there can be no substantial tax reductions while we continue to spend far beyond our tax income.

We can balance the budget only in two ways. We must balance it either by taxing more or spending less. I doubt if there is a single politician in the Congress bold enough to propose to balance the budget by imposing a five- or six-billion-dollar tax increase on the people. Every politician knows that for him to make such a proposal would be political suicide.

We must, therefore, seek to balance the budget in the only other way open to us, and that is by spending less.

DUPLICATION AND WASTE

The Hoover report says whereas there were 300 bureaus and commissions in the Federal Government 20 years ago that there are 1,818 now.

Many of these bureaus do the same work that is being done by other agencies. The General Accounting Office of

the Federal Government not so long ago reported that we then had no less than 29 Federal agencies engaged in loaning money, 3 in insuring bank deposits, 34 engaged in acquiring land, 16 in wildlife preservation, 10 in Government financing, 12 in home and community planning, 28 in welfare matters, 4 in bank examinations, 14 in handling our Federal forests, and 65 in gathering statistics.

Surely, no citizen can believe that such a multiplicity of agencies can exist without much overlapping and duplication of work, all of which results in the unnecessary and wasteful spending of taxpayers' money.

Because this duplication is so costly to taxpayers, the appropriations of all departments should be held to a minimum to the end that each department will be compelled to modernize and streamline its operations, eliminate its inefficiencies, and thereby do its job better and at less cost.

The costliness of this duplication of activities is indicated by the fact that in 20 years—Hoover Report—the number of employees on the Federal pay roll increased from 570,000 in 1930 to 2,100,000 by last fall. Also, the wages and salaries of these workers in the same 20 years had grown from about \$1,000,000,000 annually to almost \$7,000,000,000, a seven-fold increase in 20 years.

HOOPER COMMISSION REPORT

One long step toward returning to a balanced budget would be the immediate adoption of the recommendations on reorganization of the Government made in the Hoover Commission Report.

If the recommendations of the Hoover Commission are adopted, the cost of the Federal Government, now \$42,000,000,000 a year, will be reduced by three to five billion dollars annually. Over a 50-year period this will mean a saving of one hundred and fifty to two hundred and fifty billion dollars. Such savings will benefit every taxpaying American family, by allowing them to keep more of their own money to spend on themselves.

The Hoover Report shows many startling examples of Government inefficiency. Here are a few of them. The Hoover Commission investigators found:

That it requires an average of 7 months, under Government red tape, to discharge an incompetent employee from the Federal pay roll. In one case, the Commission found, it took 17 months to discharge an incompetent stenographer;

That in the Veterans' Administration more than 15,000 workers are employed to handle veterans' insurance policies. A study of private insurance companies reveals that these private companies handle a similar number of policies with 3,500 workers;

That the researchers report that the Post Office Department by spending \$10,000,000 to install improved equipment and methods in the Nation's post offices could cut Post Office Department expenses by \$180,000,000, thereby effecting savings totaling \$170,000,000;

That the Internal Revenue Department in 1947 had 500,000,000 income-tax forms printed for the use of the Nation's

49,000,000 income-tax payers, or 11 forms for each taxpayer. Hundreds of millions of these forms, after being printed, were sold for waste paper;

That the Federal Government owns three and one-half typewriters for every Federal worker who uses a typewriter, full or part time;

That the Federal Government buys \$6,000,000,000 in supplies every year, yet its inefficiency is such that it seldom takes a discount on any of its bills, as do nearly all private businessmen, because Federal Government red tape is such that it cannot audit its bills within the normal 30- to 60-day discount period.

"The Hoover recommendations, however, will not accomplish their greatest benefits unless there is a will on the part of the executive branch of the Government to make them work.

In a government, gargantuan as our Government now is with 1,818 bureaus and commissions, with more than 2,000,000 employees, and with its operations spread out over the entire world, efficiency at best will never be easy and waste never absent. New examples of waste and inefficiency always will be present awaiting detection before they are corrected.

There, therefore, ought to be a permanent commission, organized along the lines of the Hoover Commission, always to be on the alert searching for inefficiency and waste and to call the attention of Congress and the President to such waste and inefficiency whenever and wherever found.

Such a permanent Little Hoover Commission staffed with expert researchers would pay its cost manifold in the savings it constantly would make possible.

The Hoover Commission by one quick check of Government operations has unearthed weakness in our executive department, which if corrected, will save taxpayers three to five billion dollars a year. A permanent Little Hoover Commission unquestionably would reveal many additional ways to cut Government costs without diminishing present services of the Government to its citizens.

FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

Our Nation's first line of defense is not our Navy, Army, or Air Corps. Our first line of defense is a solvent and sound economy here at home. Without a sound and solvent domestic economy we cannot attain that abundant production of weapons and goods without which no successful war can be waged.

The Communists recognize this. Lenin, the father of Russian communism once said, "Someday we will compel the United States of America to spend itself into destruction."

The best way to defeat that dire Lenin prediction is to restore sound fiscal policies to our Government now while there is still time.

If either through apathy or political expedience, we continue to pursue the wasteful and extravagant policies of the past two decades nothing but great and irreparable harm can come to our country. In proof of this truth I need to call but two witnesses, Thomas Jefferson and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Jefferson said:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared—to preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt.

Roosevelt said—in 1932:

Any government like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse.

Yet, despite these warnings we, our Government, has in 19 years out of the last 21, spent more than our revenues and in 19 of those 21 years has gone further and further into debt. It is time to change our course.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

THE UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the Coast and Geodetic Survey is one of the oldest scientific and technical bureaus of the Federal Government. Its history goes back to the early days of the Republic when President Thomas Jefferson with great foresight obtained authority from the Congress in 1807 to establish an agency for surveying and charting the coast of the United States. This was done in order to promote water-borne commerce between the several States and with foreign countries. Through the years the wisdom of this undertaking has become increasingly evident from the benefits that have accrued to industry and to science, engineering, and other related fields.

The work of this important arm of the Government is not spectacular in a dramatic sense and oftentimes goes unnoticed, yet its activities are bound up, directly or indirectly, with our daily lives. The ships that bring us coffee from Brazil and sugar from Cuba use the nautical charts of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for their safe navigation; the air pilot who carries our mail uses its aeronautical charts to guide him safely to his destination; the surveyor who locates the boundaries of our farms and homesteads uses the markers which the Survey establishes throughout the length and breadth of our land; and the construction engineer who establishes building codes against earthquake hazards uses the information furnished by the Coast and Geodetic Survey to determine the stresses and strains that buildings must withstand.

Besides these peacetime values, the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey has a definite tie-up with the national defense and its personnel have served with distinction in every national emergency from the Civil War on. When General MacArthur began his reconquest of the Philippine Islands on the 20th of October 1944, he had with him navigational charts of the area on which landings were to be made. These charts were made by the Coast and Geodetic Survey from surveys carried on during the 40 years of our stewardship of the islands. They showed the character of the beaches, the safe channels, and the locations of dangers to navigation, and gave information on the rise and fall

of the tide—all of which enabled our ships and landing parties to maneuver with a minimum of hazard.

EARLY HISTORY

When the Coast Survey was first organized, the shore line of our country included only the strip along the Atlantic coast and comprised about 15,000 statute miles. The activities of the Survey grew with the Nation's territorial expansion. The acquisition of new territory along the Pacific coast—later to become the great States of California, Oregon, and Washington—added 8,000 miles to this shore line before the middle of the century. The purchase of Alaska in 1869 added 34,000 miles. The acquisition of the Territory of Hawaii and of other island possessions at the beginning of this century, together with the stewardship which we assumed over the Philippine Islands, further increased the shore line to be surveyed to a total of over 100,000 miles, or nearly four times the distance around the world. Today the jurisdiction of the Coast Survey extends to all the waters of continental United States, Alaska, Guam, the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands.

Bordering this extensive coast line is a belt of over 1,000,000 square miles of coastal waters that require repeated surveys in the interest of water-borne commerce and navigation so that the exchange of the farm products and manufactured goods between the States and with foreign governments can be carried on with a minimum of navigational hazards.

The earlier surveys made at the beginning of the nineteenth century and up until the period of the Civil War were adequate for shallow-draft sailing vessels. With the advent of the ocean-going steam vessel and the construction of larger and deeper-draft ships more detailed surveys were required because the old surveys were completely inadequate. Since the beginning of this century, and following World War I in particular, when new navigational instruments were introduced, it was found that the surveys of only 20 years ago were insufficient to meet the needs of these modern devices. For this reason and because of natural changes along the inlets of the coasts and harbor entrances, resurveys must constantly be made.

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS

Hydrographic surveys which determine the depths of water and the character of the sea bottom have been extended by the Bureau far offshore to furnish information for the mariner. These surveys have located and charted the fishing banks so extensively used by our fishing fleets of New England, the Gulf, and the California coast. Dangers to navigation which have been located offshore have included Georges Shoal, a 15-foot spot in the great fishing area 120 miles east of Cape Cod, and Bishop Rock, over 100 miles off the southern California coast.

The ocean bottom has been investigated so that the submarine features lying off our coasts have come to be known. They have been charted and

have proven of much value to the navigator equipped to determine his position by echo sounding when out of sight of land. In its offshore surveys and oceanographic work, the Bureau has pioneered in the development of methods and equipment which have increased the efficiency of these operations at less unit cost than existed under the older methods. These developments have enabled the Bureau to provide greater coverage year by year of our coastal waters with the annual appropriations which have been made by the Congress to extend this valuable work.

MODERN SURVEY EQUIPMENT

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has contributed to the development of sonic-sounding devices specifically in their construction as accurate survey instruments. By means of these instruments the depth of water under the ship can be obtained as the ship proceeds at full speed along a predetermined course on the surface. They have enabled us to know about the character and form of the Continental Shelf and its offshore slope from 100 fathoms, or 600 feet, to 1,000 fathoms. Soundings can be obtained in a matter of a second or two in depths as deep as a mile. Recorders were connected with these sonic sounders so that a continuous profile of the bottom showing the ridges and depressions was noted on a visible graph.

To fix the positions of the submerged features of the ocean bottom, such as mountain peaks, pinnacle rocks, and deep canyons, the Coast and Geodetic Survey developed and perfected the device known as Radio Acoustic Ranging, or RAR. This device utilized sound and radio to determine the position of a ship from known shore stations. It gave greater accuracy than could be obtained by observations on celestial bodies. It also had the advantage of permitting continuous operation of the survey ship day and night through fog and conditions of low visibility. The sono-radio buoy was first constructed in connection with RAR for use as an offshore hydrophone station. The extension of soundings a hundred or more miles from land, as in the case of Georges Bank, required the accurate location of individual soundings obtained by the survey ship. The development of the sono buoy was begun by the Bureau in 1933 and reached its complete efficiency prior to World War II. It was adopted in antisubmarine warfare and its operation was held confidential by the Navy until the close of the war.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey was the first agency making hydrographic surveys to adapt Shoran to these operations. Shoran, developed by the Signal Corps and used by the Air Force for pinpoint bombing of strategic targets in Europe, replaced radio acoustic ranging in hydrographic operations of the Survey because of its greater adaptability, particularly in the waters surrounding the Aleutian Islands. Its success, limited to distances of 50 to 75 miles—because this device is a line-of-sight method—cleared the way for the electronic position indicator. The latter has been completely developed within the Bureau,

without the aid of research funds, by the ingenuity and industry of the Survey's personnel during periods between active ship operations. The device has been tested and used to locate with accuracy the positions of soundings 10 to 300 miles from coastal promontories and island stations.

SURVEYS IN ALASKA

The surveys in the northernmost outpost, Alaska, were begun soon after the purchase of that territory from Russia. The coastal area and its newest waterways were known only to a few explorers and trading vessels. Its vast interior was almost completely unknown. Such charts as existed were in atlas form. They had been compiled by Sarischef under the direction of the Russian explorers Bering, Barinof, and Tebenkoff.

The first surveys were exploratory only. In the 1880's discovery of gold in the vicinity of Juneau brought many vessels into southeast Alaska and resulted in general surveys of that section of the coast. These surveys were reconnaissance in nature because it was impossible to cover the great area to meet the immediate demands. With the beginning of the twentieth century the Coast and Geodetic Survey inaugurated a comprehensive program of surveys which has been continuous in a given area from season to season.

Surveys made of the uncharted waters of southeastern and southwestern Alaska have prevented many wrecks. Only a few years ago the waters of Alaska were dotted with the hulks of ships which were wrecked on unknown rocks. This was true prior to the completion of wire-drag surveys through the inland passage and main channels of the Alaska coast. On the present-day charts there are numerous rocks bearing the names of the ships wrecked upon those rocks. Because the inland passage of Alaska was found to be infested with dangerous submerged rocks a wire-drag sweep was made of the entire passage. Numerous pinnacle rocks were found with this device rising close to the water's surface. One of the most spectacular of these finds was the rock, sometimes referred to as the Washington Monument, found in one of the main ship channels of southeast Alaska with a depth of 17 feet over it and rising from surrounding depths of 650 feet.

Surveys in Alaska not only opened up the coastal area to commerce but reduced the marine insurance rates, which prior to inauguration of the surveys had been nearly prohibitive. It was only possible to pay such rates because of the great value, or at least the great incentive for great wealth, to be returned as a result of the finding of gold and the exploitation of fisheries.

In the Aleutian Islands, where survey operations are greatly hampered by the prevalence of fog, rough seas, and bad weather, the work of surveying this exposed region has been steadily progressing, and the former inadequate, exploratory charts are gradually being replaced with modern charts.

The Aleutians are a bleak and barren chain of islands extending 800 miles in a southwesterly direction from the Alas-

kan peninsula and form the boundary between the Pacific Ocean and the Bering Sea. The area is known as a breeding ground for storms. The high winds, persistent rain, and cold weather, coupled with a rocky shore line and strong ocean currents, have made surveying operations difficult and on several occasions have resulted in casualties among survey personnel. The hydrographic and topographic surveys of the Aleutians are being prospected by the persistent efforts of the personnel of the survey ships assigned to that area.

In the past decade survey operations of the Coast and Geodetic Survey have moved northward into the Bering Sea; arcs of triangulation, which are fundamental for topographic mapping, have spanned the vast interior of Alaska, and in 1947 a perimeter survey of the Arctic and Bering Sea coasts was initiated. Surveying operations in the Arctic have been of a pioneering nature and many of the problems, dangers, and struggles for survival, so familiar to Arctic explorers, have confronted the field parties.

Except for a few isolated surveys, this area was untouched heretofore because of the difficulties of terrain and the hazards of weather. Very little is known of the depths of water, the character of the sea bottom, or the behavior of tides and currents in this region. Ice conditions and low temperatures introduce many new problems for the surveyor.

In its Arctic operations the Coast and Geodetic Survey has employed a large number of Eskimos. These people, inured to the cold and privations of the Arctic, have been trained to perform all minor survey operations. They are uncanny as guides and on numerous occasions have led detached units back to their base camps through raging snowstorms.

Operations in the Arctic have necessitated the development of entirely new techniques. Instruments not designed for this country have required special lubrication to make them operable and extreme care to prevent icing. Engines in vehicles and boats require preheating before starting. These added requirements together with working in heavy clothing for protection against extremely cold weather, traversing snow and ice, and the handicap caused by short periods of daylight, add up to make surveying operations in the Arctic regions slow and expensive.

GEODETIC CONTROL SURVEYS

As the name of the Coast and Geodetic Survey indicates, it is the Bureau of the Federal Government which makes the geodetic control surveys. The exact latitude, longitude, and elevation above sea level for thousands of points all over the country are marked by brass discs. Observations of astronomy, triangulation, gravity, and leveling in every county and State are computed and adjusted in order to establish one Federal framework for all surveys of the land. It is because of the accuracy of this control that maps covering the United States can be fully coordinated and inconsistencies and future litigation avoided in cadastral and boundary surveys. The network of marked discs is

the starting point for all surveys made by other Federal mapping agencies and by State, county, and local surveyors. The Bureau is the only agency that is authorized by the Congress to perform this function.

The earth's curvature must be taken into account when covering large areas for land development projects such as reclamation, flood control, and river valley development. Geodetic surveys serve this purpose. They fix with exactness the locations and elevations of features of the land for planning purposes. They are required for economical and efficient planning studies and the construction phases of flood control, irrigation, drainage, water supply, hydroelectric plants, navigation, and other large-scale engineering works. Geodetic surveys are used in the planning and building of transmission lines, highways, railroads, canals, tunnels, and airports. Without geodetic control, gaps or overlaps can occur between local surveys and errors of considerable magnitude may result. They avoid confusion in land and farm boundaries by furnishing the local surveyor with common points for starting surveys and tying-in stations at the close of his work.

In performing the triangulation of the United States, the surveys were made generally along arcs running east and west and north and south. This provided a network in which the arcs were spaced about 50 miles apart although the marked points along each arc were only 10 to 12 miles apart. It was necessary to set up this network first, just as the steelwork for a large office building must be erected and riveted in place to provide a framework for the construction details to follow. The work of filling the areas between arcs is the present effort of the Bureau. Stations are now to be established at intervals of about 4 miles in agricultural areas and from 2 to 3 miles in metropolitan areas. This close spacing will permit local surveyors to connect their property and boundary line surveys to the Federal control net at convenient intervals.

Leveling lines spaced 100 miles apart were first run across the country from coast to coast and from the Gulf to the Lakes to form a level network of elevations above mean sea level. Later the spacing was reduced to about 50-mile intervals. The present program provides for lines of leveling along highway rights-of-way at an approximate spacing of 6 miles. Bench marks will be located at 1-mile intervals along these lines. These bench marks are marked for identification and placed in concrete posts or in prominent building foundations in cities and towns.

Horizontal and vertical control surveys are desirable in urban areas in connection with plans for development of housing facilities, water and sewer lines, streets, location of recreational areas, and public utilities. City control surveys of this type have recently been completed in Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio. Similar control surveys were made with the 11 county, city, and municipal organizations of the east San Francisco Bay region and are now under-

way in Mahoning County, Ohio. Under these cooperative arrangements the Coast and Geodetic Survey furnishes the technical supervision, the instrumental equipment and portable steel triangulation towers. The expenses of operation and the local survey personnel are provided by the local authorities. These cooperative projects have proved economical and satisfactory to both local and Federal officials. They expand the Federal network with the least cost and give local communities basic information for accurate maps of properties and facilities. Arrangements of this nature are invited to the attention of all county and city officials.

NAUTICAL CHARTS

One of the principal products of the Coast Survey—and the one for which it was originally established—is the nautical chart, which guides the mariner over what is often referred to as the trackless sea. It shows him the hidden dangers and the safe lanes and opens our ports to the armadas of commerce. These navigational charts of the Coast and Geodetic Survey are known for their reliability and accuracy when used by the mariner.

Nautical charts are published on various scales to meet the different needs of navigation—a vessel sailing between two distant ports requires a different type of chart from that which is needed for approaching a coast or entering a harbor.

Improvements in the design of the nautical chart are constantly being made to make them more useful to the navigator. When echo-sounding machines began to be installed on merchant ships and the navigator was able to know the depth under his vessel without slowing down or stopping, the Coast and Geodetic Survey designed a new type of chart for use with such equipment.

AERONAUTICAL CHARTS

Another function of the Coast and Geodetic Survey which is of prime importance to the country in the expansion of aviation is the compilation and production of charts for air navigation. Beginning with the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1926, this Bureau has prepared the charts needed for safe navigation by the air pilot. The types of charts issued are perhaps the finest maps for an over-all coverage of the country, although they are specially prepared for simplicity of detail so that the air pilot may recognize the features of the terrain beneath him as he flies.

Various series of aeronautical charts are designed to show with greatest simplicity the locations of the numerous navigational aids and radio facilities, costing millions of dollars, that we are installing throughout the country in the interest of safety in navigation. The work of the Bureau in promoting air safety is well recognized.

WAR ACTIVITIES

During World War II, the personnel and facilities of the Bureau were utilized in specialized ways toward advancing the war effort.

Of the commissioned officers in the Bureau, 55 percent were transferred to the armed forces—28 percent to the

Army and 27 percent to the Navy, including the Marine Corps. Officers transferred to the Army served principally in the Air Forces, the Field Artillery, and the Corps of Engineers. The majority of those in the Navy served on Coast and Geodetic Survey ships which were transferred and on other naval survey ships.

These officers were selected for duty for which their technical training and experience fitted them. They were assigned to training amphibian troops in seamanship and navigation, to artillery schools for development of control survey methods suitable for use in directing mobile artillery fire, to duty as battalion observation officers, and to conducting hydrographic surveys in advance of fleet operations in the Aleutians and in the western Pacific. Some served on engineering construction work with the Civil Engineer Corps, and others were assigned to the Air Forces to participate in a program of world-wide aerial mapping and in the development and application of electronic methods for distance determinations.

It is gratifying to know that these officers acquitted themselves with distinction in their various assignments, receiving special decorations, citations, and letters of commendation.

Six of the major survey ships of the Bureau were transferred to the Navy Department for survey duty with the fleet in offlying areas. These ships were sent into areas in advance of the main portions of the fleet to sound out anchorages and to develop safe channels.

An example of the service rendered by the officers and crews of these survey ships is that of the *Hydrographer*. This ship was transferred to the Navy Department on April 15, 1942. After conversion of the vessel for naval duty and several intermediate assignments, the ship was assigned to the assault force which was preparing the recapture of Attu Island, in the Aleutians. Upon arrival at Massacre Bay, the *Hydrographer* sounded the bay, and the transports moved into anchorage close to the beach. An 18-foot rock was found within the swinging radius of the squadron flagship. A channel into Massacre Bay was surveyed and buoyed, and ships were piloted in by the commanding officer of the *Hydrographer*. After the Attu operation, the *Hydrographer* proceeded to Adak and joined the task force for the Kiska operation, where it made surveys during and after the landing expedition.

The charting facilities of the Bureau were greatly expanded to meet the needs of the armed forces. More than 90 percent of this expanded production was supplied directly to the Army, Navy, and merchant marine. The personnel of the Chart Division was increased over 700 percent, the hours of work lengthened, and the major portion of the equipment and presses placed on a two- or three-shift basis. New methods for rapid reproduction were devised and instituted. Machines were designed, built, and installed to implement the decreasing supply of manpower.

In addition, the Bureau rendered advice to other agencies in cartographic problems. The availability of the original topographic and hydrographic sur-

veys and the experience of the personnel who executed the surveys were of great value for knowledge of the coastal regions, such as the laying of mine fields, training of amphibious troops for invasion landings, and in research related to detecting and combating enemy submarines.

The demand for the regular nautical charts of the Bureau increased from an annual issue of 400,000 in 1940 to over 4,000,000 in 1945. The greatest consumers of these charts were of course the Navy and the merchant marine, these two services alone taking 75 percent of the total issue. The demand for the regular aeronautical charts of the Bureau increased from 464,000 in 1940 to 12,700,000 in 1945.

In addition to the responsibility for the production and distribution of charts of the United States and its possessions, many other special charting and mapping projects involving large portions of the world were undertaken for the military services and other war agencies. Some of these projects were as follows: World aeronautical charts and sectional aeronautical charts for the Army Air Forces; flight charts for air routes; target charts; instrument-approach and landing charts; planning charts; weather-plotting charts; and numerous other types of special charts.

Field work of the Bureau continued but was totally channeled to the requirements of the military services. Large war mapping parties were engaged in photogrammetric mapping of coastal areas. Survey vessels of the Bureau were engaged in charting important harbors and sea lanes to safeguard the movement of troops and supplies to far-flung battle fronts. Early in the war a request was made for the preparation of large-scale charts of Casco Bay, Maine, and adjacent waters, which were to be used as a base for part of the Atlantic fleet and as a rendezvous for vessels engaged in convoy duty. This required extensive new surveys including wire-drag examinations of the area, and resulted in the discovery of a startling number of rocks and reefs dangerous to navigation. The strategic importance of Alaska had been recognized by the Coast and Geodetic Survey long before World War II. A major contribution to the war effort was the expansion of geodetic and coastal surveys in that Territory. The need is now recognized for further expansion of these surveys in the interest of the national defense.

INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION

In 1941 the Coast and Geodetic Survey began participation in the international cooperation programs sponsored by the Department of State.

Since the inception of the program in 1941 the Bureau has completed 43 technical missions to Latin-American countries, and a total of 182 foreign nationals received technical training. This total includes 49 trainees from the Philippine Islands and 17 from the Eastern Hemisphere.

The technical cooperation programs executed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey have resulted in specific benefits to the individual trainee, such as position

advancement and expansion of greater responsibilities upon return to his country; the adoption, on the part of the participating agency, of the methods and techniques employed by the Bureau; the facilitating of purchases of United States scientific equipment; and the direct contacts between foreign technicians and those of the United States which have furthered good-will relations.

PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION PROGRAM

From 1901 to December 1941 the Coast and Geodetic Survey conducted coastal surveys in Philippine waters and produced the complete series of nautical charts of this archipelago. These had benefited the merchant marine and the Navy and advanced the economy of the country through the protection and aid which this great work afforded for the exchange of products of the islands with the world, particularly with our own country. Under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 the Coast and Geodetic Survey was assigned the task of continuing surveying and allied operations in the Philippines.

This work is of vital importance to the Philippine Republic because the waterways of the Philippines are the principal arteries of commerce. The availability of modern nautical charts, coast pilots, and tide tables is of prime importance for the development of this commerce. The continued flow of accurate hydrographic, tidal, and magnetic information from these waters is of prime importance to this country from the standpoint of our interest in the development of Philippine industry, through expansion of trade and exchange of its products, as well as for the needs of United States shipping and military requirements for maintaining peace in the Far East.

ATTAINMENTS AND LEADERSHIP

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has earned an unqualified reputation for accuracy and thoroughness by maintaining a high standard of work.

It has maintained a high service morale in spite of difficult tasks.

It has progressively accomplished a larger output of work at lower unit costs in spite of the over-all increase in labor and material costs.

It has maintained world leadership in standards for surveying and design of its instruments and in the development of EPI and radio current equipment.

It has contributed to the collection of scientific data and has accumulated precise data relative to geophysical phenomena.

The work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey is a pioneering effort. Its vessels roam in uncharted seas, its field engineers traverse unexplored territory, frequently suffering the hardships of isolation and exposure.

The reputation of the Bureau, with respect to the functions with which it is charged by the Congress, is internationally acknowledged. Its standards of accuracy and its thorough methods are recognized the world over and its manuals have been translated into foreign languages. Some of its officers hold high positions on international societies and commissions.

FORMER HEAD OF THE BUREAU

Prior to the appointment of the present Director, Rear Adm. Leo Otis Colbert, in 1938, this Bureau had only 12 directors in 131 years of existence. They were Ferdinand Hassler, the author of the plan for the first survey of the coast. Upon Hassler's death in 1843, he was followed by Alexander Dallas Bache, who was succeeded by Benjamin Pierce. He was followed by Carlile P. Patterson, Julius E. Hilgard, Frank M. Thorn, T. C. Mendenhall, William W. Duffield, and Henry S. Prichett. In 1900, Dr. Otto H. Tittman was appointed head of the Survey. He was followed by E. Lester Jones and Rear Adm. Raymond S. Patton.

I come now to the present director, Admiral Colbert, one of the most able and efficient executives in charge of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey. Under his leadership, the plan and organization of the Bureau has been further developed. We now have a comprehensive program for surveying all coastal waters under the jurisdiction of the United States; of delineating the topographic features of our coastal land areas; and of providing geodetic surveys on an area basis for control of mapping and large-scale engineering projects. Development of new devices and techniques, acquisition of modern survey ships, and a corps of technically trained personnel provide the means for carrying out this program. The activities of this scientific and technical Bureau should be continued for the orderly production of surveys and charts for the safety of navigation at sea and in the air, for the commercial and industrial development of our country, and for aid in the national defense.

At the time your committee was holding hearings in connection with appropriations for this agency for the year 1951, we were informed that Admiral Colbert would soon retire. The entire membership of your committee was unanimous in expressing regret that the country is about to lose the services of this valuable public servant. Because of his outstanding service, I include with these statements a biographical sketch.

REAR ADM. LEO OTIS COLBERT

Rear Adm. Leo Otis Colbert, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, has had a wide and varied service in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Born at Cambridge, Mass., in December 1883, he received his early education in the public schools of Boston. He received a degree in civil engineering at Tufts College in 1907, and was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of science by Tufts in 1939.

Entering the service of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on July 1, 1907, his field assignments have included those of navigator, executive officer, and commanding officer of the various Survey ships operating in the coastal waters of the United States, Alaska, and the Philippines.

He was first engaged on wire-drag work—special apparatus utilized to locate submerged pinnacle rocks—on the Atlantic coast, and he later extended the use of this equipment to sweep the inland

passage of the Alaskan coastal waters for submerged rocks.

During World War I he was transferred to duty under the Navy Department and served as lieutenant commander on the troop transport U. S. S. *Northern Pacific*, making nine voyages transporting troops through the submarine zone between New York and Brest, France.

He received a certificate as master of steam vessels, unlimited tonnage, any ocean, issued by the United States Steamboat Inspection Service, in April 1920. He was assigned duty in connection with the maintenance and repairs to the ships of the Coast Survey fleet upon his return from war duty.

He was Director of Coast Surveys of the Philippine Islands at Manila from 1928 to 1930. During an earlier assignment to the Philippines between 1911 and 1914, he had been engaged in surveys of Mindanao, Mindoro, Negros, and Palawan Islands and had received his first command in 1912.

In the early thirties, he was engaged in a comprehensive hydrographic survey of Georges Bank, off the coast of Massachusetts, in command of the survey ship *Oceanographer*, formerly the *Corsair*. This survey brought to light for the first time the highly dissected submarine topography of the northeast Atlantic Continental Shelf and required the most advanced methods of offshore surveys for the proper delineation and location of these details.

During his administration as Chief of the Division of Charts in the Department in Washington from 1933 to 1938, there was completed a series of 87 aviation charts and the inauguration of other specialized charts for long-distance flying. The great distribution of these charts is tangible evidence of their popularity for safety in flying. They represent the most accurate navigation charts of the United States and serve many purposes other than those for use of pilots of airplanes. He was also able to produce an increasing number of new basic marine charts and thus made available to the navigator, with the least possible delay, the results of the hydrographic surveys of the Bureau and of the improvements of coastal navigation works by other Federal agencies, principally the Corps of Engineers.

Admiral Colbert has devoted his entire professional career to the Coast and Geodetic Survey. He has served 12 years as Director, and under his management the Bureau has passed through a most important period of its entire existence. He directed with energy and imagination the activities of the Bureau during its greatly expanded war program, as well as the important planning period which took place during the years immediately preceding hostilities when preparations were being made for national defense. The numerous projects initiated under his direction, both field and office, at the specific request of the armed forces and other war agencies involved activities in all branches of the Survey's work.

Admiral Colbert has served as a member of the Mississippi River Commission since 1933. He is a member of the ad-

visory council of the Department of Civil Engineering, Princeton University, of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and of the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers. He is a director of the Society of American Military Engineers, a trustee of Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, and a life trustee of the National Geographic Society.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, the Government is presently doing a great disservice to a large segment of the American people. More correctly, I suppose, the blame should be placed on the responsible majority party in this Congress and on the administration. I, of course, refer to the continuing failure of the Ways and Means Committee, the Congress, and the Chief Executive to settle the excise-tax controversy.

The present peacetime imposition of the wartime excises is a bad thing. It has caused a severe drop in business and employment in the enterprises directly affected with corollary losses throughout our economy. It is high time that the Government redeems its promises to end these wartime excise excesses.

However, it is not my purpose here to discuss the merits and demerits of excise-tax reduction. My purpose is to urge a prompt decision. The failure to decide the issue once it was officially opened has probably hurt more than the taxes themselves.

You will recall that the President last December 1949, during the Christmas-shopping season informed the people that excise taxes should be reduced. That hurt. Soon after in his message on the state of the Union he proposed the reduction of certain excises under certain conditions. That hurt. Since then the Ways and Means Committee has had under consideration a tax-revision bill, the main portion of which deals with the possible reduction of excise taxes. From the time committee consideration started right down till now the Nation has been flooded with rumors that the excise tax on this, or that, would be cut 10, 25, or 50 percent, or eliminated entirely. This has really hurt.

We need here only reemphasize what causes the business and employment pains. The simple fact is that many people with dollars to spend have not been buying and are not buying now because they have decided to wait for cheaper prices—prices reduced by at least as much as the expected tax reduction.

It is, of course, obvious that the excise taxes price some percentage of the people out of the market for taxed goods and services. When to this number is added the number who fail to buy or utilize while waiting lower prices the total number, indefinite as it may be, is certainly considerable. Hence, it follows that when to the sales reducing effects of excise taxes you add the worse effects of delayed buying it becomes evident that you are giving business and employment a rough one-two. That just is not right or fair.

And something can be done about it. The Ways and Means Committee should

bring an excise tax-reduction bill to the floor just as soon as the appropriation bill is on its way.

The Senate should then make this tax bill the first order of business; pass it and fly it to Key West, or wherever necessary for the President's signature. Then business, labor, and the public would know with a minimum of further paralyzing delay exactly which taxes are cut and which ones are uncut. That would promptly end the rumors, hesitation, and resulting losses.

It was a sad mistake to have, in the first place, talked about excise-tax reduction as a probability until the machinery and schedule was set up to handle the issue in the shortest possible time. But that damage has been done. The thing to do now is to end the continuing damage at once.

If it is true that the votes cannot be mustered to cut the excise taxes for goodness sakes let us let the people know that fact. Let us let them know that they will have to wait a year or more for the commodities they want, if they want tax-reduced prices. Such action will stimulate much buying.

Surely we owe that much to the enterprises we have been increasing—kicking around since the close of the war. And if that in turn will, as it will, produce more revenue from excises surely we should do it for the Government's good. We find ourselves here about to pass the biggest peacetime budget in history; we have no hopes of getting enough tax money to pay for it, and at the same time by the failure to act with dispatch on the excise-tax issue we are reducing the total amount of our revenue, providing the decision is to hold the taxes at their present level.

This question of a prompt decision on excise-tax relief should not be a partisan consideration. Many on both sides of the aisle would welcome the opportunity to vote a measure up or down. But, unfortunately it is in danger of becoming a partisan issue. The Republican minority on the Ways and Means Committee did offer a formal motion to consider the excise-tax question first. They were defeated, according to my information, by a straight party vote. They still desire, for the reason I have emphasized, to at least provide the relief that a decision would provide.

Now the question arises should excise taxes be cut unless there is a corresponding increase in other revenues. That is a fair question. It is one that we could answer right now in the consideration of the pending appropriation bill. There are two ways we could make up for any loss on revenues occasioned by excise-tax reductions; we could squeeze the amount out of the still too fat budget, or we can adjust other taxes to make up the difference. Whether or not we can even consider the first of these two alternatives depends on our votes on the appropriation bill in the weeks just ahead and our willingness, in the event we do lower the budget, to make our position stick despite any possible revision by the upper body.

However, I do not wish to further deviate from my theme. I think that

the Government should redeem its promise to the people to eliminate the wartime excises. I think that the resulting stimulus to business, plus plugging tax loopholes, plus some real economies, would make the cut in excise taxes feasible. But I emphasize that the decision, whatever it may be, should be made in record short time.

I repeat that the committee, the Congress, and the powers that be have delayed too long already. While we twiddle and twaddle many of our people are being damaged—seriously hurt. I fully expect that such aid as we do give them will be too little, but there is not the slightest justification for it being too late.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I concur with the gentleman when he says that these excise taxes should be reduced and, in many instances, entirely abolished. But, I do not follow his argument wherein he places the blame for their not being reduced up to now upon the administration, or the majority party now in control of Congress, because the gentleman will easily recall that during the Eightieth Congress the present minority was then in the majority and in control of the Committee on Ways and Means, and that during that Congress there were a number of bills pending before the Committee on Ways and Means to cut excise taxes which the present minority failed to report favorably to the floor of the House.

Mr. CORBETT. Knowing the gentleman's political philosophy, I am certain that he regards these excise taxes as something which is very unwholesome to the people of the country.

Mr. ROONEY. I most certainly do.

Mr. CORBETT. When we go to fix responsibility for this matter, I can recall to the gentleman that the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was dominated by the gentleman's party, made great haste to cut the corporation taxes and left the excise taxes on. I can also concur that the Eightieth Congress did not cut the excise taxes.

Mr. ROONEY. What did the Eightieth Congress do with reference to corporate taxes and the taxes of people in the higher brackets?

Mr. CORBETT. To the best of my knowledge, the corporate income-tax reduction was the work of the Seventy-ninth Congress. I cannot give the figures on that. Let us get back to the point I wanted to make in this speech. We could argue the responsibility for quite a while, and I think I would win.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I would still be the good friends we are, even though we disagreed politically.

Mr. CORBETT. The point I want to make very definitely is that from the moment the President issued his statement in favor of excise-tax reduction and from the time he reemphasized it in his message on the state of the Union, and then when the committee began consideration of the bill, the hope that was raised in the minds of people who were

about to purchase that taxes and prices would go down have delayed their purchases and hence has been as detrimental to business and employment as the tax itself.

Mr. ROONEY. As to that point, I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman, but I am confident that before we recess the Eighty-first Congress something substantial will be done about cutting excise taxes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago 5,000 Democrats gathered in an armory not far from here to feast on a dinner of flet mignon and burgundy. They paid \$100 each for the privilege—a total of \$500,000. The theory was that they were paying respect and tribute to the founder of their party—Thomas Jefferson. I suspect the person who was most pleased by the half million untaxed dollars that flowed into the Democratic party treasury was William Boyle, the Democratic national chairman.

The name of Thomas Jefferson, the patron saint of their party and one of America's greatest men, has been invoked on countless occasions and for countless purposes by our Democratic friends on the other side of this House. So I suppose it was not really a novelty for this dinner to be staged in his name. Could he have been present, he would have been thunderstruck. The armory was jam-packed with the disciples of Government waste and extravagance—the disciples of "easy come, easy go." The diners were the leaders in the activities which are rapidly taking this country into bankruptcy and into socialism. They were so pleased with their efforts that they made the dinner a thoroughly congenial and hilarious affair.

As I have said, I do not believe that Thomas Jefferson would have felt comfortable at such a gathering. I do not believe he would have taken pleasure in rubbing elbows with the people whose only interest in the future of the country apparently is in keeping themselves on the Federal payroll.

Let us not forget that it was Jefferson who warned, "We are ruined if we do not overrule the principle that the more we owe, the more prosperous we shall be." In those few words, Jefferson must have visualized the philosophy of the administrations that have ruled this country since 1933. In those few words, Jefferson wrote the most deadly indictment of the Truman administration that I have seen.

Jefferson was indeed a wise and far-seeing man. He was able to look clearly into the future for a century and a half. He knew the time would come when the reins of Government might fall into the hands of the reckless and the irresponsible—the people who seemingly care only for the present and nothing for the future.

That dinner audience could have profited by recalling the words of another famous Democrat—Grover Cleveland, also a great man and a great President. Cleveland was the man who said:

The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned, and the better lesson learned

that, while people should patriotically and cheerfully support their Government, its functions do not include support of the people.

That is another indictment of the administrations that have been saddled upon the American people since 1933. That is another indictment of those who have been trying to peddle phony paternalism to the American people with the bait that the Government is all-wise and all-wealthy, and should be the "sugar daddy" of every last citizen. They are those who, in the words of Harry Hopkins, the Roosevelt presidential pet, believe that the average American is "too dumb to understand" and that the only safe place for him is in the arms of an all-powerful Federal Government. They are those who consider themselves the elite and the only persons in this land competent to govern. They are the people who pay lip service to democracy while their efforts are such as to wreck democracy and bring about a Socialist dictatorship.

Many thousands of words were kicked around at the famous Democrats' Jefferson Day dinner, but I am sure that no one of them quoted the wisdom from Cleveland or from Jefferson. That was quite a notable omission. I think the thousands of affluent \$100-a-plate diners, and the thousands of people in much less affluent circumstances who listened or watched on radio or television, would have had a much more enlightening evening if some attention had been paid to the warnings of the two great Democrat Presidents.

Now, let us move on from Cleveland's time and up to 1932. That was the year when a candidate for the highest public office in the land said, "Any government—like any family—can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

On another occasion that candidate for President also said, "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors." Pointing out, of course, that the higher the taxes the greater the burdens of all the people and more especially the poor and those in modest circumstances. These and many others of like character were uttered by the same candidate during the campaign. After the campaign they were promptly relegated to the limbo of forgotten things, by the man of all men who should have taken them to his breast and held them there so long as he occupied the highest position in the gift of the American people.

Upon his inauguration, that gentleman, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, lost little time in disclosing he really was a believer in the policy of easy come, easy go. He forgot the effect of increasing taxes on the poor. He began an orgy of wild and foolish spending such as had not been seen since the days of the Roman emperors. By 1934 he had pushed the national deficit up more than 50 percent, and by 1935 he had more than doubled the annual deficit.

From that point on, there was no turning back for Mr. Roosevelt. He had tasted the elixir of waste and extravagance, and he liked it. By 1939 the national debt was \$46,000,000,000, nearly

two and one-half times the size of the debt at the time he became President in 1933.

Now, let us move ahead to 1943. That was the year when a Democratic Member of the United States Senate arose to level this warning. And I quote:

It seems that, when public funds are to be expended, no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office. I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogative in connection with the purse strings of the Government, much of the money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever.

These were brave words. I only wish they had been remembered and meticulously observed, especially since 1945. The man who expressed this warning was Harry S. Truman, then a Senator from Missouri and chairman of the Special War Investigating Committee. At that time Mr. Truman apparently was quite aware of the responsibility of the Congress to exercise a checkrein on the executive departments. At that time Mr. Truman apparently realized that the future of the country depended upon the careful management of our financial resources. At that time Mr. Truman apparently knew that the Congress is the American people's first line of defense against waste and extravagance, and every other form of wild spending.

But once President Truman entered the White House, his ideas seemed to change. Along with millions of other Americans, I had thought that once the war was over, the Government would quickly settle down to a period of less spending, lower taxes, and gradual retirement of the national debt.

But we were wrong. Mr. Truman has shown himself to be a worthy disciple of the easy-come, easy-go boys. He is not merely going along with them on their free-handed spending, he is actually running ahead of them and showing them the way. He bids fair to establish himself as the new champion in the race to spend the country into disaster.

In 1947 and 1948 the country had a pleasant breathing spell from Mr. Truman's spending. A Republican Congress took over and trimmed \$9,800,000,000 in spending from the President's budget. It reduced taxes by \$4,800,000,000 and it reduced the national debt by \$7,000,000,000. Beginning in 1949, when the Democrat Eighty-first Congress took over, President Truman promptly plunged the country back into red ink. We are there now, and we will remain there until the people of the country elect a President who will do what he is elected to do—conserve the hard-earned dollars of the American taxpayers. Mr. Truman has shown he has not the slightest intention of cutting expenses or of balancing the budget, and, therefore, it is the duty of this Congress to act.

In February the President told a reporter that in no sense does he tolerate deficit spending. He also said he hates deficit spending, and it is only a temporary condition brought on by necessities which could not be removed by any

genius of statecraft known or available to him.

That talk about deficit spending being only temporary is now so old it is beginning to sprout whiskers. We have heard it since 1933 and every time we hear it, it is expressed as though it were meant to be taken seriously.

I have made a study of Mr. Truman's messages to the Congress and I find that balancing the budget is one of his favorite subjects. Nineteen times he has expressed to the Congress his intention or promise to balance the budget. On 10 additional occasions President Truman has expressed to the Congress his intention or promise to reduce the national debt.

Let me cite a few examples. In his budget message for the fiscal year 1947, President Truman said:

It is good to move toward a balanced budget.

In his budget message for the fiscal year 1950, the President said:

I do not consider it prudent * * * for Government finances to be in unbalance or even in precarious balance.

In the same message he also said:

A prosperous country cannot afford an unbalanced budget.

In this year's state of the Union message, President Truman said:

The fiscal policy I am recommending is the quickest and safest way of achieving a balanced budget.

In this year's budget message, Mr. Truman said:

The financial program which I am recommending * * * is directed at achieving budgetary balance.

In his budget message for the fiscal year 1947, President Truman said:

It is good to * * * start on the retirement of the debt at a time when the demand for goods is strong.

In his budget message for 1950, he said:

In prosperous times like the present we should take the necessary steps to reduce the public debt.

President Truman talks a good game of budget balance, but his actions are quite different. His record shows that he does not merely tolerate going into debt, but he is all for it. The best evidence to this effect is in the proposals which President Truman presented to the Congress this past January. He is not at all content with the present rate of Government spending. He presented a program for socializing agriculture, housing, medicine, and many other aspects of American life. If this program were enacted, the Federal Government's spending would double. The country would either double its taxes, or run into debt that much faster. Either way, the result is the same—some form of suicide for the Government of these United States.

Faced, as we are, with a future most uncertain; not knowing what day a great cataclysm may involve us in we know not what, it is high time that we cease our experimenting in those things which, down the centuries, have been tried time

and again, always ending in failure, to the devastation of the poor of those nations and of the complete wrecking of the civilizations of those days. We want none of this for our people.

President Truman knows that the chief impetus for balancing the budget should come from the White House. Without the President's encouragement, leadership, and consent, it is extremely difficult to trim out the fat of Federal spending. It was done by the Republican Eightieth Congress in 1947 and 1948, and I wish it could be done again. But President Truman is resisting every effort toward making a substantial cut in Government squandering. The White House story used to be that we should wait for prosperity before attempting to balance the budget. Now the White House does not say what we should wait for. It probably does not know.

In his January budget message, President Truman had only vague words about when even he thought the budget should be balanced. He said:

I am confident that the fiscal recommendations provide a solid basis for moving toward budgetary balance in the next few years.

What does "in the next few years" mean? Does it mean another 20 years? The last time the Government was in the black, except for 1947 and 1948, when we Republicans were in control of both Houses of the Congress, was 1930. Does President Truman mean that we should now wait for 1970?

Perhaps the answer is that President Truman just does not know the answer himself. He apparently feels that somehow the country will muddle through. He evidently feels that, no matter how deep a hole into which he may drive the country, it will pull itself out by some great stroke of luck. This kind of thinking is irresponsible and there is no place for it, either in the White House or in the Congress. We, the Congress, have been entrusted with managing the fiscal affairs of this Government, and we must live up to our responsibilities. The time is now. We cannot procrastinate further.

I wish to recommend some reading for the President. If he has any dull moments under the palm trees in Key West, I commend to his attention the thoughts of some eminent fellow Democrats on Government finance. I suggest that President Truman read the words of Thomas Jefferson I have quoted, the words of President Cleveland, and the words of President Roosevelt. I also wish that President Truman would read the words of President Truman himself which I have also quoted. If he does read them and believe them, and take them to heart, surely he will act.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for a very able and well-thought-out statement. The gentleman has long been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and is an authority on taxation and on the fiscal affairs of the Government. I wish to ask him this ques-

tion: If the Federal Government in this year and day when the American people have as large an income as they have ever had in the history of this Nation cannot live within its income, balance its budget, and perhaps save something to pay on the great national debt which resulted from two World Wars, when can we balance the budget and live within our income?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that it appears from our experience of 17 years with the last two Democratic administrations our only hope is a permanent change of parties. In the two short years we Republicans were in power we reduced taxes to the tune of \$4,800,000,000, despite 3 presidential vetoes, with 71 percent of the tax relief going to those with incomes under \$5,000. We removed 7,400,000 income earners in the lowest tax brackets from the tax roll entirely. We paid \$7,000,000,000 on the national debt and last, but by no means least, we balanced the budget. Compare this splendid record of 2 years of Republican accomplishment with the 17 long years of Democrat deficits, wasting and squandering of the taxpayers' money, and then ask yourself what must be done if this fine country is to return to a sound economic basis. The answer is so simple that even a child can produce that answer.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, the central subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee was appointed by our chairman the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, about March 1, this year. The main task of our central subcommittee was to assemble the proposed supply bills and the reports thereon into one single bill and report and then present the same to the House for consideration. That bill is now being considered by you.

Of course, no authorizations can be included, that is subsequently made by the Congress. This bill does not include other expenditures, such as interest payments on the public debt.

Heretofore very little connection was made of the individual appropriation bill with the other expenditures of the Government, and with the total income of the Government, and whether there would be a balance or deficit at the end of the fiscal year. Congress, in other words, was not presented figures on total receipts and expenditures, and had only limited opportunity to know about the Treasury balances and deficits.

This year the data is before you in this one bill and the report thereon. You know what is desired to be expended by the several Government agencies, you know what the estimated income of the Government is for the next fiscal year, and you know about what the deficit will be if these appropriations are made. In other words, you have the budget of the United States for the ensuing fiscal year before you.

This is not the first time in the history of our Government that we have had one supply bill covering the entire

budget of the United States. In view of this change in appropriations procedure this year, I have made, with the assistance of several of the most able experts available, some degree of research regarding the history of appropriations by the Congress of the United States which might be of interest to the House and to the country and, therefore, with your indulgence, I am going to review as briefly as possible the history of appropriations procedure of our Government.

During the first years of the Republic appropriations for the support of the Government were passed, for the most part, in a single appropriation act. Writing in 1879, James A. Garfield states that "in the main, during the first 40 years of our history, the appropriations were made in one act, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the support of the Government.'"

From the beginning, to be sure, Congress passed each year a number of special appropriation acts making appropriations for miscellaneous purposes, in addition to the main appropriation act for the support of the Government. Down to the end of 1792, for example, according to Alexander Hamilton, Congress passed 2 appropriations acts in 1789, 12 appropriation acts in 1790, 5 appropriation acts in 1791, and 7 appropriation acts in 1792.

The first step toward division of the appropriation acts occurred in 1794, when Congress passed two general acts, one for the support of Government and one for the support of the Military Establishment. One reason for segregating the War Department bill apparently was to expedite the passage of the civil list bill so that Congressmen could receive their salaries. Madison said that Members had been reduced to the most serious difficulties by the delays in the payment of their salaries, and Nicholas added that it was not fair to suppose that every gentleman in the House came to town with enough money in his pocket to meet his expenses. Another reason was to secure ample time to consider military expenditures, free from any pressure to vote the civil list.

The second step toward division occurred in 1799 when Congress passed a separate appropriation act making appropriations for the Navy Department which had been created in 1798. The annals of Congress do not reveal the reasons why a separate appropriation act was passed for the Department of the Navy in 1799, but presumably the explanation is to be found in the establishment of a separate Navy Department the previous year.

Almost a quarter of a century passed thereafter before Congress resumed the process of dividing the general appropriations into separate acts. During the 1820's separate appropriation acts were passed for the first time for fortifications, 1823; pensions, 1826; and rivers and harbors, 1826. Two more appropriation acts originated during the 1830's: One for the Military Academy, 1834; and the Indian Act, 1837. The Post Office Appropriation Act originated in 1844 and the Sundry Civil and the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Acts

made their appearances in 1856. In 1880 the Agriculture and District of Columbia Appropriation Acts were adopted. The multiplication of the appropriation acts during the first half of the nineteenth century was a concomitant of the growth of the country, the expansion of the Federal Government, and the increasing and varied financial needs of the Government. Just as Congress was dividing the labor of its legislative business during this period among the newly created standing committees in both Houses, so was the labor of providing for the financial needs of the Government subdivided into several appropriation bills. The following table shows the date of origin of the separate appropriation acts:

Appropriation bills

Present title of act	Date of origin of act	Date of origin of present title
Army.....	1794	1832
Navy.....	1799	1799
Fortifications.....	1823	1823
Pensions.....	1826	1854
Rivers and Harbors.....	1826	1871
Military Academy.....	1834	1836
Indian.....	1837	1837
Post Office.....	1844	1845
Sundry Civil.....	1856	1857
Legislative, Executive, and Judicial.....	1856	1857
Agriculture.....	1880	1881
District of Columbia.....	1880	1881

This table shows that the same gradual process which had distributed the business of the House among more than 40 committees by the year 1880 had also classified the work of its Committee on Appropriations into 13 separate annual bills prepared by its subcommittees.

The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives was established in 1865, when all the general appropriation bills were confided to its care. Before 1865 the Ways and Means Committee handled both the revenue and the appropriations bills. From 1835 to 1920, jurisdiction over the general appropriation bills was distributed among eight standing committees of the House. Finally, on July 1, 1920, the Committee on Appropriations was given jurisdiction over all appropriations by an amendment to the rules adopted June 1, 1920. Thus, during the last 30 years the Committee on Appropriations has had exclusive jurisdiction over appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

During the 85 years since the Committee on Appropriations was first established the total expenditures of the Federal Government have grown from \$536,000,000 in 1865 to more than \$40,000,000,000 in 1950. This tremendous growth in the cost of the Government affords some conception of the increase in the work load of the Appropriations Committees of Congress. These committees are now responsible for scrutinizing the financial estimates of an executive establishment which had 1,863 component units as of January 1, 1950, and a total of 1,961,029 employees on the same date. For the performance of this tremendous task the Committee on Appropriations of the House has performed divided its work among a series of standing subcommittees organized along lines

roughly parallel to the organization of the executive departments and agencies. At the present time there are nine of these standing subcommittees, each with five members.

Under this traditional procedure the appropriation process is necessarily piecemeal in nature, each supply bill being separately considered by different subcommittees, without much opportunity for consideration of their interrelationships or of the over-all aspects of expenditure and revenue programs. Each of the appropriation bills has been considered individually at the committee and floor stages. The needs covered by one supply bill have not been measured in proportion to the needs of others. It has been possible for relatively unimportant projects to be provided for in one bill and for relatively important projects to be rejected in another. The Committee on Appropriations has necessarily divided its work among subcommittees whose knowledge and understanding have largely determined the presentation and decision respecting items in the several bills.

Under this procedure, which we have inherited from the past, little over-all consideration of the entire budget picture has been given by the full committee or by the House. This lack of over-all control has encouraged deficiency and supplemental appropriations which still further weaken congressional control of expenditures. The Executive has submitted a unified budget to Congress which has heretofore broken it up into bits and pieces. There has been no legislative machinery for obtaining a coordinated over-all view of total income and outgo. Last year, for example, Congress considered and separately passed 10 general appropriation bills, 3 deficiency and 2 supplemental bills, and 5 special appropriation bills.

Today, the Committee on Appropriations is reporting for the consideration of the House a consolidated appropriation bill for the first time in more than a century and a half. This bill is made up of separate chapters each of which has been reported by its standing subcommittees after careful consideration of the departmental estimates. We hope that this omnibus bill represents a great forward step in appropriation procedure and that it will result in many advantages both to Congress and the country. Bringing all the general supply bills together into a single measure will give Congress and the country a picture of the total outlays contemplated for the coming fiscal year. Moreover, this procedure will permit a comparison to be made of these total proposed appropriations with the latest available estimates of total receipts by the Public Treasury for the coming year. By comparing total appropriations and total anticipated receipts the House will be able to decide in its wisdom whether to balance the budget or to create a surplus for debt retirement or to incur an increase in the public debt. The new procedure will focus responsibility upon the Congress for any increase in the national debt and it will offer us a method of financial retrenchment. By means of

the omnibus bill Congress will be able to act more intelligently on budget requests. A grand debate will ensue upon the financial state of the Union in which, perhaps for the first time in our history, the House and Senate will be able to make deliberate and rational decisions regarding over-all fiscal policy. Furthermore, this procedure will, I believe, help to offset and counteract the spending pressures of powerful interest groups which are constantly demanding of the Congress that it subsidize this or that program and which tend to identify their special claims with the general welfare. We will now be able for the first time to see the claims of each of these pressure groups in relation to the total national fiscal picture and thus to appraise their relative worth. To be sure, there will probably still be need from time to time for deficiency and supplemental appropriation bills, but we hope that the new omnibus procedure will reduce the number of such measures. It remains to be seen, of course, how the new procedure will actually work in practice, but we believe that its adoption represents a long step forward toward a much-needed reform in congressional appropriation procedures.

The omnibus bill recommends the appropriation of \$27,266,403,664. It recommends in addition \$1,778,626,500 in contract authorizations. This represents a reduction of \$1,385,377,504 from budget estimates of \$28,651,781,168 for appropriations, and \$1,961,149,500 for contract authorizations.

Total budget estimates for 1951 appropriations amounted to \$40,244,532,221. The \$11,592,751,053 difference between this amount and the \$28,651,781,168 estimated appropriations considered in this bill represents budget estimates of anticipated appropriations for the Senate, foreign aid and mutual defense assistance, 1951 supplementals under existing legislation, proposed legislation, reserve for contingencies, and permanent appropriations—from table in committee report, page 7.

Of this \$11,592,751,053 estimated 1951 appropriations not considered in the omnibus bill, \$5,949,018,531, including \$5,625,000,000 for payment of interest on the public debt, represents permanent appropriations. These are generally beyond reach of the Committee on Appropriations. Of the remaining \$5,643,732,522 subject to annual appropriation, the \$500,000,000 estimated appropriation for mutual defense assistance is the amount estimated to be required for liquidation of present contract authority. Thus, the committee will have real control over only a little more than five billion, or considerably less than half, of the estimated appropriations not considered in this bill.

The extent and kind of discretion permitted the Committee on Appropriations under existing legislation also varies widely with respect to different classes of items included in the \$28,651,781,168 estimated appropriations considered in the omnibus bill. I call your attention particularly to four categories of appropriation estimates over which the committee has little real control.

1. LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

No less than \$4,513,830,394 of the total budget estimate of 1951 appropriations represents appropriations for liquidation of existing and prior contract authorizations. Of this amount, \$3,998,730,394 is included in the \$28,651,781,168 appropriation estimates considered in this bill.

Generally speaking, the committee has little real control over these items. It can use its judgment as to the amounts that will actually be required during the fiscal year, but only in the rarest of cases would it be justified in refusing to recommend the amounts necessary to liquidate.

In the Department of Defense alone, \$2,277,600,000 of the total estimated appropriations of \$13,025,000,000 is for liquidation of contract authorizations. The Atomic Energy Commission estimated that \$450,000,000 would be required for that purpose. In the case of the Bureau of Public Roads, \$426,000,000 of the total requested appropriations of \$455,930,000 represented the agency's estimate of appropriations required to liquidate contract authorizations under the Federal aid, postwar highway-development program.

Obviously the committee was not in a position to make large cuts in this \$3,998,730,394 total. As a result of careful examination of estimates in this category, however, to make sure that appropriations requested would actually be needed in 1951, it was able to make a reduction of \$83,000,000.

In view of the extent to which incurred liabilities under contract authorizations limit discretionary control of appropriations and expenditures in future years, it is significant that under this bill recommended new contract authorizations for the fiscal year 1951 amount to \$1,961,149,500, a reduction of \$1,877,408,128 from 1950 contract authorizations.

2. PENSIONS, RETIREMENT FUNDS, AND OTHER FIXED-RATE ITEMS

There are many items in which the amount to be appropriated is rather definitely fixed by law and not subject to material control by the committee. The largest item of this description included in the appropriation estimates is for veterans' pensions. It amounts to \$2,237,000,000. An additional \$6,830,000 estimated is for the Veterans' Administration's military and naval insurance program, and \$31,600,000 for the national service life insurance appropriation.

Other large appropriation estimates in this category include \$356,000,000 for the Department of Defense for retired pay; \$333,344,000 charged to the Civil Service Commission as the Government's contribution to the retirement fund for civil employees; and \$594,000,000 for the Railroad Retirement Board.

Altogether, it is estimated that appropriation requests in this category total over \$3,640,000,000—see appended table.

As in the case of appropriations for liquidation of contract authorizations, the committee's discretion is limited largely to scrutinizing the estimates and exercising its judgment as to the amounts that will be required to make the various payments. The rates of payment for

these pension, insurance, and retirement items being rather definitely established by law, the committee has very little real control in the matter. Again, however, by careful scrutiny of the basis of the estimates it was able to effect a reduction of \$269,491,276 in this category of requests—see appended table, Railroad Retirement Board reduction is included.

3. VETERANS' READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Payments made to veterans under the various readjustment benefit programs fall in a somewhat different category. Here again, however, so long as the veterans' laws remain as presently written, the committee has relatively little discretion, other than to estimate the amount that will be required to pay the benefits due. If an applicant meets the specified conditions, the rate of payment or allowance is fixed by law. The Government is morally bound to provide whatever funds are required to meet these payments.

The budget estimate for appropriations for veterans' readjustment benefits for the fiscal year 1951 was \$2,610,000,000. The committee estimated that \$2,505,600,000 would be adequate to pay the benefits due. It therefore recommends a reduction of \$104,400,000 in the budget request.

It is interesting to note that of total appropriations of \$6,007,615,000 recommended by the President for 1951 for the Veterans' Administration, no less than \$5,045,430,000 represents such fixed or relatively uncontrollable items as liquidation of contract authorizations, \$160,000,000; pensions and insurance, \$2,275,430,000; and readjustment benefits, \$2,610,000,000.

4. GRANTS-IN-AID

Approximately \$1,663,000,000 of the appropriation estimates considered in this bill represents Federal contributions to the States under major grants-in-aid programs—see appended table. This does not include appropriations for liquidation of contract authorizations in connection with Federal-aid programs, so the items that make up this total do not overlap with any of those included above.

In the case of many of these programs, the law specifies that the Federal Government shall make grants or advances to the States, sometimes up to a stated maximum, upon compliance with prescribed conditions. In such cases, making appropriations is again largely a matter of estimating to what extent the States will apply and meet the prescribed conditions.

The largest item in this category is \$1,200,000,000 requested for the Social Security Administration for grants to the States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind under titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act. I quote from the committee's report—committee print, page 104—relating to this item:

The appropriation is allotted to the States on the basis of specific formulae and no Federal official has any discretion as to the amount paid other than to determine that all beneficiaries under State plans meet the requirements of the Federal law. The committee is powerless to control the amount of the item; the only control is in the formulæ.

of the statute itself. In this connection, it was testified that the provisions of H. R. 6000, now pending, dealing with public-assistance grants will, if enacted, increase requirements under this appropriation by approximately \$256,000,000.

In a similar category is the request for \$188,000,000 for the Bureau of Unemployment Security, now in the Department of Labor, for payments under the unemployment-compensation program. Eighty-three million five hundred thousand dollars is requested for payments under the National School Lunch Act; \$27,856,538 for payments to the States by the Extension Service, Department of Agriculture; \$10,000,000 by the Forest Service for forest-fire cooperation; and \$7,416,208 by the Office of Experiment Stations, Agricultural Research Administration, for payments to the States.

The estimates also include \$22,000,000 for payments to the States by the Children's Bureau for maternal and child welfare, and substantial amounts for payments under various programs by the Office of Education, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Public Health Service—see appended table for further detail. The programs vary considerably with respect to statutory provisions governing payments.

By revising estimates and exercising the most rigid control where control was possible, the committee has succeeded in reducing these estimates by some \$45,000,000—see appended table.

The grand total of estimated 1951 appropriations in the four categories described above is almost \$12,000,000,000, over 40 percent of the total estimates considered in the omnibus bill. Under existing legislation, and in the light of commitments already made, the committee could do little more than to examine the basis for estimating the amount of funds that would be required. Even so, it has succeeded in effecting total reductions in this class of estimates amounting to approximately \$500,000,000.

With respect to the \$16,738,769,028 estimated appropriations considered in this bill but not included in the categories enumerated above, the committee has recommended a reduction of \$883,052,450.

In order to appreciate the significance of this reduction, it must be realized that while the Committee on Appropriations in a legal sense has relatively wide discretion as to the amounts to be recommended, in a practical sense its discretion was severely limited.

Apart from the fact that essential services cannot be wholly eliminated or reduced to an unduly low level, there are certain appropriations that have to be made to prevent actual economic loss. Consider for example the case of going public-works projects.

Apart from funds required to liquidate prior contract authorizations, a certain minimum level of expenditure is required on going public-works projects just to keep them going. In other words, there is a point below which deferment of elements of programs in progress would bring about a net economic loss, as a result of nonproductive expenditures which would be required to safeguard the projects and, later, to prepare for resumption of work.

Finally, attention is called to the fact that of the \$16,738,769,028 estimates in the relatively controllable category, no less than \$10,395,075,000 represents the requested appropriations for the Department of Defense. This figure does not include amounts requested for liquidation of contract authorizations and for retired pay. The committee recommends a reduction of \$203,332,700 in the total 1951 appropriations for the Department, including a reduction of \$14,000,000 in the estimate for retired pay.

Subtracting the controllable Department of Defense estimates from total controllable estimated appropriations amounting to \$16,738,769,028, leaves \$6,343,694,028 controllable estimates for all of the remaining functions of the Government considered in this bill. The committee has recommended reductions from these estimates amounting to \$693,719,750. In other words, aside from Department of Defense estimates, this is a reduction of approximately 11 percent in the controllable estimates included in the omnibus bill. This percentage would

be even higher—12 to 13 percent—if even a minimum allowance were made for going public-works projects.

This remaining \$6,343,694,028 of what may be considered as controllable estimates in this bill can be broken down into three major items:

First. Permanent salaries as figured by the Bureau of the Budget—not as figured by the United States Civil Service Commission—\$3,401,423,510;

Second. Part time and temporary salaries, again as figured by the budget and not the Civil Service Commission, \$714,340,481; and

Third. All other purposes, including projects of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and a number of smaller activities, \$2,227,930,037—cut \$693,719,750.

Gentlemen, the bill can be further reduced by this committee. However, until the Congress repeals or reduces the authorized contributions and activities, or until the receipts of the Government are substantially increased, the budget cannot be balanced.

Now is the time for us to stand up and be counted. The money cannot be spent unless we make the appropriations. Do not say the President is entirely responsible. He cannot appropriate the money. Congress must do that. We should not transfer the responsibility of practicing economy to the President and ask him to reduce the budget. Under the Constitution the job belongs to Congress. Let us discharge our duties and make additional cuts here on the floor of this House.

In the future we also might stop passing new authorization unless of paramount importance. We might review a number of present authorizations and reduce or repeal some of them. Whether we want to or not is really not the question. The question is: We do not have the money.

We must cut as much as possible. Soon we shall reach our debt ceiling if these expenditures are to be continued. The responsibility is ours, on both sides of the aisle.

Categories of appropriation items for 1951 to which reference is made in statement

	1951 estimate	Recommended in bill	Reduction
I. Permanent appropriations (not considered in omnibus bill).....	\$5,949,018,531		
II. Appropriations for liquidation of contract authorizations:			
Total estimated.....	\$4,513,830,394		
Not considered in omnibus bill:			
Mutual defense assistance.....	\$500,000,000		
Department of State.....	\$5,100,000		
Atomic Energy Commission (revised estimate, H. Doc. 457).....	10,000,000		
Considered in omnibus bill.....	\$3,998,730,394	\$3,915,730,394	\$83,000,000
III. Pensions, insurance, and retirement funds (nonpermanent fixed charges):			
Major items:			
Veterans' Administration:			
Pensions.....	2,237,000,000	2,147,520,000	89,480,000
Military and naval insurance.....	6,830,000	6,830,000	
National service life insurance.....	31,600,000	31,600,000	
Department of Defense: Retired pay.....	356,000,000	342,000,000	14,000,000
Civil Service Commission: Civil-service retirement and disability fund.....	333,344,000	305,000,000	28,344,000
Railroad Retirement Board.....	594,000,000	487,832,724	106,167,276
Federal Security Administration: Bureau of Employees' Compensation, employees' compensation fund.....	26,500,000	25,000,000	1,500,000
Treasury Department: Coast Guard—retirement pay.....	15,575,000	15,575,000	
Philippine War Damage Commission.....	40,200,000	40,200,000	
Total.....	3,641,049,000	3,371,557,724	269,491,276
IV. Veterans' readjustment benefits.....	2,610,000,000	2,505,000,000	104,400,000

Categories of appropriation items for 1951 to which reference is made in statement—Continued

	1951 estimate	Recommended in bill	Reduction
V. Grants-in-aid and other advances to the States:			
Major items:			
Federal Security Administration:			
Social Security Administration:			
Bureau of Public Assistance—Grants.....	\$1,200,000,000	\$1,200,000,000	-----
Children's Bureau—Maternal and child welfare.....	22,000,000	22,000,000	-----
Office of Education: Vocational education.....	23,435,000	19,977,760	\$3,457,240
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation—Payments.....	23,000,000	20,600,000	2,400,000
Public Health Service:			
Veneral diseases.....	14,000,000	14,900,000	+900,000
Tuberculosis.....	9,600,000	10,000,000	+400,000
Assistance to States, general.....	26,425,000	16,915,000	9,510,000
Department of Labor: Bureau of Employment Security.....	188,000,000	178,500,000	9,500,000
Department of Agriculture:			
Agricultural Research Administration—Office of Experiment Stations.....	7,416,208	7,406,208	10,000
Forest Service—Forest-fire cooperation.....	10,000,000	9,500,000	500,000
National School Lunch Act.....	83,500,000	83,500,000	-----
Extension Service—Payments to States.....	27,856,538	27,000,000	856,538
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Public Housing Administration, Low-rent contributions.....	28,000,000	7,500,000	20,500,000
Total, Grants-in-aid items.....	1,663,232,746	1,617,798,968	45,433,778

¹ See 1951 budget, appendix 2, pp. 1154-1157, for detail. The budget total for permanent appropriations is given as \$5,937,613,204.
² For summary, see 1951 budget, table 3, p. A6. For detailed items, see table 9, pt. B, pp. A96-A98.
³ Report (committee print), p. 7.
⁴ 1951 budget, p. A98.
⁵ These figures are based on a quick check of major items. Three major reductions were noted as follows: Atomic Energy Commission, from estimate of \$450,000,000 (amended) to \$414,000,000 (report, pp. 203, 225); Public Health Service, hospital construction grants, from \$125,000,000 to \$100,000,000 (pp. 98, 117); Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, from \$420,000,000 to \$405,000,000 (pp. 48, 64).
⁶ See report p. 87, which states that this reduction represents offset of a like amount of rescissions proposed by the budget against the amount otherwise for appropriation to the railroad retirement account. See 1951 budget, p. 111.

SUMMARY

	Estimates (considered in omnibus bill)	Recommended	Reduction
1. Appropriations for liquidation of contract authorizations.....	\$3,998,730,394	\$3,915,730,394	\$83,000,000
2. Pensions, insurance and retirement funds (major items).....	3,641,049,000	3,371,557,724	269,491,276
3. Veterans' readjustment benefits.....	2,610,000,000	2,505,600,000	104,400,000
4. Grants and other advances to States (major items, not included above).....	1,663,232,746	1,617,798,968	45,433,778
5. Department of Defense (not included above).....	10,395,075,000	10,205,742,300	189,332,700
6. Permanent salaries (not included above).....	² 3,401,423,510	-----	-----
7. Salaries—Part time and temporary, etc. (not included above).....	714,340,481	-----	-----
Subtotal.....	4,115,763,991	-----	-----
8. All other purposes.....	2,227,930,037	-----	-----
Subtotal.....	6,343,694,028	5,649,974,278	693,719,750
Total.....	28,651,781,168	27,266,403,664	1,385,377,504

¹ Exclusive of \$14,000,000 reduction in retired pay estimate, accounted for elsewhere.
² Figures obtained from the Bureau of the Budget.

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

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I feel it my duty to speak these few words for the record and to tell the membership of the House that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] has been most faithful in his studies on the problems before us, and has shown a splendid devotion to the Committee on Appropriations and has applied himself diligently to this great task.

Mr. NORRELL. I thank the gentleman very, very much.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, permit me to add to what the gentleman from Michigan has so well said. The gentleman from Arkansas is one of the most valued and honored Members of the House, and during the absence of the gentleman from Michigan he served as chairman of the central committee which mobilized and harmonized all the separate chapters into one bill. In doing so he rendered an invaluable service to the committee and to the House and to the country.

Mr. NORRELL. I appreciate the remarks on the part of my chairman very much.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE] such time as he may require.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have today introduced a bill to restore the steam plant and other public power features of the Central Valley project of California. I wish to commend the House Appropriations Committee for its action in providing in the pending appropriation bill the full estimate of funds for the construction of irrigation facilities for the Central Valley project. I am at a loss, however, to explain the action of the committee in reducing the estimate for power facilities by \$4,450,000. The items deleted in making this reduction are the Delta steam plant, Folsom power facilities, Elverta switchyard, Elverta-Folsom via Roseville 115-kilovolt line, the Keswick-Tracy 115-kilovolt line, the Tracy-Patterson 69-kilovolt transmission line, and the Roseville-Patterson and Vernalis substations.

The district which I represent lies right in the center of the great Central Valley project of California. Being partly a farmer by profession myself, I am familiar with the need for an assured water supply at all times. Many of my neighbors who are not provided with surface water from canals are required to rely on the underground water supply which is pumped to the surface to meet our irrigation requirements. During periods of drought, such as we experienced a few years ago, the underground

water table was depleted to such a level that large quantities of electric power were required to lift the water to the surface where it could be used. These increased power requirements result in an equivalent increase in the cost of pumping water.

During such drought periods the curtailment in power production is very pronounced, due to the high ratio of hydro to steam electric production. This reduction in available power occurs at the very time when additional demands are placed on the power system to provide the necessary energy to operate the vast number of irrigation pumps throughout the Central Valley project area. In order to meet the essential needs in the past, severe curtailment in the use of power for all types of loads was put into effect.

For many years the Bureau of Reclamation has recommended the construction of a steam plant on the project to assure a balanced operation between hydroelectric and steam generation to provide maximum assurance of a firm power supply under all conditions of operation. This program has been repeatedly opposed by the officials of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., who have in the past apparently not seen the need for adequate steam capacity in the area. They had not only failed to put into operation adequate steam capacity of their

own, but opposed the construction of any steam capacity by the Bureau of Reclamation. Now the company has a program of construction which, when completed within the next few years, will give an almost even balance between hydro production and steam production on their own system. The company officials no doubt have learned that it is good business to properly balance steam and hydroelectric production.

When the Central Valley project was conceived and went through the various stages as a State project and now as the presently authorized Federal project, the need for steam capacity was recognized at all times. What was considered a sound principle during that period is still a sound principle; that is, it is recognized now and has been in the past that a steam plant is an essential component of any hydroelectric system. The action taken last year in providing funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority's steam plant at Johnsonville, Tenn., is certainly an action which bears this out. If it is good business for the utilities and for other areas, it is certainly good business for the Bureau of Reclamation to provide a completely self-sufficient project which is not dependent upon others to assure its proper operation to supply power for its own project pumps and to the preference customers who have preference rights under existing reclamation law. These preference customers will be municipalities, public-utility districts, farmer cooperatives, and others who may utilize vast quantities of electric energy for domestic, commercial, and irrigation pumping purposes. Should these customers sign power-delivery contracts with the Bureau of Reclamation, the number of customers will be limited to the firm capacity of the system operated as an independent hydro system, unless complete dependence can be placed upon the private power company which is operating as a monopoly in the area.

Gentlemen, I can only say this: It is a serious error to defer the construction of the Delta steam plant on the Central Valley project any longer.

Furthermore, the action of the committee eliminated transmission lines and the Elverta switchyard which are essential for the Bureau of Reclamation to interconnect project facilities and to carry out the preference provisions which govern its operations. The city of Roseville has a future delivery power contract signed with the Bureau of Reclamation which had been in effect since July 1945. Now this municipality which has been desirous of obtaining Central Valley project power for so many years has been thwarted in its efforts by the continued successful opposition of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to the construction of any facilities required to provide service to it. The committee has denied funds for the Elverta-Folsom via Roseville line to serve this load. The line also will go to the Folsom damsite where it can be used to supply project power for construction purposes and save a considerable amount in construction costs. If power is to be supplied by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for that purpose, it will be at a substantially higher

rate. After it has served its purpose during the construction period it will serve as the outlet for power to be generated at Folsom power plant.

The Folsom power plant and switchyard were also eliminated. The dam which is under construction by the Corps of Engineers will hold back the water of the American River and the water thus stored will be dropped through the Folsom power plant and afterbay power plants to generate much needed power. Action by the committee in delaying these features cannot, in my mind, be understood inasmuch as all generating capacity that can be constructed by both public and private agencies are needed in California to meet the ever-increasing demands. The trend in population growth continues to exist and we will be faced with shut-downs in the future as we were during 1948 if adequate provision is not made to supply the future needs.

The committee has also eliminated funds for the construction of a 115-kilovolt line from the Keswick switchyard to the Tracy pumping plant via the Elverta switchyard. This line is essential to provide service to municipalities and irrigation pumping loads as they may develop in the northern and central area of the Central Valley project. Due to the continued opposition of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., preference customers are not assured of being able to obtain this power supply until funds are actually appropriated for the necessary facilities to bring this power within their reach even though a contract may be signed with the Bureau of Reclamation. Failure to appropriate funds for this necessary construction will continue to place municipalities at the mercy of a huge monopolistic power company.

The Tracy-Patterson 69-kilovolt line is designed to provide power for irrigation pumping and municipal uses in the territory south of the Tracy pumping plant. Many applications for power have been on file with the Bureau of Reclamation for a number of years dating as far back as 1939. These people have been promised power for many years, but how long must they wait? Now I do not mean that the Bureau of Reclamation or the Department of the Interior has promised this power, but the Congress itself did through the enactment of preference provisions since 1906, when municipal requirements were given first consideration, has given that promise. Many laws enacted since that time have reiterated this preference to municipalities and have included rural cooperatives and other public bodies. By the continued denial of funds to carry out these provisions, the Congress has placed itself in the position of nullifying the laws that have been in effect over a long period of time.

It has been argued by many that it is essential to cut appropriations to the bone and economize. But let me remind the Members of the House that these funds are reimbursable and will be returned to the United States Government through power revenues. These appropriations are an investment in the future and I need but point out the Northwest as an example of the great

benefits that can be derived from adequate distribution of power developed by the Federal Government.

Private and public enterprises can exist side by side and this has been accomplished in many areas, but the continued practice by private enterprise to monopolize the benefits of Federal works that are constructed with the people's money can only lead to the ultimate stagnation of economic development. I do not believe, and I am sure that the majority of the Members of Congress will agree with me, that public expenditures should not be made for only those features of public projects which can benefit a limited group of private individuals. The Government has the responsibility, when it authorizes the initiation of these projects, to carry them through to the ultimate conclusions and provide the necessary facilities such as transmission lines and auxiliary steam plants to carry out the purpose for which the project was authorized by the Congress.

I am today introducing a bill to provide for the construction of the public power features I have mentioned and I earnestly solicit the support of all the Members of the House for that bill.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there is an extremely important relationship between the financial power of the United States, the solvency of our Federal Government, and the question of world peace. The time an enemy government would be most likely to decide to attack us would be when we appeared to be having serious financial troubles.

Before developing this major premise, let me quickly review our financial situation. Our Government is now in debt approximately \$260,000,000,000. This has been pointed out, not once, but several times during this debate. The interest on that debt alone is more than the total cost of operating the Federal Government during the late thirties. I am informed that the present public debt of the people of the United States is greater than the combined debts of all of the other governments of the world.

The war-debt situation is bad enough, but we are going more deeply in debt at the rate of \$16,000,000 a day. In his budget message to Congress this year, the President told us we will have a Treasury deficit of five and a half billions for the current fiscal year. He then stated the estimated deficit for the coming year for which the appropriations in the pending bill are made will be another five and one-tenth billions.

The Government will have to borrow money to meet this deficit. We will have to pay interest on the money we borrow. At the end of the coming fiscal year the interest charges alone on the deficit we are building up will amount to almost \$1,000,000 every working day. Think of it. We will soon be paying between \$800,000 and \$1,000,000 a day just to pay the interest on the deficit we are in the process of creating here and now.

Therefore, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the financial status of the United

States Government is extremely bad and becoming worse every day—yes, every hour. We seem to be deliberately placing ourselves in the position most desired by an enemy, should he wish to attack.

When we speak of the next war, or the cold war, I think we should clearly understand the kind of war we are talking about. The objective of our enemy today is quite different from the historical objectives of war. The idea that to the victor belongs the spoils is hopelessly old-fashioned in our present-day world. Our enemy today is bent on world conquest. He is determined to destroy all free governments and replace them with Communist, totalitarian control. No material gain is actually contemplated.

The war of world conquest now conducted from the Kremlin is the most ambitious and most diabolical war effort in all history.

The success of the Russian campaign is equally amazing. Without firing a shot, without the loss of Russian lives or the expenditure of Russian money, that Government has actually conquered and brought under its control more than 400,000,000 people in less than 5 years. The Russian Government has not, by its own action, ravaged or looted the conquered areas. Just one important thing has disappeared from all of the territory over which the hammer and sickle now flies—freedom.

Russian victory over the United States, whether won in the cold war or in a shooting war, would mean just one thing so far as the people of America are concerned. A Communist victory over us would mean the loss of our individual freedom. It should be noted that the first objective of the Communist dictator is the destruction of our system of free representative government. Our enemy would care little what form of total control appeared here after our free system was done away with. The Kremlin well knows that any other type of totalitarian government can be quickly dealt with by the Communists.

The Communists know they have two possible ways of destroying our freedom. One is the long method of infiltration and destruction from within. This method involves at least two steps; the first is government control under a system called socialism. This step would be followed fairly soon by communism and Russian domination. The other route they might choose for obtaining their objective would have the advantage of speed, destruction, chaos, and would make intermediate steps unnecessary. This plan involves a shooting war. But to the Communist destruction and military success is not enough. Our people must be forced to place themselves under dictatorship for a war emergency. If a military attack on our country failed to do this, the enemy would not achieve his objective. If there is a chance of failing, I do not believe such an attack will be made.

The dangerous situation into which we are heedlessly plunging with our present deficit spending is simply this: If this course continues we must surely, and fairly soon, reach a time when the free

government of the United States cannot borrow enough money to finance a shooting war. If war comes and we are in that position, there is only one alternative. The Federal Government must confiscate enough money, material, and labor to fight the war. If and when this should happen, the first step in the Communist objective would be won. Under such circumstances, it would be absolutely necessary for us to abandon our present free system and submit all persons and property to the absolute control of the Central Government for the period of the emergency. It is obvious, I think, that the enemy could prolong such an emergency to any length that suited its purpose.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this danger I have recited is real. It is not theoretical, nor is it imaginary.

There is only one way that this danger, which exists now and which is being magnified daily under present policies, can be relieved. We must shake ourselves out of the dream world in which we are obviously living. We must tighten our belts, make certain sacrifices in the way of Government services to which we have become accustomed, and which we like. We should cut and curtail to the most drastic limits necessary to balance the budget and begin accumulating a surplus with which to retire at least some of our present astronomical debt.

Unless we do this, if we continue as we are now heading, we are inviting disaster.

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his very original approach to this problem, especially as he recited the interest on the deficit which we are now creating. I should like to ask the gentleman if in his opinion deficit spending not only has the effect which he has outlined but also will affect the value of the American dollar in the commercial markets of the world and destroy its stability and value in that respect?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that by deficit spending we are cheapening the value of the dollar. In other words, we are taking an inflationary course at the same time that we are borrowing and sending \$3,000,000,000 to Europe to aid in the economic recovery of those countries. The essential purpose of sending this \$3,000,000,000 is to build up their dollar exchange, yet by our inflationary methods we are increasing the dollar deficit of Europe.

Mr. DOLLIVER. In other words, the policy is self-contradictory.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes; it goes around in a circle. We borrow to help out, and in borrowing we fail to help; so we cannot possibly expect to cure the dollar deficit by that means.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I compliment the gentleman again on his analysis of the situation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall devote a part of the time allotted to me

today to talk about some matters in addition to items in this bill which are also basic to the continued peace, prosperity, and happiness of every American.

When we read this one-package appropriation bill for amendments to be offered under the 5-minute rule I will offer amendments to reduce the bill and at that time I shall have more to say about specific items in the bill, especially those items pertaining to the Department of the Interior.

However, at this time I will call attention to the fact that in the 1948 Presidential campaign a few professional, political Fair Deal fakers were running loose over the 17 Western States, telling the people that the Eightieth Republican Congress had all but destroyed the reclamation program. Now to put the lie to that gang once and for all, please listen to the words of the Commissioner of Reclamation, Michael W. Straus, himself, when he appeared before the Senate Interior Appropriation Subcommittee on June 13, 1949, after 11 months and 13 days of operations under the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress, with only 17 days yet to go to complete that full fiscal year. Here are Commissioner Straus' own words; they are most enlightening. You will find them on page 2180, Senate Appropriation Subcommittee hearings for fiscal year 1950, part 2, quote:

By overcoming a myriad of difficulties more water (over 13,000,000 acre-feet) has been delivered to more land (nearly 5,000,000 acres) than in any crop year heretofore. Also, more power (17,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours) has been transmitted from reclamation generators to serve more ultimate consumers (nearly 5,000,000) than in any other calendar year. These energy sales are one-third greater than those in the prior year and bring back revenues that have increased from about twenty-three and one-half to twenty-nine and one-half million dollars.

Likewise greater progress has been made in actually building the new dams, power houses, canals, and transmission lines that are new and regenerative national assets than in any like period. On this vast construction program, works contracts amounting to \$217,000,000 have been awarded and work accomplished has exceeded \$200,000,000 as we constantly come closer to our exacting schedules. But despite this increasing scope and velocity of program, the demands for water and power continue to outstrip our program.

But it was too late, the fakers had already misled a lot of good folks out west where water is liquid gold.

So much for that. Now one of the really important things I want to talk about today is a matter which affects all the people of our Nation and that is the billions we are spending to build these great dams all over America, especially in the West, the Southwest, and more recently in the Southeastern States, all of which begin filling with silt the minute the water starts storing up behind the dam at a rapid rate, and hence before too many years have passed many of those dams will be almost worthless for flood-control purposes, irrigation, and hydro power for which they were intended.

Now what is the solution? Simply this; very few of those dams should be built until we first put into effect sufficient and proper soil and moisture conservation practices on the lands in the

entire watershed which drains into those dams. You understand, I am sure, that such a program does not only keep the priceless top soil on the land where it belongs, and out of the streams and dams where it does untold harm, but also such a program is the most effective and least costly flood prevention that can be had. Hence, many, many millions, yes billions, over a period of years, could be saved in controlling disastrous floods which occur annually in most every river, large and small, in the valleys of our Nation.

I am pleased to say that the farmers of many areas, such as in my own section of Iowa, are fully aware of these facts and they are doing something about it. But here we are appropriating hundreds of millions of the taxpayers' dollars in this bill to build a lot more dams before we do what we should do first, as I have advocated from the floor of this House year after year. We took steps to do that very thing in the 1948 session of the Eightieth Congress, for the great Missouri Valley, which covers one-sixth of the entire area of our land, and which we hoped would be a model and was intended to be a model for every other river valley, large and small, over the entire United States of America.

Under the provisions of the 1936 Flood Control Act, early examinations justified the making of a complete survey of the Missouri Valley for remedial measures. This survey, which was authorized by the Eightieth Congress, and was completed in good faith by the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service in late 1948, was submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture March 28, 1949, for transmittal to the Public Works Committee of Congress. It was generally concluded that this committee would look favorably on the survey report which called for an appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 plus to be expended over a period of 30 years to speed up soil-conservation flood-prevention work on small-stream watercourses in the Missouri Valley.

But instead of the survey being transmitted to the Public Works Committee for action, the front office of the Department of Agriculture at Washington decided to use the survey as a basis of a more comprehensive program, creating a very questionable justification to expand the program to practically all USDA agencies in the valley. To do this, the program raised the appropriation needs from a total of \$1,000,000,000 plus as called for in the original survey to about \$3,500,000,000 for the new program.

In reality, the Department of Agriculture's valley plan was a trial balloon to see how far the people of the Missouri Valley would be willing to subjugate themselves to obtain the assistance they needed to control effectively soil erosion and bring about upstream flood prevention. The extra \$2,500,000,000 was the price. If the people of the Missouri Valley sold their freedom, it would have been but the first step of a Nation-wide movement of political encroachment.

The Missouri plan was a guinea-pig effort by many of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture to solidify their position in the Missouri Valley,

create greater thought control over the people, and to make the people subservient to the political desires of a centralized government.

We can be thankful that the people of the Missouri Valley have seen what is behind the USDA front-office maneuvering. If our people had purchased the serfdom the administration's Missouri plan extols, it would have been but the first of political enslavement for people in all of the major river valleys of our Nation. Conform or you get no valley-wide flood-control and soil-conservation aid from the Federal Government is what the plan means.

This important program is yet today bogged down in the pigeonhole of the Agriculture Committee of the House and held there by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan.

There has never been a greater need for the people of our Nation to organize to fight all such efforts which would encroach on the rights and liberties of our people for the supposed purpose of valley development. All of us want to develop and conserve the natural resources of our valleys, but there are still ways this can be done which will not destroy the foundation on which our Republic has grown and prospered.

I urged that the people restudy the principles of our Government and make sure that valley development does not in any way destroy these principles.

One way we might uphold these principles is to select a number of guideposts for valley development which all of us can support. Such principles should provide for technical accuracy as well as political and economic freedom. Such guideposts can become a blueprint for valley-wide development with everyone demanding that any valley-wide development proposal first of all adhere to those principles.

In brief, such principles should include:

First. Valley development should be based on a careful evaluation of national and human needs, and should recognize the interdependency of all resources: soil, water, forest, grass, wildlife, recreational, and mineral. This will counter any valley development which might be based on specialized interests. It will also counter many of the proposals of the administration's Missouri plan, most of which was based on guesswork and opportunism.

Second. Successful valley development is dependent upon the full understanding and active participation of the people of the valley. Such development is a joint responsibility of the Nation as a whole through the Federal Government, the several States and their local units of government, and the citizens residing or engaged in farming or business in the valley.

Third. Maximum delegation of responsibilities to local government units give us the best assurance of continued maintenance of such resource programs, as well as their initial sound installation. An example of this is the work of our soil-conservation districts, which not only assures sound approach but excellent maintenance as well.

Fourth. Valley development programs should strengthen, not weaken, the position of local, county, and State governments.

The delay in getting soil-conservation and flood-prevention work underway in the Missouri Valley has become of great concern to many Senators and Congressmen since the Missouri Valley program is considered a model for soil-conservation and flood-prevention work in the other river valleys of the Nation. The Secretary of Agriculture, I hope, will yield to the demand to initiate this soil-conservation and flood-prevention work, so that work can get underway at the earliest possible date, in order that the farmers of America may save billions of dollars of all the taxpayers' money, and at the same time preserve and conserve their own precious topsoil, which they want very much to do and will do with just a little help and encouragement and cooperation from their government—local, State, and National.

Can we preserve free private enterprise for America, the keystone of our liberties? That is the question we face today.

My answer is, "Yes," if we are worthy of it in your sight and it be the will of God to save us from our own folly at this late hour. Where do we start, you ask? First, we must take stock of our debits and credits in order to ascertain about where America now stands as a going concern, and what is most needed to keep our America in business. History records there are three sure roads to national suicide—bankruptcy, dictatorship, and starvation. Bankruptcy: Is it necessary to remind the American people that every nation in the wide world that has traveled the full length of the wasteful, reckless spending route we are now traveling at breakneck speed has come to utter ruin and tyranny. Look at old Germany. A great people who enjoyed their best times when the wage earner made 50 marks a week, but they, too, followed the siren call of utopia, by a wasteful, national spending program, which finally brought a bogus, high national income, and inflation. Then the wage earner received an armful of marks each week, but it took almost all of it to buy just a few loaves of bread. Sure we can have a \$300,000,000,000 national income. Germany had a billion, trillion mark income, just as Red China has today, and just as American will have unless we stop this mad rush to financial, national suicide.

Think this one over for a minute and please remember it. If everyone in the United States cashed in all his life insurance policies the total would amount to about \$44,000,000,000, which is about what it takes to run your Government just for the year 1950. Or, if every farmer in America sold all his farm land, all his farming equipment and all his livestock, the total would amount to about \$43,000,000,000. Again this would hardly run your Government a full year. Do these figures mean anything to you? I am sure they do, but not to a lot of fellows in Washington, whom I could name. Facts are those fellows simply do not care so long as they get theirs.

Now you may ask, how can we stop it? The answer is, When America thinks and speaks up, America is safe.

So speak up Americans.

Here are some more facts: The white-collar workers, plus the blue-collar workers, plus our retired elderly folks, represent about 60 percent of our consuming public; our farmers, who consume one and one-half times more on an average than the rest of us, represent 30 percent of our consuming public; business and industry, who must add taxes to the prices of their goods or soon go broke, and a few more of us, make up the balance of around 10 percent. Remember the consumer pays all taxes in the final analysis, so I will leave it to you as to just who is paying our tax bill, and should be most vigorously opposing wasteful spending. Income taxes, withholding taxes, and hidden taxes no end, maybe you can stand it now, but the end is not in sight at this rate of Federal spending.

Private industry, taxpaying industry, is the whipping boy among the great economic planners now in Washington. And they are honeycombing throughout our country, planning and scheming ways to drive free, private, taxpaying industry to the wall. I know what I am talking about, for I have been fighting that gang ever since coming to Congress and have really been in the thick of the fighting for the past 8 years as a member of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Dictatorship: I am sure it is not necessary for us to look behind Stalin's iron curtain to know the sad story of follow the leader and his promises of security. All people who have done that now have neither liberties nor security. That we know at least.

Starvation: Thank God, the farmers of America are solving that problem by good soil conservation practices and crop rotation and other scientific farming methods. But there is yet much to be done. Let us never forget that every nation in this world that neglected to take proper care of its priceless topsoil is now at our doors crying for bread.

Also, do not forget that our national income is always about 7 times our farm income, and that for every dollar of farm income the businessman sells \$4 worth of goods and labor collects over \$4 in wages for each dollar of farm income. All wealth springs from mother earth; she is our only economic generating plant. We must never again turn off that kind of power in America. Remember, also, that we have never had a depression with good farm prices, but always a depression with poor farm prices.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased to yield to my good colleague from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I want to congratulate the gentleman and call attention to the Members of the House that the gentleman's own district is very close to being the pioneer district in the whole United States in soil conservation. I will also ask the gentleman this question if he does not believe that the correct and proper solution of flood control

is the development of the soil conservation program, particularly that part of it that builds up the fertility of the land and keeps the water on the land, rather than have it washed into the streams and rivers. It loses as much value as topsoil for the farms if it is in the streams and rivers as if it were in the Gulf of Mexico; is that not right?

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly right. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I can say that even though the gentleman comes from the capital city of Iowa he has been very active in assisting in every way possible to help the all-important program of soil conservation and every other program which is good for America over the long pull.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I am happy to yield to another one of my able colleagues from the tall corn State, where beautiful nature abounds.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I, too, wish to join in complimenting the gentleman on his very fine statement about soil conservation. I join wholeheartedly in his statements.

Is it not true that the surest way to national destruction is a loose and deficit-spending policy on the part of the Federal Government?

Mr. JENSEN. Indeed. I spoke about that a minute ago, but will now elaborate. I thank the gentleman for asking me that question.

History records as far back as you care to search that the quickest way to commit national suicide is through the bankrupt route, spending more of the people's money by the Government in control than the people can pay, until such time that they must start the printing presses rolling out the bills. Then we have uncontrolled inflated currencies, and then it is not long, as the gentleman knows, until it takes a basketful of those almost worthless bills to buy a loaf of bread. Certainly we are a long way down that road, and we had better stop. Not just look and listen, but stop. I say stop this silly, wasteful, unnecessary spending spree and save a little at least to use should a real genuine emergency come such as world war III, which is in the making this very minute and which might take an election or an act of God to avoid.

If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be the author and finisher.

Abe Lincoln said that almost 90 years ago. I believe that admonition to be just as weighty and true today as then.

In recent years, we have seen the extent to which Government has interfered in the lives of its citizens. We have been led into a time of great danger by oppressive taxation, extravagant and wasteful spending by Government, deficit financing, and a staggering national debt. And the end is not yet in sight.

Whose fault is it? We have allowed the cost of Government to grow and grow, year by year, in peacetimes like these until we are consuming nearly one-third of our income just to govern ourselves.

What is the reason? Have the American people lost their capacity for self-

government? Must the cost of Government be so great as to endanger our national existence?

Must peacetime taxation placed upon our people be so burdensome as to destroy all incentive for industrial growth and economic progress?

Must the people give up to Government such a large share of their earnings that they are deprived of all opportunity to get ahead?

The greatness of America was not built by Government spending. It was not created in legislative halls. It was not produced by the enactment of laws which led people to believe that they were getting something for nothing.

The greatness of America is ours because of the toil and sweat, and the inventive genius of generations of courageous, industrious, self-reliant Americans. They were willing to work and sacrifice and save to build economic security for themselves, for their families, for their communities, and for their country.

And they did not export jobs as we are doing today under a system of tariff reductions that permit the importation of cheap foreign goods through a so-called reciprocal trade agreement at the discretion of one man which has caused whole industries in our country to be shut down and our workers thrown out of work. We now have not only a national socialist philosophy at work in our country, but a global concept of this system. This—in spite of the fact that those governments which have tried socialism over a period of years have turned their backs on it.

How else can we recognize the Trojan horse of socialism which is being offered to the American people? We have been told that we can produce a \$300,000,000,000 economy, providing jobs for everyone without any large increase in taxes. It sounds good, does it not? And it is good, provided our liberties, as we know them, are not sacrificed in its achievement.

But, we are presented a 5-year plan. Where have we heard of 5-year plans before? Russia has had a series of them. Germany had them. Italy had them. They all ended the same way—starvation, misery, dictatorship, and inflation. Yes, they had a high national income, but it was a bogus income. Their currency was not worth the paper it was written on. A basket full of bills was needed to buy bread. That was not so good. Sure, those folks were all promised utopia. All that was required was for them to bow to wasteful spending by the leaders. Does that song sound familiar to you?

What else did these three dictatorships have in common? They are all socialist states. Socialism and communism are sisters under the skin. Remember the official name of Russia is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

How did all of this start? Let us take a brief look at how the Trojan horse of socialism took over in England and then show the deadly peril here. First, they took over all banking, then all electric power; the people were then told, be good or you get neither money nor electric power; the rest was easy. Remember this, few Socialists of modern times will admit that they are Socialists.

The large majority of American Socialists abhor the name while doing the deed. They call themselves economic planners, and other high-sounding titles. But their objectives are all the same—the regimentation of the people into robots to obey the commands of the big brains fastened onto the payrolls of the Government.

In England, the Socialists masking under the name of the Labor Party were a small group at first. They fastened themselves onto the larger Liberal Party and bored from within. They worked slowly and began to take more and more power over the Liberal Party until in this last election the Liberal Party was practically out of existence. They came into power with catch slogans such as "jobs for all," "security from the cradle to the grave" and other vote bait. Then the real planners of the so-called welfare state got to work. I need not go into any details as to what has happened to once mighty England. You know she is bankrupt and living off the dole of the United States, the last and most powerful free enterprise country in the world. How long can we take it? But you say it could not happen here? Listen to this. There is a bill, H. R. 2756, called the Economic Stability Act of 1949. It is part of the 5-year American Socialist plan. It sounds good, does it not? Everyone wants economic stability. But this bill gives the President the right to go into any business with Government funds to compete with any private business. Last year they wanted to put the Government into the steel business. Under this bill, the President can also channel scarce materials and facilities into what he may deem essential production and uses. If the socialist planners feel that your business is not essential, they can put you out of business by simply refusing you materials or plant facilities. You could also be subpoenaed in person with your records and books and if you refused, be in contempt of court and suffer the penalty. This bill permits the President to fix prices. I have not time to go into all phases of this bill, but these are a few examples to show you how far down the road to socialism a powerful, well-organized clique is determined to take America.

The Brannan farm bill is another example. High prices to farmers and low prices to consumers also sounds good, but even the author himself or his experts either cannot or dare not estimate the cost to the taxpayers of this one; and my advice to all young men planning to be farmers is to learn accountancy good, to keep the numerous records and reports which are necessary if this plan ever went through, in order to keep himself out of jail, for there is a jail penalty in the 15 pages of penalties written in this bill which would regiment farmers beyond anything Americans ever dreamed would happen here.

The time has come when we must abandon our easy-going attitude toward regimentation and needless and wasteful Government spending. We have been presented this year with the largest peacetime budget in our history, plus the fact that we will have a 1950 fiscal deficit of at least five or six billion dollars.

What are we going to do about it?

We must give the people a clear-cut choice of the issue confronting us today. Let those who are for a Socialist state get into their corner. Those who are for our free-enterprise competitive system get over in our corner. Let us fight it out on clear-cut issues. Anyone who can think and read and who has followed the goings-on in Washington for a long, long time can have no doubt as to where the road ahead will lead, unless we do a quick about face.

We must stand for a republic in which the elected representatives and public officials are servants of the people and not their masters.

Public opinion, when aroused, is yet the strongest force in this land. It is your job to see to it that the people understand the truth—understand that eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty—and that our freedom be preserved.

We must stand up fearlessly against the folly of a domestic program that teaches people to depend upon government for all good things in life, remembering that Lincoln said: "You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence."

We must constantly warn against the dangers of a Federal policy that deceives the sane of mind and strong of body into thinking that they got something for nothing. And we must ever remember our duty and responsibility as Americans to the aged and infirm, to the widows and orphans, and our disabled veterans who are paying the greatest price for our wars. This we must do and can do unless we spend all America into bankruptcy needlessly.

We must place, where it properly belongs, full responsibility for secret agreements which betrayed free governments into socialistic and communistic enslavement.

We must fight here against the drift into a socialistic pattern of government because that system has brought death and destruction to every country where it has been attempted.

In conclusion I ask, Mr. Chairman, what will it gain America or the world if we commit national suicide by the bankruptcy route? Will the prophecy of that ruthless Communist leader, Lenin, come true, when he said shortly before he died just a few years ago, "Russia will force America to spend herself into bankruptcy, then we will take her over"? I pray God forbid.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was very much interested a few minutes ago when the gentleman referred to the fact that if what he was talking about continued to go on in America, Government officials will become the masters and the people the servants. In connection with that, I heard the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] this afternoon quote from a former President of the United States, I believe it was President Cleveland, who stated in substance that the purpose of the people is to support the Government and not the purpose of the Government to support

the people. My question of the gentleman is, is it not a fact that if we continue the way we are going, with the Government from time to time assuming more and more the role of supporting the people, rather than expecting the people to support it, that it can ultimately lead only to one thing, namely, where the Government becomes the master and the people the servants? And when that time arrives all the freedom and liberty of the American people will be gone.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course the gentleman is exactly right. Too many of the American people have been bitten by this "gimme" bug, expecting the Federal Government, which has no money except what it collects from the people, to loan them or give them what they think they need in order to get along in this great, wonderful, free Nation of ours.

I had not intended to take this much time, but I do want to take a little more time to give you a little idea of things my father and mother went through in order to come to this great free America, so they and their children could enjoy the blessing of this free new America of ours which they had read and dreamed about.

My father was a stablehand on a plantation in Denmark. My mother was a milkmaid on the same plantation. They met and married and four children were born over there in Denmark. They knew about this great free America, it beckoned to them, and in 1880 father came over. He worked a couple of years to earn enough money to send for mother and the four girls. They were poor folk. It was tough going, but they were happy. The day after my mother arrived at her new home near Cedar Rapids, Iowa, she walked a mile and a half and did a washing for a quarter. As time went on 9 more Americans arrived, making 13 children, and they too were happy and free Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware that our earliest settlers experienced greater hardship than did my parents, and my parents knew full well that they were the beneficiaries of those rugged pioneers.

The point I want to make is that with all of the struggles my parents went through they so dearly loved America that when anyone would even mention the fact that there might be something wrong with America or the Constitution or the Bill of Rights or George Washington or Thomas Jefferson or Ben Franklin or Abraham Lincoln or any of the rest of these great statesmen—our founding fathers—my parents would become furious. They loved America; they instilled that love in their children's hearts, and they also instilled in our hearts and in our souls the principle that there was no substitute for work and square dealing. I have been raised on those principles, just as you have, my colleagues. I am simply reciting a story which, no doubt, many of you here could duplicate, for the simple purpose of showing how in the last 20 years certain fundamental principles of our way of life have changed to the detriment of peace of mind and the true happiness of our people.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I presume that the gentleman's father and mother never received a dime from the Government of the United States in raising the splendid family of which the gentleman is so able a member, and I presume further that the gentleman was brought up with the idea of thrift and that his whole nature rebels against the thought of the great American Government's overspending itself by \$5,000,000,000 in this fiscal year.

Mr. JENSEN. Never a dime did Uncle Sam send them, and the only times my parents saw a Government official was when they saw their postmaster, or in later years, their rural mail carrier, John Willie Cannon; he was Uncle Sam to us.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take any more time except to say that I pray to God that the American people will, if they have not already, waken to the fact that they live in the only free land which remains in this world today and that we have groups all around us, well organized, who are working day and night, to destroy everything that my parents, and your parents, and you and I hold dear; and because of that we will do something about it, so that your children and my children and generations yet unborn will never have reason to point their finger at one of us and say: "You helped to destroy, or you did nothing about preserving, that great free America of yesteryear which was so richly blessed by God in heaven."

Now I must conclude by saying that I am deeply concerned, just as I know most of you must be about the road we are traveling and to plead with every good American in our land to stand up and fight as never before or we shall surely lose the God-given liberties as we know them in America. The pitfalls ahead are now in plain sight for all to see, if we will but open our eyes, look well, and think through.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

"YES-MAN" PSYCHOLOGY IS RUINING OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I know that all of you enjoyed Chairman VINSON's comments on the question of national defense. There is no man in the Congress of the United States who is entitled to more credit for the building of our national defense than is the gentleman from Georgia. His long career here in Congress as a champion for our armed forces properly labels him as a spokesman for those of us who believe that the security of our country can best be protected by an adequate national defense.

To further Chairman VINSON's discussion of national defense, I should like to consume the time allotted me in discussing what I consider one of the most dangerous practices that has ever been permitted to develop. This practice which is commonly referred to as "yes man" psychology concerns information given to congressional committees by spokesmen of our armed services only after it has been screened by the head

of their department or by someone in the Defense Establishment. It simply means that congressional committees are not getting first-hand information on the needs and the state of our national defense by those qualified by position and experience.

There are two factors in this "yes-man" psychology that brought about this dangerous practice. First, directives issued by the President and heads of departments, and second, the threat of reprisal against those spokesmen for our Defense Establishment who dare to speak their own mind when called upon to do so by various congressional committees.

This practice of telling spokesmen what they can or cannot say before congressional committees had its beginning on November 15, 1946, when President Truman issued a memorandum in which he said:

I have noticed that on several occasions, certain department and agency officials have shown a tendency to seek from Congress larger appropriations than were contemplated in official budget estimates.

Then the President said this to the Director of the Budget:

When you notify the heads of the various departments and agencies of the amounts to be included in the 1948 budget for their activities I wish you would include a reminder that I shall expect them and their subordinates to support only the President's estimates in hearings and discussions with Members of Congress.

This "yes-man" psychology really came into being in the spring of 1947 when the House Armed Services Committee of which I am a member, behind closed doors and off the record, had to extract from the civilian heads of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces information as to how much money was necessary in their minds for the fiscal year 1949 to give the American people the type of an Army, Navy, and Air Force the civilian heads felt necessary. Very reluctantly, and with red faces, the civilian Secretaries gave the committee the information concerning the following budget requests for 1949.

Budget requests, 1949

[In millions]

	Army	Navy	Air Force
Amount requested.....	\$3,978	\$5,310	\$4,422
Present request.....	3,013	3,510	3,054
Difference.....	965	1,800	1,368

Since 1948 much has been said about the fact that the Bureau of the Budget was requesting appropriations that were far less than the amounts the civilian secretaries felt absolutely necessary. This brought about denials on the part of the administration and others who spoke for the administration.

In addition to these denials it was freely said that spokesmen for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps could appear before Congress and give any information they were asked for and without any restrictions.

Well, we all know what happened to Admiral Denfeld after being given as-

surance by the Secretary of the Navy that he was free to testify and to give any information he wished without fear of reprisal.

On the heels of Admiral Denfeld's dismissal we have now the transfer of Rear Adm. Joel T. Boone, chief of the Joint Plans and Action Division, Office of Medical Services, Defense Department who violated this "yes-man" psychology when he spoke his own mind before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services.

It is said that there were plans to transfer Admiral Boone beforehand. But from the hearings of the subcommittee, it is learned that the day he left his office to come to Capitol Hill to testify, he was literally told that he should be careful what he said and to keep in mind his fitness report had not yet been submitted. To any fair-minded person, the action in transferring Admiral Boone is nothing more than another act of reprisal.

According to the Associated Press, and I quote:

Both Admiral Sherman and his admirals appeared so reluctant to quarrel with the budget handed them by Defense Secretary Johnson that a House subcommittee held a separate hearing to determine whether they had been gagged. Of course, Secretary of the Navy Matthews denied that they had been.

Anyone who reads the hearings on this bill which concerns naval appropriations will understand that Admiral Sherman, the Chief of Naval Operations, was not satisfied with the budget although his remarks were very guarded and exceedingly discreet.

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to say that as chairman of the subcommittee handling military appropriations that no special hearing was held in regard to any reluctance on the part of witnesses to express themselves freely before the committee. It is true that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], a member of the subcommittee, did express the feeling that some of the witnesses were reluctant. My own view is—and I think this view would be sustained by an investigation of the record—that the men who testified before our subcommittee testified with every degree of freedom, and I invite the Members of the House to read the testimony of Air Force and naval witnesses in which it is shown that they took violent disagreement with certain budget estimates, and not in any case did any witness for any of the national defense departments refuse to answer any questions asked them. It is true that generally speaking they did not volunteer to advocate expenditures over the budget. However, I think they almost did advocate expenditures over the budget voluntarily, but generally speaking if a Member said, "What is your own personal view?" those views, I think, were given in complete freedom, and I want to say for Admiral Sherman that if there has been an abler man in Navy uniform on Capitol Hill in recent years, I have not seen him. I think he

is a remarkable man and I think he gave us his best judgment, and if you read his testimony, you can see that he was speaking from out of his heart and as an American patriot. I believe we need men of this type in positions of military responsibility. If the Members will just read the hearings, they will see at once that it was not a "yes-man" proposition. The men expressed their views.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I read the hearings, and it is not my intention to be critical of Admiral Sherman. I know him to be a very gallant and capable naval officer, yet the quotes that appeared in the press since the hearings indicate definitely that he guarded his words very carefully.

The country as a whole is fed up with this "yes-man" psychology and the newspapers of the country editorially have this to say about screened information.

From the March 2, 1950, issue of the Christian Science Monitor we read:

Purposed or not, the effect is to impose a gag on the services and to nullify the investigative powers of the representatives of the people.

The Washington Evening Star on March 3, 1950, had this to say regarding the shoddy treatment of Admiral Denfeld in an editorial titled "For Free and Honest Testimony":

Many persons inside and outside the Pentagon will agree with the committee's finding that the summary dismissal of Admiral Denfeld from his top-level Navy post was a blow against representative government, in that it tends to intimidate witnesses and hence discourages the rendering of free and honest testimony to the Congress.

Continuing, the editorial says:

If the effect should be lasting—and it is difficult to eradicate so intangible a reaction—Congress and the American people cannot be sure of learning the true state of our military strength. Congress has a right to receive, and defense authorities have an obligation to give free and honest facts and opinions on the Nation's security, however distasteful or embarrassing the testimony may be to someone at the Pentagon.

In regard to the transfer of Admiral Joel T. Boone, the Washington Evening Star on March 9, 1950, commented as follows:

But ordinary courtesy, to say nothing of the cause of good service relations, would have justified more considerate treatment of these key officers in a matter so vitally concerning their services. * * * Coming so close in the wake of the Denfeld ouster, however, the unfortunate effect will be to create a "yes-man" psychology at the Pentagon that is not good for national defense.

I know that every Member of this House realizes what is going on. The issue is simply whether or not our country's Defense Establishment is to be controlled by us who are the elected representatives of the people or by a small clique of political appointees.

In my opinion the Congress of the United States should take action to eliminate this "yes-man" psychology and make certain that we get nothing but first-hand information on our national defense and not screened information. Congress is also entitled to correct information but under the present policy, we do not know whether the spokesman

is telling the full story, or what he has been ordered to come up and tell us.

I agree with the Washington Evening Star that "yes-man" psychology at the Pentagon is not good for national defense.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true also that Admiral Sherman, when he made his request for the Navy, made many of the same requests Admiral Denfeld had already made? Those requests had been frowned upon. The sacrifice of Admiral Denfeld and the outraged feelings of the country at his removal and the weakening of the Navy were responsible for the Navy's getting as much as it is.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is true. We hear much talk about submarine warfare. Admiral Denfeld is a highly qualified and experienced submarine officer. While Chief of Naval Operations he launched the present submarine campaign that is being conducted in the way of planning and schooling at Key West, Fla. A lot of the credit for the submarine program belongs to Admiral Denfeld.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, let me first congratulate the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the committee in the adoption of the one-package procedure of making appropriations. This is indeed a great step forward. Under that procedure, with well-informed public opinion behind us in the consideration of the bill, great savings will be made.

More important, indeed most important, the savings which will be made and the economies thereby obtained, will be the result of careful consideration and deliberation in the Committee of the Whole House and will more truly represent the will of the Congress itself, rather than the will of the committee. It is well to effect economies, it is imperative that economies be effected, but those economies should be the result of careful planning and consideration and not the result of a wielding of the ax indiscriminately. The procedure now being followed will lead to the elimination of unwise cuts and, I hope, the adoption of wiser reductions.

The distinguished chairman of this committee and the ranking member of the committee in affording us the opportunity for unlimited debate before taking up the bill chapter by chapter have rendered a great public service. This gives us the opportunity of pointing out items where, in the words of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] yesterday, the action of the committee if not revised may result in our being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

I take this time now to discuss one such reduction so that it may be given careful consideration between now and the time when that particular item will come up for discussion and consideration in the reading of the bill. The money involved is very small compara-

tively speaking, but the principle involved is of the utmost importance to the Congress, to my State, and, in fact, to the entire Nation. It involves a question of policy of the utmost significance and importance in our dealings with the Indian problem.

In order that it may be better understood let me first give you a little of the background. With the appointment of Dr. Nichols as Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and with the selection of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, a new direction was given to the policy respecting our solution of the administration of Indian Affairs, a policy which has for its goal the ultimate integration of the health services of the Indians with the health services of the various States, and following that the integration of other services such as those in the field of education, soil conservation, and so forth. This is a goal in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, on which Dr. Nichols rendered a great service in the task force dealing with the administration of Indian affairs.

As part and parcel of that new policy very definite steps have been taken in various parts of the country toward enlisting the cooperation of the States, counties, and non-Indian communities. In New Mexico we are fortunate in having two able, unselfish, and public-spirited citizens in position to formulate and implement that policy. One of those is William Brophy who served as Commissioner and had started pointing the Indian policy toward that goal when he unfortunately was stricken by illness which kept him bedridden for over a year. He has now recovered and as attorney for the United Pueblos Indian Agency at Albuquerque, has given his full cooperation to another young man, Mr. Eric Hagberg, the superintendent of that agency, who thoroughly believes in working himself out of a job as he often says in his many addresses before civic and service clubs in his efforts to enlist cooperation by the State and its communities. He advocates the taking advantage of every opportunity for steps, small though they may be, leading toward the complete amalgamation and integration of Indian services with the services of the State and the community, and relieving the Indian Office from the responsibility of maintaining and operating such services.

In line with that policy he has been able to enlist the support and cooperation of the people in my State to a degree never before attained.

Two years ago Albuquerque and the county of Bernalillo took the lead in obtaining enactment by the State legislature of an act authorizing counties and municipalities to levy property taxes for the operation of hospitals, and also providing for cooperation with the Federal Government in the matter of hospitals by joint action.

The United Pueblos Indian Agency had a tract of useless barren land on a small portion of which is located the Indian Tuberculosis Sanatorium. Though the county could have obtained by donation any number of sites, they nego-

tiated with Mr. Hagberg for the acquisition of a part of that lot on which to build the county hospital right next to the Indian sanatorium. A bill was enacted and passed making that authority available. In the meantime the county had floated \$1,000,000 worth of bonds which were sold in 1948 and the money is now on deposit in the Albuquerque banks. The county is negotiating for other contributions from the city, the State, and other agencies, so as to make this hospital as up-to-date and adequate as possible.

In the same spirit and pursuant to the same policy Mr. Hagberg, Mr. Brophy, and other public-spirited citizens invited the county officials to negotiate for a combined county-city and Indian hospital.

After weeks of negotiations an agreement was reached which would make it possible for the county to build a 225- or 250-bed hospital instead of one-half that size through cooperation of the Indian Service by way of contributions for the construction of the hospital.

It should be said right here that the Indian Service desperately needs such a hospital for the care of the Pueblos under its jurisdiction, and one which may be also available for the two Apache Tribes in addition to the 19 or 20 pueblos. This arrangement would make it possible for the construction of one substantial hospital institution instead of two small and inadequate plants.

The bill providing for this combined enterprise was drafted and sent to the Indian Office in Washington for approval. Again it was subjected to careful scrutiny and study by the Indian Office and introduced in both the House and the Senate. Thereafter it was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and there again subjected to careful consideration. The Bureau of the Budget offered certain amendments somewhat onerous to the county-city authorities and more advantageous to the Federal Government. Those recommendations were adopted by the Public Lands Committee of the House, which studied the bill and unanimously reported it out. The bill was enacted and the President in signing the bill took the unusual step of making a public statement, from which I quote, as follows:

I wish to express my full approval of the basic objective of this legislation, which is to encourage the integration of hospital facilities for the care of Indians and non-Indians in the same community.

This proposal does fall into the category of new enterprises, and it is in a sense a new precedent in the administration of Indian affairs, but it is a precedent which has the approval of all those in the Nation who are anxious to get away from the everlasting wasteful and inadequate attempt on the part of the Indian Service to construct, carry on, and operate hospitals for the sick and needy Indian population.

Since it is a new function, and in line with postponing new expenditures wherever possible, and because the subcommittee was not sufficiently familiar, I am sure, with all the implications, it postponed action by eliminating it from the

appropriations approved and requested by the Bureau of the Budget. I am happy to learn that members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling these items are giving the matter new and careful study, and I am as certain as I can be that by doing so they will convince themselves of the wisdom and desirability of amending the bill so as to include the \$1,500,000 authorized for this hospital. They will inevitably come to the conclusion that this is not a postponement, but that the action of the committee if not reversed on the floor will constitute not a postponement but a nullification of the action of the legislative committee and of the Congress in this matter, and this is the thing that is tragic about it.

The county authorities have over a million dollars on hand lying in the bank on which they are paying interest to the bondholders. In reliance on this understanding with the Indian Service, and with the Congress I should say, they have postponed their much needed construction of a county hospital until now. Unless these moneys are made available they will be compelled to proceed with their own little hospital, which cannot be as adequate and economical as a larger one, and eventually the Indian Service will have to built its own hospital which cannot be as adequate and economical as the one joint hospital here proposed. That being the case, the action of the legislative committee and of the Congress in passing this bill will go for naught, because once the county has constructed its own little hospital the bill will be of no use to them or to the Indian Service.

What is more, a blow will have been dealt to this farsighted and intelligent policy which cannot be carried on except by enlisting the cooperation of State, county, and community agencies at the right moment, and by living up to those policy agreements entered into between them.

Let me quote from a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] at the time the authorization bill was under consideration, which I consider most significant and which ought to be heeded, and heeded now. In the consideration of the bill, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] said:

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to say, also, Mr. Chairman, for the record, that one of the greatest handicaps for the Indian Bureau working out some of these cooperative arrangements, I think, is a lack of getting through appropriations on time. It makes it very difficult to work out these cooperative arrangements with local people when appropriations are delayed and uncertain. I think that is quite a handicap to the Indian Bureau in that regard, and I wish that some sort of a plan might be promoted to give local people a little better assurance in the future as to what we will do in here, so far as appropriations are concerned.

Let me also quote from a letter addressed by my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MILES] to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs on March 21. He said:

The action of the Appropriations Committee will have the effect of nullifying this

effort which had the careful consideration of the legislative committee. The county which has had its money ready for 2 years will be compelled to proceed to build its own smaller hospital, which will not be adequate to care for the Indian population of the surrounding pueblos. I have thought it wise to call this to the attention of the members of our committee since it is of such vital importance not only to me as Representative from New Mexico but to the policy which the Indian Affairs Subcommittee has been gradually establishing and which is in line with recommendations of the Hoover Commission. This is a policy which meets with the approval of all thinking people who are anxious to bring about the end of segregation of Indians in health and educational services.

At the proper time during the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule, an amendment will be offered to restore this small item of \$1,500,000 as the Federal contribution of the Government toward the building of this combined hospital.

The construction of this hospital in the long run will save far more than the initial contribution. It will give the Indians an adequate hospital, fully equipped, with expert staffing and supervision. It will make available to them the expert medical advice and research available in Albuquerque.

Furthermore, under the amendment suggested by the Bureau of the Budget and adopted by the committee and the Congress, the authority to contribute toward the operation and maintenance of the beds used by the Indians will expire in 1954. At that time, a complete report will be issued, with 2 or 3 years' actual experience behind us, and in the light of that report a new authorization will be adopted for the operation and maintenance of those beds. If the contributions are inadequate they may be increased in fairness to everybody, and if they have been liberal, including the construction contribution, they will be trimmed. The county authorities and the businessmen and public-spirited citizens who have been working toward the construction of this hospital, in agreeing to this requirement placed their faith and trust in the good sense of Congress. So certain are they and all of us that this experiment will be so significant and so advantageous to the Indian Service that we have no fear as to future action of the Indian Service and the Congress in this respect.

However, if this appropriation is not granted now we will have been penny-wise and pound-foolish. If we do not provide the funds for this purpose now, we will have effectively nullified the law authorizing it. If we do that it will be an affront to the Committee on Indian Affairs which worked out and reported that bill, and an affront to the House and to the Congress and to the President who placed the stamp of their approval on this act. Furthermore, we will have forevermore discouraged the States, counties, and white communities from entering into the same arrangements in the future and we will have taken a retrogressive step in the direction of forever compelling the segregation of the Indians.

I sincerely hope that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the members of the subcommittee, will be able to see their way clear to accept the amendment when it is offered after the Easter holidays.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, the most important single issue confronting the second session of the Eighty-first Congress is the question of public expenditures. The American people are appalled to learn that after the passage of the appropriations for the fiscal year of 1950, the Federal Government was overspending its estimated income by about \$6,000,000,000. The constituents of every Member are alarmed that in a period of peacetime prosperity, the Federal outgo exceeds the income by so huge an amount.

There is an instinctive and very proper revulsion against deficit spending. In wartime, it is true, borrowing to meet huge expenses may be unavoidable. But with a heavy tax burden weighing upon the taxpayers, taking nearly a third of the national income, and the shooting war over for 5 years, it seems absurd that the Government should still be going in the hole. Such a situation reflects directly upon the Congress, and specifically upon the House of Representatives, where all revenue bills must originate according to the Constitution, and where appropriation bills also originate.

The responsibility for balancing the budget and cutting appropriations rests squarely upon the majority party in the Congress. They are in control of the committees which formulate the legislation and the spending. The majority is in charge of the kind of legislation that reaches the floor of the House for consideration.

Of course an important factor in the whole situation is the effect of deficit spending on the value of the dollar. History is replete with economic disasters resulting from wasteful spending and loose fiscal policy. Overspending is a major disservice to the people of our country. It is not only a contradiction of the long and well-established principles of thrift, but it destroys the value of the American dollar in a completely insidious and concealed way.

Deficit spending is the surest path to disastrous inflation. No other means is so effective in draining away the purchasing power of the people. Indeed, our own economy has undergone this very process in the last 10 years. The value of the dollar if considered as 100 cents in 1939, now has a purchasing power of less than 60 cents. This is the direct result of monetary inflation.

It not only destroys money values, but inflation also robs the farmer, the pensioner, the person employed with a fixed and regular income. It also destroys the standing and stability of the American economy and currency as related to international affairs. Today the American

dollar is recognized as the soundest currency of our times. It will not be so for long, unless this House puts the financial affairs of this country in order. Currencies of great stability often have been destroyed by the improvidence and carelessness of those charged with the responsibility of maintaining its stability. Examples of such destruction are too recent in world history to require elaboration.

What is the answer to the problem? It may be said that our Appropriation Committee has worked to reduce the budget in drafting this omnibus bill. But it is apparent that the objective—a balanced budget—has not been attained. So the job is to curtail these expenditures further. There is no other answer.

It is and will be a painful process. It will hurt some segments of our people who desire sums of Federal money for worthy objectives. But it is a task that must be done—it is imperative that the budget be balanced.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time for two purposes: First, I notice the provision on page 193 of the bill authorizing the Department of Agriculture to pay out of section 32 funds transportation and handling charges on surplus commodities owned by the Department or any of its instrumentalities or agencies for the purpose of distribution to public-welfare agencies.

It is my understanding that this particular amendment was sponsored by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and I certainly want to commend him for undertaking this work. I believe that he is entitled to the gratitude of literally thousands of people who may benefit, and I believe will benefit from this constructive procedure. I wish to ask him a couple of questions in connection with it. Does not the gentleman believe that we might well give consideration, since we now have in the recently enacted agricultural bill certain wider language and a larger number of groups, to whom this distribution should be made, that we might consider an amendment which would broaden the provisions of his amendment so as to include, for instance, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and our private nonprofit institutions, such as hospitals, orphanages, schools, penal and mental institutions as well as possibly private welfare organizations, for the assistance of needy persons outside of the United States? I have in mind in that connection the excellent work that is being done by many of our private organizations. For instance, if we could provide some of this for the starving Chinese, one organization is equipped to distribute it and would do it immediately through their missionaries who are located behind the iron curtain. It would have a tremendously good psychological effect as far as we are concerned.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. First of all, may I say to the gentleman that I thank him for the kindly reference he has made to what I was able to accomplish in the subcommittee. He will also

recall that as early as last January and even earlier, both the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Minnesota were working along these lines trying to figure out how to get this food to the people who needed it and how to prevent our entire price-support program from suffering because of the stigma being cast upon it as a result of the deterioration of the perishable-food stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. I asked the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, when he appeared before us on January 12: "Why can you not pay the freight and handling charges on these perishable commodities to points where they can be distributed?" I had in mind, for example, that we could give a few dozen eggs each month to the thousands in every State on old-age assistance. We could help them to stretch their paltry average budget of \$44 a month by allotting to them also such surplus foods as butter, fruits, and potatoes. We could help people with low income to give their children an adequate diet by distributing this good food instead of permitting it to spoil. Mr. Brannan, in reply, maintained he did not have the authority to pay freight and handling charges upon these surplus perishables.

I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Committee on Appropriations, of course, has no basic reason or right to legislate, but I did convince my subcommittee and the chairman of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], very kindly agreed with me, that it would be only right to place such a provision in our bill in order to call to the attention of the Congress this most serious problem. The opponents of our farm-price-support programs have seized upon the potato and egg surpluses as an excuse to try to wreck our entire program. They do not stop to realize that the entire price-support program has not cost the taxpayers over \$100,000,000 yearly since 1940, but on the other hand has done much to hold up our national income.

May I say to the gentleman in direct answer to his question: Yes, I think my amendment needs broadening considerably. A month ago I said on the floor that I personally would be very glad to withdraw my amendment and cooperate in any possible way to help in getting this job done. It makes no difference to me as to whose amendment it is. What I do want is to see this huge quantity of food distributed to people who need it.

At this time I want to commend the gentleman for his insistence during the past 3 months in seeing that something is done toward curing this stigma to our farm price-support program and at the same time helping thousands of children in his district get enough to eat.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman and I shall place in the RECORD this evening two forms of amendments which I know the gentleman will study. I would appreciate any suggestions he may care to make as to their wisdom. If he feels that either can be improved upon I will try to do that. If he feels they are a constructive approach toward accom-

plishing what he and I have in mind I would appreciate his support of one of them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman realizes, of course, that whatever we do is subject to a point of order here on the floor.

Mr. HESELTON. I realize that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But I cannot conceive, may I say to the gentleman, that any Member of the House of Representatives will assume the responsibility of getting up here and objecting to a provision in this bill which attempts to make available these tremendous quantities of surplus perishable products to the people in America who need that food.

Mr. HESELTON. That will be a tremendous responsibility for any individual Member to take and I hope we will not be confronted with that situation.

I now include the text of the first amendment which I have prepared:

At line 21, after the citation (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), strike out the balance of the sentence and insert "and out of funds made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation transportation and handling charges on surplus commodities owned by the Department or any of its instrumentalities or agencies for the purpose of distribution in the order of priority set forth: First, to school-lunch programs, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Federal, State, and local tax-supported institutions, such as hospitals, orphanages, schools, penal and mental institutions, and public-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy Indians and other needy persons; second, to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States; third, to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons outside the United States; fourth, to intergovernmental or international nonprofit welfare agencies, for assistance to needy persons outside the United States."

You will note that this uses the identical language of the omnibus appropriation bill, provides for payments out of funds made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation and then sets forth four categories of recipients, being those mentioned in the recent conference report as to the disposition of surplus potatoes.

Finally, I submit a further amendment which seeks to combine the language of the conference report on the disposition of surplus potatoes, of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and then provides, as has been done in other proposed legislation, for the Secretary to make a determination that such commodities are in ample supply over the necessary reserves and then a provision for the payment out of the equivalent of 6 months' storage charges to cover the cost of transportation, with the proviso suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] when we last discussed this matter:

Page 193, line 18, strike out lines 18 through 24 inclusive, and insert "In order to prevent the waste of food commodities acquired through price-support operations which are found to be in danger of loss through deterioration or spoilage before they can be disposed of in normal domestic channels without impairment of the price-support program, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation

are authorized and directed to make available such commodities as follows in the order of priority set forth: First, to school-lunch programs, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Federal, State, and local tax-supported institutions, such as hospitals, orphanages, schools, penal and mental institutions, and public-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy Indians and other needy persons; second, to private-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States; third, to private-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons outside the United States; fourth, to intergovernmental or international nonprofit welfare agencies, for assistance to needy persons outside the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture shall first determine that such commodities are in ample supply over and above such reserves as may be required and deemed in the public interest. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Corporation shall make any such commodities available at no cost at point of use

within the United States or at shipside at port of embarkation. The Secretary and the Corporation may pay as against handling and transportation costs in making delivery up to the equivalent of 6 months' storage costs on any such commodities turned over: *Provided*, That no transportation or handling charges shall be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation or Department of Agriculture if in so doing it would lower the total amount of agricultural commodities acquired by any institution or organization through the normal channels of trade and commerce."

I think it might be useful to have a tabulation of data developed from the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of December 31, 1949, and in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations on which the gentleman from Minnesota is such an able and persuasive a member.

Item for immediate use	Quantities and units	Cost	Carrying charges fiscal 1949 ¹	Carrying charges first half of fiscal 1950 ¹
Butter.....	98,675,801 pounds.....	\$61,003,323.06	\$37,143	\$832,778
Cheese.....	23,935,057 pounds.....	8,030,266.80		173,277
Dried milk.....	259,801,803 pounds.....	33,003,319.68	559,712	1,472,899
Prunes.....	49,985,455 pounds.....	5,006,203.64	416,315	1,208,459
Raisins.....	22,972,380 pounds.....	2,210,133.26	318,457	612,942
Edible dried beans.....	4,850,795 hundredweight.....	42,859,926.40	1,108,233	1,578,449
Rice.....	431,820 hundredweight.....	2,936,252.60	1,419	602,837
Dried eggs.....	76,433,954 pounds.....	98,645,444.68	1,272,918	1,089,537
Turkeys.....	725,480 pounds.....	300,173.80	465	2,681
Canned Mexican meat.....	49,445,878 pounds.....	12,468,074.26	No data	No data
Potatoes.....	2,199 hundredweight.....	2,864.14	35,358.631	1,654,567
Dried peas.....	2,048 hundredweight.....	10,306.32	10,100	563,455
Soybeans.....	3,028,865 bushels.....	7,497,729.94	1,007,585	993,247
	190,981 bushels.....	251,848.90		
Total.....			40,991,008	\$ 10,785,128

¹ Pt. 5, Hearings before Subcommittee, Appropriations, Agriculture, p. 1419.
² \$1,797,521 per month or \$59,917 per day.

Commodity	Quantities and units	Cost	Carrying charges, fiscal 1949	Carrying charges, fiscal 1950 through Dec. 31, 1949
Peanuts, farmers' stock.....	70,594,445 pounds.....	\$7,440,793.50	\$866,735	\$211,561
Peanuts, shelled.....	2,131,420 pounds.....	314,041.88	1,850,543	615,077
Soybeans.....	3,119,846 bushels.....	7,749,578.84	1,907,585	993,247
Wheat flour.....	18,470,000 pounds.....	822,853.62		
Grain sorghum.....	6,331,299 hundredweight.....	17,739,460.92	3,768,114	3,145,399
Potato starch.....	10,632,658 pounds.....	630,095.76	116,392	31,808
Fats and oils:				
Linseed oil.....	418,298,054 pounds.....	118,228,415.79	2,229,004	1,090,041
Menhaden fish oil.....	138,560 pounds.....	10,587.16		
Peanut oil.....	318,065 pounds.....	39,599.10		
Soybean oil.....	15,960,620 pounds.....	1,613,480.15	1,907,585	993,247
Total.....	434,715,299 pounds.....	119,892,082.20	4,136,589	2,083,288
Barley.....	24,641,329 bushels.....	25,108,620.97	5,764,525	6,169,952
Corn.....	76,137,725 bushels.....	116,887,643.88	2,335,826	17,050,439
Oats.....	11,256,146 bushels.....	9,596,728.32	1,752,424	1,640,696
Rye.....	1,613,259 bushels.....	2,774,578.26	154,324	332,261
Wheat.....	168,994,882 bushels.....	414,035,457.41	67,254,089	37,508,624
Total.....	282,645,341 bushels.....	568,403,028.84	77,261,188	72,701,972

I believe it will be helpful also to have here a significant portion of the testimony by Ralph S. Trigg, president of the Corporation before the House Agriculture Committee on March 30. I placed the full statement in the RECORD of that date but this part has an important bearing on this subject, dealing as it does with perishable and semiperishable commodities and showing sharp increases in certain of them during January. I call your particular attention to the comparable figures for dried eggs, dried milk, cheese, peanuts, linseed oil, corn, oats, and wheat:

In addition to the distinction between commodities held as loan security and those which are in inventory, another break-down is fundamental in an understanding of surplus-disposal problems. I refer to the difference between storable commodities, which can be kept indefinitely, and the so-called perishables or semiperishables, which must be disposed of in a relatively short time to avoid deterioration or spoilage. The disposal problems for the latter are of course much more immediate and acute.

With this in mind, a look at the breakdown between storables and perishables is revealing. In the first place, commodities held as loan security are obviously in the storable class, and 87 percent of the total

Investment in this group is accounted for by wheat, corn, cotton, and tobacco.

The complete listing of loan advances is as follows:

Corn, 563,745,949 bushels----	\$768,551,342
Wheat, 324,825,430 bushels----	645,036,238
Cotton, upland, 2,638,022 bales-----	373,536,838
Tobacco, 365,251,157 pounds--	145,833,335
Grain sorghum, 42,161,480 hundredweight-----	94,978,593
Beans, dry edible, 7,145,415 hundredweight-----	49,254,351
Flaxseed, 9,079,608 bushels---	33,640,325
Barley, 27,314,643 bushels---	29,792,917
Soybeans, 10,513,484 bushels---	22,171,777
Oats, 29,988,676 bushels-----	19,985,278
Peanuts, 148,232,342 pounds---	14,625,376
Rosin, 178,989,169 pounds-----	12,190,480
Potatoes, 11,175,385 hundredweight-----	7,829,373
Rice, 1,536,244 hundredweight-----	6,585,914
Peas, dry edible, 750,343 hundredweight-----	2,308,535
Turpentine, 2,981,709 gallons---	1,225,187
Rye, 823,371 bushels-----	959,369
Cotton, American Egyptian, 2,667 bales-----	772,923
Cottonseed, 7,224 tons-----	357,775
Lespedeza seed, 1,201,000 pounds-----	144,089
Total-----	2,229,810,015

Turning to the commodities which are in inventory, we find a somewhat similar pattern. Of the \$1,806,365,438 total cost value of inventory holding on February 28, wheat, corn, and other feed grains, and cotton accounted for \$1,278,818,849, or 70 percent. The rest—\$527,546,589—covers the semiperishable group and some special commodities such as linseed oil and wool, with the semiperishables themselves accounting for less than \$300,000,000. This is obviously the area of immediate problems as far as inventory holdings are concerned.

The complete listing of commodities in inventory, with cost values, is as follows:

Cotton, upland, 3,646,272 bales-----	\$613,353,057
Wheat, 144,853,295 bushels---	358,042,121
Corn, 167,582,777 bushels---	255,733,783
Linseed oil, 421,577,441 pounds-----	119,549,121
Eggs, dried, 79,317,979 pounds---	101,361,973
Flaxseed, 12,801,153 bushels---	81,278,225
Butter, 92,796,753 pounds-----	57,670,108
Beans, dry edible, 4,865,985 hundredweight-----	43,025,268
Milk, dried, 294,252,026 pounds-----	37,532,538
Barley, 25,079,381 bushels---	36,064,035
Wool, 35,427,479 pounds-----	27,688,394
Rosin, 210,837,798 pounds-----	17,145,215
Cottonseed, 199,478 tons-----	10,327,809
Oats, 11,255,782 bushels-----	9,772,260
Cheese, 24,805,653 pounds-----	8,396,935
Peanuts, farmers' stock, 56,058,463 pounds-----	5,914,897
Peanuts, shelled, 18,679,120 pounds-----	2,780,289
Grain sorghum, 2,073,245 hundredweight-----	5,853,594
Soybeans, 2,005,507 bushels---	5,055,644
Prunes, 35,326,345 pounds-----	3,593,150
Raisins, 9,876,690 pounds-----	937,061
Turkeys, 3,380,079 pounds-----	1,866,923
Minor items-----	3,923,038
Total-----	1,806,365,438

It will be noted that potatoes, the crop which has posed the most serious current disposal problem, do not show up in this CCC inventory listing. This is because the Government does not buy potatoes to store. It distributes all price-support potato purchases immediately, through whatever diversion outlets are available. The same pro-

cedure has been followed with some other crops, principally limited seasonal purchases of fresh vegetables and fruits for immediate school-lunch or welfare distribution. Disposal questions for this group are closely related to those for the holdings of non-storables.

While pointing out that the immediate questions of disposition center in the non-storable commodities, and that those of this group which are in inventory or under current purchase operations constitute the real surpluses, I do not wish to leave the impression that there are no serious problems with regard to large CCC holdings of cotton, wheat, corn, and other storable crops. A lot of money is tied up in price-support operations for these crops now, and more undoubtedly will be before we are able to strike a production balance.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to another and a more personal matter involving a reduction in the bill for projects in my district. I want to preface my statement by saying that I deeply appreciate the consideration that was given to these projects by the subcommittee which handled this matter. I want to say, too, that I have discussed the matter of a reduction with responsible officials in the two communities involved and have advised them that, in my opinion, it is an equitable reduction in terms of the reduction applied across the board and that I did not think in fairness to the committee which was undertaking to produce some results so far as sound economy is concerned or in fairness to them I should make any effort to have these sums replaced in the bill by any amendment. These officials and the people they represent are deeply anxious about our fiscal situation. I know I speak for them when I say they are ready to share any fair reduction which can help us in trying to avoid a deficit and in balancing the budget.

That is my present intention. However, I would like to get the record a bit clearer and I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if it is not true, on page 255 of the committee report, that the amount involved in Adams and North Adams for flood-control work is \$350,000 each, and that is to be compared with the recommendation of the budget of \$500,000 each.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HESELTON. That was my understanding.

I want to call attention to the fact, on page 380 of the hearings on the Civil Function Department of the Army, that there is a list of estimated costs, and as against this \$350,000 in Adams the 1951 estimated cost is \$4,600,000, and as against the \$350,000 in North Adams in 1951 the estimated cost is \$13,170,000, so that obviously there is going to be quite a continuing period of time during which this construction will have to be undertaken.

I asked the engineers to advise me as closely as they could as to what the effect would be on both of these projects, and I would like to make this statement at this time primarily because I want the people in my district to know what will not be undertaken in next fiscal year, and to call to the attention of the committee one particularly significant point as to the Adams project.

I am advised that the reduction in funds made by the House will not permit construction of the concrete walls and levees along a 200-foot length of the main stream and one check dam which was proposed for fiscal year 1951. The check dam is necessary to prevent erosion in the channel and possible damage to permanent works and in lieu thereof it will be necessary to construct a temporary dam closure at an increased project cost of about \$10,000. Completion of the project will be delayed for 1 year with the attendant increase in Government cost and continued lack of protection to the area.

In the North Adams project, the reduction in funds made by the House will prevent construction of the concrete paved chute for an additional distance of 400 feet proposed for fiscal year 1951. This will upset the planned schedule of construction operations.

I know that the subcommittee will have these facts in mind next year when we will go into the substantial phase of construction on these two projects.

In the meantime, we can and will pray that these communities shall be spared from floods or high water until the work can be completed at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to a program being conducted in my native city of Boston aimed at reducing the tragic loss of life and property due to fire. The most harrowing assignment I can think of is that of the fireman who must grope his way to a crib and remove the charred flesh of what a few minutes before was a little child. A child whose little body was horribly burned in a fire that might easily have been prevented.

Today we can pick up the newspapers and read such captions as these: "Mother and three children burned to death in fire." "Family of six children die in flames." "Flash fire wipes out family of nine." "A fire of small damage today took the lives of a mother and two children." "Twenty-two children die in Maine fires the first 2 months of this year." Those are actual stories. And they continue day after day.

I believe that if we give deserved recognition to the program now in operation that similar programs can be adopted throughout the Nation and will go far to reduce this unnecessary slaughter of innocent children. This program is being conducted by the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters, one of the oldest and most effective insurance organizations in the United States, and in cooperation with the Boston schools and the Boston Fire Department. I am particularly interested in the man in charge of this program because he has been a life-long friend of mine, Herbert L. McNary. His late uncle served in the Congress, representing in this body the district I now have the honor of serving. He represented his people in an outstanding manner.

The program is one of fire-prevention education. I used the word "education"

advisedly. To the best of my knowledge this program is the first to recognize that man, himself, is the No. 1 fire hazard. That we must have more than fire protection, which, in substance, is controlling and reducing damage after a fire has started; more than fire prevention, which again in substance is the enactment of protective laws and the administration of these laws and regulations. We must reach man himself.

We are handicapped by the obvious fact that fire has been our friend as well as our enemy since the beginning of time. Only within relatively modern times have we looked upon the ravages of fire as anything else but an act of God. Man's efforts to fight fire dates back only to the early days of our Nation. Even then, to protect one's home against fire one had to join a company and put a special marker on the door. If the wrong apparatus responded the home was permitted to burn.

Even today fire is in the nature of a spectacle, the greatest free show on earth. We are dulled to indifference by the sight of apparatus speeding by or excited to the extent of giving chase according to our natures. But our concern over the potential loss of life is seldom evoked. A fire to most of us is always something that happens to someone else.

When we do concern ourselves with the great fire waste, we are inclined to do so on a national basis and to concentrate our interest in a Fire-Prevention Week. Both have great limitations. More than almost any other potential threat to life and property fire is a local, community problem. And the problem of fighting fire requires year-around attention.

Visualizing the need for year-around action and the wisdom of concentrating on a community, the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters a year ago adopted an intensive fire-prevention campaign. Generally it follows four patterns:

First. Government: This means attention to the enactment of beneficial legislation and the administration of existing laws and regulations.

Second. Business and industry level: This means improving fire protection and providing fire prevention education to factories and mercantile establishments.

Third. Civic and other organizations: This means carrying the fire-prevention education programs directly to the adult.

Fourth. Youth programs. Concentration of effort on this last phase—the youth programs—is the basis of the program I am discussing at this time. Unfortunately, we as a nation, have been so far behind in fire-prevention education that we are almost forced to consider our present adult population as a lost generation. We hear the statement made that carelessness is responsible for 90 percent of all fires. This so-called carelessness results from what people do or fail to do because of habits formed in the home over the years. If we are to reach these adults at all it can best be done through the children. But more important, by providing to the children now the education their elders did not receive we are educating the adults of tomorrow.

This program in Boston, therefore, has three objectives. It catches children at

an age when they can form good habits and acquire those instinctive reactions to fire hazards that will serve them later in life. It trains and instructs the children now with the result that they participate in the actual correction of thousands of existing hazards. In addition, through the children, we have the most effective means of reaching the adults.

In my State of Massachusetts as well as in many other States one- and two-family dwellings are specifically exempt from official inspections by firemen and other dwelling units are limited to inspection on complaint only. I do not criticize such laws because there are other factors involved and we need to adhere to the principle that "a man's home is his castle." But it is a fact, too often demonstrated, that a fire in a single home can become a conflagration that wipes out a community.

We must find some means of getting fire-prevention knowledge and fire-hazard correction into these homes. It should be done by the occupants themselves. This is the most effective means of safeguarding the home. And the way to reach the occupants is through the children.

In Boston right after the start of the school year and coincident with Fire Prevention Week, home-inspection blanks, sufficient in number to account for every home in the city, are provided by the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters and distributed through the schools. These are returned completed in great numbers.

Shortly thereafter in all elementary grades the pupils receive on a regular basis about once a month a compact list of fire-hazard warnings that are current at the time such as burning leaves hazards in October, home-heating hazards in November and Christmas hazards in December. These are prepared in a very effective manner and brought home to the parents.

This and other work in lower grades points up to the special program conducted in the sixth grade, which in many schools is the top grade before moving on to a junior high school. In some instances the fifth and seventh grades are combined. But experience has shown that the age group at this stage is the most alert, capable, and responsive for assimilating fire-hazard knowledge and conducting fire-prevention programs.

Trained firemen in uniform provide instruction on periodic visits. On each visit material supplied by the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters is provided. Included is a manual listing the many types of fire hazards to be found in the home.

The high point of the program is reached when a period of 2 to 3 weeks is set for a home and neighborhood inspection drive. Slips are provided on which the hazards corrected are noted and explained. These slips are countersigned by the parent or occupant. The cooperation of the public has been excellent. These boys and girls, and I might say, especially the girls who, in later years will be the homemakers, do a marvelous job. It is not unusual for some to make well over 100 individual corrections. Even at an average of 10 corrections made by each boy or girl this means

10,000 corrected hazards per 1,000 pupils. Five corrected hazards entitles a boy or girl to an inspector's badge. Gold badges for higher rank are awarded on competitive basis.

There are many other features of the program, such as examinations, fire-prevention compositions, and art work all included in regular classwork. The programs require no additional work of teachers. Instructions are given by firemen, material is provided by the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters, and the handling, distribution, and tallying of material is done by the school children.

Already there has been a marked improvement. For years, in Boston, there had been a steady increase in number of fires and alarms. The building fires per 1,000 population for Boston was one of the highest of all large cities. Already there has been a marked decrease in number of fires, especially in dwellings, and Boston showed the best improvement in 1948 in the building fires per thousand population index of any of the large cities. Even more important, there has been a sharp decrease in the number of deaths due to fire, especially involving children.

In the opinion of qualified fire-prevention experts this program is the most effective means of combating loss of life and property from fire in the homes. I sincerely recommend this program for your consideration in your own districts. I am certain that detailed information will gladly be furnished to any interested party by addressing a request to Herbert L. McNary, executive manager, Boston Board of Fire Underwriters, 89 Broad Street, Boston 10, Mass.

The fear of fires is a constant one existing in our minds. Any constructive proposal and effort to reduce the occurrence of fires is a matter of interest to all communities throughout our country. This plan in operation in Boston has produced real results. It also is a character-building program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in this week's issue of the National Tribune, the editor, Capt. Edward K. Inman, has written an editorial concerning the recent cut-backs in Veterans' Administration personnel and the veterans' hospital-bed situation that is worthy of reproduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I know that his sentiments, as expressed in the editorial, are shared by most of you, but it is vitally necessary to do more than feel strongly about this subject. While it is true that cut-backs were made by the Congress it is our duty to those who served for us to act and act promptly to insure that medical service and treatment of our veterans are not impaired by ill-considered reduction programs.

It is not the fault of the Congress, but the administration that the cut-backs in personnel in the Veterans' Administration, and the cut-backs in the construction of the 16,000-bed hospital program have been made, and the elimination and the consolidation of the Army

and the Navy hospitals, which has resulted in a great shortage of beds. I think the Members all feel that it should be our duty to insist that the program as planned and authorized and appropriated for by the Congress progress in order that the veterans may have adequate hospitalization.

Captain Inman said in part:

More and more of our elected representatives seem to be recognizing that cut-backs in Veterans' Administration personnel, for the sake of economy alone, the closing of Army hospitals for the same reason, and the earlier orders to vacate in part the VA hospital construction program are all having a disastrous effect on the Nation's obligation to care for its disabled veterans. Protests to the President on the part of legislators and by leaders of veterans' organizations are falling upon deaf ears.

Although I am reliably informed that General Gray will ask the budget for money to continue some of the personnel in the Veterans' Administration hospitals, yet we do not know what the budget of the President will do about that.

The tremendous influx of patients of World War II has made it very difficult to find beds in existing facilities. We know that the end result is that so-called emergency beds are being crowded into sun porches in existing hospitals. Additional ones are being eliminated for want of medical personnel who will not sign up with the VA because jobs would be insecure. Food and sanitation are worsening, and service to the sick and wounded is becoming deplorably bad.

Complaints are coming in to this veterans' spokesman from all over the country. In New York City, for instance, a big center of veteran population, it is asserted that neither ambulance nor bed is longer available in emergency. In Texas, older veterans are being compelled to vacate their beds so that younger ones may be admitted. In Indianapolis recently a very sick and very old veteran was sent home to relatives on a stretcher so that his spot could be filled by another on the waiting list. And so it goes in almost every locality.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Congress will again insist that this money be reappropriated. It is necessary to appropriate for the cut-backs in personnel. It is not necessary to reappropriate for the construction of facilities for 16,000 beds, because the Appropriations Committee in its wisdom authorized and appropriated that money over 2 years ago. The Congress did not order the closing of Army and Navy hospitals.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. How does the gentlewoman think the Congress is going to get anywhere with its so-called one-package-bill approach on appropriations if 2 or 3 months before the end of the fiscal year administrators downtown will say to the country that they have erred grievously and made mistakes involving hundreds of millions of dollars? Where are we going to get with our one-bill approach that is supposed to tell the people about the income and outgo and let the people know where they stand insofar as the expenses of Government are concerned?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We certainly will not get very far, especially as in the case of the Veterans' Administration, when it did not ask for adequate money. The will of Congress is constantly being thwarted by the administration. I think the only thing that will cure the situation is the tremendous revolt among the people of the country. They feel that we sent the veterans to war and that we should care for them. That is their wish, and they want enough money appropriated and wisely spent for them. They want the administration to be fair to the veterans and to the Congress.

The complete editorial in the National Tribune by Mr. Edward Inman is as follows:

On the floors of Congress these days more and more of our elected Representatives seem to be recognizing that cut-backs in Veterans' Administration personnel, for the sake of economy alone, the closing of Army hospitals for the same reason and the earlier orders to vacate in part the VA hospital construction program are all having a disastrous effect on the Nation's obligation to care for its disabled veterans. Protests to the President on the part of legislators and by leaders of veterans' organizations are falling upon deaf ears. It appears to us that those men and women in the Congress, whose duty it is to assure adequate care to the country's disabled servicemen, must take the bit in their teeth and assume their responsibility whether or not it is pleasing to the administration now in power.

We have discussed on numerous occasions in this column the need to do something and what makes necessary immediate action. Over a year ago, and despite the fact that a huge influx of World War II veterans made enlargement of existing facilities essential, Executive orders were issued to reduce veterans' hospital building by 16,000 beds. More recently an Army reduction of 10,000 beds in service hospitals created a more critical condition because three-quarters of them were under contract for the use of Veterans' Administration patients. Normal building does not begin to take care of the load. The end result is that so-called emergency beds are being crowded into sun porches in existing hospitals; additional ones are being eliminated for want of medical personnel who will not sign up with the VA because jobs would be insecure; food and sanitation are worsening, and service to the sick and wounded is becoming deplorably bad. In addition to these conditions that are alone a blight upon the good name of our Government, dangerously ill patients are being moved out of the hospitals and are being sent home to die.

Complaints are coming in to this veterans' spokesman from all over the country. In New York City, for instance, a big center of veteran population, it is asserted that neither ambulance nor bed is longer available in emergency. In Texas, older veterans are being compelled to vacate their beds so that younger ones may be admitted. In Indianapolis recently a very sick and very old veteran was sent home to relatives on a stretcher so that his spot could be filled by another on the waiting list. And so it goes in almost every locality. Thousands of men, who served their homeland in time of war, are denied medical care, all in the name of doubtful economy, while new means are being found constantly to pour billions of dollars down the sink-holes of the world in the names of charity and the advancement of backward areas. The word comes through, as it did from the manager of an Illinois hospital a short time ago, needy veterans must give up their beds because it is felt maximum benefits have been had and further

treatment "would delay admission of others who are in need of active hospitalization." The long and short of it is that the people, through their responsible representatives, are running out on the men and women to whom they owe their very salvation.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have received letters and telegrams from directors of hospitals in the State of Connecticut, who are seriously concerned over the action of the House Appropriations Committee in reducing the amounts granted for hospital construction and expansion from \$150,000,000 to \$75,000,000.

Such action, if endorsed by this House, would be a clear breach of faith. Only last year this Congress authorized the larger figure—believing it to be both wise and necessary. Certainly it was the responsibility of the hospital authorities to predicate their future program upon the amount which would be available. Connecticut was to have distributed \$1,012,000 for this purpose, and grants were so allotted. If the committee action is upheld the Connecticut share will dwindle to \$506,000, I am informed.

This is truly wasteful economy as we are depriving the sick and disabled of proper care and prolonging their absence from occupational pursuits. A sick person neither works nor pays taxes to support the Government. We would be derelict in our public duty were we to now reduce the amount authorized for this purpose. I do not propose to deprive the sick of proper medical care in the name of economy. Should Congress violate its previous action we will go further down the road to socialized medicine as the American people will not tolerate inadequate hospital care.

The funds appropriated by the Government are matched by public or private subscription, and arbitrary action now will do irreparable damage to this manner of financing hospital construction and expansion.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to commend and congratulate the Department of Justice and the United States attorney, the presiding judge, and the jury in the trial of Harry Renton Bridges, which resulted in a verdict of guilty yesterday.

This was a long and tedious trial, during which passion and prejudice flared up frequently. The fairness exhibited by Government witnesses, the prosecuting attorney, and the trial judge was typical of our American system of jurisprudence. It goes without saying, of course, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation deserves a large part of the credit for the results of this trial. I happened to be a part of the FBI force which investigated the Harry Bridges case in San Francisco. While the nature of my work in San Francisco made it impossible for me to act as a witness in this case, I am well aware of the fact that the jury's verdict of guilty is well grounded and substantiated by the actual facts. As in other cases involving Communists, the trial judge could not, and, of course, did not, admit evidence secured by the FBI through highly confidential and technical sources. If the jury could

have heard Harry Bridges speak as I and hundreds of other FBI agents have heard him at Communist Party meetings and other Red gatherings on the west coast, they would know for a certainty that Harry Bridges perjured himself in connection with his obtaining United States citizenship in 1945.

It is regrettable that much similar information on Communist activities in this country cannot be made available to the American juries and the American people generally, due to restrictions in our laws and the guaranties of our Constitution. The long history of Bridges' connection with communism will, I hope, someday be fully disclosed. It is a perfect example of the treachery and intrigue Stalin's forces are engaging in here in the United States.

The verdict of the San Francisco jury in the Bridges case recalls to our minds that there are still many equally dangerous subversives in the United States who are operating and spreading their filthy propaganda and yet remain untouched by our laws. These subversive forces are still in the very heart of our Government and, unless our law-enforcement agencies become more active and aggressive, may eventually become the tool by which Soviet Russia will establish her Communist dictatorship here in this country. The very thought is abhorrent to all of us who love our freedom and liberty, but is nevertheless realistic. Whether we realize it or not, there is a present and immediate danger to our country from Communist aggression from within.

I urge the President of the United States, who ultimately is in charge of our law-enforcement policy, to forget his political prejudice, to wake up to the real threat to our country, to be an American statesman instead of a political ward heeler, and take up the battle against the threat of communism wherever its treacherous tentacles can be found, and do it now before it is too late.

It has occurred to me that Members of Congress may be interested in reading a brief history of Harry Renton Bridges, so I include in the RECORD at this point a statement concerning his life and activities.

Harry Renton Bridges was born at Melbourne, Australia, on July 28, 1900. He first entered the United States from that country. At the time of his deportation, Bridges was president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

Harry Bridges first entered the United States in 1920. On May 7, 1920, he registered as an alien in the United States Department of Labor. Shortly after his arrival in the country, he went to work as a longshoreman in San Francisco, Calif., at which port he had entered the country. Shortly thereafter he went to New Orleans, La., where, on July 13, 1931, he filed his first papers for application for American citizenship. He failed, however, to perfect his citizenship within the 7 years required by law. On August 9, 1928, less than a month after the expiration of his first period of application, he again filed his first citizenship papers. This declaration was

made before the clerk in the United States District Court of the Northern District of California. Again Bridges failed to perfect his citizenship within the required 7 years.

On May 2, 1946, Bridges filed a Form A-2213, which is entitled "Preliminary Form for Declaration of Intention." It might be stated that on all of these forms Bridges made misstatements as to his exact marital status and the number of children he claimed to have had.

In a release dated March 1938, the Department of Labor stated briefly that Bridges had first been charged with communism in 1934 and that an investigation was made at that time and a report was filed on February 2, 1935, but that no action was taken until the fall of 1937, when certain persons filed new complaints against Bridges in the Seattle district of the Immigration and Naturalization Service which was then operating under the Department of Labor. An investigation of these new charges was made during the winter of 1937 and on March 5, 1938, Bridges was served with a warrant and was given a preliminary examination at the Baltimore office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. As a result of this hearing, Bridges was held for a hearing on deportation charges.

During the summer of 1939 a deportation hearing involving Harry Bridges was held before James M. Landis, who at the time was dean of the Harvard Law School. On December 28, 1938, Dean Landis turned in his verdict, in which he said:

The evidence, therefore, establishes neither that Harry R. Bridges is a member of, nor affiliated with, the Communist Party of the United States of America.

On February 14, 1941, Harry Bridges was again arrested and held for deportation on a charge that after entering the United States he had been a member of, or affiliated with, an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advocates, or teaches the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States. From March 3, 1941, through June 12, 1941, hearings were held in connection with this second deportation charge.

On May 28, 1942, Hon. Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, in a deportation proceeding entitled "Re Bridges" made a finding that the Communist Party is an organization that advocates the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States. On the same date an order of deportation was made by the Attorney General against Bridges. On January 30, 1945, the Supreme Court agreed to hear arguments on the Bridges case. On April 2, 1945, the Court reviewed the facts of the Bridges case. On June 19, 1945, the Supreme Court ruled 5 to 3 that the deportation order issued against Harry Bridges was illegal. Justices Douglas, Black, Reed, Murphy, and Rutledge voted for Bridges. Justices Roberts, Frankfurter, and Stone dissented. Justice Jackson did not participate.

On September 19, 1945, Harry Bridges became a naturalized citizen of the United States in San Francisco, Calif.

On May 25, 1949, Harry Bridges was indicted by the Federal grand jury in San Francisco, Calif., on charges of conspiracy and perjury in connection with his obtaining citizenship. On April 4, 1950, as a result of these charges, Harry Bridges was convicted in Federal court in San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PRIEST, having assumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the general appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951 be concluded when the House adjourns tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951 have right of way over all other privileged business under the rules until final disposition, with the exception of conference reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CHRISTOPHER (at the request of Mr. CANNON) was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Wednesday, April 19, 1950, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

REHABILITATION OF NAVAJO AND HOPI TRIBES OF INDIANS

Mr. MORRIS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill S. 2446.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. MORRIS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain telegrams and an article contained in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening

Post, entitled "We'll Never Make Them Do It Our Way," notwithstanding the fact that the estimate of the Public Printer is that the cost will be \$266.50.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a bill which he introduced today relating to grain bugs in wheat and some letters from certain committees.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made by Mr. Joseph C. Duggan, and a memorandum prepared for him by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks immediately following the remarks made by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in two instances, in one to include a letter and resolution from the Board of Selectmen of Watertown, Mass., and in the other a letter from William Foster, Deputy Administrator of ECA.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 743) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan, and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

RENT CONTROLS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, if rent control is ended with one quick blow at the end of June, what will happen to millions of American families who cannot pay more rent without cutting expenditures for other necessities?

Congress could answer with accuracy only if it had a report from every American family in those remaining rent-control areas where available housing does not meet demand. I submit that these reports would prove the need for a continuation of rent controls.

For presentation to Congress, I wish every Seattle tenant, for instance, could and would answer the following questions:

First. If rent control is ended, what do you expect to happen to your rent?

Second. Can you afford an increased rent?

Third. What part of your income now goes to rent?

Fourth. How much of an increase could you pay before changing your present living arrangements?

Fifth. If the increases are greater than you can afford, how would you change your living arrangements?

(a) Would you double up with other persons or other families?

(b) Would you try to find cheaper quarters?

(c) Would you buy a home?

(d) Would you take in roomers or boarders?

Sixth. If you could not change your living arrangements, would you meet the increased rentals:

(a) By having additional family members seek employment?

(b) By reducing expenditures for other items, if so what items?

(c) By forfeiting goods being paid for on the installment plan?

(d) By substituting credit and installment for cash purchases?

(e) By reducing savings?

(f) By going into debt?

(g) By going on relief?

With answers to these questions from Seattle, or any other representative area, the Congress would have at least an approximation of the answers to national questions such as these which decontrol would raise:

How many families will be standing on the streets—eviction cases—looking for a roof overhead?

How many families will have savings they can draw upon to make up the increases?

What will increased rents mean to the livelihood of the butcher, the baker, the clothier, the farmer, the doctor, and all the other producers and suppliers of life's necessities, when this decrease in purchasing power begins to take effect?

These questions ought to be fully considered, lest we make hasty and unwise decisions. It is easy enough for the Members to stand here and debate the pros and cons of rent-control legislation on a high legal and technical plane. I am thinking of the family that will wake up the morning of July 1 and find a notice from the landlord that the rent has been raised.

And let us not fool ourselves that rents will stay put without controls. The Bureau of Labor Statistics made a recent survey of rents in the decontrolled city of Dallas, Tex. The results showed that 59 percent of all tenants had rent increases and their increases averaged 36 percent. They had to pay out an average of \$13.96 each month in added rent.

I remember reading a letter from a Dallas mother soon after decontrol. Her rent was just about doubled. What happened to the rest of the family budget? Some of the rent money was taken out of the small sum that went for the children's school supplies, including their clothes and shoes and lunch money. The cleaning man got less business, even though the family wanted to be properly dressed for churchgoing. This mother could not afford train fare to be at the side of a stricken relative in another city.

This Dallas mother was bitter—and she had a right to be. Her city was a "big man's town," as she described it, and the penthouse dwellers who ran the city did not care very much about the plight of the small renter.

Bear in mind, further, that the families with the largest numbers of children

will suffer the most. Available studies show that the largest families are bunched in the lower income range. More children to feed and clothe means less for each one—and still less when the rent-taker gets more.

One-fourth of all the families in the country have annual incomes of less than \$2,000. If rent controls go quickly and prematurely, these families will pay more rent. But they will eat less, wear poorer clothes, cut down on other essentials—and the economy will suffer with them.

The Bureau survey I cited above showed that 71 percent of the Dallas families with incomes of less than \$2,000 a year reported rent increases after decontrol, and their increases averaged 47 percent. It is true that when you average these increases with the units which had no increases, the over-all increase in the city's rent bill was not as great, but I call attention to the fact that this survey was conducted soon after rent controls had been removed and that many additional tenants received notices of increases to become effective after the date of the survey.

Some months ago the organized landlords of Cook County, Ill., which embraces the city of Chicago, carried their case for rent increases—for the second time—to the United States Emergency Court of Appeals. They pointed to evidence which they said justified a 71.5 percent increase. They insisted that the court order a 45 percent increase now, and that they were willing to take the balance after rent control was removed.

What would such increases mean to the millions of families I have been talking about? Our middle and low income families are already struggling to make ends meet. When food and clothing prices jumped up, they took cheaper cuts of meat, and made their old clothing do another year. But if their rents soar, they have no other choice except to beat the pavements in search of a meaner dwelling.

Let us review the housing and rent control situation briefly. Congress approved such control originally due to a national emergency. The war effort caused a vast movement of people to industrial centers. Housing facilities were strained to the breaking point and rents threatened to soar skyward. Wherever the impact of the war effort presented such a threat, rent control was established.

The housing shortage increased by leaps and bounds during the war years when we lacked materials or manpower to build new houses. Add to these housing pressures the tremendous increase in families which accompanies every war.

Just what is the situation today? New housing has gone up since the war, but we are still at least 2,000,000 units short of the increase in families. Since 1940, about 5,000,000 new units have been produced, but there are 7,000,000 more families.

When the building industry began to tackle this enormous housing shortage, it turned first to the production of high-price houses for home ownership and sale. Sights were set high, so high that

they overlooked the needs of the average family. A small percentage of the housing units were built for rent, and these at rents which the average family cannot afford.

It does not take a brochure of statistics to prove that rentals for newly built two-bedroom units usually start at about \$90 per month. This is common knowledge, and we also know that the average income of the American family cannot begin to measure up to such housing costs.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman from Washington with me heard the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee present the budget for the fiscal year 1951 as a war budget. Is it not true that rent control is an incident of war, be that war cold or hot?

Mr. MITCHELL. I agree very definitely with the gentleman, and certainly this Congress should approach the problem with that in mind.

What about the veteran's family? In Seattle the average income of World War II veterans is less than \$3,000 a year. If we take the prewar percentage of income going for rent—about 16 percent—it is clear that \$480 or \$40 per month is the maximum amount which can be spared out of the family budget for rent. Certainly these Seattle veterans are in no position to pay \$90 a month rent.

There is no argument over the fact that rent control is an emergency measure. It must be wound up at some point. The question is how and when. The answer is not a sudden termination that will cause suffering and hardship to millions of families at one blow, and disrupt the economy that depends on their sustained purchasing power.

The answer, I submit, lies in the direction we have been following since April 1 of last year. Under the present act, local communities and States are permitted to end rent control when they decide it is no longer needed. Already a few States and larger cities have taken such action and an increasing number of smaller communities have been decontrolled.

Of the 90 cities having a population of more than 100,000 which were under control on April 1 of last year, more than 70 are still under control. Out of more than 1,500 communities with a population of 5,000 or more which were under control last April, there are still more than 1,000 under control. Decontrols have been effected on more than 3,000,000 units but there are still about 11,000,000 controlled units.

This clearly indicates that we still have a national problem but it shows the way to an orderly system of decontrol, city by city and State by State, without the disruptive effects on our economy and the widespread suffering which would inevitably be the result of a sudden and premature ending of all control on June 30 of this year.

A progressive and orderly system of decontrol will also give State and local

authorities a grace period to take such measures as they deem wise in protecting tenants from undue rent increases. I have outlined the rent-control problem to the Governor of the State of Washington with that thought in mind.

Let us make our decision with foresight and understanding as to the problems of the ordinary American family. Another year of rent-control legislation is not too much to ask. It is a small price to pay for the protection of family welfare and economic stability.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent that a letter—I might say an unanswered letter—which I sent to Governor Langlie on March 13 be printed at this point in the RECORD. Following that I request the printing of a most objective statement of rent decontrol problems prepared for the Seattle City Council by the Retain Rent Control Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. The letter is as follows:

LETTER TO GOVERNOR LANGLIE

MARCH 13, 1950.

HON. ARTHUR B. LANGLIE,
The Governor's Office,
Olympia, Wash.

DEAR GOVERNOR LANGLIE: The Eighty-first Congress has made and continues to make an outstanding record in the enactment of housing legislation. We have provided the legislative framework for home building on an unprecedented scale. Until the practical results are seen in more and better homes many of our citizens will still be confronted with difficult housing problems. It is with that compelling thought in mind that I share the President's point of view that rent-control legislation should be continued for 1 year after the present date of expiration—June 30, 1950.

You are doubtless aware that strenuous opposition has been manifested by Senator CAIN and others to such continuation of rent control.

Anticipating the possibility that the Congress may not vote an extension of the law, some States and localities have taken preparatory steps to protect tenants from the burden of undue rent increases by enacting stand-by rent legislation.

It is my hope that you are giving serious consideration to this problem as it affects the people of the State of Washington. Inasmuch as the Congress last year voted local responsibility for decontrol, there are many in Congress who believe the logical second step is for the States and cities to be made responsible for both rent control and decontrol. As you know, decontrol has been followed by varied results depending upon the housing available in the community. In Spokane the real-estate interests reported an average rent increase of only 14.3 percent but in Houston the average increase was 41.3 percent; in Topeka, 30.3 percent; Knoxville, 26.8 percent, and Dallas, 35.4 percent.

I will appreciate being advised as to what extent the State of Washington or its cities are prepared to protect tenants against unjustified rent increases in the event Congress does not extend the controls prior to June 1. If the basic legislation allowing local control has not been enacted do you plan the calling of a special session of the State legislature?

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

FUGH B. MITCHELL.

THE PROBLEMS OF RENT DECONTROL

MARCH 24, 1950.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE,
SEATTLE CITY COUNCIL,
County-City Building, Seattle, Wash.

DEAR SIRS: The undersigned organization is interested in the petition recently filed for a hearing on decontrol of rents.

We wish to suggest to your committee, first, that it is not required of you that you hold a hearing or yourselves act upon the question of decontrol. What you could do is to deny the petition at this time and suggest that those seeking decontrol obtain a public hearing on the question from the Seattle-King County Rent Advisory Board, of which Joseph A. Mantineau, Arcade Building, is chairman. Section 204 (e) (1) of the Federal Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, provides that such a local advisory board shall hold a public hearing on a decontrol petition if it finds the petition substantial in character.

One great advantage of following this method is that whereas a city council resolution for decontrol, approved by the Governor, would put an irrecusable end to rent control in Seattle (sec. 204 (i) (6)), decontrol by the Seattle-King County Rent Advisory Board can be revoked and rent controls reestablished upon a change in conditions (sec. 204 (i) (2) (3) (4)). We urge you, therefore, first, to seriously consider turning the matter over to the Seattle-King County Rent Advisory Board.

If you decide to retain jurisdiction, we believe that your first step should be to ask the petitioners to file with you immediately the factual data upon which they base their belief that there is no shortage in rental accommodations. This should be done before you determine upon a hearing or fix its date. The object, of course, would be to give you and other interested parties an adequate opportunity to examine, investigate and weigh the evidence. Naturally, you would not proceed any further if the showing made was patently lacking in substance.

You will have in mind it is not your business to debate the merits of rent control. Under the law (sec. 204 (j) (3)), your only duty is to take evidence and arrive at a "finding" as to whether "there no longer exists such a shortage in rental housing accommodations as to require rent control in such city, town, or village."

If the evidence filed with you is substantial, you should turn it over to the appropriate city employees, agencies, and commissions, and have them check it, analyze it, and report to you. Only then would you be able to know whether you should have a hearing.

May we take the liberty of pointing to some of the types of evidence which you will probably wish to compile and consider?

1. Demand for housing:

(a) Population:

(1) Estimated population in 1940, on VJ-day, and at the present time.

(2) Anticipated increases or decreases in population.

(b) Employment:

(1) General trend of employment in the past 6 months.

(2) Anticipated changes in total employment in next 90 days.

(3) General statements on employment situation.

(c) Military installations (including hospitals):

(1) Name of installation and branch of service.

(2) Number of personnel with families outside of installation, both military and civilian.

(3) Type of housing most in demand, apartments or rooming-house accommodations.

(4) What is the experience of the housing officer in securing needed housing? (Are

waiting lists maintained? If so, what is the waiting time for housing units?)

(Sources: Commanding officers or housing officers.)

- (d) Colleges and universities, if any:
 - (1) Names and locations.
 - (2) Prewar peak enrollment and date.
 - (3) Present enrollment.
 - (4) Approximate number of veteran students living with wife and family.
 - (5) Special measures taken by school to house veterans.

(Sources: School authorities and veterans' organizations.)

(e) Approximate number of families and individuals seeking housing accommodations.

(Sources: State officials, rental agencies, chambers of commerce, local housing authorities, veterans' organizations, labor unions, major employers, newspaper advertisements, and other local officials and organizations.)

2. Rents and housing supply:

(a) Rents: (1) Extent of rent decreases, if any, during the past 6 months. Specify whether decreases have occurred for high- or low-rent dwellings, and whether for those in good or poor condition.

(Sources: Mayors, chambers of commerce, real-estate men, newspaper editors, labor and veterans' organizations.)

(b) Vacancies.

(Sources: Recent vacancy surveys, real-estate offices, landlords, mayors, chambers of commerce, newspaper advertisements, housing centers, labor and veterans' organizations.)

(c) New construction: The approximate number of new dwelling units completed since 1940 and since VJ-day.

(Sources: Local building inspectors or other officials, FHA office, builders, and contractors.)

(d) Temporary public housing projects: List projects which are scheduled for removal in whole or in part within 90 days and the number of units in each such project which are now occupied and now vacant.

(Sources: Project managers.)

The existence or nonexistence of such a shortage in rental housing accommodations as to require rent control should be capable of objective demonstration so that reasonable minds will not differ. If you approach this study with the sole purpose of arriving at the facts, our organization should have no quarrel with your conclusions.

Sincerely yours,

Seattle Committee to Retain Rent Control: Paul Coughlin, Jerry Martin, Jeanne Roderick, David Roderick, John M. Morse, John J. Sullivan, Jr., Roy Atkinson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SEX CRIMES

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, throughout our Nation one form of crime has gained steadily in recent years until today it has become a serious menace to the home, the family, and the community. Reports from area after area and town after town show that sex crimes are occurring with greater regularity and viciousness.

In my district alone I know first-hand how the momentum of such heinous acts has accelerated recently. Parents have grown increasingly concerned, with the safety of their children; women have curtailed their evening shopping and visiting because of what might lay in store for them. There is general fear that this terror may strike at any time and any place.

From contacts with officials in other localities, I am reliably informed that the pattern of events in my district is not unique, but Nation-wide. City after city is being blanketed with fear. And case after case is being recorded where previously there was none.

There are many aspects of this problem that demand our immediate attention if we are to eradicate this evil. People are overanxious to lay the blame on their local police force when several such outrages take place. This is unfortunate. The fault does not lie here. I know of many efficient police officials who have confided that the outbreaks are like leaks in a dam. No matter how large a proportion of their force they assign to this detail the problem still remains. No areas of town are immune from it nor is any group or class of people. It strikes when it is least expected.

It is foolish to assess local police officials with the blame for not controlling sex crimes. It was just as foolish 20 years ago to blame local police for the kidnaping outrages then so common.

Like kidnaping, sex crimes are a national problem. Sex criminals do not generally confine themselves to a single community or to a single State. Many are constantly on the move to avoid detection. Those who have been caught and have served a term for their crimes often move to another State where they are not known. Police officials in their new stalking areas are not even aware that they are present.

Sex criminals tend to be repeaters. Once they have committed a sex crime, there is every likelihood that they will not stop even when they have served a prison term for their offenses. Some people call sex criminals victims of a sick mind. I call them victims of a dangerous mind, dangerous to society. In the past, many persons who have investigated the problem of the sex criminals have mistakenly given these criminals their sympathy instead of their victims. They have said, "What we must do is to put them under the care of a psychiatrist so that he will discover why they behave as they do. We must help them to be normal." It is time that we drop this coddling attitude and think of those they have outraged, the women and children they have killed, maimed, and terrorized.

In the interest of the Nation and would-be future victims of these foul criminals, I have today introduced H. R. 7994. I propose to bring the police knowledge and authority of the Federal Government into the picture. We must lend a helping hand to our cities and our towns in order to clean up this situation as well as we cleaned up kidnaping in the early thirties. We all owe a great debt of gratitude to J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI for their work in eliminating the menace of the kidnaper. When my bill is enacted, we will shortly owe them a further debt.

To the Federal Government I have assigned the responsibility for maintaining the records and movements of sex criminals who leave one State for another. These records and movements will be made available to local police officials so

that they will know definitely who may cause trouble and where he can be located. And in the interests of the likely victims of sex criminals, I have made mandatory certain penalties to deter sex criminals and make them hesitant to commit their crimes.

H. R. 7994 is composed of three sections which would amend title 18 of the United States Code. I have kept the proposed act simple in order to prevent any misinterpretation. The first part, section 2251, defines a sex crime as any crime involving a sexual assault or the molestation of a female or a minor.

The second part, section 2252, requires any person who has been convicted of a sex crime to register with the United States attorney or his designated agent within 10 days after his arrival in a new State. Whoever fails to register is liable to a fine of \$1,000 or a prison sentence of not more than 1 year. Not many will fail to register when they know that such failure will immediately bring the FBI out after them.

This registration provision is especially important for it will enable the FBI and local police to know for the first time the whereabouts of those who have committed sex crimes in other States. For the first time, local police officials will have the opportunity for preventative work in this field, for these sex criminals will be known to them. In addition, those sex criminals who have moved within their jurisdiction will hesitate to commit their crimes because there will be a greater likelihood that they will be apprehended.

The third part, section 2253, imposes a fine up to \$10,000 and a prison sentence up to life for those who travel in interstate commerce for the purpose of committing a sex crime. This is a Federal court action and is in addition to any sentence that may be imposed by a State court. When a man commits a sex crime today in one State after a previous conviction in another State, he will be hunted only by the police of the State where he commits the crime. H. R. 7994 will for the first time bring the FBI out after such a criminal, for by committing a new offense in a second State he will have violated a Federal law.

The Lindbergh kidnaping law of 1932 proved that when a kidnaped person was not released in 5 days, he was presumed to have been moved in interstate commerce. This was to overcome the constitutional limitation on the commerce clause. For the same reason, I have adopted a similar provision, to the effect that any person who commits a sex crime within a year after moving to a new jurisdiction after a previous conviction in another State will be presumed to have traveled in interstate commerce for the purpose of committing such sex crime.

I fully believe that the enactment of H. R. 7994 will hasten the end of the heavy fear which lies over my district and other parts of our country. Let us return their birthright of safety and protection to our women and our children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

COMBATING COMMUNISM IN ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have secured this time today to discuss two bills H. R. 7998 and H. R. 7999, which I introduced in the House yesterday, and which proposed legislation I think is of vital importance in combating communism, which some Members of this House feel is rather strongly entrenched right now, in Alaska and Hawaii.

These two bills relate to Alaska and Hawaii in event that they do become States of the United States. They are couched in identical language and are as follows:

A bill prohibiting the acquiring of United States citizenship, by persons who are not bona fide residents and citizens and actual voters of the Territory of (Alaska) (Hawaii), solely by virtue of the fact that they were residents of the Territory of (Alaska) (Hawaii) at the time of its admission into the Union as a State of the United States of America; providing for the making up of two copies of the voting rosters of all electors taking part in required specified elections before statehood; providing for the filing of same with designated entities; and further providing penalties for failure to make up and duly file said election rosters, and for knowingly placing any ineligible or unauthorized person's name upon any such required election roster

SECTION 1. Notwithstanding any provision in the law to the contrary, no person who is not an actual bona fide resident, citizen, and qualified voter, of the Territory of (Alaska) (Hawaii) and who, prior to statehood, has not exercised his right of ballot by voting in any one of the elections contemplated by the provisions of the act known as H. R. 49, the (Alaskan) (Hawaiian) Statehood Act, and whose name does not appear upon any election roster required to be made up and filed under this act, shall to be, or considered to be, or shall become, solely by virtue of the admission of said Territory into the Union as a State of the United States of America, a citizen of the United States of America, but in order to become a citizen of the United States, any such afore-mentioned person shall acquire naturalization only by resorting to the general laws of the United States in force pertaining to the naturalization of aliens.

SEC. 2. That, in order to apply and carry out this provision of the law in question, two copies or rosters of a true and correct voting list shall be made up of all qualified electors who actually voted at any election provided for by this act, and one copy of same shall be sent within 30 days after each election held under this act, to the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States of America, at Washington, D. C., for filing, and the other copy of said voting roster shall be retained forthwith at the then seat of government of said Territory in charge of its chief executive for filing with the proper official or department of (Alaskan) (Hawaiian) government.

SEC. 3. If any person required by law so to do, shall fail, neglect, or refuse to make up and file any required election rosters, or shall knowingly place or cause to be placed, or aid, abet, encourage, assist, authorize, or conspire with another or others, to put the name of any ineligible person upon any such roster or list of qualified electors, any such person, if a then citizen of the United States or of the Territory of (Alaska) (Hawaii) upon conviction shall forfeit his own right of citizenship, and any such person and all other persons offending against this law shall in addition to forfeiting his right to such citizenship, be imprisoned for a term

not to exceed 30 years and also pay a fine of not to exceed \$30,000 and pay the costs of the prosecution.

For the reason that these House Members sincerely felt that communism was so entrenched in Alaska and Hawaii, they voted, I believe, against receiving these two Territories into the United States as States.

While I was listening to the debate before the House pending the passage of the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills this thought occurred to me. "If I were a Communist what would I do to advance the cause?" After pondering over this question the thought occurred to me "why, I would fill these Territories with Communists just prior to the time they were admitted as States and then these Communists would become naturalized citizens of the United States by virtue of the Territories being admitted to the Union as States."

In passing it might be well to remember that one may become a naturalized citizen of the United States in one of four ways: First, by birth; secondly, by being a minor at the time the father becomes a naturalized citizen; thirdly, by becoming naturalized according to statutory procedure, and fourthly, by being an inhabitant of a Territory of the United States at the time that Territory is admitted into the Union as a State of the United States.

Being a long-time resident of Omaha, Nebr., and having known one of the great Nebraska lawyers, if not the greatest, John Lee Webster, personally, I happened to remember a celebrated case, which he tried in the Supreme Court of the United States, which was widely discussed by the legal fledglings and others during my "Who is Who and Why Years." That case is Boyd against Nebraska ex rel. Thayer, one hundred and forty-third United States Reports, page 135.

I have heard would-be historians with great dramatic effort recite how the fearless and capable John Lee Webster in his argument before the Supreme Court of the United States, asked certain of the Justices of the Supreme Court by name, how their ancestors, living in a named State, claimed their right to be regarded as citizens of the United States, when no United States naturalization law was ever resorted to and in some instances was not then in being. How the people of the Original Thirteen States acquired citizenship in the United States.

It was decided by the Supreme Court on February 1, 1892, and a check of Shepard's Citator discloses that various phases of that case have been cited with approval at least 125 times, and that it has never been reversed or modified, and is still the law of the land. I secured this case from the library and read it over again and talked about its applicability to the Alaskan and Hawaiian situation with my colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana, Hon. RALPH HARVEY, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM. We were all in agreement that the case pointed out the way to protect our Nation against mass Communist naturalization.

I am not a member of the Committee on Public Lands, which handled the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills, and never had the opportunity to present my views before that committee because I had not acquired the idea at that time.

I thought that I had best give this case to the gentleman from Florida, Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, together with my notions in the matter. He took the case and consulted with the bill drafter and finally advised me that the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills took care of the matter. I let the matter rest for a time and am still of the opinion that these bills do not take care of the situation, so I introduced these bills, H. R. 7998 and H. R. 7999, in the House yesterday. By this means I hope to bring this matter to the attention of the other body who can take up the subject matter of these bills and incorporate so much as they think is appropriate or proper, if any, in the Senate version of the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills, and then when the bills go to conference, the merits of this matter may be thoroughly discussed and considered and perhaps embraced in the final draft.

I want to quote the following from Boyd against Nebraska ex rel. Thayer, supra. The syllabi sets forth the facts and law as follows:

Boyd was born in Ireland in 1834, of Irish parents. His father emigrated to the United States in 1844, with all his family, and settled in Ohio, in which State he has since resided continuously. In 1849 the father duly declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, but there is no record or other written evidence that he ever completed his naturalization by taking out his naturalization certificate after the expiration of the 5 years. For many years after the expiration of that time, however, he exercised rights and claimed privileges in Ohio, which could only be claimed and exercised by citizens of the United States and of the State. The son, on attaining majority, voted in Ohio, under the belief that his father had become a citizen. In 1856 he removed to Nebraska, in which State he resided continuously until the commencement of this action. He voted there at all elections, held various offices there which required him to take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, served in the Army during the war, was a member of a convention to frame a State constitution, was mayor of Omaha and, after 30 years of unquestioned exercise of such rights and privileges, was elected governor of the State of Nebraska, receiving a greater number of votes than any other person voted for. He took the oath of office, and entered on the discharge of its duties. His predecessor, as relator, filed an information in the Supreme Court of Nebraska, in which were set forth the facts as to the declaration of intention by Boyd's father, and it was further averred that the father did not become a citizen during the son's minority, nor until the October term of the Court of Common Pleas in Muskingum County, Ohio, in the year 1890, when the son, was 56 years of age, and it was claimed that Boyd, the son, never having himself been naturalized, was not, at the time of his election, a citizen of the United States, and was not, under the constitution and laws of Nebraska, eligible to the office of governor of that State, and the relator therefor prayed judgment that Boyd be ousted from that office, and that the relator be declared entitled to it until a successor could be elected. To this information the respondent, in his answer, after stating that his

father, on March 5, 1849, when the respondent was about 14 years of age, made before a court of the State of Ohio his declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States, and averring "that his father for 42 years last past has enjoyed and exercised all of the rights, immunities and privileges and discharged all the duties of a citizen of the United States and of the State of Ohio, and was in all respects and to all intents and purposes a citizen of the United States and of the State of Ohio," and particularly alleging his qualifications to be a citizen, and his acting as such for 40 years, voting and holding office in that State, further distinctly alleged "on information and belief, that prior to October, 1854, his father did in fact complete his naturalization in strict accordance with the acts of Congress known as the naturalization laws so as to admit and constitute him a full citizen of the United States thereunder, he having exercised the rights of citizenship herein described, and at said time informed respondent that such was the fact." To this answer the relator interposed a demurrer, and on these pleadings the court below entered a judgment of ouster against Boyd, to which judgment a writ of error was sued out from this court. Held

(1) That, as the defense relied on arose under an act of Congress and presented a question of Federal law, this court had jurisdiction to review it (Field, judge, dissenting);

(2) That the fact that the respondent's father became a citizen of the United States was well pleaded, and was admitted by the demurrer;

(3) That upon this record Boyd had been for 2 years, next preceding his election to the office of governor, a citizen of the United States and of the State of Nebraska;

(4) That where no record of naturalization can be produced, evidence that a person having the requisite qualifications to become a citizen did in fact and for a long time vote, and hold office, and exercise rights belonging to citizens, is sufficient to warrant a jury in inferring that he has been duly naturalized as a citizen.

And it was further held, by Fuller, chief judge, and Blatchford, Lamar, and Brewer, judges:

(5) That, the Supreme Court having denied to Boyd a right or privilege existing under the Constitution of the United States, this court had jurisdiction, on that ground also, to review the judgment of the Supreme Court of Nebraska;

(6) That, even if the father did not complete his naturalization before the son attained majority, the son did not lose the inchoate status which he had acquired through his father's declaration of intention to become a citizen, and that he occupied in Nebraska the same position which his father would have occupied had he emigrated to that State;

(7) That within the intent and meaning of the acts of Congress he was made a citizen of the United States and of the State of Nebraska under the organic and enabling acts of Congress, and the act admitting that State into the Union;

(8) That Congress has the power to effect a collective naturalization on the admission of a State into the Union, and did so in the case of Nebraska;

(9) That the admission of a State on an equal footing with the original States involves the adoption, as citizens of the United States, of those whom Congress makes members of the political community, and who are recognized as such in the formation of the new State with the assent of Congress;

(10) That the rule prescribed by section 4 of the act of April 14, 1802, 2 Statutes 155, chapter 28, was to be a uniform rule, and there was no reason for limiting such a rule to the children of those who had been already naturalized, but, on the contrary, the intention was that the act of 1802 should have a prospective operation.

I shall quote the following verbatim from the argument of the defendant in error, Boyd, which is to be found at pages 152 to 157 of this case:

It may be true that James E. Boyd believed himself during all those years to have been a citizen of the United States, but that is immaterial. Aliens can only become American citizens through the process of naturalization. It will not do to permit the argument to prevail, that he should be adjudged to be a citizen of the United States, simply because the people of Nebraska, through ignorance of his alienage, permitted him to vote and hold office.

The case of *Dryden v. Swinburne* (20 W. Va. 59), is on all fours with this case. In that case section 2172 of the Revised Statutes was construed, and it was held that a naturalization order cannot be made retroactive; that naturalization cannot be presumed from taking a conveyance of land, voting and exercising other rights of citizenship; that an order admitting to citizenship rebuts the presumption of any previous naturalization; that parol evidence was not competent to prove the fact of naturalization; that section 2172, Revised Statutes was but the act of 1802 continued in force, and that it was not the purpose of Congress by that section to modify or change the law as expressed in the old statute; and that the word "now" as used in the Revised Statutes has reference to the year 1802, when these provisions first became law.

This question has been twice before the legislative department of the Government.

Albert Gallatin was born in Switzerland in 1761, and came to the United States in 1780. In the year 1783 he went to Virginia, and in the month of October 1785 he took the oath of allegiance in that State. In December 1785 he removed to Pennsylvania, where he purchased land and became a permanent resident. He was elected in 1789 a member of the convention which was called to amend the constitution of the State of Pennsylvania, and subsequently he was for three successive years elected a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature. In February 1793 he was elected a Senator from Pennsylvania, and he came to the Senate and took his seat in the December following.

It appears that from the time he took his oath of allegiance in Virginia, in 1785, to the period of his election as Senator, in 1793, he had not been a citizen of the United States for the time required by the Constitution, which is 9 years.

The committee appointed to investigate the case made their report to the Senate, setting forth the foregoing fact. Upon the coming in of the report of the committee, a resolution was offered in these words:

"Resolved, That Albert Gallatin, returned to this House as a Member from the State of Pennsylvania, is duly qualified for and elected to a seat in the Senate of the United States."

This resolution was rejected by a vote of 14 yeas to 12 nays. The record then proceeds as follows:

"A resolution was then offered in these words:

"Resolved, That the election of Albert Gallatin to be a Senator of the United States was void, he not having been a citizen of the United States the term of years required as a qualification to be a Senator of the United States."

"A motion was made to divide the question at the word 'void'; and

"On motion to agree to the first paragraph on the motion so divided, it passed in the affirmative: Yeas 14, nays 12.

"On motion to adopt the resolution, as follows:

"Resolved, That the election of Albert Gallatin to be a Senator of the United States was void, he not having been a citizen of the United States the term of years required as

a qualification to be a Senator of the United States.

"The vote was: Ayes 14, noes 12; and so the resolution was carried."

General Shields was elected a United States Senator from the State of Illinois on the 13th day of January, 1849. He was an alien by birth. He was naturalized in the circuit court of Effingham County on the 21st of October, 1840. He took his seat as United States Senator on the 4th of March, 1849, when his seat was contested upon the ground that he had not been a citizen of the United States the term of 9 years required as a qualification to be a Senator of the United States. He had resided in the State of Illinois 17 years. He had held a number of public offices. He had been a member of the legislature, which required naturalization. He had held the office of Auditor of Public Accounts, which required naturalization. He had been a Judge of the Supreme Court of Illinois, which required naturalization. He had been Commissioner of the General Land Office. He had been a General in the United States Army, and lastly had been elected United States Senator.

The question of his eligibility was referred to a committee which, on the 13th of March, 1849, reported, and the Senate, after a short discussion, resolved "that the election of James Shields to be a Senator of the United States was void, he not having been a citizen of the United States the term of years required as a qualification to be a Senator of the United States at the commencement of the term for which he was elected."

III. The fact that Boyd was an inhabitant of the Territory of Nebraska at the time when Nebraska was admitted into the Union as a State did not have the effect of making him (he then being an alien) a citizen of the United States.

The question for consideration is whether the admission of Nebraska as a State into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, as provided in the enabling act and the act of 1867, made all inhabitants thereof, including aliens ipso facto citizens of the United States.

Similar or the same language is found in the enabling acts by which the various Territories were authorized to form State governments in order to be admitted into the Union of States.

It will be observed by an examination of the enabling act of Nebraska, as also of various other enabling acts, that it contains no provision touching the rights, privileges and immunities of the inhabitants, upon the State coming into the Union. The silence of the enabling acts on this subject is here very important. The inhabitants of these Territories were living within the jurisdiction of the United States, were subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and were already citizens of the United States except such as were aliens. Those inhabitants who were citizens of the United States were nonetheless citizens by reason of the fact that they were inhabitants of the Territories.

Citizens of the United States do not lose their citizenship by changing their residence from a State to a Territory. Citizens of the United States residing in the District of Columbia and in the Territories are such citizens to the same extent that they would be if residing in one of the States. (*Prentiss v. Brennan* (2 Blachford 162); *Pecquet v. Swan* (5 Mason 35).)

It would not be unfair to state that about as large a relative proportion of the inhabitants of the Territory were citizens of the United States as of the inhabitants of any of the States of the Union. There was no occasion, therefore, for Congress to intend the admission of the State into the Union as an act of collective naturalization. There was no more urgency or necessity for such a collective act of naturalization for this Territory than there would be to pass a col-

lective act of naturalization for aliens residing within a State. If Congress had ever intended the admission of States into the Union formed under the various enabling acts to operate as a naturalization of all aliens residing therein, it would doubtless have been so provided in the act itself, in unmistakable terms.

The language of the enabling act has no reference to the status of the inhabitants of the original States when they came into the Union, any more than it can be said to have reference to the footing or relative rights of the original States at the time when they formed the Union of States. Indeed, it is self-evident that no Territory can now be admitted into the Union as a State with all the rights and privileges which were possessed by the original States when they came into the Union.

The view which we have expressed to the effect that the inhabitants of the Territory did not become citizens of the United States by the admission of such Territory as a State into the Union, is expressly held to be sound in *The State v. Primrose* (3 Alabama, 546). This case is referred to in the opinion of the supreme court of Nebraska. We are aware of two earlier cases in Louisiana which seem to announce a contrary view, but we cannot accept them as applicable as the circumstances and legislative provisions were essentially different.

The third section of the Treaty of Paris of 1803 speaks solely of the "inhabitants" of the ceded Territory. It says the "inhabitants" shall be incorporated * * * and admitted as soon as possible * * * to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States, and in the meantime," etc. Neither the circumstances nor the language make the case analogous or similar to the Nebraska case.

The Nebraska enabling act empowers only the inhabitants who are qualified voters, free, white male inhabitants above the age of 21 years, who are already citizens of the United States, or have declared their intention to become such, to prepare a constitution; and provides that this constitution shall be preliminary to the admission of the State into the Union, not preliminary to the admission of the inhabitants to citizenship of the United States.

The closing paragraph of section 5 of the enabling act, referring to the former language of the same section, which relates to the adoption or rejection of the constitution by the qualified voters, which closing paragraph assumes that the constitution has been adopted, says: "Whereupon it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to issue his proclamation declaring the State admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States;" i. e. the new State from that time stands in line with every other State in the Union, with all the privileges and under all the burdens of a State government. No mention is made of the inhabitants; no statement is made that the inhabitants are admitted to citizenship as in the Treaty of Paris. No foreigners or aliens are adopted, nor are any made citizens of the United States.

All the inhabitants of the Territory who were aliens when the same was made a State remained aliens, and no privileges were accorded them which they would not have enjoyed before had they removed from the Territory to a State already admitted. The distinction made in the constitution and the legislation of that State between citizens and aliens is at war with the suggestion that all the inhabitants of Nebraska were citizens of Nebraska and made ipso facto citizens of the United States by the admission of the State into the Union. How can such legislation be harmonized with the argument that all inhabitants were citizens? If all inhabitants were citizens, why was there a provision in the Constitution and in the statutes providing that aliens should file

their declaration of intention to become citizens of the United States before they were entitled either to vote or to hold office? To say that the aliens inhabiting the Territory when the State was admitted into the Union were thereby made citizens of the United States is in conflict with the political history of this country from the time the first State was admitted into the Union down to the present day.

The organic act, the enabling act, the act admitting the State, are each and all simple legislative exertions of the powers of Congress, and in no correct sense treaties or the exercise of the treaty-making power. For the reasons hereinbefore stated we submit in conclusion of this part of the discussion, that there is no analogy between the case of the acquisition by treaty of foreign territory and the status of the inhabitants of the Territory so acquired and the case of the national ownership of the public domain and the status of the people residing therein with the consent of the National Government, which first erects a Territorial government and subsequently makes provision to admit the Territory thus erected as a State of the Union.

Mr. Chief Justice Fuller delivered the opinion of the Court saying in part as follows:

It follows from these documents that Congress regarded as citizens of the Territory all who were already citizens of the United States, and all who had declared their intention to become such. Indeed, they are referred to in section 3 of the enabling act as citizens, and by the organic law the right of suffrage and of holding office had been allowed to them. Those whose naturalization was incomplete were treated as in the same category as those who were already citizens of the United States. What the State had power to do after its admission is not the question. Before Congress let go its hold upon the Territory, it was for Congress to say who were members of the political community. So far as the original States were concerned, all those who were citizens of such States became upon the formation of the Union citizens of the United States, and upon the admission of Nebraska into the Union "upon an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatsoever," the citizens of what had been the Territory became citizens of the United States and of the State.

As remarked by Mr. Chief Justice Waite in *Minor v. Happersett* (21 Wall. 162, 167): "Whoever, then, was one of the people of either of these States when the Constitution of the United States was adopted, became ipso facto a citizen—a member of the Nation created by its adoption. He was one of the persons associating together to form the Nation, and was, consequently, one of its original citizens. As to that there has never been a doubt. Disputes have arisen as to whether or not certain persons or certain classes of persons were part of the people at the time, but never as to their citizenship if they were."

But it is argued that James E. Boyd had never declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, although his father had, and that because, as alleged, his father had not completed his naturalization before the son attained his majority, the latter cannot be held to come within the purview of the acts of Congress relating to the Territory and the admission of the State, so as to be entitled to claim to have been made a citizen thereby.

The act of March 26, 1790 (1 Stat. 103, ch. 3) provided for the naturalization of aliens and then that "the children of such persons so naturalized, dwelling within the United States, being under the age of 21 years at the time of such naturalization, shall also be considered as citizens of the United States."

The third section of the act of January 29, 1795 (1 Stat. 414, 415, ch. 20) provided "that the children of persons duly naturalized, dwelling within the United States, and being under the age of 21 years at the time of such naturalization, and the children of citizens of the United States, born out of the limits and jurisdiction of the United States, shall be considered as citizens of the United States," etc.

The fourth section of the act of April 14, 1802 (2 Stat. 153, 155, ch. 28) carried into the Revised Statutes as section 2172, was: "That the children of persons duly naturalized under any of the laws of the United States, or who, previous to the passing of any law on that subject, by the Government of the United States, may have become citizens of any one of the said States, under the laws thereof, being under the age of 21 years at the time of their parents being so naturalized or admitted to the rights of citizenship, shall, if dwelling in the United States, be considered as citizens of the United States." In *Campbell v. Gordon* (6 Cranch 176) it was held that this section conferred the rights of citizenship upon the minor child of a parent who had been duly naturalized under the act of 1795, although the child did not become a resident of the United States until she came here after that but before the act of 1802 was passed.

The rule was to be a uniform rule, and we perceive no reason for limiting such a rule to the children of those who had been already naturalized. In our judgment, the intention was that the act of 1802 should have a prospective operation (*United States v. Keller* (13 Fed. Rep. 82); *West v. West* (8 Paige 438); *State v. Andrian* (92 Missouri 70); *State v. Penney* (10 Arkansas 621); *O'Connor v. The State* (9 Florida 215)).

By the second section of the act of March 26, 1804 (2 Stat. 292, ch. 47, p. 293), if any alien who had complied with the terms of the act should die without having completed his naturalization, his widow and children should be considered citizens upon taking the oaths prescribed by law; and this was carried forward into section 2168 of the Revised Statutes.

By the first section of the act of May 26, 1824 (4 Stat. 69, ch. 186), carried forward into section 2167 of the Revised Statutes, any alien, being a minor, who shall have resided in the United States 3 years next preceding his arrival at majority and continued to reside therein, may, upon reaching the age of 21 years, and after a residence of 5 years, including the 3 years of minority, be admitted a citizen of the United States without having made during minority the declaration of intention required in the case of aliens.

The statutory provisions leave much to be desired, and the attention of Congress has been called to the condition of the laws in reference to election of nationality; and to the desirability of a clear definition of the status of minor children of fathers who had declared their intention to become citizens, but had failed to perfect their naturalization; and of the status gained by those of full age by the declaration of intention (2 Whart. Int. Dig. 340, 341, 350).

Clearly minors acquire an inchoate status by the declaration of intention on the part of their parents. If they attain their majority before the parent completes his naturalization, then they have an election to repudiate the status which they find impressed upon them, and determine that they will accept allegiance to some foreign potentate or power rather than hold fast to the citizenship which the act of the parent has initiated for them. Ordinarily this election is determined by application on their own behalf, but it does not follow that an actual equivalent may not be accepted in lieu of a technical compliance.

James E. Boyd was born in Ireland of Irish parents in 1834, and brought to this

country in 1844 by his father, Joseph Boyd, who settled at Zanesville, Muskingum County, Ohio, and on March 5, 1849, declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States. In 1855 James E. Boyd, who had grown up in the full belief of his father's citizenship and had been assured by him that he had completed his naturalization by taking out his second papers in 1854, voted in Ohio as a citizen. In August 1856 he removed to the Territory of Nebraska. In 1857 he was elected and served as county clerk of Douglas County; in 1864 he was sworn into the military service and served as a soldier of the Federal Government to defend the frontier from an attack of Indians; in 1866 he was elected a member of the Nebraska Legislature and served one session; in 1871 he was elected a member of the convention to frame a State constitution and served as such; in 1875 he was again elected and served as a member of the convention which framed the present State constitution; in 1880 he was elected and acted as president of the City Council of Omaha; and in 1881 and 1885, respectively, was elected mayor of that city, serving in all, 4 years. From 1856 until the State was admitted, and from thence to this election, he had voted at every election—Territorial, State, municipal, and National. He had taken, prior to the admission of the State, the oath required by law in entering upon the duties of the offices he had filled, and sworn to support the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of the organic act under which the Territory of Nebraska was created. For over 30 years prior to his election as Governor he had enjoyed all the rights, privileges, and immunities of a citizen of the United States and of the Territory and State, as being in law, as he was in fact, such citizen.

When he removed to Nebraska, that Territory was to a large extent a wilderness, and he spent years of extreme hardship upon the frontier, one of the pioneers of the new settlement and one of the inhabitants who subsequently formed a government for themselves. The policy which sought the development of the country by inviting to participation in all the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizenship, those who would engage in the labors and endure the trials of frontier life, which has so vastly contributed to the unexampled progress of the Nation, justifies the application of a liberal rather than a technical rule in the solution of the question before us.

We are of the opinion that James E. Boyd is entitled to claim that if his father did not complete his naturalization before his son had attained majority, the son cannot be held to have lost the inchoate status he had acquired by the declaration of intention, and to have elected to become the subject of a foreign power, but, on the contrary, that the oaths he took, and his action as a citizen, entitled him to insist upon the benefit of his father's act, and placed him in the same category as his father would have occupied if he had emigrated to the Territory of Nebraska; that, in short, he was within the intent and meaning, effect, and operation of the acts of Congress in relation to citizens of the Territory, and was made a citizen of the United States and of the State of Nebraska under the organic and enabling acts, and the act of admission.

Another and shorter course of reasoning leads to the same conclusion.

The respondent, in his answer, after stating that his father, on March 5, 1849, when the respondent was about 14 years of age, made before a court of the State of Ohio his declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States; and averring "that his father for 42 years last past has enjoyed and exercised all of the rights, immunities, and privileges and discharged all the duties of a citizen of the United States, and of the State of

Ohio, and was in all respects and to all intents and purposes a citizen of the United States and of the State of Ohio;" and particularly alleging his qualifications to be a citizen, and his acting as such for 40 years, voting and holding office in that State; further distinctly alleges "on information and belief, that prior to October 1854, his father did in fact complete his naturalization in strict accordance with the acts of Congress known as the naturalization laws, so as to admit and constitute him a full citizen of the United States thereunder, he having exercised the rights of citizenship herein described, and at said time informed respondent that such was the fact."

As the allegation last quoted sets up a right and privilege claimed under the laws of the United States, this court must determine for itself the question of the sufficiency of this allegation, and is not concluded by the view taken of that question by the Supreme Court of Nebraska. In the words of Mr. Justice Miller, speaking for this Court: "The question whether a plea sets up a sufficient defense, when the defense relied on arises under an act of Congress, does present, and that necessarily, a question of Federal law; for the question is and must be, does the plea state facts which under the act of Congress constitute a good defense?" (*Mitchell v. Clark* (110 U. S. 633, 645).)

It is true that naturalization under the acts of Congress known as the naturalization laws can only be completed before a court, and that the usual proof of naturalization is a copy of the record of the court. But it is equally true that where no record of naturalization can be produced, evidence that a person, having the requisite qualifications to become a citizen, did in fact and for a long time vote and hold office and exercise rights belonging to citizens, is sufficient to warrant a jury in inferring that he had been duly naturalized as a citizen. (*Blight v. Rochester* (7 Wheat. 535, 546); *Hogan v. Kurtz* (94 U. S. 773, 778)). And by the constitution of Ohio of 1851, none but white male citizens of the United States were entitled to vote, or to hold office. Article 5, section 1; article 15, section 4; Charters and Constitutions, 1472, 1478.

Such being the settled law, we can have no doubt that the fact that the respondent's father became a naturalized citizen of the United States before October 1854, is well pleaded in the allegation in question, and is, therefore, admitted by the demurrer. The allegation "that prior to October 1854, his father did in fact complete his naturalization in strict accordance with the acts of Congress known as the naturalization laws so as to admit and constitute him a full citizen of the United States thereunder," necessarily implies that he had been duly naturalized before a court as required by those laws. Specific allegations of the time and place at which, and of the court before which, he was so naturalized, or setting forth a record of his naturalization, would have been superfluous, and, in view of the respondent's imperfect information, as manifest upon the face of the allegation, of a transaction taking place so long ago, hardly possible.

Under this allegation, and the earlier allegations leading up to it, if traversed, a jury would have been warranted in inferring that the respondent's father became a citizen of the United States before October 1854, and consequently that the respondent himself was likewise a citizen.

For this reason, without regard to any other question argued in the case, the respondent was entitled to judgment upon the demurrer.

Mr. Justice Harlan, Mr. Justice Gray, and Mr. Justice Brown concurred in the

conclusion of the Court upon the latter course of reasoning only:

All the justices, except Mr. Justice Field, unite in holding that this court has jurisdiction of the case, and that upon this record James E. Boyd had been for 2 years, next preceding his election to the office of governor, a citizen of the United States and of the State of Nebraska.

The judgment of the Supreme Court of Nebraska is reversed, and the cause remanded to be proceeded in according to law and in conformity with this opinion.

Mr. Justice Field dissented but I shall not set same forth here.

So you can see that this is important. You can very well understand that it would be an easy matter to flood Alaska and Hawaii with inhabitants who are Communists just prior to the admission of these Territories into the Union, and the very act of admission would naturalize everyone who was an inhabitant of either one of those Territories.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and to include therein all of an editorial by Edward K. Inman of the National Tribune.)

PATRIOTS' DAY, APRIL 19, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hope that every school in the United States on the 19th of April will read and discuss for an hour the battle of Lexington and Concord and discuss "the shot that was heard around the world," the first shot that was fired in this country for freedom.

In 1620 a little band of Pilgrims from England landed at Plymouth, Mass. They left England because they wanted religious freedom and freedom of action and speech. They enjoyed religious and other freedoms until about 1775. Then they felt that freedom was being impaired. They were being attacked by the British, and although they were not properly armed those farmers at Lexington and Concord took their flintlocks and such ammunition as they could find, and many had only their pitchforks, and beat the British. That is how we won our first freedom in this country.

It is very important, Mr. Speaker, that every child in every school and every student in every college in the United States realize what the patriots of 1775 did to protect our freedom, and for those children to realize today what they themselves must do to keep our country, our institutions, our churches, and our Government free. Our free institutions and free way of life are menaced today by those within and without the United States.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. KELLY of New York (at the request of Mr. CELLER), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. TAURIELLO, for Thursday, April 6, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3946. An act to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'SULLIVAN, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 6, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1359. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the financial statements, accounting procedures, and operations of National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 542); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1360. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to provide for a maximum of funds that may accrue to the Soldiers' Home permanent fund (trust fund), and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1361. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Jose Antonio Gomes, A-9544106 CR 27485, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1362. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Pantaleon Gutierrez-Zuniga, A-6183872 CR 24609, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1363. A message from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$79,887,861 for various departments and agencies (H. Doc. No. 543); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1364. A message from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 and prior fiscal years in the amount of \$96,718,333, together with certain proposed provisions and increases in limitations pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 544); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRYSON: Committee of conference. H. R. 4692. A bill to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World

War II (Rept. No. 1880). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 436. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 22; with amendment (Rept. No. 1881). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 461. Resolution authorizing a survey of the feasibility of constructing a conveyor belt between the House Office Buildings and the Capitol; with amendment (Rept. No. 1882). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 125. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed 5,000 copies of the hearings, held before said committee, on the resolutions entitled "Study of Monopoly Power;" with amendment (Rept. No. 1883). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 5943. A bill to provide for the erection of a monument at the grave of Constantino Brumidi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1884). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 186. Concurrent resolution authorizing a statue of the late Brigham Young, of Utah, to be placed in Statuary Hall; with amendment (Rept. No. 1885). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 535. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Bowers Lawrence Hebard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1886). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 192. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of hearings relative to revenue revision held before the Committee on Ways and Means during the current session, including an index; without amendment (Rept. No. 1887). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 7941. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1888). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6278. A bill to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Health Officer of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1889). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7623. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint to the District Boxing Commission a retired member of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7881. A bill to amend sections 675 and 676 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, regulating the disposal of dead human bodies in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1891). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee of conference. S. 2734. A bill to promote the rehabilitation

of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1892). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of conference. S. 2246. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1893). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 8018. A bill to provide for the transfer to the Department of the Interior of certain furniture for permanent exhibition at the Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Monument; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 8019. A bill to amend section 1404 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the transfer of certain civil actions from one district to another; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 8020. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for those employees engaged in operating civilian-manned vessels of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 8021. A bill to recognize nonprofit nonpolitical veterans' organizations for purposes of bestowing upon them certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8022. A bill to establish a national lottery, the proceeds from which are to be used toward the payment of a Federal bonus to veterans of the armed services of World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 8023. A bill to amend chapter 61 (relating to lotteries) of title 18, United States Code, to make clear that such chapter does not apply to certain contests to advertise or develop the natural or recreational resources of a State or any region or section thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 8024. A bill to recognize nonprofit nonpolitical veterans' organizations for purposes of bestowing upon them certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 8025. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to equalize the legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers and to permit labor organizations to bar Communists from membership; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'SULLIVAN:

H. R. 8026. A bill to amend paragraph 1 (b) of title 49 of the United States Code by striking out of said subsection (b) the words "and except natural or artificial gas"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 8027. A bill to provide financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 8028. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the remaining Government lots in the town site of St. Marks, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 8029. A bill to authorize an appropriation to Mount Ida, Ark., for sewer-construction purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. R. 8030. A bill to insure the periodic election by secret ballot of officers of labor organizations representing employees in industries affecting commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 8031. A bill authorizing the granting of contract authority for the purpose of expediting the construction of additional power-generating facilities on the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 8032. A bill to provide emergency cotton allotments in areas which have been infested by greenbugs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FURCOLO (by request):

H. R. 8033. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that retired medical and dental officers recalled to active duty after September 1, 1947, shall be entitled to receive the special pay provided by such act for other medical and dental officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8034. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 8035. A bill to provide benefits for survivors of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 8036. A bill to provide for national recognition of Adelaide Johnson, the sculptor of the Woman's Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 8037. A bill to amend section 2801 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8038. A bill to provide for the payment of sums in lieu of real-property taxes on Government properties transferred to the national industrial reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8039. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at or near the city of Kenosha, Kenosha County, Wis.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACY:

H. J. Res. 451. Joint resolution to provide a method for obtaining additional information for the Seventeenth Decennial Census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. J. Res. 452. Joint resolution establishing a Federal Motor Vehicle Commission for the purpose of making uniform laws pertaining to operation, ownership, and control of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. Res. 539. Resolution rejecting Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 540. Resolution providing for an increase in salary for an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. Res. 541. Resolution in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 8040. A bill for the relief of Winnfried Amrhein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 8041. A bill for the relief of the estate of Staff Sgt. Harry M. Manson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 8042. A bill for the relief of Clara Bogar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 8043. A bill for the relief of Capt. Richard D. Sullivan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 8044. A bill for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 8045. A bill for the relief of Maria Adam (Maria Adam Schattauer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2051. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature, in favor of an immediate survey of the hydroelectric potentialities of New England States; to the Committee on Public Works.

2052. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging extensive study of New England water development; to the Committee on Public Works.

2053. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, to enact legislation for the distribution of surplus foods to the several States and the political subdivisions thereof in proportion to their population and per capita income; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2054. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, in favor of extending the effective period of the rent-control provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2055. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, to resist any attempt that may be made to subject the American people to a compulsory health-insurance plan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2056. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, in favor of an immediate survey of the hydroelectric potentialities of New England States; to the Committee on Public Works.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the *Americas*, honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil, and an honorary professor in the Catholic University of Chile, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we implore Thy blessing upon the Speaker of this House and upon the Members of the Congress. Let the light of Thy countenance shine upon all our good neighbors, with a spe-

cial benediction for the sons and daughters of the American Republics and Canada.

Recalling the loyal, generous-hearted friendship of the Republic of Chile in our recent ordeal, dear Saviour, we beseech Thy most abundant graces for the President of that noble country throughout the visit which, this month, Don Gabriel González Videla will make to the United States of America.

Vouchsafe this magnificent leader of representative government a safe and prosperous voyage to our Capital and to our people so that he may take back to his own splendid fellow citizens the divine gifts of brotherly love and good works.

This we pray in the name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4567. An act to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. O'CONNOR, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. FERGUSON to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

The SPEAKER. On February 27, 1950, the House of Representatives passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Thursday, April 6, 1950, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, on which day remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today we again welcome the opportunity to celebrate Pan-American Day. It is a day of recognition of the common goals of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. It is a day on which we express good will, mutual respect, and an understanding of one another's problems and ideals.

It is a day also to bring to the attention of our people an evaluation of the recent progress made in inter-American relations because they do represent the spirit and the achievements of the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

RECENT PROGRESS IN INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS

First. Achievements of the Organization of American States: The past year has seen notable progress in streamlining and so making more efficient the machinery of the Organization of American States. The United States has a full-time representative on the Council of the OAS, the Honorable Paul A. Daniels, with rank of ambassador. This fact in itself indicates that our country recognizes the importance of this body. Activities of