

employees of a political subdivision covered by contract under a State-wide retirement system may be granted a separate referendum from other employees covered by the State-wide retirement system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 7222. A bill to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7223. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 7224. A bill to improve the efficiency of the United States civil service; to deny benefits, under the civil service and other retirement systems, to persons convicted of certain felonies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 7225. A bill to improve the efficiency of the United States civil service; to deny benefits, under the civil service and other retirement systems, to persons convicted of certain felonies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 7226. A bill to improve the efficiency of the United States civil service; to deny benefits, under the civil service and other retirement systems, to persons convicted of certain felonies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 7227. A bill to improve the efficiency of the United States civil service; to deny benefits, under the civil service and other retirement systems, to persons convicted of certain felonies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AANDAHL:

H. R. 7228. A bill to prohibit certain reservations of mineral interests by Federal land banks, the Land Bank Commissioner, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Association, and to provide for disposition of certain mineral interests heretofore reserved by them; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 7229. A bill to provide reduced annuities at age 55 after 15 years of civilian service for persons involuntarily separated from the Federal service not by removal for cause; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7230. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, so as to make nontaxable certain stock transfers made by insurance companies to secure the performance of obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 7231. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 7232. A bill to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7233. A bill to amend paragraph (4) of section 15 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the

United States, relating to their senate joint resolution No. 7, relative to assuring a fair share of national defense work for California shipyards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 7234. A bill for the relief of certain Polish sailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 7235. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Campion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENWOOD:

H. R. 7236. A bill for the relief of Joseph Suski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 7237. A bill for the relief of Zohair Abu Roshaid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7238. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Ventimiglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 7239. A bill for the relief of Masuko Oshima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 7240. A bill for the relief of Liborio Guida Rutillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 7241. A bill to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 7242. A bill for the relief of Oscar Beregi, Sr., and Oscar Beregi, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7243. A bill for the relief of Margarethe Leiss Laimburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7244. A bill for the relief of Maria V. Beregi De Pataky and Coloman de Pataky; 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:

649. By Mr. BETTS: Petition of T. L. Plotts and other residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Ohio, requesting Congress to pass a bill limiting foreign service to 1 year's duration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

650. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Lycoming County, Pomona Grange No. 28, of Pennsylvania, in opposition to the placing of a full-time Soil Conservation Service technician in Lycoming County; to the Committee on Agriculture.

651. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Wisconsin, assembled at its midwinter conference, at Beaver Dam, Wis., going on record as approving universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

652. Also, resolution of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Wisconsin, assembled at its midwinter conference, at Beaver Dam, Wis., going on record as approving an immediate increase to those in the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

653. Also, resolution of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Wisconsin, assembled at its midwinter conference, going on record in favor of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Public Works.

654. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John P. Mullen, Washington, D. C., relative to requesting the immediate passage of S. 2800 and H. R. 3265, Presidential primary law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1952)

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

Rev. Robert C. Fletcher, former missionary to the deaf of the South, now missionary to the deaf of the Episcopal Diocese of Alabama and rector of St. John's Church for the Deaf, Birmingham, Ala., offered the following prayer in the sign language, while Dr. Irving S. Fufeld, dean of Gallaudet College, read it orally:

O God, our Heavenly Father, who hast in all ages showed forth Thy power and mercy in the preservation of this world, our Nation and its people, and in the protection of all who put their trust in Thee. We commend this world and especially this Nation to Thy merciful care, that being guided by Thy providence, we may dwell secure in Thy peace. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Defend our liberties, preserve our unity.

Most heartily we beseech Thee with Thy favor to behold and bless each Member of this august body, the Senate of the United States, all others in authority and their beloved ones at home. And so replenish them with the grace of Thy holy spirit that they may always incline to Thy will, and walk in Thy way. Endue them plenteously with heavenly gifts and make them ever mindful of their calling to serve our people, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 25, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7151) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT
RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, March 26, 1952, he signed the following bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

- H. R. 648. An act to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of aliens Max Mayer Hirsch Winzelberg and Mrs. Jenty Fuss De Winzelberg;
H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Basil Vasso Argyris and Mrs. Aline Argyris;
H. R. 773. An act for the relief of Mering Bichara;
H. R. 827. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas;
H. R. 1043. An act to provide for medical services to non-Indians in Indian hospitals, and for other purposes;
H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl;
H. R. 1416. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Valdenigo and Albertina Gioglio Valdenigo;
H. R. 1446. An act for the relief of Calcedonio Tagliarini;
H. R. 1828. An act for the relief of Maria Szentgyorgyi Mayer;
H. R. 1831. An act to admit Luigi Morelli to the United States for permanent residence;
H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of James Yao;
H. R. 2283. An act for the relief of Setsuko Yamashita, the Japanese fiancée of a United States citizen veteran of World War II, and her son Takashi Yamashita;
H. R. 2775. An act for the relief of Anneliese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margaret Elise Vollrath;
H. R. 2833. An act for the relief of Rudolf Bing and Nina Bing;
H. R. 2923. An act for the relief of Adelaide Reyes;
H. R. 3144. An act relating to certain construction cost adjustments in connection with the Greenfields division of the Sun River irrigation project, Montana;
H. R. 3153. An act for the relief of Signa Angela Maino Cristallo;
H. R. 3374. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lourdes Augusta Pereira Ladeira Rose;
H. R. 3847. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to school district No. 28, Ronan, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian land;
H. R. 4010. An act for the relief of William Grant Braden, Jr.;
H. R. 4288. An act for the relief of Elvira Zachmann;
H. R. 4467. An act to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C.;
H. R. 4798. An act to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to qualifications of jurors;
H. R. 5347. An act for the relief of Fusako Terao Scogin;
H. R. 5389. An act for the relief of Ching Wong Keau (Mrs. Ching Sen);
H. R. 5558. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Krause;
H. R. 5598. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a parcel of land to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association, Salt Lake City, Utah;
H. R. 5951. An act to add certain owned land to the Mound City Group National Monument, in the State of Ohio, and for other purposes;
H. R. 6065. An act for the relief of Patrick J. Logan;
H. R. 6242. An act to restore certain land to the Territory of Hawaii and to authorize said Territory to exchange the whole or a portion of the same;
H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.; and

H. J. Res. 363. Joint resolution to provide for the presentation of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Henrik Kurt Carlsen, master, steamship *Flying Enterprise*.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE
SESSION

On request of Mr. STENNIS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. LEHMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has the floor, but I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business without jeopardizing his right to the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chief scout executive of the Boy Scouts of America, New York, N. Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Boy Scouts of America, for the year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONSTITUTION OF COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO
RICO

A letter from the secretary of the Constituent Convention of Puerto Rico, transmitting a copy of the constitution of the commonwealth of Puerto Rico (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE
ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COM-
MERCE—PETITION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present a petition signed by some 97 citizens of Newcastle County, Del., praying for the enactment of S. 2444, to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over radio and television. I request that the petition be referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be received, and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as requested by the Senator from Delaware.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUB-
MERGED LANDS—LETTER FROM IOWA
STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from Charles F. Martin, executive secretary of the Iowa State Education Association, of Des

Moines, Iowa, praying for the adoption of the Hill amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20, to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

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

IOWA STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Des Moines, Iowa, March 19, 1952.
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The executive board of the Iowa State Education Association, representing some 23,000 teachers in the State of Iowa, in special session March 15, 1952, passed a resolution supporting Senator LISTER HILL's amendment to the Senate Joint Resolution 20. This action was taken after careful deliberation and evaluation of all available aspects of the issue involved. The evidence in support of the Hill amendment was so obvious that the executive board had no hesitancy in unanimously endorsing it.

We trust that you will be able to give this amendment your support on the floor of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. F. MARTIN,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS LIVESTOCK
ASSOCIATION, WICHITA, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to make a short statement with reference to some resolutions adopted by the Kansas Livestock Association.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Livestock Association held its thirty-ninth annual convention at Wichita, Kans., on March 13, 14, and 15, at which time they adopted some very strong resolutions, in which they expressed unanimously and vigorously their opposition to Government planning and subsidies in all forms and price ceilings in connection with the production of meat animals, and the sale of meat and meat products.

The membership of the Kansas Livestock Association is composed of outstanding livestock producers who are not only thoroughly familiar with the problems of producing livestock, but have had wide experience in the marketing of meat animals.

It is interesting to note for the year 1951 Government planning and price controls reduced the slaughter of meat animals to the smallest slaughter for any year in the past 10 years.

It seems as though the present national administration will not learn from past experiences. Certainly with the historical background of price controls and their effect on the production and marketing of livestock and livestock products in World War II, we should

have realized that price controls and regulations for meat products disrupts the livestock industry and does not benefit the consumer.

Recently the Record Stockman, Denver, Colo., the largest livestock publication in the West, reported that a survey showed prices of beef and lamb on the hoof are lower than in 1948, yet prices to consumers are higher.

The price of top fat steers on the Denver market, it said, dropped from \$40.25 a hundredweight in August 1948 to \$34.50 in March this year.

Retail prices on T-bone steaks went to \$1.16 per pound this month from 85 cents in August 1948, round steak to 99 cents from 97, chuck pot roast to 72 cents from 59, and hamburger to 77 cents from 57.

The Record Stockman said fat lamb prices paid to producers were \$31.65 per hundred pounds in 1948 and \$27 this March, and that lamb chop prices went to \$1.12 per pound from 58 cents, leg of lamb to 81 cents from 59, and stewing lamb to 39 cents from 29.

The market price on top hogs fell to \$18.35 this month from \$32.25 in August 1948, the paper said. Retail prices were up 7 cents on loin chops to 67 cents and up 6 cents on ham to 75 cents, but bacon prices dropped 5 cents per pound to 64 cents.

Presently our citizens are spending 6 percent of their disposable income for meat and on the basis of present prices should be buying their meat at a lower price than in 1948, yet statistics prove that the cost to consumers is considerably higher.

Meat is an essential item of food and forms an important part of the diet of our American citizens.

In my opinion, Congress should eliminate the Government planning and price fixing in regard to livestock and meat products.

The operations of the law of supply and demand in the livestock market and the distribution of meat to our citizens will result in an increased supply of meat for our people.

The resolutions adopted at the annual convention deal with other problems affecting our domestic welfare, and I ask unanimous consent to have them made a part of these remarks, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KANSAS CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

The Kansas Livestock Association extends its thanks and deep appreciation for the untiring efforts of our congressional delegation in Washington toward freeing the livestock industries of this Nation, as well as the general public, from the shackles of OPS regimentation which, if pursued indefinitely, can only lead to lower production, a lower standard of living, and the loss of our greatest treasure, liberty.

FREEDOM

We frankly recognize the fact that the policies and acts of government, which we did heretofore and do now condemn, have been legalized ostensibly under the theory that, by promoting the economic security of the individual, they would abolish want and fear. This, we assert, is the identical false

theory on which rests the doctrine of communism—a belief which denies the nature of man, insults the Creator, desecrates our Constitution, and violates the Ten Commandments. It has sapped the spirit and strength of every Christian nation that has indulged it, including once-invincible Britain, and is now dismally depleting our own national spirit, pride, and power.

We fully recognize the grim fact that, adhering to the false doctrine here condemned, our country has already strayed so far down the easy road to ruin that the way back to righteousness will be rough and hard.

We are quite conscious of the pain that will attend the reversal of our present course. The transition from an untenable artificial economy to the law of supply and demand inexorably decreed by nature; from the lavish spending of inflated dollars to the enforced exercise of public and private thrift in the use of an honest currency; from dependence on the subsidies of socialism to the self-reliance of enlightened capitalism; this transition, we know, will inflict upon each one of us heavy hardship and stern sacrifice.

But, upholding the old Constitution and honoring the founders of the Republic, we demand its restoration and, with the help of the eternal, pledge to that accomplishment, as did they, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Whereas the Kansas Livestock Association in convention at Topeka 2 years ago passed a resolution entitled "Holding to Freedom"; and

Whereas the policies of government therein condemned have continued unabated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we now repeat and reaffirm our denunciation of those policies with renewed vigor and with determination, strengthened by the added evidence of their evil that time has afforded; and be it further

Resolved, That we summon all patriots and honest advocates of human freedom to unite and act with firm purpose to recover the natural rights and freedom of which government has deprived them; to this end be it further

Resolved, That we will support for elective office, in both Federal and State Governments, only those candidates who, by word and deed, honestly demonstrate their purpose to reverse the current trend toward socialism and to restore the Republic; be it also

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to every Representative and Senator of the Congress now convened in Washington, to the President, and to every candidate who either actively or passively seeks nomination at the approaching party conventions in Chicago.

QUOTAS

The slaughter of cattle during the year 1951 was the smallest of any year in the past 10 years, and this reduced supply of beef was caused by Government planning and price fixing. In the interest of better nutrition and the health of our people, meat must be kept on the tables in the homes of the people of our Nation in an ample amount: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to reject the bills pending in both the House and Senate that would give the administration the power to reimpose cattle slaughter quotas.

CEILINGS

At the present time, meat at the wholesale level is selling below ceiling, and yet the industry is forced to spend millions annually, just to handle extensive paper work necessary to comply with meat ceilings and regulations; this in addition to the millions being spent by the Government to enforce ceilings.

Furthermore, with meat selling for less than ceiling at the wholesale level, there

has been little or no reduction at the retail level, because ceilings have been used by the meat retailer as a leverage and guide to secure the highest possible price from the consumer: Be it

Resolved, That every Member of the Congress be advised of these conditions and urged to thoroughly investigate a situation which is proving costly to both consumer and producer alike.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT AND SOCIAL WELFARE

Our Federal Government is and will be faced for some time with a continued high expenditure of money for the defense effort as well as for routine governmental expenses. If we as a Nation are to remain solvent, all unwarranted and nonessential expenditures of our money must be eliminated. The care of the needy is and should be a local and State responsibility, as in their hands a more businesslike and economical administration of these matters could be expected.

It is imperatively necessary that all Government spending be held to a figure at or below actual revenue, and that the present unsound policy of greater spending, higher taxes, and deficit spending be changed immediately and a sound fiscal policy be adopted.

The cost of social welfare is ever increasing despite a period of high-level employment. It is certain that many persons who are able-bodied are receiving welfare benefits to which they are not entitled; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the legislative committee of the Kansas Livestock Association institute every effort toward the end of helping the Kansas Legislature pass adequate legislation providing for a lien against the property at the death of those receiving aid from our social-welfare program. Moreover, that these committees should thoroughly investigate with the end in mind of determining whether or not a reduction could be made in the present social-welfare costs in this State, without injury to worthy persons now receiving aid.

FLOOD CONTROL

Whereas the need for the control of flood waters of our Kansas farm lands and streams has long been recognized; and

Whereas the 1951 rainfall produced the greatest floods of record, resulting in direct property damage of unprecedented extent to both our cities and to our farms, resulting in tremendous financial losses and great jeopardy to the personal safety of many of our people; and

Whereas extensive damage does occur annually on our fertile farm lands during the season of heavy rainfall, and which damage, if unrestrained, can render many farms unproductive and of little use in production of vital foodstuffs: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association urge that all participating Government agencies be so coordinated that their united efforts may accomplish the greatest good in the public interest and that effective economy result from such coordination; and be it further

Resolved, That control of water run-off where it falls be as fundamental and primary in any flood-control program as may be the building of dams, whether large or small, in order that we may preserve the most precious heritage of our topsoil and inundate an absolute minimum acreage as of our rich bottom land since maximum food production is essential; and be it further

Resolved, That this expression of our deep concern for the present and future security of the Kansas people be furnished to each Member of our congressional delegation in Washington.

PRICE CONTROL

Experience and history in countries controlled and dominated by socialistic doctrines and governments imposing controls and regulations demonstrate and reveal a resulting lowering and decrease in the supply of all foods, but particularly meat, in all of such countries.

For the year 1951 Government planning and price controls reduced the slaughter of meat animals to the smallest slaughter for any year in the past 10 years.

It is a simple economic fact, the truth of which has been witnessed in this and other countries, that Government planning and price fixing do not create any more meat animals and cannot create any more meat for the consumers, but have the opposite effect of limiting and restricting meat animals and meat, and have the further effect of disturbing the normal distribution thereof by encouraging black marketing and resultant disrespect for law.

Inasmuch as the production of meat for human consumption will be limited, restricted and reduced by continued Government planning and price fixing, and there is not sufficient meat in this country to supply the consumers on the basis of past consumption records, which indicate that approximately 6 percent of the disposable income of consumers has been spent for meat, and

Moreover, as the estimated human population of this country by the year 1961 will be approximately 180,000,000, an additional 25,000,000,000 pounds of meat will be necessary to supply Americans with as much meat per person as they had during the year 1951, a year in which Government planning and price fixing resulted in a reduction in the slaughter of meat animals.

It is generally accepted fact that meat as an item of food is essential and requisite to the health, progress and welfare of the American public.

Again those who are in possession of the facts know the elimination of Government planning and price fixing will encourage a voluntary increase in the production of meat animals and will result in an increased supply of meat for all consumers, according to American principles and traditions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Kansas Livestock Association, in convention assembled, unanimately and vigorously oppose Government planning subsidies in all forms and price ceilings in connection with the production of meat animals, and the sale of meat and meat products; and further oppose any and all restrictions upon the production of meat animals, all for the reason that such Government planning and price ceilings have the effect of reducing the production of meat animals and the supply of meat available to the public; be it further

Resolved, That Federal bureaus and agencies take immediate action to dissolve and eliminate all Government planning and all price fixing pertaining to the production of meat animals and the sale of meat; and thereafter actively encourage the voluntary and free production of meat animals and the sale of meat; and the voluntary and free production and distribution of feeds for the purpose of increasing meat animals.

ESSENTIAL INDUSTRY

In the interest of adequate production of food and fiber, as a vital phase of the American defense effort, we view with deep concern the ever-increasing critical shortage of farm manpower, along with a less encouraging outlook for fertilizers and other kinds of materials and equipment needed for agricultural production.

Experienced farm workers have been drawn from the land by the draft and by the high wage rates and draft security of industries designated by the Government as critical and essential to the defense effort.

To prevent further serious curtailment of food-production activities, we respectfully implore that Federal officials take immediate action, as follows:

1. Include agriculture in its rightful place as one of the critical industries designated as essential to the defense effort, as a means of channeling more nearly adequate supplies of manpower, materials, and equipment to the Nation's farmers and livestock producers.

2. Adjust draft quotas, now based on available population figures, which in many cases are unrealistic because of large shifts of labor from farms to the defense areas during the past 5 years.

3. Include veterinarians with farm labor as essential workers, as a means of protecting the Nation's meat supply, giving to the farm workers and veterinarians every consideration that is accorded workers of any other industry in the defense effort.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2748. A bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1952; without amendment (Rept. No. 1354).

JOINT COMMITTEE TO ARRANGE FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT, JANUARY 20, 1953—REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to arrange for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on January 20, 1953, submitted by him on March 24, 1952, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1953.

JULIA LEE LUCAS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution. The resolution provides for the payment of 6 months' compensation to Julia Lee Lucas, widow of Roy Lucas, the amount being approximately \$1,575. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 297) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Julia Lee Lucas, widow of Roy Lucas, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY AND ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 288) extending the authority of, and providing additional funds for, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, under Senate Resolution 53, to investigate personnel needs and practices of the various governmental agencies, submitted by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] on March 7, 1952, I report it favorably, without amendment, and I submit a report (No. 1353) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service under Senate Resolution 53, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to February 19, 1951, as amended (authorizing an investigation of the personnel needs and practices of the various governmental departments and agencies), and the time for reporting the results of its study and investigation thereunder is hereby extended to January 31, 1953.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out its duties under such resolution, the committee is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman, the sum of \$50,000, in addition to any sums heretofore authorized for such purpose.

FUNDS FOR STUDY OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND RELATED PROBLEMS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without additional amendment, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) providing funds for a study of the Railroad Retirement Act and related problems, submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on January 24, 1952, and I submit a report (No. 1351) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which had been reported previously from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after "S. Con. Res. 51", to strike out "Eighty-first" and insert "Eighty-second".

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That for the purposes of Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to October 17, 1951 (establishing a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study of the Railroad Retirement Act, and of such related problems as it may deem proper) the joint committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to ex-

pend not to exceed \$50,000, and such expenses shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

EXPENDITURES BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 64) authorizing certain expenditures by the Joint Committee on the Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, submitted by my colleague the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] on February 21, 1952, I report it favorably with an amendment, and I submit a report (No. 1352) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, on page 1, line 3, after the word "expend", to insert "until January 31, 1953".

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration is authorized to expend until January 31, 1953, not in excess of \$25,000, one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman, for the purpose of paying the expenses of the committee under section 10 of the act entitled "An act 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 Reservation, and for other purposes," approved April 19, 1950. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "MAKING ENDS MEET ON LESS THAN \$2,000 A YEAR"

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 289) providing for the printing of a document entitled "Making Ends Meet on Less Than \$2,000 a Year," submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on March 7, 1952. The total cost of printing the document will be \$960. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 289) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Making Ends Meet on Less Than \$2,000 a Year" be printed as a Senate document; and that 2,000 additional copies shall be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

INVESTIGATION OF RELATIONSHIP OF UNITED STATES WITH THE INDIANS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 296), submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ECTON, and Mr. WATKINS) on March 18, 1952, I report it favorably, without amendment. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, is the resolution unanimously reported?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was no objection in the committee.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditure under Senate Resolution 292, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 13, 1950, and as extended by Senate Resolution 32, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 29, 1951, and as further extended by Senate Resolution 152, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to June 29, 1951, authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the relations of the United States with the Indians and Indian tribes, is hereby increased by \$15,000.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2918. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 2919. A bill for the relief of Luigi Tanzil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 2920. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2921. A bill for the relief of Spiros A. Magoulas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2922. A bill to amend subsection (d) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOODY:

S. 2923. A bill for the relief of Sadao Ninomiya, Yoshiko Ninomiya and Kayoko Ninomiya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2924. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2518) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 AND HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947—AMENDMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2645) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7151) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Robert E. Wolfard and sundry other officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve, for appointment in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Eighty-eight postmasters.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by Senator BENTON at sixty-seventh annual meeting of HIAS in New York City, March 23, 1952.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

Statement prepared by him expressing resentment of taxpayers in Idaho over wasteful Federal expenditures.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him and article and editorial from the Macon News of March 17,

1952, regarding the visit to Macon of students from Manitowoc, Wis.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Article published in Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner of March 16, 1952, relating to unveiling of a plaque in memory of John Moses Browning, firearms inventor.

Editorial entitled "They Are Thinking of Our Posterity," published in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, on March 22, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "The National Guard," published in the Pennsylvania Guardsman for March 1952.

Editorial entitled "Pennsylvania's Korea Loss Mounts to 1,245 Killed in Action," published in the Pennsylvania Guardsman for March 1952.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Article entitled "Safeguarding the Constitution," written by Fred Brenckman, and published in the March 1952 issue of the Pennsylvania Grange News.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Article entitled "Interview With Eisenhower," published in U. S. News & World Report of March 28, 1952.

By Mr. MOODY:

Article entitled "Monday Wash Line," written by Malcolm W. Binyay, and published in the Detroit Free Press, March 24, 1952.

NATIONAL MONUMENT TO MARYLAND VOLUNTEERS IN BATTLE OF BROOKLYN DURING REVOLUTIONARY WAR—EDITORIAL FROM BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, one of the least known but certainly one of the most heroic battles ever recorded in the history of our country was the engagement between the courageous volunteers from the State of Maryland and the seasoned British regulars in the Battle of Brooklyn during the American Revolutionary War.

At long last there has begun a united effort to secure recognition for these gallant men. Recently I introduced a bill to establish a national monument to these men of courage.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore Sun on this subject.

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

WHEN MARYLANDERS SAVED THE REVOLUTION

In military ground operations, seldom is there a more exacting assignment than acting as rear guard. Seldom is there anywhere greater opportunity for the display of heroism.

That rare opportunity came to Maryland troops early in the history of our country. Defending New York against the British, who were using Staten Island as a staging area for an amphibious attack, General Washington took up a precarious position with an army of 10,000 men on Brooklyn Heights, Long Island. There he was attacked by a British army of thrice the number.

Under the impact of the assault the left of the American line was broken and thrown into confusion. Behind the Army lay the East River. Washington's situation was desperate. The only hope of saving his forces from complete destruction rested in a retreat across the river. The British were driving him hard and time was precious. Fortunately there were New Englanders in the Army who could handle boats.

Fortunately too, as it turned out, there were present the flower of Maryland's youth to the number of about 400. This was Smallwood's first Maryland battalion, commanded by Maj. Mordecai Gist. Three com-

panies were composed of Baltimoreans. On this day, August 27, 1776, they were to get their baptism of fire.

While the rest of the Army withdrew, the Marylanders were ordered to counterattack and hold off the British. They did it so effectively that the American main body escaped with all its arms and equipment. But the cost to the Marylanders was heavy. Of the 400 who went into battle, 256 were killed, wounded, or missing.

The Marylanders were buried where they fell and the spot has since become a slum area of Brooklyn. Thanks largely to the unceasing efforts of Mr. James A. Kelly, Brooklyn Borough historian, who would not let the matter rest, it now looks as though those heroes of 175 years ago are going to get the honor they deserve. Bills sponsored by New Yorkers and Marylanders have been presented in both Houses of Congress authorizing the Army to purchase and restore the cemetery in which the Marylanders are buried and to erect a suitable memorial.

In recognition of Mr. Kelly's services, Governor McKeldin has made him an honorary citizen of Maryland. Certainly he has earned the gratitude of this State for the interest he has taken on behalf of its heroic sons.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call without jeopardizing the right of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection, provided I do not lose the floor. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McFARLAND. — I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before resuming my remarks on the pending business I wish to refer briefly to a matter which has been called to my attention, having to do with a news article in the New York Times of this morning, from the United Press. The pertinent portion of the article reads as follows:

The Senate suspended its jealously guarded rules today to permit an \$18,000-a-year lobbyist to sit in a chair on the Senate floor to advise a Senator during debate.

The Senator was SFESSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, who spoke on the controversial issue of Federal control of the rich oil lands along the country's coasts.

Mr. HOLLAND asked unanimous consent of the Senate to give Walter R. Johnson floor privileges. The latter is a former attorney general of Nebraska and since 1948 has been a registered lobbyist for the National Association of Attorneys General. Only a few Senators were present when Mr. HOLLAND made his request and no one objected.

Mr. Johnson has been a leading lobbyist for legislation to give the States unquestioned title to the off-shore oil lands. In 1947, the Supreme Court ruled that the Federal Government has paramount rights to these lands.

During his 3-hour speech, Senator HOLLAND conferred with Mr. Johnson from time to time. Veteran Senate attachés said that they could recall no precedent for permitting a lobbyist floor privileges during debate. Senate rules permit former Senators who become lobbyists floor privileges, but others are barred.

Mr. President, I shall not read the latter portions of this article, which are factual reports of the matters which came up during the course of yesterday's discussion. I think, however, that I would be wholly derelict in my duty, both to former Attorney General Johnson and to all the States of the United States, as well as to myself as a Senator representing a sovereign State, which State has a very deep conviction on the submerged lands' question, as shown by the resolution of the Florida Legislature, which I introduced in the RECORD yesterday and which was unanimously adopted by both Houses of the Florida Legislature and approved by the Governor of Florida, if I did not at this time say that in my judgment it was completely proper and a perfectly legitimate exception to the ordinary rules of the Senate for me to ask for a waiver of the rule by unanimous consent so that Attorney General Johnson could be available to give technical and professional advice in the course of my argument on the highly complex questions of law and fact which we are now discussing.

Mr. President, in order that the record may show rather fully what the facts are, I ask Senators to listen to a recital of the position of General Johnson in this whole picture.

Gen. Walter R. Johnson served as attorney general of the State of Nebraska, after being elected five times to that office by the people of Nebraska, from 1939 to 1949.

He was chairman of the submerged lands committee of the National Association of Attorneys General during the consideration by the United States Supreme Court of the California case, from the very inception of this question, and the beginning of the showing of necessary interest on the part of the States in seeing to it that their own interests were heard and properly presented.

General Johnson has been the leading advocate for the attorneys general, and through them for all the States in the presentation of the States' side of this important question, beginning, as I have just said, when, as chairman of the submerged lands committee of the National Association of Attorneys General, he ap-

peared in 1946 and 1947 in the United States Supreme Court in company with various other attorneys general, as representative of the association, and as representative of all the States in the filing of briefs, as *amici curiae*.

The States have been diligent from the very beginning in seeing to it that their own interests were presented, and to the best of their ability were safeguarded, as is shown by his appearance and presentation of the case of the States as *amicus curiae*, and as representing the submerged lands committee of the attorneys general, of which General Johnson was at the time chairman. Later he served as president of the National Association of Attorneys General, but by special request of the association he remained as chairman of the submerged lands committee throughout his incumbency as president of the association, because of his peculiar knowledge and technical skill in that field.

In 1948, while still attorney general of the State of Nebraska and while he was appearing before congressional committees as chairman of the Submerged Lands Committee in behalf of the Association and in behalf of all States, he thought that out of an excess of caution he should register as a lobbyist, though his whole appearance in Congress was in behalf of the States and at a time when he was serving as attorney general of a sovereign State.

There was a distinct question at the time as to whether he needed to register, but he felt that he should resolve that question in the affirmative, which he did. He has continued that course during the period of time since he ceased to serve as attorney general of Nebraska in 1949 when he came here under the employ of the States as a whole to serve, entirely in a professional way, as the technical consultant and adviser of the States who were seeking, through the development of this question in both Houses of Congress, to see that their case was properly presented and heard.

He has been employed from 1949 until this time by the National Association of Attorneys General, on a salary, to represent the States. General Johnson tells me that although repeatedly offered other Washington business to handle for private concerns before Congress he has represented no other interests during his handling of the case of the States, which he has conducted with the utmost decorum and the highest ability, and never in the attitude of being a behind-the-corner persuader of Senators. Instead, he has confined his activities to appearances in behalf of bills which were pending in the several committees in both Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, those services have been performed entirely as a professional, entirely under the name of the National Association of Attorneys General, and as the representative of the association and of all the States of the Nation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. If Senators will allow me to do so, I should like to complete my statement, which will be brief. The record should show the complete background of the case.

Beginning in 1947 the National Association of Attorneys General, in order to make their position very clear, adopted a resolution, which they have continued annually to adopt, in which they have expressed their intention to see that the rights of the States are protected, defended, and adequately presented. In each instance one feature of the original resolution has been repeated, which I shall quote:

Resolved, That all of such activities in this association shall remain entirely independent of private interests and shall be financed solely from public funds voluntarily contributed by the States to this committee.

I understand that the resolution of each year adopted, since the one in 1947, contains that identical provision.

I have read the text of the resolution as it appears in the joint hearings before the Committees on the Judiciary of the Congress of the United States, Eightieth Congress, at page 1046. At that time the attorneys general wanted to make it very clear what their organization was doing in this matter, namely, that they represented no private interests, but, instead, were financed entirely from State funds. In pursuance of law, reports have been annually filed since that time showing clearly the sources of the association's finances. The reports show clearly that the financing has been solely from State sources and that its sole representative, General Johnson, has been the advocate of States' rights and has been the technical adviser and spokesman of the States in the presentation of their claims for consideration by Congress.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me at this point?

Mr. HOLLAND. When I yield, I shall yield first to the majority leader, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

Mr. President, if Senators will bear with me for a moment, I simply wish the RECORD to show this picture clearly.

First, Mr. President, I point out the fact that it is quite customary in the Senate to grant unanimous consent to Senators who are handling technical and complicated matters which closely affect the Federal Government or Federal agencies to have technical employees of those agencies admitted to the floor of the Senate for the purpose of advising the Senators who are handling those complicated matters. I could recall numerous instances of that kind, but at this time I shall mention only two. One of them was in connection with the handling of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. In that connection it was considered entirely proper for the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Finance Committee, to request and receive unanimous consent to have a technical employee of the Department of State admitted to the floor, to advise the Senators who were handling that measure, which was of such great importance to the State Department, and was primarily requested and recommended by the administration and the State Department. Likewise, I recall that in connection with my own handling of the so-called dis-

persal bill, it was considered entirely proper for the Senate to admit to the floor of the Senate, by unanimous consent, following my request, the Commissioner of Public Buildings, Mr. Reynolds, and the technical officer from the Defense Department, Colonel Potts, who had peculiar knowledge of atomic energy matters. By unanimous consent, they were admitted to the floor of the Senate, so that their technical assistance might be available to me and to other Senators who were handling that measure, the enactment of which was so urgently desired and recommended by the agencies I have mentioned.

The only difference between those two cases and the instant one are as follows: First, the salaries of those experts were paid by the Federal Government, whereas General Johnson's salary is paid by all the State governments. That is one point of difference. A second point of difference is that General Johnson—out of what I regard as an excess of caution—has registered as a lobbyist, in order that by no means could his position here ever be misunderstood.

The present question is simply whether the States, acting together as a group in a matter which vitally affects them, and having paid out of their own public funds an able, skilled lawyer who began his representation as a distinguished attorney general for 10 years of a very fine State, may have him available here on the floor of the Senate, to advise on the technical side of the issue which is being presented and handled by a Senator who believes in States' rights, and who is supporting States' rights, and who is advocating the bill which has been approved by so many State legislatures and is supported by about 40 of the States, through their State governments. The question is whether the technical information solely available from this distinguished former attorney general, who alone has had continuous professional contact with this question in the precise capacity I have just mentioned, and who, as I have said, is paid out of State funds, shall be available in the way in which they were made available yesterday.

The Senate will recall, of course, that General Johnson came on this floor only after having been granted unanimous consent to do so, and that he spoke, I believe, to no one except myself. I was speaking at that time, and on two or three occasions I referred to General Johnson for some technical information.

Senators will also recall that I requested that consent, and that the consent was given, and that the distinguished Senator who then was serving as Presiding Officer of the Senate, in welcoming to the floor General Johnson and the assistant attorney general of Louisiana, another distinguished attorney, made comments which I shall now read into the RECORD from page 2816 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday. First I shall read the request I made at that time, as follows:

I should like to ask unanimous consent at this time that Mr. Walter R. Johnson,

former attorney general of the State of Nebraska and presently special counsel of the National Association of Attorneys General, and Mr. John L. Madden, assistant attorney general of Louisiana, be permitted to be present in the Chamber during the discussion of this subject.

The Presiding Officer of the Senate replied as follows:

Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Chair wishes to welcome these two distinguished gentlemen to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I simply wish to have these facts appear in the RECORD.

It so happens that the technical matters on which I wish to be advised by General Johnson and by Assistant Attorney General Madden are completed, insofar as my remarks are concerned; and now I propose to introduce the substitute bill which I announced in the beginning I would be ready to introduce for myself and a large group of other Senators at the close of my remarks. Therefore, although the question could not arise today because I now have no occasion to need the presence of either of these distinguished gentlemen, who are such outstanding experts in this technical field, yet I felt that in justice to them, in justice to the States of the Union, and in justice to myself as a Senator of the United States, I could not leave unchallenged the article which at least implies that there was something improper both in my request to have General Johnson available to advise in regard to technical matters, and in the granting of that request by the unanimous consent of the 20 or 30 Members of the Senate who were present at that time.

Incidentally, Mr. President, the article would also in a measure reflect upon the remarks of the distinguished Senator who then was the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and who at that time I think was not only entirely within the facts, but also was most gracious in welcoming those two distinguished attorneys to the floor of the Senate, after the Senate had given its unanimous consent to their presence here. I felt that the RECORD should affirmatively show these facts.

Then the whole issue becomes as follows: Can the States of the United States be deprived of the presence of the sole person, as a technical adviser, who has had continuing professional contact with these important and highly technical questions, simply because he has registered as a lobbyist, although he has carefully confined all his activities in Washington solely to representation of the States of the Union, which it seems to me are equally entitled to have their rights safeguarded by such a proceeding, which is customary in the matter of safeguarding the rights of agencies of the Federal Government.

Now I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Florida, that I do not think anyone has a higher standard of ethics than does he.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I know the distinguished Senator from Florida would

not under any circumstances do anything which he believed to be improper. I know also that he is very much interested in the joint resolution which is now pending before the Senate and in the way it affects his State.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I must say in all candor that had I been on the floor of the Senate when the unanimous-consent request was made, I would have been compelled to object, not because of General Johnson or his standing, but because of what I believe the rules to be and because I believe they should be observed on the floor of the Senate.

I happened to be in the majority policy committee, and was not on the floor of the Senate at the time. However, I simply wish to state the reasons why I would have objected.

Mr. President, if we were to allow representatives of States to appear on the floor of the Senate on behalf of proposed legislation in which the States were interested, we could have as many as 48 representatives of the various States on the floor at the same time, sitting by their respective Senators.

From time to time the Senate has had under consideration proposed legislation which vitally affected my State, and I must say in all frankness that I would have been happy to have had at my side one of the officials of my State. However, I did not think it was proper to do so.

Of course, the other States also are interested in this important measure, and they would wish to have representatives here on the floor. If that were permitted, there simply would be no limit to the number of persons who might be on the floor of the Senate.

I wish to explain my attitude because I do not desire to have the distinguished Senator from Florida think that my position in this instance is any different from what it will be in regard to requests of other Senators. If this question arises in the future, I shall be compelled to object.

In regard to the representatives even of the departments in Washington, I believe that, generally speaking, they should not be on the floor of the Senate. I think the people of the United States will misunderstand if an unlimited number of persons are admitted to the floor of the Senate. In my judgment, no member of any department of the Government should be allowed on the floor to lobby or lend aid to a bill in which he is interested. The only possible exception I can think of would be where a committee uses a technical man from one of the departments, who becomes in that respect an employee of the committee, although he is paid by the department. I would be willing to abide by the opinion of the committee that he was in truth an adviser of the committee, and, to that extent, an employee of the committee, although not paid by the committee.

I think there are frequently on the floor of the Senate too many persons who are not Senators; indeed it sometimes seems to me that too many of our own employees are on the floor. At

times when Senators are busy on the floor, it is almost impossible to get a seat, because of the presence of so many employees from our own offices. From time to time action has been taken to clear them off the floor.

Of course, this has nothing to do with the problem confronting the distinguished Senator from Florida, but I merely want to make my position clear, because in the future I shall have something to say about the presence on the floor of the Senate of employees who are not in fact assisting Senators.

I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. WELKER rose.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me first reply to the remarks of the distinguished majority leader. He, of course, is entitled to his opinion, and no doubt will maintain it. There will probably be not one case out of a thousand where anyone registered as a lobbyist would so clearly fulfill the highest standards from every professional and ethical standpoint as did General Johnson in this particular case. In any other case of which I can think at the moment I would certainly concur with the distinguished majority leader. But I reiterate my feeling that it was entirely within the rules of propriety for one who was a distinguished Attorney General of his State for 10 years, and who served the State in general for a large part of that time as chairman of the Submerged Lands Committee of the Associated Attorneys General of the United States and likewise served as president of the association, to come here, after the end of his term, simply to finish the course of action which he had begun while serving as Attorney General. Particularly is this true when he had shown his ethical standards while he was Attorney General, by registering as a lobbyist, although I think no Senator would feel that that course was necessary, and when he has confined himself entirely and exclusively to the representation in technical matters of the States of the Union in this highly complicated presentation of the States' views in this subject matter.

I still respectfully differ with the view of the distinguished majority leader, for I think the States are entitled to some rights even upon the floor of the Senate; and, so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he is not disposed to abdicate those rights.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more remark?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely wanted to say to my good friend that I hope no Senator will ask that any Attorney General be permitted to sit on the floor to advise in regard to these matters. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator for not having on the floor today, the gentlemen to whom reference has been made in view of the fact that objection has arisen.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let me make the point very clear that the only reason for my not having these gentle-

men on the floor today is because I had concluded those parts of my discussion which required their presence here; and the only thing I shall do, after the termination of this colloquy, will be to move ahead and to offer the amendment in the nature of a substitute sponsored by more than 30 Members of the Senate of whom I am one.

I now yield to the Senator from Idaho. Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senate that no explanation was required of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, so far as the Senator from Idaho is concerned. There is not a man who occupies a seat on this floor who has a greater sense of honor or of duty than has the Senator from Florida.

I should say to my distinguished friend from the State of Florida that my own attorney general, Robert Smiley, has heretofore written me to contact General Johnson in connection with intricate and technical matters involved in the debate now proceeding in the Senate.

I agree with my distinguished colleague from Arizona, the majority leader, when he mentions the fact that perhaps we have had too many lobbyists here from the departments of the Government. It is rather embarrassing, indeed, to see a flight of gentlemen from the Defense Department or from the State Department coming to the Senate daily, whenever some question comes before the Senate which involves their respective departments.

I agree with my distinguished colleague from the State of Florida. He had a message to bring to the Senate of the United States and to the people, and he had honor and integrity enough to tell the people exactly the story which would come from this former attorney general, who has represented all the States of the Union. I think we owe the Senator from Florida a vote of thanks. We certainly know that his integrity and honor are of the very highest.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate beyond measure the generous and friendly remarks of the distinguished acting minority leader.

Mr. WILEY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I had promised the Senator from Louisiana that I would yield next to him; after which I shall yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. LONG. I merely wish to say that, without reflection upon any Senator on the floor, that no more honorable or more principled or conscientious man has ever served in the Senate than the distinguished senior Senator from Florida. I say that because, to the best of my knowledge, men simply do not become any more principled than I have observed the Senator from Florida to be.

I regard it as unfortunate that those of us who have attempted to defend the rights of the States in what we believed was the just point of view in this matter, and who have opposed the trend of the Federal Government's seizing more and more power, have to be confronted with a constant barrage of smear on the

part of certain columnists and certain commentators who would like to attempt to impugn our motives. For example, at the present time, as everyone knows the oil and gas companies are not supporting the position taken by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Louisiana, and yet the press is attempting to make it appear—and I refer to some of the ultraliberal papers—that there is something before the Senate designed to benefit the oil companies, when actually the oil companies are supporting the measure which we propose to defeat by means of an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

We observe other instances similar to that of yesterday, when someone who was not on the floor complains because someone else did come on the floor. The junior Senator from Louisiana, who opposed the Alaskan statehood bill, certainly did not object when the present Governor of Alaska, came on the Senate floor, to confer with Senators.

All in the world that happened yesterday was that two technical experts sat beside the Senator from Florida while he was delivering his speech, and occasionally assisted him in finding something in the record or in the hearings that he might wish to find.

The opposition to the side taken by the Senator from Florida has had available the entire committee staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and no one complains about that. It is only fair that they should have them available. But it seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that it is a far cry when someone attempts to make headlines, or attempts to smear those of us who take the side of the States, merely because two men were by unanimous consent given the right to receive the privileges of the floor of the United States Senate.

As a matter of fact, all the Governors of the States have a right to come on the Senate floor, and the junior Senator from Louisiana many times has seen the same type of consent given, to permit one expert or other to have the privileges of the floor during debate on various and sundry measures in order that he might advise in connection with them, as happened in connection with discussions of foreign affairs, military aid, and many other measures. I have seen them come on the floor, and I regard it as very unfortunate that someone should have seized upon this incident to attempt to discredit someone representing the side of the States. I personally know that my own legislature has appropriated as much as \$40,000 in one session for this very cause, to assist in seeing that the point of view of the States was understood by the Representatives of the people in Washington and by the people generally. I believe that to have been a proper course of action. Certainly the Federal Government has many employees who come before our committees to advise us on the Federal side of this question, and it seemed only appropriate that the States should be entitled to have their side presented.

So far as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned, should the occasion present itself, he would again

urge his State legislature that it appropriate such money as might be necessary to help develop the facts and to have their side presented to the people of the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the gracious and generous remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, and I also am glad that he mentioned the fact that apparently the press is quite indifferent to the fact, as stated upon this floor by several Members of the Senate—and it is true—that many of the oil companies are moving heaven and earth to secure the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 20, and have made contacts with Members of the Senate, including the Senator from Florida, in an effort to explain their point of view. They are certainly entitled to explain their position, and they have been graciously received by the Senator from Florida, but he dislikes the unwillingness of the press to carry what is the truth, that many oil companies are aggressively supporting Senate Joint Resolution 20.

Since the Senator from Louisiana has mentioned it, I invite attention to the fact that the article from which I quoted earlier is a dual article. There is a write-up from the United Press, and another write-up in the same column by the Associated Press. There are many factual matters in those two news items as to what transpired yesterday on the floor of the Senate, but Senators and the public will look in vain for the statement made clearly, unequivocally, and, as a matter of fact, to the effect that many oil companies are supporting this measure, Senate Joint Resolution 20, and that that is where the oil influence is at this time. Senators will look in vain for any such recital either by the United Press or the Associated Press, which I hope was a matter of oversight yesterday in the report of the debate, and which oversight I hope will not be repeated today as the story goes out from both of those fine press associations as to what takes place on the floor of the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Florida for yielding. First, I want to associate myself with all the Senators on the floor who have complimented the Senator from Florida. There is no more able Member of this body than is the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is none with a higher sense of propriety, none with a higher sense of integrity; and I know that the Senator from Florida would not, under any circumstances, take any undue advantage of any request he might make.

I was not present on the floor when the matter was brought up, but I can say without any reservation that any reflection that may have been made upon the character and the reputation of the Senator from Florida would be wholly and completely without foundation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator, and I hope he will be

gracious enough, also, since his seat adjoins mine in the Senate, to state what I know to be the fact: That the only activities of the two distinguished gentlemen who came to the floor of the Senate under unanimous consent to advise on these technical questions yesterday—the only activities in which they participated in any way—were on two or three occasions when the Senator from Florida sought information from them. They were not moving around the Senate buttonholing anyone else or even speaking to anyone else, but were here only as technical advisers on a very complicated subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to testify to that. I was here most of the time during which the Senator was presenting his point of view, and I know that during all that time neither of these gentlemen made any attempt to buttonhole or to influence any Member of the Senate. But there is a big "but" to which I now wish to invite attention, arising from the reference which the Senator from Florida has made to the fact that some of the oil companies have indicated that they would like to see passed the joint resolution reported by the committee. I think they would. I think their reason for wanting to see it pass may be exactly the same reason as that which I have had.

Mr. President, for 14 years the Coastal States have been striving to induce the Government of the United States to pass a quitclaim bill to these submerged lands. Perhaps the first bill for a quitclaim was not introduced as long ago as that, but quitclaim bills have been before the Senate. One was passed and went so far as to reach the President's desk. There it was vetoed. It was not passed over the President's veto. The result has been that when the Supreme Court of the United States, in its decisions in the California, the Louisiana, and the Texas cases, asserted without reservation that the States have no property right in the lands which are submerged, and declared unequivocally that the paramount right lies in the Government of the United States, the oil companies which were operating beyond the tidelands and on the lands bordering the open ocean were idle. I do not know how many rigs along the coast of the State of Louisiana have been idle because of this controversy. Oil workers have been idle. No exploration has been going on, because, naturally, the oil companies were not in position to expend their funds or make new investments so long as the title and the right of the State were in dispute. I think, as a matter of common sense, that the oil companies have reached the conclusion which I have reached—that a quitclaim bill cannot pass over a veto; that the wise thing for the Congress to do is to enact into law the measure which has been reported by the committee.

This resolution does not attempt to deny the leases which were made by the States. When the representatives of the Department of Justice appeared in the Supreme Court to argue against the claims of the States, the statement was made on behalf of the Department of Justice that no attempt would be made to cancel such leases. All this measure

does is to provide that good, safe leases may be confirmed by the Secretary of the Interior, and instead of undertaking to demand the last penny under the Supreme Court's decision, which asserts the paramount right, we make no attempt to cancel those leases, nor do we make any attempt to cut off the States. There is a provision in the measure to grant to the States 37½ percent of the royalties. The measure was presented in an effort to produce oil while the controversy was raging.

Every Member of the Senate knows that we are now involved in a great economic war with the Soviet government. Every Member of the Senate knows that petroleum is not only the fuel of industry, but is the fuel of military activity. So the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was anxious to make certain that we could put oil rigs to work and put the oil workers to work and produce the oil needed by the Nation, instead of continuing the present stalemate in which there is not much production and no more exploration. Production, of course, is being carried on under the stipulation which was entered into in the Supreme Court cases.

But reference to the fact that some oil companies may be supporting this bill seems to me only to emphasize the fact that even oil companies can be guided by good sense. They support a measure which will again make it possible to begin exploration on the Continental Shelf, and which in turn will make it possible to produce oil that we need.

I am sure the Senator from Florida intended no reflection upon the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when he said that oil companies were supporting the pending measure. Nor did he intend any reflection in his remarks about his disappointment that the press associations had not reported a statement he made and indicating that he was inviting them to tell their readers that the pending resolution presented by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is an oil company resolution, and that some inference should be drawn from that.

That reminds me of a remark—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before we get away from that point, I may say that there was not or is not any inference or implication of impropriety in the mere statement of a fact, which the Senator from Wyoming knows to be a fact, and which his present statement practically admits to be a fact—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not admit it; I confirm it.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator confirms it to be a fact that many oil companies are actively supporting the proposed legislation. As a matter of fact, if the Senator does not already know it, the oil companies have their representatives present, and they are buttonholing Senators and are trying to get Senators to yield their convictions and to support the pending measure.

I do not blame the Senator from Wyoming for that, because the oil companies have a right to consider their own interests, and they have a right also to their own convictions as to what is in

the national interest, but I wish to make it very clear that the facts are as I have just stated, and as they are admitted, or rather confirmed, by the Senator from Wyoming, that much oil-company support is on the other side of the fence from those who are fighting for the principle advocated by those of us who favor a substitute measure. That is what I wish to have clear.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to say, in that connection, that the statement that the oil-company support is on the other side of the fence is just a wee bit too broad, because I have personal knowledge of a great deal of oil-company support which is on the other side.

So the point of this whole discussion, Mr. President, is simply that I know the Senator from Florida acted honorably and within his rights when he made the request yesterday for the presence of certain gentlemen on the floor of the Senate, in spite of the fact that one of them is a registered lobbyist under a law passed by Congress. The fact that Congress passed that law and permitted registration was an acknowledgment that the people of the United States, in the interest of the United States, are entitled to have registration. The only point of the law is that we should know who the lobbyists are. In that, of course, I think all agree.

Although the Senator from Florida should not be criticized because he asked unanimous consent to have these gentlemen on the floor, particularly since it is clear, from my own observation, that they were not trying to take advantage of their position and were communicating only with the Senator from Florida, at the same time it ought to be made perfectly clear in any report made with respect to this particular debate that no improper inference should be drawn because of the fact that some oil companies are supporting, in good, common sense, a measure which will restore the possibility of exploration and production of a natural resource which the Nation so greatly needs.

I may add one further word. The Senator from Louisiana said that supporters of the joint resolution have the aid of the entire staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which the Senator from Louisiana is a very able and distinguished member. I merely wish to state that the chief counsel of our committee, who is presently on the floor, has served every member of the committee without regard to his position upon the pending measure, and there is no partisanship, either political or with respect to any other activity of the committee, on the part of the staff. We have had here only one member of the whole group, and none of them is lobbying.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe the RECORD should show that I said the committee staff was available to the committee chairman for technical information, as well they should be.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. LONG. I may state further that the committee chairman has found for himself a very able committee assistant, who is an attorney, Mr. Stewart French,

to advise him in this matter. That is the good fortune of the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We now have him blushing.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was not present yesterday, but I have heard a part of the discussion this morning. I wish to have it appear that I agree fully with the statement that there is no more honorable man than the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I am satisfied that when the Senate speaks, it speaks autonomously. It may have rules, but it can also set aside those rules and procedure in due form by receiving the consent of the Senate. It seems to me that that should end the controversy. However, I am happy to add to what has been said in relation to the fine character and dependability of the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I again thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Since the question of the position of the oil companies has been raised, I should like to say that we do not claim there is anything wrong about their position or that there is anything shameful about the fact that the proponents of the joint resolution have the support of the oil companies in the position which the representatives of the Federal Government assume at this moment. We do believe it was very wrong and shameful, however, to have some members of the press attempt, over a period of years, to make it appear that there was something wrong about the advocates of the rights of the States trying to maintain their position, and at that time having the oil industry supporting their cause.

I refer the Senator to page 74 of the hearings, the statement by Mr. Walter Hallanan, president of the Plymouth Oil Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., who appeared as chairman of the offshore lessees committee, which consists of representatives of most of the holders of leases on submerged lands off the coasts of Texas, Louisiana, and California.

I also refer to the statement of—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? Did the witness whom the Senator mentioned as appearing on behalf of the Association of Lessees, which includes many oil companies, indicate their position with reference to the so-called interim bill?

Mr. LONG. That was not made nearly so clear by the testimony of Mr. Hallanan as it was by the testimony of Mr. Clary, another lessee representative, the only other witness to testify representing the lessees, to my knowledge. Mr. Clary's testimony with regard to this problem is found on page 324. I believe it should be quoted, in order that the record may be clear. He said:

Mr. CLARY. I want to add just a closing word. I personally have over the past years

XCVIII—182

appeared before this Congress and its committees on numerous occasions. I have advocated the enactment of what we shall call—and I do not object to calling it—quitclaim legislation, what, in effect, would vest the control of these areas in the States.

I advocated that because I believed the Supreme Court decision, while we respect it while it is in force, was unsound for the reason that I have already stated and other possible reasons. I have not changed my view on that at all.

Mr. Hallanan in his testimony the other day testified that it had always been the position of the oil tideland operators that they preferred and favored the State control of these areas. I think I am quoting him substantially correctly.

Nothing has happened to change that viewpoint so far as the ultimate disposition of this case, of this very complicated controversy, is concerned. But operators favor this bill primarily for the principal reason that we believed when it was introduced last summer and again this year, that it would bring about production of oil and enable the oil producers to meet the demands of the Military Establishment of the United States, which now looms up a million barrels a day, more quickly than any other possible solution. We have never opposed quitclaim legislation, and we appreciate the great efforts that have been made by the States to obtain that legislation, but we fear that, if that legislation is pursued, it may result in a veto and it may result in a stalemate which will drag this whole controversy along for perhaps another session of Congress.

That, as I understand, is the position of the oil operators. To the best of the knowledge of the junior Senator from Louisiana it is the position of every operator who holds a tidelands lease. If there is any different position, I have not heard from any State lessee holding such a position.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I understand, it is the position of those operators that they now favor the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 20.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct. Many of us who take the States' position feel that those operators, finding their investments in jeopardy, have taken the position that they would almost be willing to sacrifice the States in order to protect their own investment. Possibly from the shareholders' point of view one can understand why they should take such a position. Nevertheless, those of us who represent the States feel that the States should not be sacrificed in order to protect the oil companies.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

I note the presence in the Chamber of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who yesterday rose to ask me a question. I told him that I would get back to him in a few minutes. When I did get back to him I found that he had left the Chamber. Does the Senator from Texas wish to ask me a question at this time?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not been in the Chamber during the Senator's previous remarks. I do not care to interrupt the Senator at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I want him to know that I was looking forward to a colloquy with him. By the time I reached that point, apparently, he had been called from the Chamber.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. For what purpose?

Mr. HUMPHREY. For the purpose of comment in reference to the discussion which has taken place regarding General Johnson.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to yield for that purpose without losing my place on the floor.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to make it quite clear that I concur in the statements which have been made this afternoon by the majority leader and other Senators in reference to the honor, integrity, sense of propriety, and high ethical standing of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think anyone would question his qualifications in that regard. They have been demonstrated by his personal conduct and his actions as a Senator.

The issue which I rise to discuss is one which goes far beyond any question of propriety of the actions of the Senator from Florida. It goes to the matter of the use of the rules of the Senate for the purpose of legislative debate.

I have listened to the reading of the record of the distinguished former Attorney General, General Johnson. I think it is an enviable record. I believe that anyone who knows of his public service knows that his record is outstanding. However, the issue here is whether or not, in legislative debate on such a highly controversial issue as this, upon which men of honest convictions have differences of opinion, someone who is registered under the Lobbying Act, even though such registration was voluntary, and even though there is nothing improper in being a legitimate lobbyist—in fact, it may be very desirable—should be permitted to enjoy the privileges of the floor. The Senator from Florida surely was most fair about it. He asked unanimous consent for a departure from the rule, and he received unanimous consent. If those of us who were not present had a different opinion, and would have objected to the unanimous-consent request, surely we come in with belated arguments. However, in such a situation I think it is only fair, for the future, at least to make some declaration of intent and opinion, as to whether or not we should permit such a thing to happen again.

Of course, under the rules, those who are employed by the committees of the Congress are allowed the privilege of the floor. Rule XXXIII, on page 46 of the Senate Manual, lists the persons entitled to the privileges of the floor. As has been stated, I believe, by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senate may abridge its rules or suspend them by unanimous consent, which it has done.

However, I think it should be noted that the Association of Attorneys General has been one of the most active participating groups in America on this particular issue, pertaining to oil in the

submerged lands. Whether they are right or wrong is not the question. Furthermore, the Association of Attorneys General is not a governmental body as such. It is a representative, quasi-public body of public officials. It is no more a governmental body than the American Municipal Association, the United States Conference of Mayors, or the Council of State Governments. It represents certain persons in public office who have joined together for the purpose of improving their activities and their service as government officials. It does not speak for States. It cannot speak for legislatures. It cannot speak for any public body. It can speak only as an association.

For that reason I rise to protest. I submit, as the majority leader has well pointed out, that the use of the floor by persons other than Senators and others specifically accorded the privileges of the floor, is really an abuse.

I further submit that the States of the United States have plenty of representation on this floor, with two United States Senators each, and that at any time we wish to do so we can attach to our staffs, by making proper adjustments within the staffs, competent advisers in case we are vitally interested in a particular issue.

What is more important in this instance is that General Johnson has had plenty of opportunity to appear before the committees of Congress. He has had plenty of opportunity to appear in the office of any Senator, and to talk with any Member of Congress.

I do not say that anything that has been done is wrong. I think the Senator from Florida has carefully explained what has transpired. As an example, let us take a member of an association such as the National Public Housing Conference, which represents public-housing officials all over the United States. They are persons who are paid from public funds. Would we think for a moment of bringing one of those representatives onto the floor of the Senate when a public-housing bill was under consideration? If we were considering legislation pertaining to rent control, would we think of bringing onto the floor of the Senate representatives of the United States Conference of Mayors, even though they might have unanimously resolved in favor of a particular point of view with respect to rent control?

I submit that once a person has submitted a lobbyist's report—and I have a copy of such a report in my hand—he ceases to be a representative of the public, and becomes a private representative. Once a person submits a lobbyist's report, it indicates that a certain type of activity is going on, activity which comes within the provisions of the Lobbying Act.

On that basis I think we are going somewhat astray from the intent and purposes of rule XXXIII when we ask unanimous consent to expand that rule so far as it pertains to the categories of persons entitled to the privileges of the floor of the United States Senate.

I have only the highest respect for the Senator from Florida. He is a hard de-

bater; he is able; and certainly he knows how to present his point of view. I know that the Senator from Florida was seeking only legal advice and counsel from a man for whom he has great respect, and one who he felt had conducted himself most honorably in his relationship with the committees of Congress and other public bodies.

I still submit that such procedure is going afield in terms of privileges of the floor, and I say that in view of the great controversy involved in this issue and the millions of dollars which are involved, as well as the privileges and economic interests which are involved, not only to the States but to individuals as well, that we have made a very sad mistake. If not improper, at least it was unfortunate. Surely it was not done improperly, but I believe it could lead to unfortunate circumstances and consequences in the future. Therefore, I felt so strongly that I thought I should register a protest—not with the Senator from Florida—because of the precedent which may have been established.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his courteous and cordial remarks with reference to the Senator from Florida, and also with reference to the very distinguished former attorney general of Nebraska, Mr. Johnson.

Of course, I do not agree with many of the things which the Senator from Minnesota has stated, because it seems to me to be very clear that not only were the rules of the Senate carefully followed, as confirmed by the statement of the Senator from Minnesota, but that in addition to that, the proprieties were all carefully observed. If there is one person of the highest technical and professional character, who has been constantly appearing in behalf of various States and knows all the ins and outs of the subject, and knows the subject better than any other living person in the United States, it seems to the Senator from Florida that the 48 States of this Nation are not on improper or unsound ground in asking that they may have nearby, in defending their States' rights, that one person, particularly when he meticulously has preserved himself from any proper charge of being a general lobbyist by refusing to take any business whatsoever except for the States, in which capacity, by the way, he acted while he was yet the attorney general of the sovereign State of Nebraska before he became private counsel.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to point out that there are many distinguished former public officials whose record of public service has won them honor and who are of the highest integrity, who represent many private organizations and many quasi-public organizations. What I am pointing out is, first of all, that the National Association of Attorneys General is not like a legislature, like a governor's office, or like a judicial system. It is a quasi-public organization which represents public officials. I should like further to point out that it is not, to my

recollection, supported by all 48 States. I believe it is supported by approximately 40 States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Forty-four was the last I heard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Forty-four.

Mr. HOLLAND. It may be less or more. At any rate, it is supported by almost all the States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that if one were to examine the contributions which have been made to the National Association of Attorneys General he would find that the States which have been most vitally interested in the so-called submerged-lands bill have made the greatest contribution to the National Association of Attorneys General. I think that is entirely possible and perhaps probable. Because of the work of the distinguished former attorney general of Nebraska, Mr. Johnson, the National Association of Attorneys General is known throughout the land as having taken one of the most vigorous positions on the submerged lands issue.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is because they believe the States are right. It is because each attorney general is himself elected by the people of a sovereign State, and because he has not yet had his mind dimmed to the fact that States have rights, and he wants to preserve and conserve those rights. I think that the attorney general of a sovereign State, particularly of these many States which by action of their legislature have furthered State legislation in this matter would be derelict in his duty if he did not throw himself wholeheartedly into the furtherance of the protection of rights of his State and of other States, which he believes are being dangerously jeopardized and would even be taken away by the Supreme Court decisions, unless Congress in its discretion, and from the standpoint of what is best in the interest of sound national policy, provides otherwise.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I may say that one of the reasons why the legislatures of many of the States have taken the position that they have taken is because of the lobbying work of the National Association of Attorneys General. The attorneys general have taken the message back to their legislatures, as they have done in one State with which I am particularly familiar.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Minnesota suggests that an attorney general is on unsound ground in making recommendations to his legislature on issues which very keenly and vitally affect his State, I shall have to differ very profoundly with the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is not my view. My view is that the National Association of Attorneys General is a lobbying organization, which fact has been testified to by the very Honorable General Johnson himself. It is fundamentally improper for the Senate of the United States, as a precedent and as an experience, to have a paid lobbyist, who registers as a paid lobbyist, to sit on the floor of the Senate. I am afraid that there may be no end to this thing.

because almost everybody has a good case.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly recognize the fact that in most positions, or 99 out of 100, I would agree with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I think that there are differences in situations. I think the Senate has it completely within its own power to recognize those differences.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senate, acting regularly and properly and by unanimous consent did so act unanimously, with the exception of several Senators who were not present, including the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yesterday when the Senate granted unanimous consent for making an exception in this case the Senator from Florida felt that the States would have been deprived improperly of advice, which at least all the Senators present seemed to think they were entitled to have, if the action had not been taken. The Senator from Florida regrets the fact that his friend the Senator from Minnesota was not present. All that the Senator from Minnesota has to do to block a unanimous consent request, properly made during the consideration of this subject or any other subject requiring unanimous consent, is to be in his seat and to state his objection when such a request is made. Certainly there was no intent on anyone's part to bring this up behind the door somewhere.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course not.

Mr. HOLLAND. It was brought up in the open on the floor of the Senate, with the statement as to the representative capacity of General Johnson.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want the Senator from Florida to know that no one is saying that anyone tried to pull a fast one, as the saying goes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I believe that the Senate will have to be its own judge on each question as it arises. I believe that the Senate very properly acted on its own judgment yesterday.

In closing this aspect of the matter I want to quote again from the very apt and very cordial words of the distinguished Senator who was presiding at the time the unanimous-consent request was granted:

Without objection, it is so ordered—

That is, the unanimous-consent request was granted—

and the Chair wishes to welcome these two distinguished gentlemen to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for further observation?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I notice that when associations such as this, which has public support, as they do have, go to my distinguished colleagues, there is a great deal of friendly spirit that permits these unanimous-consent requests to be granted. However, I want to say that insofar as the Senator is concerned, regardless of the proper manner in which the unanimous-consent request was

granted, in view of the fact that several Senators had leave to attend committee meetings, it is fundamentally wrong, on the basis of laws and rules which we have for the purpose of reporting the activities of lobbyists, to have persons who are registered lobbyists granted the privileges of the floor of the United States Senate, particularly upon such a controversial issue as this, which involves millions of dollars and a high public question, which has been resolved at one time by Congress and many times by the Supreme Court. I am only saying that I hope that what was done yesterday has not opened Pandora's box.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would agree with the Senator from Minnesota in that expression. I would not be in favor of a general letting down of the bars. The Senator from Florida felt that there was a proper exception made yesterday afternoon. If the Senator from Minnesota will read again the law to which he has referred he will find that there is no provision in it which excludes registered lobbyists from the floor of either House.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The matter is left to the sound discretion of the Members of both Houses on any occasion when such a request is made. Of course, the Senator from Minnesota is not making any charge—and I think he would be hard put on the basis of any substantial reason to make a charge—that there was any departure whatsoever from completely proper course of conduct in what was followed yesterday by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only thing I would say is that when any such further request is made for an abridgment of the rules of the Senate at a time when several committees of the Senate have received special and official leave of the Senate to hold sessions, there should be a quorum call, so as those of us who have already received permission of the Senate to sit in committee to take testimony and conduct hearings may be alerted as to what is going on. I say that because I am sure that if that alert had been given, some of us would have objected.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I must object to the inference contained in the colloquy with the Senator from Minnesota and the suggestion that the reason why the counsels of State governments and various other groups were opposed to the Federal position was that they had been misinformed, in effect, by the attorneys general of the States.

Actually, the facts show that the American Bar Association appointed a committee on submerged lands to make a study of this matter, and that the American Bar Association is on record in favor of the States' position. It would be rather difficult to assume that the American Bar Association is a group which has the wool easily pulled over its

eyes and is fooled by individuals. As a matter of fact, it has been my impression that any attorney who made a study of this matter invariably arrived at the conclusion that the States were right in regard to it.

The United States Chamber of Commerce has supported the position taken by the States.

I have noticed that the conference of governors, composed of the governors of the 48 States, supports the position taken by the States, and it is my understanding that almost all the governors support the position taken by the States.

So, Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Minnesota objects, he will have to change the rules, because there are approximately 40 some odd Governors, among the 48 Governors, who have the privilege of the floor of the Senate, who also support the position taken by the States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his remarks.

Let me say that I think it will appear that practically all States and all important groups favor the position we have taken, except those relatively few organizations who favor the further swelling of centralized government and, in my humble judgment, the further weakening of it.

(At this point Mr. HOLLAND yielded to Mr. McCARRAN, who addressed the Senate, and whose remarks appear at the conclusion of Mr. HOLLAND's speech.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at the commencement of my remarks yesterday I had stated, and I had likewise stated during the able remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in a colloquy with him, that at the end of my remarks I proposed to offer to the pending measure, Senate Joint Resolution 20, an amendment in the nature of a substitute for that measure. At this time I wish to send to the desk the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is offered by me, for myself and the following other Senators: Mr. BUTLER of Maryland; Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska; Mr. BYRD, of Virginia; Mr. CAIN, of Washington; Mr. CAPEHART, of Indiana; Mr. CARLSON, of Kansas; Mr. CORDON, of Oregon; Mr. DUFF, of Pennsylvania; Mr. EASTLAND, of Mississippi; Mr. ELLENDER, of Louisiana; Mr. FREAR, of Delaware; Mr. GEORGE, of Georgia; Mr. HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey; Mr. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa; Mr. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina; Mr. KNOWLAND, of California; Mr. LONG, of Louisiana; Mr. MARTIN, of Pennsylvania; Mr. McCARRAN, of Nevada; Mr. McCLELLAN, of Arkansas; Mr. MUNDT, of South Dakota; Mr. NIXON, of California; Mr. O'CONNOR, of Maryland; Mr. ROBERTSON, of Virginia; Mr. SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; Mr. SCHOEPPLE, of Kansas; Mr. SMATHERS, of Florida; Mr. STENNIS, of Mississippi; Mr. TAFT, of Ohio; and Mr. THYE, of Minnesota.

Mr. President, in sending forward this measure, to lie on the desk at this time, I call attention to the fact that the list of over 30 joint sponsors of this amendment, which within a few minutes I shall ask to have considered and made the

pending question, includes not only Senators from the maritime States, but also approximately 10 or 12 Senators coming from interior States of the Nation.

I want to say for the RECORD that the Senator from Florida believes that a large number of additional Senators approve completely of the philosophy and substance of the proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute which is now to be offered to the pending measure, and will show their approval of it when the time comes for voting.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, that I may address a parliamentary inquiry at the moment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would merely like to inquire whether, under the procedure outlined by the Senator from Florida, this amendment in the nature of a substitute will be printed and made available automatically.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute will be ordered to lie on the table and be printed. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think it is incumbent upon me merely to make a few brief remarks about the amendment in the nature of a substitute just sent forward, and its contents. Senators will remember that early in 1951 more than 30 Senators—and of those the Senator from Florida was one—joined in presenting for the consideration of the Senate a bill, which was known as Senate bill 940, in the field of submerged lands of coastal States, likewise relating to the interior submerged lands, and likewise referring to the lands under the Great Lakes and to other subject matters.

Mr. President, unfortunately that measure was never reported from the Senate committee, but instead, the committee conducted hearings upon Senate Joint Resolution 20, and while those hearings had to do in general with the whole of the subject matters involved in this complex field, nevertheless the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, so ably headed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, has not reported Senate bill 940, but, instead, still retains custody of that bill, as it likewise still retains custody of the so-called Walter bill, which has been passed by such a huge vote in the House, and which likewise came over to the Senate in ample time for consideration and action and recommendation to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. President, in that situation the Senators who are actively supporting the claim of the States for the return to them, out to their constitutional limits only, of those rights which they held, and which they enjoyed so fully, prior to the recent Supreme Court decisions—those Senators have felt justified in changing in several minor ways the provisions of Senate bill 940, so that the same will accord entirely with titles 1 and 2 of the Walter bill, dealing with the subject matter covered by the proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute,

namely, dealing solely, so far as coastal lands are concerned, with those lands extending out to the 3-mile limit, in most cases, and, in two cases, to a greater distance, because of the fact that the constitutional limits of two States go further than the 3-mile limit. The amendment in the nature of a substitute which we propose is carefully confined to that area, to that shoestring of land and water, whether it lies offshore in the coastal States from low water to the State boundaries, or to the 3-mile line, in the event the State has no fixed boundaries.

Mr. President, it so happens that titles 1 and 2 of the Walter bill completely relate to that particular subject, whereas title 3 of that measure goes much further and relates to a much larger belt of land and water lying outside the constitutional limits of the State, to which we may refer as the Continental Shelf lying off the various States. In some cases the Senator from Florida understands that that Continental Shelf may extend as far as 120 or even 150 miles offshore.

The Senator from Florida, and other Senators associated with him originally in the introduction of Senate bill 940, and now, in the introduction of rewritten Senate bill 940, to comport with the appropriate provisions of the Walter bill, have not felt that it is proper to confuse the issue of returning to the States the powers which were theirs, and the privileges and the property enjoyed, which was so fully held by them prior to the decisions of the United States Supreme Court. And so they have confined themselves deliberately to the presentation of the problem of whether the States should receive back from the Federal Government, by grant of Congress, such rights as they had, or believed they had, and such rights as they were enjoying in a completely full way prior to the action of the United States Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases.

Mr. President, Senate bill 940 was confined to the limited field of the restoration of State jurisdiction which the States had formerly enjoyed, since the founding of this country. In the measure which we will submit today we are trying to take advantage of the perfecting language which has been adopted in the long hearings of the appropriate House committee, which took place during 1951, but subsequent to the date of the introduction of Senate bill 940.

Some of those changes—and many of them are entirely minor—are changes of wording. None of them are changes of material substance. But it is the judgment of those who are advocating a return to the States of the rights which were theirs that the wording as perfected by the House committee and subsequently in debate on the floor of the House, should be made available. So I want the Senate to understand fully that in submitting this measure instead of Senate bill 940 we offer a measure which in most respects is identical in language with Senate bill 940 but which in various respects, as Senators will find from reading the proposed measure, differs

because of the perfection of the language of the original bill, which took place in the consideration of the Walter bill by the House of Representatives. I want to say we excluded entirely title 3 of the Walter bill, which deals with the second belt of lands and waters; that is, that one which extends from the State boundary out to the Continental Shelf.

In order to make that exclusion effective we had to strike certain portions of section 1 which had to do with definitions of terms which appeared in the Walter bill only in title III. I think Senators will find from a consideration of the proposed measure that those are the principal changes, and that there are no changes of substance; that the bill has followed carefully the language of titles I and II of the Walter bill, with certain omissions from title I of matters which are handled only in title III, and that it is in substance the same as Senate bill 940, departing from the wording of that bill only in those particulars in which the House committee and the House itself perfected the measure.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does the language of the substitute make any difference in the treatment of claims of the State of Texas over claims of other States? I have reference to the position of Texas with regard to the 10 miles supposedly reserved on the admission of Texas to the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator that the bill as presented does recognize the State limits of Texas under its constitution, and existing even while it was a republic, as extending 3 leagues instead of 3 miles from the low-water mark. The point of the bill has been to seek to restore to each State its rights in accordance with its own constitutional limits, or, if it had none, in accordance with the 3-mile limit followed by most of the States, or the constitutional limits of any State which go beyond the 3-mile limit, which applies in only two cases, the State of Texas and the west-coast line of the State of Florida. That limit is fixed by the constitutions of those two States at 3 leagues.

The bill in that respect meticulously follows the path laid down by Senate bill 940 and does not depart from it in any regard.

Mr. CASE. With respect to the west coast of Florida, was there similar language in the enabling act for the State of Florida as there was in the enabling act for the State of Texas?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not think so. I will say, as a matter of fact, that the language does appear in the State constitution, which constitution was approved by formal act of the Congress of the United States. But I am not able to say whether the language appeared in the enabling act, because I have not had opportunity to have access to that act. Insofar as Florida is concerned, we rely upon the clear provisions of our State constitution which have been accepted by affirmative act of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for one further question—

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield further; but may I make one further remark at this time? There is a reason, of course, for the slightly different situation in some places from that which is found in others. In the case of the west coast of Florida, as the Senator probably already knows, the waters are very shallow for a long distance. I am informed that before the Continental Shelf is reached, it is necessary in some places to travel 150 miles into the Gulf of Mexico from the west coast of Florida. So the reason why the early founding fathers, both of our State and those in Congress, gave approval to that limit was to give recognition to the fact that the shallows extend as far in that particular area as they do.

Mr. CASE. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that the junior Senator from South Dakota has felt there was considerable merit in the argument advanced for the west coast of Florida and for the limits generally ascribed to the State of Texas, but I do not know that any similar situation exists with respect to other States?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would say that normally, as I understand, the enabling act provided for extending the distance to 3 miles, and that in the case of those States which originally came into the Union it would appear that the 3-mile limit has been considered as applicable for at least a hundred years. I understand that in admitting a State there has always been language entitling the new State, whether the limit be stated or not, to similar treatment with States formerly created.

The Senator from Florida is glad to hear that the Senator from South Dakota feels that where the constitutional limits are placed farther out than 3 miles, as is the case in only two instances, so far as I know, there is a substantial difference.

I should like to repeat only one thing, Mr. President, because of my feeling that under no circumstances should anyone receive the impression that those advocating the bill now to be introduced as a substitute feel that we would be justified in going beyond State lines. We feel that the question of the much larger belt outside the State lines is a completely different question from that of protecting the jurisdiction of the State. The State of Florida has to police its own waters in such cases as the sponge industry and the shellfish industry. That has been recognized by the Supreme Court out to the constitutional limits. It seems very important to give to the citizens of the States the full rights, duties, and service to which they are entitled out to the constitutional limits. But those of us who advocate the proposed substitute regard as a completely different matter the lands and waters lying outside the constitutional limits, and we do not wish to have that question becloud the consideration of the one which we propose, namely, that the States be restored to the position which they held

for more than 100 years prior to the recent cases decided by the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. President, with that brief discussion of the proposed substitute, I now ask that it be made the pending question if the parliamentary situation is such that that can be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). There is a committee amendment on page 10, line 18, which has not been acted upon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table, if that is as far as we can go under the existing parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask if there is any objection to the submission at this time of the substitute proposed by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the absence of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. O'MAHONEY), I would certainly want to see that he is advised, unless the Senator from Alabama can act for him.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think it might be well if we could make the substitute amendment of the Senator from Florida the pending amendment. I then wish to make a perfecting amendment to the bill itself. If the Senator from Florida has concluded his speech, I think we might have a quorum call, as I had promised the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. O'MAHONEY) that I would suggest the absence of a quorum when the Senator from Florida had concluded. The Senator from Wyoming will then come to the floor. I think that would make for expedition.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, Mr. President, I have no opposition whatever to that course. As I understand, my proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute simply lies on the table, subject to be taken up by the Senate later. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LONG, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONNOR, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. THYE) to Senate Joint Resolution 20, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HOLLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by me on behalf of myself and 30 other Senators, and heretofore ordered to lie on the table and be printed, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and as a part of them.

There being no objection, the amendment submitted by Mr. HOLLAND (for

himself and other Senators) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this joint resolution may be cited as the 'Submerged Lands Act'.

"TITLE I

"DEFINITION

"Sec. 2. When used in this act—

"(a) The term 'lands beneath navigable waters' includes (1) all lands within the boundaries of each of the respective States which were covered by waters navigable under the laws of the United States at the time such State became a member of the Union, and all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line three geographical miles distant from the coast line of each such State and to the boundary line of each such State where in any case such boundary as it existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress, extends seaward (or into the Great Lakes or Gulf of Mexico) beyond three geographical miles, and (2) all filled in, made, or reclaimed lands which formerly were lands beneath navigable waters, as herein defined; the term 'boundaries' includes the seaward boundaries of a State or its boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico or any of the Great Lakes as they existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by the Congress, or as extended or confirmed pursuant to section 4 hereof;

"(b) The term 'coast line' means the line of ordinary low water along that portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters, which include all estuaries, ports, harbors, bays, channels, straits, historic bays, and sounds, and all other bodies of water which join the open sea;

"(c) The terms 'grantees' and 'lessees' include (without limiting the generality thereof) all political subdivisions, municipalities, public and private corporations, and other persons holding grants or leases from a State, or its predecessor sovereign, to lands beneath navigable waters if such grants or leases were issued in accordance with the constitution, statutes, and decisions of the courts of the State in which such lands are situated, or of its predecessor sovereign: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall be construed as conferring upon said grantees or lessees any greater rights or interests other than are described herein and in their respective grants from the State, or its predecessor sovereign;

"(d) The term 'natural resources' shall include, without limiting the generality thereof, fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life but shall not include water power, or the use of water for the production of power at any site where the United States now owns the water power;

"(e) The term 'lands beneath navigable waters' shall not include the beds of streams in lands now or heretofore constituting a part of the public lands of the United States if such streams were not meandered in connection with the public survey of such lands under the laws of the United States;

"(f) The term 'State' means any State of the Union;

"(g) The term 'person' includes any citizen of the United States, an association of such citizens, a State, a political subdivision of a State, or a private, public, or municipal corporation organized under the laws of the United States or of any State.

"TITLE II

"LANDS BENEATH NAVIGABLE WATERS WITHIN STATE BOUNDARIES

"SEC. 3. Rights of the States: It is hereby determined and declared to be in the public interest that title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and the right and power to control, develop, and use the said natural resources, all in accordance with applicable State law be, and they are hereby, subject to the provisions hereof, recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States or the persons who were on June 5, 1950, entitled thereto under the property law of the respective States in which the land is located, and the respective grantees, lessees, or successors in interest thereof; and the United States hereby releases and relinquishes unto said States and persons aforesaid all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to all said lands, moneys, improvements, and natural resources, and releases and relinquishes all claims of the United States, if any it has, arising out of any operations of said States or persons pursuant to State authority upon or within said lands and navigable waters. The rights, powers, and titles hereby recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States and their grantees are subject to each lease executed by a State, or its grantee, which was in force and effect on June 5, 1950, in accordance with its terms and provisions and the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease, and such rights, powers, and titles are further subject to the rights herein now granted to any person holding any such lease to continue to maintain the lease, and to conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions, for the full term thereof, and any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued such lease: *Provided, however,* That, if oil or gas was not being produced from such lease on and before December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease: *Provided, however,* That all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such lease and the laws of the State issuing or whose grantee issued such lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date hereof, which have not been paid to the State or its grantee issuing it or to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, shall be paid to the State or its grantee issuing such lease within 90 days from the effective date hereof: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power at any site where the United States now owns or may hereafter acquire the water power or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation or to provide for flood control or the production of power at any site where the United States now owns the water power: *Provided further,* That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States which lie wholly or in part westward of the ninety-eighth meridian, relating to the ownership and control of ground and surface waters; and the control, appropria-

tion, use, and distribution of such waters shall continue to be in accordance with the laws of such States.

"SEC. 4. Seaward boundaries: Any State which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line three geographical miles distant from its coast line, or in the case of the Great Lakes, to the international boundary of the United States. Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line. Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond three geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

"SEC. 5. Exceptions from operation of section 3 of this act: There is excepted from the operation of section 3 of this act—

"(a) all specifically described tracts or parcels of land and resources therein or improvements thereon, title to which has been lawfully and expressly acquired by the United States from any State or from any person in whom title had vested under the decisions of the courts of such State, or their respective grantees, or successors in interest, by cession, grant, quitclaim, or condemnation, or from any other owner or owners thereof by conveyance or by condemnation, provided such owner or owners had lawfully acquired the title to such lands and resources in accordance with the statutes or decisions of the courts of the State in which the lands are located; and

"(b) such lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States and such interests therein as are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

"SEC. 6. Powers retained by the United States: (a) The United States retains all its powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, none of which includes any of the proprietary rights of ownership, or of use, development, and control of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States and others by section 3 of this act.

"(b) In time of war when necessary for national defense, and the Congress or the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the prevailing market price, all or any portion of the said natural resources, or to acquire and use any portion of said lands by proceeding in accordance with due process of law and paying just compensation therefor.

"SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to amend, modify, or repeal the acts of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 251), July 9, 1870 (16 Stat. 217), March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

"SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to affect in any wise any issues between the United States and the respective States relating to the ownership or control of that portion of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters, described in section 2 hereof.

"SEC. 9. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application

of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

Strike out all of the preamble.

Amend the title to read as follows: "Joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources."

CRITICISM BY THE DAILY WORKER AND BY DREW PEARSON OF THE McCARRAN OMNIBUS IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION BILL

During the delivery of Mr. HOLLAND's speech,

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—
Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in rising, it is not my intention to ask the Senator from Florida to yield to me in order that I may ask a question regarding the issue now before the Senate, the unfinished business. However, I have to leave the Chamber to preside at a committee meeting. Therefore, I wonder whether the Senator from Florida will yield to me at this time to permit me to submit a matter for printing in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for that purpose, provided I may do so with unanimous consent, so that I shall not lose the floor.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on March 23 there appeared in the Daily Worker, the authorized mouthpiece of the Communist Party in America, an article entitled "New McCarran Bills Strike at Heart of Democratic Liberties."

On the same day, to wit, March 23, Mr. Drew Pearson, evidently taking his cue from the article which appeared in the Daily Worker, published a similar statement. I ask unanimous consent that both statements be printed at this point in the RECORD, to show how nearly along the path of communism Mr. Pearson travels, because he copies and carries on the sentiments of the Daily Worker.

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

[From the Worker of March 23, 1951]
NEW McCARRAN BILLS STRIKE AT HEART OF DEMOCRATIC LIBERTIES
(By Harry Raymond)

New despotic powers, aimed at further restriction of liberties granted by the Bill of Rights to citizens and noncitizens alike, would be placed in the hands of the Justice Department by the new immigration and naturalization bill (S. 2550) introduced by Senator PAT McCARRAN.

The McCarran bill and companion measures in the House of Representatives are being pushed by both Senate and House leaders for early adoption.

These bills, disguised as recodification of existing deportation and naturalization laws, would, if adopted:

Subject the freedom and welfare of the noncitizen and naturalized citizen to arbitrary discretion of every petty Justice Department official.

Grant power to these officials to interrogate without warrants and under threat of imprisonment noncitizens and citizens alike.

Freeze into law the recent Supreme Court 5-4 decision empowering the Attorney General to revoke bail "at any time . . . in his discretion" for persons contesting deportation proceedings in legal action. The person thus denied bail would be limited in the right to appeal to the courts.

Empower the Immigration and Naturalization Service to deport without cause and subject noncitizens to criminal penalties without due process of law.

Establish Jim Crow immigration provisions under a quota system permitting only 200 persons a year to immigrate from China and India and 100 from the West Indies, while setting totals for Great Britain and Germany at more than 90,000. The bill would intensify discrimination against the colored peoples inherent in the existing quotas.

Empower the President to stop all immigration at will, to exclude, deport, or denaturalize persons deemed detrimental to interests of the national administration in office.

Not since adoption in 1798 of the infamous alien and sedition laws, later overthrown by an outraged American public, or since establishment of Hitler's anti-Semitic decrees, has there been written such an elaborate body of autocratic law striking at the very base of democratic institutions.

In three prime areas—immigration, deportation, and denaturalization—the McCarran bill repeats most provisions of existing laws, then appends clauses nullifying any constitutional safeguards that may still remain on the books.

Hardest hit under immigration provisions of McCarran's proposed law are the West Indian Negroes who are seeking entrance into the United States. Heretofore the West Indian quota was comprised in the British quota of 66,000 a year. McCarran's bill, setting the quota of 100 a year from the West Indies, would, according to an analysis by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, slash immigration from our neighboring islands more than 90 percent.

Sponsors of the bill have announced it would wipe out all racial restrictions in existing immigration laws. But it does just the opposite. It weights the quotas heavily toward countries of Western and Northern Europe and sets up special Jim Crow bars against areas populated by the colored peoples.

In addition, the bill would empower a consulate officer or the Attorney General to exclude aliens from entering the United States if there is "reason to believe that these aliens would engage even incidentally . . . in activities which would be prejudicial to the public interests." Even more sweeping is the power the bill would grant the President to suspend the entry of any class of aliens from entry into the country.

A new crime is then created by McCarran and his Fascist cronies. The measure outlines the crime of conspiracy to allow or permit a subversive alien to enter the country, imposing a penalty of 5 years' imprisonment or \$5,000 fine. This provision is aimed at organizations who might invite a foreign trade-union leader or spokesman for peace to address a meeting here. If the Attorney General ruled the invited person to be subversive, those extending the invitation or arranging meetings could under the bill be prosecuted for conspiracy.

Deportation provisions of the bill go even further in imposing political conformity and suppressing dissent than does the thought control provisions of the Smith Act. Not only does it forbid a noncitizen to advocate so-called subversive doctrines on pain of imprisonment and deportation, but it includes as part of the outlawed advocacy mere belief in the doctrines.

The measure provides for deportation of any noncitizen who "at any time after entry has had a purpose to engage in any of the activities" which the Attorney General from time to time may deem subversive.

"This would establish the principle of preventive arrest," said the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, "a kind of lettre de cachet under which the Attorney General, like absolute monarchs in former times, could exile all noncitizens who oppose his decrees."

Ball provisions of the new proposed law are even more repressive than the Supreme Court's recent decision granting the Attorney General the right to hold persons in deportation proceedings without bail. The proposed law would not only vest the Attorney General with power to revoke bail in his discretion but would limit court review of his action merely to the question of whether he acted expeditiously.

Under provisions of the bill the Immigration and Naturalization Service would be exempted from complying with the Administrative Procedure Act, which is applicable to all Government agencies and establishes a minimum guaranty of conduct for fair hearings. The McCarran bill provides that persons arrested on deportation warrants shall be tried by a judge, who is also the prosecutor and jury.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

Have you written to your Congressman, your Senator, opposing the new McCarran police-state law?

Write or telegraph your Representatives in Congress now. Ask them to vote against this law which would drag the Nation further down the path to fascism.

Have your union, your club, your organization, your church to protest this attempt to place an additional curb on American civil rights.

[From the Washington Post of March 23, 1952]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND (By Drew Pearson)

TRUMAN SEES PLACE IN HISTORY

One reason why the President is privately for Gov. Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois, to be the Democratic nominee for President is illustrated by a remark Truman once made to Col. Jake Avery, Chicago's astute Democratic leader.

"Stevenson," remarked the President, "is about the best-informed man I know on foreign affairs."

He was referring to the fact that Stevenson, after serving as assistant to the late Frank Knox when he was Secretary of the Navy, later joined the State Department and played an energetic part at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco.

The remark also illustrates an increasingly obvious pride which the President takes in his foreign policy. He believes that his place in history will be made by the fact that he took an unflinching stand against Communist aggression and built up the defense of Western Europe.

The bickering of domestic politics, he is convinced, will be passed over by historians, who will not, however, forget Truman's courageous battle against the encroachment of Russia.

The United States is so engrossed in its own political squabbles and domestic problems that less and less attention is focused on some of the sore spots where wars can brew. Also, less attention is paid to those responsible.

In Egypt, for instance, it isn't generally known that the British Ambassador in Cairo is so sore at Prime Minister Churchill's reactionary policies that he is about ready to resign.

Churchill, who once covered the Sudan War as a young newspaperman, is determined that the Sudan, which controls the upper Nile, shall not unite with Egypt, and has followed such tough policies that Ambassador Sir Ralph Stevenson has notified London that, if Churchill continues to ignore his advice, he will resign.

Stevenson thinks Churchill is driving Egypt slowly into the arms of Communist Russia—just as he drove the Greeks toward communism by his orders in 1944 to General Scobie to treat Athens as a conquered city.

Senator PAT McCARRAN, powerful chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has learned from long experience that one way to get a bill through Congress is to make it so long and involved that colleagues won't take the trouble to read it.

McCARRAN's latest contribution, due for consideration by both Houses soon, is a record in this respect—302 pages long and with 406 sections. It is also loaded with enough boobytraps against our constitutional freedoms to cause the founding fathers to do a mass turn-over in their graves.

The Nevada Senator calls the voluminous measure a recodification of our immigration and naturalization laws. However, some stalwart Members of Congress who have managed to wade through the technical mumbo-jumbo have given it another name—"McCARRAN'S Iron Curtain Bill"—since it exposes foreign-born immigrants to the same police-state tactics from which many of them fled.

If the bill passes in anything approximating its present form, we might as well send the Statue of Liberty back to France. Here are some of the things it does:

1. Makes Communist or Nazi court convictions a bar against entry into the United States—even if the offense involved no moral turpitude by American standards. Thus, an ardent churchman who violated a Communist law against religious worship, or any other offense not purely political, and who was sentenced by a Communist court to more than 5 years, could not enter the United States as a refugee.

2. Stipulates that an immigrant may apply for a visa to the United States only in the country in which he has an established residence. This would automatically bar any refugee from a totalitarian nation, since he can never get a visa from his homeland.

3. Eliminates college and university professors from the class of aliens who are admissible as quota-exempt immigrants. Yet, without the professors who have come to our shores in recent years, we would not have world leadership in the atomic bomb. McCARRAN would also strike at some of the distinguished exiles who have been teaching at Harvard, Catholic University, and Georgetown, such as former Chancellor Bruening, of Germany, who took refuge from Hitler at Harvard.

4. Since 1917, we have exempted victims of religious persecution from literacy requirements. McCARRAN's bill says that such religious exiles, if illiterate, are no longer welcome to our shores. Yet McCARRAN's ancestors fled from Ireland because of religious persecution, and many of such refugees at that time were illiterate.

If the foregoing sounds shocking, you haven't heard the worst. The man who more than anyone else in the Government shapes our immigration policies, Senator McCARRAN, has cooked up some even more sinister police-state medicine regarding the deportation of immigrant Americans.

One provision of his bill abolishes statutes of limitation in deportation cases and gives the Attorney General power to deport any alien who at any time after entry is convicted in the United States of any criminal offense.

In other words, under McCARRAN's bill an immigrant could be deported for a crime he committed 50 years ago, for which no witnesses are available. Furthermore, since McCARRAN stipulates any crime, this conceivably could mean a traffic violation. And there is no checkrein—much less judicial review—to control a possibly prejudiced Attorney General.

Several investigators for the King tax-fraud subcommittee are talking about quitting. They are disillusioned over the way the committee is hearing the unimportant witnesses in open session, while the big shots are heard behind closed doors. * * * Representative Keogh, of Brooklyn, has been conferring behind the backs of other Congressmen with former Internal Revenue Commissioner Joe Nunan, a key witness before the King committee.

SUPPORT OF McCARRAN OMNIBUS IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION BILL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement endorsing the omnibus immigration and naturalization bill, Senate bill 2550. The statement was issued by representatives of a number of patriotic organizations, at a meeting in Washington on Tuesday, March 18, 1952.

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

STATEMENT IN REGARD TO THE McCARRAN-WALTER OMNIBUS IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION BILL

Members of the following 23 organizations met in Washington on Tuesday, March 18, 1952, and agreed unanimously to a declaration condemning the campaign now being waged by a small group of other organizations against the omnibus immigration and naturalization bills (S. 2550, introduced in the Senate by Senator Pat McCARRAN, of Nevada, and H. R. 5678, introduced in the House by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania), which would effect a much-needed revision and codification of the existing laws on the subject. These bills have been favorably reported by the Judiciary Committees of the Congress.

Contrary to the statements which have been circulated against these bills, they have actually been the subject of extended public hearings by a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at which all persons, including representatives of all organizations throughout the country, were invited to testify, and at which representatives of the few organizations now opposing the bills actually testified.

Contrary to what the minority group opposing these bills would have the public believe, these bills are not new, but are the last in a succession of earlier bills introduced in Congress during the last 3 years and based upon a 4-year examination and study of the existing statutes by the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, at an expense of over a quarter of a million dollars.

Contrary to the representations made by the small group opposing these bills, all of the various executive departments of the Government interested in the bills have been heard by the congressional committees which have reported them favorably to the House and Senate. Since the letter of the Department of State was written, approving in principle the provisions of H. R. 5678, the representatives of that Department have suggested only two changes in that bill, one of which was adopted and is now incorporated in the bill as revised and printed. The other suggested change was considered and rejected by the House subcommittee.

The members of the organizations listed below urge the small group opposing these bills to lay aside their present campaign to prevent floor consideration, and let the bills speak for themselves. We respectfully urge the Members of Congress to adhere to the American system of majority rule in order that these bills may be brought up in Congress for action on their merits. A majority

vote should determine whether the proposed bills should become law.

The members of the following organizations earnestly favor the prompt enactment of the legislation proposed in the McCARRAN-Walter bills, as reported by the Judiciary Committees; and, because of the urgency of the situation involved, this method of presenting the subject was adopted: Mrs. John Hall Axford, Patriotic Women of America; Charles E. Babcock, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Nagene Campbell Bethune, National Society for Constitutional Security; Brig. Gen. M. B. Curtis, National Sojourners; Dr. Maude S. DeLand, Wheel of Progress; Charles E. Foster, Disabled American Veterans; Rear Adm. William Rea Furlong, United States Navy (retired), Military Order of World Wars, National Sojourners, Sons of American Revolution; Gen. U. S. Grant III, Military Order of the Loyal Legion; Mrs. Ernest W. Howard, American Legion Auxiliary; Arthur Jack Janelli, Regular Veterans Association; Mrs. William D. Leetch, National Society of New England Women, National Society Women Descendants of Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company; Mrs. James C. Lucas, Daughters of the American Revolution; Mike Masaoka, Japanese American Citizens League; Welburn Mayock, American President Lines; Charles H. Michaelson, Junior Order United American Mechanics, State Council of New Jersey; Hon. Hugh Mitchell, Patriotic Order Sons of America; Gardner Osborn, American Coalition; Miss May Phelps, Service Star Legion; Harold L. Putnam, Sons of the American Revolution; M. H. Thatcher, American Coalition; Orville H. Walburn, Sons of the American Revolution; Mrs. Flora A. Walker, American Coalition; J. B. Wilson, National Wool Growers; Mrs. Margaret Hopkins Worrell, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Wheel of Progress; A. A. Zoll, Society of the War of 1812.

RUDOLPH BING AND NINA BING

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Florida has been so kind in yielding to me, let me say at this time that during the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday, the Senate passed a bill to which there has been, in the opinion of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, some serious objection. The bill was passed by the Senate by unanimous consent. Our care in dealing with immigration bills prompts us to ask unanimous consent—and I now desire to enter a motion to that effect—to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed House bill 2833. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so, and that I may make a brief explanation, for the RECORD.

This bill is a private immigration bill affecting the status of Rudolph Bing and his wife. Mr. Bing is the manager of the Metropolitan Opera, in New York City.

Since the Senate passed the bill, a number of protests have been made to the Judiciary Committee and to the chairman of the committee by responsible persons who appear to feel that there is information concerning this case which was not before the committee at the time when the committee reached its decision regarding the bill.

Mr. President, I have no knowledge on this point. However, as the Senate knows, it has always been the policy of the Judiciary Committee to give to bills of this nature the most careful screening

and the most careful scrutiny and the most deliberate consideration which is possible under the circumstances in each individual case.

Therefore, I believe it would be well to hold up the bill for the time being, so that the availability of any new information in connection with this case can be thoroughly investigated. When this has been done, I shall report again to the Senate with respect to the bill.

I now ask unanimous consent to enter the motion to reconsider. I do not wish to call it up at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that this bill was passed by the Senate after having been passed by the House, and has been signed by the Vice President and the Speaker, and has gone to the President.

Mr. McCARRAN. My reason for making the motion was that I thought I was within the 3-day rule. If I am in error on that point, of course the Chair is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that a motion to that effect is in order, but it would have to be followed by the adoption of a concurrent resolution requesting the return of the bill from the White House. Such a concurrent resolution requesting the President to return the bill would be in order if a motion to reconsider is entered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. May that be done by means of a motion from the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The adoption of a concurrent resolution to that effect would be required, inasmuch as the action of the Presiding Officer would have to be rescinded.

Mr. McCARRAN. That would require the adoption of a concurrent resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, a concurrent resolution requesting the President to return the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that at this time I cannot enter the motion and have it available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senator from Nevada is within the 3-day limit, and the motion to reconsider is in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is what I thought.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But additional steps would be required because of the fact that the bill has been passed by both Houses and has been signed by the Vice President and by the Speaker of the House, and has been sent to the President. Therefore, it would be necessary to have both Houses adopt a concurrent resolution requesting the President to return the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. I thank the Chair for the advice, and I am very grateful to the Senator from Florida for yielding to me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Yuriko Tsutsumi; and

H. R. 3668. An act for the relief of David Yeh.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 899) for the relief of Malka Dwojra Kron.

CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION IN LIEU OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,

JOHN O. PASTORE,

FRANK CARLSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

TOM MURRAY,

JAMES H. MORRISON,

EDWARD H. REES,

Members on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of what the conferees did?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is a bill which transfers to the Civil Service Commission the responsibility for making certain investigations which heretofore have been made by the FBI. The FBI has such a backlog of cases that we thought some of the investigations ought to be made by the Civil Service Commission. We passed the bill in the Senate and it went to the House. The House adopted amendments to which the Senate dis-

agreed, and the bill went to conference. The conferees struck out the amendments inserted by the House, and the bill is in the same form in which it passed the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Am I to understand that by this legislation the FBI would be relieved of the routine so-called file checks?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But in the event that what we sometimes call file checks by the Civil Service Commission should reveal any information which appeared to be significant, the FBI would have an opportunity to investigate?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The case would be immediately referred to the FBI for further investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as I understand, subject to correction by the Chair, the parliamentary situation is that there is still one committee amendment pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. That is the amendment on page 10, line 18.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the amendment to which I refer. That amendment was drafted in the spirit of compromise, when it was hoped that there might be an agreement between the supporters of the measure to allow these lands to be developed and those who were seeking to secure the passage of a quitclaim bill of one kind or another.

It is now quite obvious that the supporters of the quitclaim theory are not acting in the spirit of compromise, although, as I understand—and I speak quite frankly—House bill 4484 is not to be pressed. I understand that those who support the quitclaim theory will concentrate their efforts in support of the bill introduced by the able Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

So, speaking for the supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 20, I have no particular desire to urge the adoption of this committee amendment, and I make the parliamentary inquiry as to whether, in these circumstances, I may withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator is making the request on behalf of the committee, if the committee has authorized him to make the request that the amendment be withdrawn, he may do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am making the request on behalf of the majority of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Otherwise the amendment may be withdrawn only by unanimous consent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to be perfectly fair. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and all the other members of the committee have been perfectly fair, and I do not wish to withdraw the amendment without complete agreement. So in all the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment on page 10, line 18, be withdrawn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG. Reserving the right to object, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LONG. Is this the amendment involving inland waters, and also shrimp and crabs?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. This is the amendment which provides that the Secretary may not lease within the State without the consent of the authorities of the State. It is the amendment which the Senator from Louisiana and I discussed at one time.

Mr. LONG. I have no objection to the amendment being withdrawn.

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

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, as I understand, this does not modify the position which the able Senator has been taking, that the rights of the States to inland waters should be permanently declared by this measure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. I maintain that position absolutely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendment on page 10, line 18, is withdrawn.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr.

MOODY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama for himself and other Senators will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out subsection (2) of subsection (a) of section 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(2) All other moneys received under the provisions of this resolution shall be held in a special account in the Treasury during the present national emergency and until the Congress shall otherwise provide the moneys in such special account shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine and thereafter shall be used exclusively as grants in aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

(3) The National Advisory Council on Grants in Aid of Education is hereby created to be composed of 12 persons with experience in the field of education and public administration, 4 to be appointed by the President of the Senate, 4 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 4 by the President of the United States. No more than 2 from each group of 4 appointees shall be members of the same political party. It shall be the function of such Council to draw and report to the President of the United States for submission to the Congress not later than January 1, 1954, a plan for the equitable allocation of the grants in aid of primary, secondary, and higher education provided in paragraph (2) of this section.

(4) It shall be the duty of every State or political subdivision or grantee thereof having issued any mineral lease or grant, or leases or grants, covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf to file with the Attorney General of the United States on or before December 31, 1952, a statement of the moneys or other things of value received by such State or political subdivision or grantee from or on account of such lease or grant, or leases or grants, since January 1, 1940, and the Attorney General shall submit the statements so received to the Congress not later than February 1, 1953.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in view of the discussion which took place earlier in the afternoon with respect to the action which was taken under the unanimous-consent request of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the junior Senator from South Dakota feels that he should state, speaking for himself, at least, that he does not believe that unanimous consent should be granted to admit to the floor of the Senate representatives of organizations who are registered lobbyists or representatives of organizations of any character other than those expressly provided for in rule XXXIII.

In venturing this personal observation, the Senator from South Dakota wishes to make it clear that he believes the senior Senator from Florida yesterday observed the spirit as well as the text of the rule by asking for unanimous consent. Rule XL expressly provides that—

Any rule may be suspended without notice by the unanimous consent of the Senate, except as otherwise provided in clause 1, rule XII.

Clause 1 of rule XII relates to voting. It provides that—

No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor shall the Presiding Officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent.

The privilege of the floor is expressly reserved, by rule XXXIII, to certain categories. It seems to me that unanimous consent to abrogate that rule should be requested only in very unusual circumstances. If in this case we look upon the gentleman who was admitted to the floor yesterday as in a sense a representative of a State, which personally I doubt, then it would follow that representatives in all the other categories which are named in rule XXXIII of the Senate might be expected to be admitted.

The President of the United States and his private secretary; the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States; and ex-Presidents and ex-Vice Presidents of the United States are admitted to the floor of the Senate in the same manner that governors are admitted to the floor of the Senate. If the argument for admitting a representative of the Association of Attorneys General is that in some sense he is a representative of the States, it would follow that an association of Federal employees in an executive branch of the Government could expect admission to the floor of the Senate. A representative of the Federation of Post Office Clerks could just as logically say, "I am representing an association of Federal employees in the executive branch of the Government. The President is entitled to the floor; therefore we should be admitted to the floor also, because a representative of the Association of Attorneys General has been admitted to the floor."

It seems to me that the incident of yesterday should not be regarded as a precedent to be followed in the future, for it would lead us into innumerable difficulties.

Representatives of the Mutual Security Administration, representatives of the Defense Department, and representatives of various divisions of the executive branch of the Government could also be admitted to the floor of the Senate under such a precedent, whereupon the Senate would lose all semblance of being a deliberative and legislative body.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator from South Dakota believe that certain specialists from the administrative branches of Government should be admitted to the floor of the Senate when bills are under consideration which are of special interest to such agency or executive department?

Mr. CASE. The junior Senator from South Dakota does not believe that they should be admitted to the floor of the Senate when bills of interest to their particular branch of the Government are being debated on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, my only reason for speaking is that yesterday when this subject came up I would have objected to the unanimous consent request except for the fact that I was attending a hearing of one of the committees of the Senate, which was meeting under permission granted to it by the Senate. I regret very much that occasionally committees of the Senate must meet when the Senate is in session. When they do meet Members of the Senate who are members of such committees have a special responsibility to discharge, and necessarily they must go to those meetings. The fact that I was not present on the floor of course forecloses my right to have protested the action that took place yesterday. However, my silence may be interpreted to be assent to the action taken yesterday, and therefore I want these remarks to make perfectly clear that I would have objected had I been present, and that I shall object in the future if I am present.

OIL FOR THE LAMPS OF LEARNING

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment which has been reported to the Senate and which was introduced by me in behalf of myself and in behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. President, we support the amendment, and I rise to speak in defense of a priceless and incalculable national heritage against a determined effort on the part of a dissatisfied minority of the States to snatch that heritage from the American people. I refer, of course, to the so-called tidelands bill, which is designed to make a multi-billion dollar gift from the people of the United States to the three States of California, Louisiana, and Texas.

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

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will permit me to proceed with my speech, I should like to do so. However, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has referred to a multi-billion-dollar gift. Can the Senator tell me how many billions of dollars are involved within the original boundaries of the States, not considering the Continental Shelf? I ask that question because I intend to support the Holland amendment.

Mr. HILL. I refer not only to the Holland amendment but also to the bill which has been passed by the House, and which the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] stated he will offer as an amendment. That bill is known as the Walter bill. It takes in not only the submerged land under the marginal sea but also considerable parts of the continental shelf.

Mr. LONG. I am referring to the bill which relates to the original boundaries of the States. It is that amendment which I intend to support. It is being sponsored by more than 30 Senators. Can the Senator from Alabama assure me that there is involved as much as \$1,000,000,000 of revenue to the Federal Government and the States?

Mr. HILL. I was coming to that point a little later in my remarks. I was coming to an estimated sum, because, as the Senator knows, in the case of oil we are still in the realm of estimates. I take it that no one really knows exactly how much oil there is until the oil wells have been drilled and it is ascertained how much oil comes out of the submerged lands.

The other day in debate the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana referred to the fact that there were undoubtedly large amounts of oil off the coast of Louisiana, and we know that the continental shelf off the coast of Louisiana extends for many miles. Undoubtedly there are huge sums in terms of dollars and cents involved in the oil in the submerged lands, I will say to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Alabama knows, does he not, that we can pretty well estimate how much oil can be found within the boundaries of the three States involved?

Mr. HILL. I shall come to estimates in a few minutes, if the Senator will bear with me.

THE GIVE-AWAY BILL

Mr. President, the bill which passed the House of Representatives and was rejected by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is claimed by its sponsors to be variously a tidelands bill, a quitclaim bill, and a bill to restore the historic rights of the States.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator sure that the bill was rejected by the committee?

Mr. HILL. I say it was rejected by the committee. When a bill comes over from the House of Representatives, with the prestige and backing and support of having been passed by that body, and instead of reporting that bill the committee reports a different bill, particularly when there are Senators on the committee who advocate that bill, I would say that that constitutes a rejection.

Mr. LONG. The Senator knows that there was no action taken in the committee on that bill.

Mr. HILL. There was no action taken on that bill because it was impossible to get it out of committee. The Senator is a member of that committee.

He knows that to be a fact. I do not doubt that if the Senator from Louisiana could have succeeded in having that bill reported he would have done so. It shows how weak the bill is. The very fact that there was such an able, brilliant, and indefatigable advocate as the Senator from Louisiana sitting on that committee, the bill did not come out of the committee, could not be better evidence of the fact that that bill was rejected by the committee.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator from Alabama point to a committee of the Senate which is more favorably disposed to Federal ownership and Federal control than the particular committee to which the Senator refers?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Louisiana is a member of that committee, and he knows his committee much better than I do. I have never had the honor of serving on it. I have great respect for the committee. I do not know that that committee is any more disposed toward Federal ownership and Federal control than any other committee. However, I would say, knowing the committee as I do, the committee has a keen sense of its responsibilities as trustees representing the Senate and representing the people of the United States in safeguarding and holding fast to the lands for which they are trustees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The able Senator from Alabama would not mean to imply, would he, that the members of the committee had any higher sense of obligation as trustees for the people of the United States than the Members of the Senate of the United States. Would not the best test of how these trustees feel be demonstrated by a vote of the Senate on the subject?

Mr. HILL. It is surprising to me that my friend from California would even think that any Senator would have any higher sense of responsibility than the Senate itself, except that some Senators have a peculiar and a more immediate and more direct responsibility by virtue of the fact that they are members of the committee which has jurisdiction over our public lands and our natural resources.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Alabama familiar with the fact that when the prior measure was passed by the Senate another able committee of this body, the Judiciary Committee, I believe, which also has a high sense of trusteeship, favorably reported to the Senate the proposed tidelands legislation?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I am familiar with that. I am also familiar with the fact that the Senate Committee on the Judi-

ciary in August 1937, by reporting unani- mously to the Senate a resolution which subsequently was adopted by the Senate, really and truly began the struggle that has gone on through the years to make certain that that which belongs to all the people of the United States shall be used for their benefit and advantage.

Mr. President, as I was saying, I really feel somewhat gratified, for I did not realize that the first five sentences of my speech would draw so much blood. [Laughter.] The attack rather com- mends the speech.

As I said a moment ago, the bill which passed the House of Representatives and was rejected by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is claimed by its sponsors to be variously a tide- lands bill, a quitclaim bill, and a bill to restore the historic rights of the States.

Today I shall demonstrate to the Sen- ate that the bill is none of the things which its sponsors claim it to be. It is a give-away bill, which permits a few States, with the help of big companies, to grab from the people of the United States the inestimable oil resources of the marginal sea—and, even beyond this, to stick their fingers into the untold wealth of the great Continental Shelf.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a ques- tion?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator from Alabama show that this measure is as much a give-away measure as is the Minerals Leasing Act, which provides for leases, for the purpose of mineral ex- ploration, discovery, and development, in the public lands in the various States, and with the further provision that the States shall receive directly 37½ percent of the revenues and that 52½ percent shall go into a reclamation fund for the benefit of those States?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I think those two things are entirely different. I think that is where my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, really has misunder- stood the entire question which is now before the Senate. He does not realize the difference between the lands in the public-land States and the submerged lands, lands under the water, and how they were acquired originally, how their whole genesis is different, how the entire historic arrangement is different. Fur- thermore, if the lands in the public-land States are in the hands of private per- sons, those lands are subject to taxation. All those factors must be considered.

Of course, Mr. President, the lands under the sea would not bring to anyone anything by way of taxation, and never have done so. So the two are entirely different, and in many respects the ac- quisition of these lands by the Federal Government has been somewhat dif- ferent.

I wish to say to my friend that one stems from our national external sov- ereignty; the other comes to us under what we might call the old common- law title to property, the holding of prop- erty, and so forth.

Mr. LONG. There was no doubt that the Federal Government owned the land in the interior States, was there?

Mr. HILL. I think that is undoubtedly true. However, there is a difference between the two, and that is the difference which the Senator from Louisiana has been unwilling to recognize. Of course, I can understand his position. He represents in part here the great State of Louisiana. Good gracious alive, Mr. President. Earlier today some Senators were speaking on the floor about having admitted to the floor of the Senate the attorney general of one of the States, in advising Senators. I never dreamed that would occur. That would have been the last thing I would ever have thought, namely, that the great State of Louisiana would need to have its attorney general sit here on the floor of the Senate at a time when the two able Senators from Louisiana were also here on the floor.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Alabama knows that I did not make that request.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate that fully, and I did not mean in any way to imply that the junior Senator from Louisiana did make the request. However, I cannot help but say that the presence here of the distinguished and able junior Senator from Louisiana, who always is so able, indefatigable, and devoted in his efforts to look after the welfare and the interests of the people of his State, and who now seeks to take from the people of the United States a property which the Supreme Court of the United States has said belongs to all the people of the United States, illustrates how diligent and how zealous is the Senator from Louisiana in behalf of the people of his State.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further to me?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have not finished even the first paragraph of my speech, and I should like to proceed without too many interruptions. I do not think this debate is giving much light or information to the Senate. I am enjoying the debate, and I am sure the Senator from Louisiana is enjoying it, but I do not believe it is giving much information to the Senate.

However, I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. When the Senator from Alabama says this measure is a give-away to the States, with respect to property that has been regarded as theirs for 150 years, I ask the Senator whether this measure is any more a give-away than is the Minerals Leasing Act?

Mr. HILL. Of course, I do not accept the Senator's premise at all, namely, that this property has always belonged to the States. To the contrary, I think the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States was correct in the case of *Toomer against Witsell*, when he said that this property has always belonged to the Nation.

Mr. President, if I may be allowed to proceed, I think I shall show that this property never belonged to the States.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. There is a great difference between the oil under the land in the States and the oil under submerged lands along the coasts. The Minerals Leasing Act was designed to permit the discovery and development of oil-bearing lands in the interior areas, but that measure has no relationship to the situation we are considering at this time, in connection with which certain of the States are seeking to gain title to lands which the Supreme Court has held belong to the United States of America.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Montana is exactly correct.

Of course, Mr. President, we have been generous under the Minerals Leasing Act, just as we have been generous under the sugar subsidy, about which the Senator knows.

Mr. President, in ordinary circumstances it would give me great personal pleasure to support the enactment of any proposed legislation which would be of particular benefit to the people of California, Louisiana, and Texas. But here we are dealing with an issue which is more important than any single State, more important than any single industry, more important than any special or local or private interest. We are dealing with a great national asset, declared by the Supreme Court of the United States to belong to the people of the United States: an asset which may prove essential to our national economic well-being in time of peace and vital to our common defense against threatened aggression; indeed, indispensable to our very national existence in time of war.

A MULTI-BILLION-DOLLAR GIFT

The oil resources of the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf are too great to be dealt with as the plaything of a political game or the pawn of a financial grab.

In an earlier speech in the Senate I pointed out that the ablest petroleum geologists in the oil industry estimate the offshore oil reserves of the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf at 15,000,000,000 barrels. More than a year ago Dr. E. O. DeGolyer, of Dallas, Tex., who has an international reputation as one of the most outstanding petroleum geologists in the world—if not the outstanding one—stated in an article in *Life* magazine that there may be 10,500,000,000 barrels of oil along the coasts of Texas and Louisiana alone. The Geological Survey of the United States Department of the Interior confirms these estimates. At present prices, these 15,000,000,000 barrels are worth over \$40,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I have stated that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana himself, when speaking on the floor just a few days ago in the course of this debate, referred to the fact that undoubtedly there are enormous amounts

of oil off the coast of Alaska. We also know that in addition to those enormous amounts of oil, there are large quantities of gas.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me at this point?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I do not believe I can stand as an authority to the effect that there is oil off the coast of Alaska. That could be, but I do not know it to be so. I merely said that the Continental Shelf there is wider than the Continental Shelf along the coast line of the United States itself.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President I do not wish to attribute to the Senator from Louisiana statements which are not properly attributable to him. However, I am quite certain that the Senator from Louisiana will find, when he catches up with this procession, that there will be oil off the coast of Alaska, just as there is oil off the coast of Louisiana.

In addition to the huge reserves of undersea oil off the coasts of California, Texas, and Louisiana, estimates published by the American Petroleum Institute and the American Gas Association state that there are also fabulous quantities of gas. According to a bulletin in December a year ago, published jointly by the American Petroleum Institute and the American Gas Association, estimates of proven gas reserves off the coasts of these three States total a little over 140 trillion cubic feet of gas. The commercial unit of gas measurement is 1,000 cubic feet—called an mcf. This would place the gas reserves at 140,000,000,000 mcf. The price of gas per thousand cubic feet varies a little in different areas; but if we take 7 cents per thousand cubic feet as a fair figure for the purpose of arriving at the value of the gas reserves, and if we multiply it by the 140,000,000,000 mcf., we find that the gas is worth almost \$10,000,000,000.

We have seen the pressures that have been exerted, the false fronts that have been constructed. We have seen the parade of scarecrows that have been led up and down the aisles and in and out of the committee rooms of both Houses of Congress. Despite the false fronts, despite the specious arguments, despite the political pressures, I do not believe that the United States Senate is willing to assume the responsibility of giving away billions of dollars worth of the people's property. Indeed, I do not believe that the House of Representatives, which has already passed this measure, will be willing on the final show-down to assume such a responsibility. Indeed, Mr. President, I remind the Senate that the House of Representatives refused to assume that responsibility, as was demonstrated when the House of Representatives sustained the President's veto of the previous give-away bill.

Today it is my purpose to analyze the measure which passed the House of Representatives was rejected by the Senate committee, but is being offered here as a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution

20, and to strip from it the false labels intended to conceal this unprecedented proposal for giveaway and grab. Some of these labels are designed to frighten the American people and the American Congress. Others are designed to lull them into a desired sense of serenity as to what the joint resolution proposes to do. Let us, therefore, take a look at the RECORD and see just what the sponsors of this measure propose to do with the Nation's offshore oil reserves.

"TIDELANDS" A MISNOMER

In the first place, the very name by which the joint resolution has been tagged is a spurious one. It has been called a "Tidelands bill." The fact is that this joint resolution has nothing whatever to do with the tidelands, just as the measure which preceded it had nothing to do with the tidelands. The tidelands, properly called, are the lands around the coast which lie between the high-water mark and the low-water mark of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the Gulf of Mexico. The Federal Government has never asserted the slightest claim to ownership or dominion over the tidelands or the oil or other minerals which may lie beneath them.

For more than a century the Supreme Court of the United States has held—and in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases this holding has been reaffirmed—that the States—and here I quote the Court in the California case—are now seized of "ownership of lands under inland navigable waters such as rivers, harbors, and even tidelands down to the low-water mark."

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend, the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. In addition to the fact that the Federal Government has never asserted ownership in inland waters, is it not true that an amendment has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, supported by a number of other Senators, which clearly sets forth that the Federal Government does not now, and never expects to assert ownership, of any of the inland waters?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York is entirely correct. I expected to refer to that amendment next in my remarks. But the Senator has stated it so well that I wish to thank him for his contribution. The amendment has been adopted by the Senate. The amendment is now an integral part of the pending measure, and it confirms the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which hold that all of the submerged lands under the inland navigable waters and the tidelands belong to the several States.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Alabama will recall that I spoke to him recently about an editorial which appeared in the leading newspaper of my State, the Minneapolis Star, in reference to this very name, "tidelands," and

to the influence which "tidelands" has insofar as denying State control over those areas under rivers and under lakes. The editor, I am sure, did not wilfully misstate what was his opinion. He stated that it was clear to all people that the tidelands, or, as he called them, the submerged lands, under rivers and lakes, belong to the States; and yet that the measure which we are considering would deny to the States the land under the rivers and under the lakes.

Mr. HILL. It would not deny but would confirm the States' rights, titles, and interests in those submerged lands; and in confirming the States' rights, titles, and interest, it would confirm the decisions of the Supreme Court, decisions beginning, incidentally, with a case in my State of Alabama—Pollard against Hagen—over 100 years ago. In that case, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the right, title, and interest in tidelands was in the particular State.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. There have been approximately 52 subsequent decisions, including the decisions in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, confirming the fact, as the Senator has said, that title is in the States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yet the opposition to the Senator's point of view has tried to distort this picture by making it appear as if the Federal Government were going to step in, by court action, to usurp those established rights, which we are now proposing to confirm by law.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely correct. Unable to sustain on the merits their contention as to the rights they might have to the lands under the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf, they reached out and set up as a bogymen the idea that perhaps the Federal Government was going to take over all inland waterways.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is the widows-and-orphans aspect of this picture, is it not?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely correct.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that they went so far, in trying to paint a picture of an iniquitous Federal Government, as to state that there would be a question as to the title and the ownership and the control even of piers and structures which project from the land into the waters?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. If there has been any bogymen of which the mind of man could conceive, which has not been brought into this picture, I do not know what it is. But, fortunately, the people of the United States understand this issue. They know what is involved, just as we in the Senate know what is involved.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it goes to the application of the funds, or a certain portion of the funds, leaving the remainder of the bill, which is to be offered as an amendment, to take care of the controversy as to the different types of land to be embraced.

Mr. HILL. No, all the funds which would accrue would be subject to this amendment, I would say to the Senator.

Mr. CASE. But the amendment itself does not go to the determination of the title to the land between the Continental Shelf and the 3-mile limit, does it?

Mr. HILL. No. The amendment itself does not go into that question at all, because the joint resolution to which the amendment is offered deals with all of that. This is merely a perfecting amendment to the joint resolution. It is not a substitute for the joint resolution. It merely goes to that section dealing with the funds, and then the amendment would provide the manner in which the funds should be distributed.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that if that question could be clearly understood by the Members of the Senate generally, there would be little opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HILL. I thank my distinguished friend for his contribution, and for making the point entirely clear to the Senate.

Mr. President, as I have said, the whole question of a threatened Federal claim to ownership of the tidelands, lands under the rivers, harbors, bays, inlets, and other navigable waters lying inside the low-water mark of the sea is a bugaboo designed to get the backing of the other 45 States behind the 3 States which seek to have the Federal Government give them billions of dollars' worth of oil and gas, and perhaps other minerals. We do not know; it may be that as time goes on and modern technology develops—and we have discovered many things in recent years—other valuable minerals may be found. Let us remember that, once we give away this land, we can never reclaim it; it is gone; it is lost.

As I have said, the tidelands and other inland navigable waters are definitely not involved in this controversy. What is here involved and what was involved in the three historic cases of United States against California, United States against Texas, and the United States against Louisiana was the ownership of the rich oil lands lying under the marginal seas; that is, lying beyond the low-water mark out to the 3-mile limit. These lands are constantly under the waters of the sea and their ownership had never been adjudicated prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in these three cases that followed the discovery of oil a few years ago.

The fact of the matter is that Mr. Justice Reed, of the Supreme Court, who, as we recall, dissented in the California case, himself stated, as a dissenter, that this question had never been previously adjudicated or determined. That was confirmed a little later on by the Chief

Justice of the Supreme Court, in the case of *Toomer against Witsell*, and it was similarly confirmed in the Louisiana and Texas cases. In those cases, the three States involved asserted that they were the owners of the oil, while on the other hand the Attorney General contended that the Federal Government was the owner. The Attorney General's contention was upheld by the Supreme Court in each of the three cases.

The purpose of the give-away bill is to overrule the Supreme Court's decisions and to give away the oil which lies under the marginal sea. Title III of the give-away bill—that is, the amendment which will be offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]—goes even beyond the marginal sea and proposes to give to the States an interest in the royalties derived from oil in the Continental Shelf, namely, the submerged lands of the American Continent which lie beyond the 3-mile limit. Title III of the give-away bill deals with a proposition which was never considered by the Supreme Court in any of the three cases to which I have referred, and it goes far beyond the most fantastic claims ever made by the proponents of State ownership or State control.

So, Mr. President, I again emphasize that this is not a tidelands bill. This is a bill to give away to three States the Nation's oil, which the Supreme Court has said belongs to all the people of the United States—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the first place, I think the Senator from Alabama knows that there are many of us who believe that the States had for more than 150 years and, in the case of my State of California, for approximately 100 years, sovereignty and title out to the 3-mile limit, until the question was raised in a suit by the then Secretary of the Interior and the Department of Justice. I think the Senator also well knows that there are many of us who feel that there is a valid claim on the part of the States to have that area restored to them and who are not in favor of title III of the so-called Walter bill or the Connally substitute amendment which would go beyond the historic boundaries of the State on to the Continental Shelf, and for that reason they joined with the able Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in a bill which strikes out, in effect, title III of the Walter bill.

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to know that my friend from California—and he is aware of the esteem in which I hold him—is not asking for all the oil, all the gas, and all the minerals which may lie under the sea, but is asking only for a good portion.

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

Mr. HILL. Of course, I yield to my good friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Even the Walters bill would leave the Federal Government with 62½ percent of the revenue pro-

duced from the Continental Shelf. After all 95 percent of the submerged land is on the Continental Shelf beyond State boundaries.

Mr. HILL. I did not say my friend was going to take every drop of oil; I said he was trying to take oil, gas, and perhaps other minerals which belong to all the people of the United States. An extremely large slice belonging to the people would be taken.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama know that when the Supreme Court in its decision divested the State of California and in subsequent decisions divested other States of that which for a hundred years or more had been recognized as belonging to them, it did not at that time assert that the Federal Government had ownership, but enunciated the new and, we feel, very dangerous doctrine of paramount rights?

Mr. HILL. But they did not stop with paramount rights. They also asserted the proposition of the Federal Government having full dominion. The reason why the Supreme Court used the words "paramount rights," "power," and "full dominion," was that our rights and our dominion in this area came within the realm of international relations, international law, and international agreements. The Supreme Court did not refrain from using the word "title" because of any question in its mind as to any rights of the State of California, but because of the fact that we were in the realm of international affairs. In fact, the language of the Court, as I recall, stated very clearly that California did not have any ownership in these lands.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has brought in the international complications. He has been speaking of the resources as belonging to all the people. Is he speaking of all the people in the world or of all the people in the United States? It occurs to me that if these resources belong to all the people, perhaps we are going to see other nations of the world claiming they are entitled to some of the resources of the Continental Shelf off the United States.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Louisiana knows that I was speaking of the people of the United States. But there is no gainsaying the fact that when we leave the shores of the United States and go out into the great ocean, we get into an international realm. I am sure that my brilliant friend from Louisiana recognizes that fact.

Mr. LONG. Was it not a Representative from Alabama, Mr. Hobbs, who argued that the resources belonged to the family of nations?

Mr. HILL. I cannot say what he argued. He was a very fine, estimable gentleman and a very able lawyer.

Mr. LONG. I agree.

Mr. HILL. The Supreme Court decided that the State of California was not the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along its coast—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the Senator say that the Federal Government has paramount rights or full dominion over all the 48 States, and, therefore, might in the future assert a right to the minerals beneath the soil on some broad theory—

Mr. HILL. No; I would not only not say that, but I invite the Senator's attention to decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, beginning with a case in the State of Alabama, which completely nullify any such suggestion as that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What confidence can one have in those decisions if in some future situation judges might be appointed who would perhaps change and upset the theories which have been expressed for a period of a hundred years, as was the case in the tidelands cases.

Mr. HILL. The Supreme Court not only did not upset or change those decisions, but it reaffirmed and ratified them and once again proclaimed them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is a considerable difference of opinion on that point.

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

Mr. HILL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A good deal of effort is being made to differentiate between what we call property rights and sovereign jurisdiction over an area. I think the opinion of the Court in the Texas case contained some very enlightening language. I quote from that case as reported in the hearings on page 492:

Property rights must then be so subordinated to political rights as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign. Today the controversy is over oil. Tomorrow it may be over some other substance or mineral or perhaps the bed of the ocean itself. If the property, whatever it may be, lies seaward of low-water mark, its use, disposition, management, and control involve national interests and national responsibilities. That is the source of national rights in it.

But the Senator is interpreting the language of the Court and saying that property rights are inclusive within the rights of the national sovereign, and the principle of sovereign power is a principle which is recognized in the domain of international law. The term "title"—

Mr. HILL. A better word is "dominium."

Mr. HUMPHREY. The term as the Senator uses it, in terms of fee-simple title, is something which relates to what we call our national law.

Mr. HILL. Or common law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Common law, yes. Dominion or jurisdiction or sovereignty relates more specifically to international law, and in this instance I think it is wrong to try to confuse what we call

common law or civil law, which is statutory law, with international law, which deals with the rights between nations, on which these very cases are based.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his splendid contribution.

A GIFT NOT A QUITCLAIM

Mr. President, this proposed give-away legislation has also been misnamed a quitclaim bill. Those of my colleagues who are lawyers will clearly realize what a false label this is. If my neighbor and I both claim a certain strip of ground that falls within the boundaries of our respective properties, we may wish to settle the matter without litigation. Each of us may have been advised by his lawyer that he has a good title to the property in question. One of us must be wrong. Each of us thinks he is right, but, in the absence of some court decision, neither of us can be sure which is right. Under these circumstances it might be desirable for us to compromise the matter rather than to incur the expense, the delay, and the bad feeling incident to a lawsuit. If that is the way my neighbor and I feel about the controversy, it would be natural for one of us to pay the other a sum of money, in return for which the rival claimant would abandon his claim and put an end to the controversy. If we resorted to that procedure, then one of us would give a quitclaim deed to the other relinquishing all claims to the disputed property.

If, Mr. President, there had never been any litigation between Texas, California, and Louisiana and the Federal Government; if there had never been a judicial determination as to the ownership of the oil lying under the marginal sea; if these things had never happened, then it might be proper to talk about a quitclaim bill. But all questions of claim have been settled. There has been litigation, and there has been a solemn determination of all the issues by the highest judicial tribunal known to our constitutional system, the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. President, after the suits have been brought, the briefs submitted, the arguments made, and the cases decided, how can there be any serious talk about quitclaims to \$50,000,000,000 worth of oil and gas? The Supreme Court of the United States has consistently held that this oil belongs not to the States but to the Nation. There is no controversy to be settled, nothing to be quitclaimed.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Did not the distinguished Mr. Justice Black, who is from the Senator's State, and himself a former United States Senator, indicate in his opinion that it was up to Congress to decide what should be done with this property?

Mr. HILL. No, Mr. President. I think if one reads the language in the light of its text, he will find that Mr. Justice Black had particular reference to the fact that perhaps certain improvements had been made on the property and certain things had been done that would

create equities there, and he knew that the Congress of the United States would be fair and absolutely considerate in dealing with any equities or any questions which might arise.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Alabama know that Mr. Perlman, the Solicitor General, testifying for the Federal Government, said it was up to Congress to decide what disposition should be made of this property and the profits which may come from it?

Mr. HILL. Of course Congress is the trustee of this property, just as Congress is the trustee of other property. Congress is the trustee of this very Capitol building. I suppose Congress, if it desired, could give away this Capitol building. It might even move it to Baton Rouge.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that although it has not been my pleasure to visit the capitol of Louisiana, the father of the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana erected that building, and I understand it is one of the finest buildings in the United States, there being no other building in America that more fully reflects the dignity, the majesty, power, and greatness of a people than the capitol building at Baton Rouge reflects the greatness of the people of Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama. At least for a moment we are in agreement.

Mr. HILL. In that I rejoice.

Mr. President, if I may continue with my quitclaim parallel, if my neighbor and I, instead of compromising our differences, had gone to law, and if the courts had decided that the property in dispute belonged to me and not to my neighbor, then there would be no question of my quitclaiming anything. If my neighbor wanted the property, and if I were willing to sell it, perhaps he might buy it from me. Or, if I were sufficiently generous, I might even give it to him. But the newspaper Labor, the organ of the Railway Brotherhoods, put the oil issue in a nutshell when it stated "\$40,000,000,000 is too much to give away."

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. When the Senator speaks of \$40,000,000,000, he is speaking of the total value of all oil that might lie under the Continental Shelf. I think that is a very high estimate. Nevertheless, the Senator well knows that there would not be a net return of \$40,000,000,000 merely because \$40,000,000,000 worth of oil might be there. It would be necessary to reduce the estimate to about one-sixth of that figure, which would be about the best we could hope to get as royalty from oil and gas leases. If the Senator will divide by 6, he will not get \$40,000,000,000, but around \$7,000,000,000.

Mr. HILL. That might depend upon circumstances. If the United States needed the oil for its airplanes, battleships, and submarines, we might use far more than 12½ percent. I must say to the Senator, because I wish to be

perfectly frank with him, that of course there will be some cost involved in the exploitation and development of the property. To take the oil from under the property we are discussing will cost money. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana as to that.

Mr. LONG. I doubt if the Senator himself could get more than one barrel out of six. The Secretary of the Interior has estimated that the most that could be obtained, if the property were fully developed, would be about \$100,000,000 a year. As the Senator knows, the first budget estimate for Federal aid to education was \$300,000,000 a year, or three times the revenue which the Secretary of the Interior estimates the submerged lands could yield if they were fully developed.

Mr. HILL. I have a statement from the Senator's own committee, in a report filed by its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Wyoming, which sets forth the figures I have given, namely, 13,000,000,000 barrels of oil. That is to be found at page 5 of the committee report.

Mr. LONG. I do not know who wrote the committee report.

Mr. HILL. It bears the name of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. It is from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. LONG. I know the Senator from Wyoming has subscribed to the figures given by the Secretary of the Interior, when he estimated that the property, fully developed, might yield the Government perhaps as much as \$100,000,000 a year. But I have not seen any estimate greater than that by anyone in a responsible position to make such an estimate.

Mr. HILL. This estimate is carried in the committee report, which is what I have stated earlier in my remarks—13,000,000,000 barrels.

Mr. LONG. That was a personal report by the chairman, so far as I know, because it was not submitted to me, and I doubt whether it was submitted to other members of the committee, if my experience was the same as that of other members of the committee.

Mr. HILL. The chairman of the committee thought so much of the estimate that he included it in the report on the joint resolution for the attention of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator knows that the chairman of the committee is the principal exponent of the Federal position in this matter.

Mr. HILL. I understand that, but I do not believe that that would affect the position of the chairman on the estimate. I think the chairman would have the same desire to present a true estimate as would the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Alabama, or any other Member of this body. We who seek to preserve this property as trustees are, of course, naturally very anxious to know exactly what the value of the property may be.

SYNTHETIC HISTORIC RIGHTS

The sponsors of this give-away legislation have referred to it as a bill to restore the historic rights of the States to the submerged lands underlying the marginal sea. As I have already pointed out, title III of the give-away bill—that is, the bill passed by the House, and now offered in the form of a substitute by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]—reaches far beyond the marginal seas, and I shall in this connection discuss it in a few moments at greater length. But even if this legislation were confined to handing over to the States just the oil underlying the marginal sea, it would still be incorrect to call it a bill to restore the historic rights of the States. No decision of the Supreme Court had ever held that this property belonged to the States. As I stated earlier, even in the dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Reed it was declared that the question had never been litigated and adjudicated. While it may be true that the States claimed certain rights, or assumed certain rights, the Supreme Court, in the Texas, California, and Louisiana cases, held that these claims and assumptions were not valid.

Sometimes the proponents of this legislation talk of the historic rights of the States as if the States and their lessees had been drilling oil wells in the marginal seas for centuries. The fact is that it was only a few years ago that anyone suspected the existence of something to fight about. Then, when these three States and the Federal Government had reason to believe that valuable reserves of oil existed beneath the marginal seas, the controversy started to brew.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the able Senator from Alabama has quite accurately portrayed the situation. The Federal Government had never challenged the right of the States to their borders, extending out three English miles into the sea in the case of California, and 10 miles in the case of Texas, which had been an independent republic. The cupidity of the Federal Government was not excited until oil had been developed by the State of California and other States. When the Federal Government saw that there were mineral resources within the boundaries of California, in an area which is as much a part of the State of California as are our inland valleys such as the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, it excited the cupidity of the Federal Government, and it undertook to seize a part of the sovereignty of the State of California and other States involved.

Mr. HILL. The Senator uses the term "cupidity." I shall not argue with him. He might have used the word "cupidity" with reference to the Federal Government as meaning all the States except perhaps three—that is, 45 States. Someone else might use the word "cupidity" with reference to the three other States. The fact remains, as the Supreme Court

has said in at least four different decisions, that this question had never arisen. As the Court said, these lands have never belonged to California or Louisiana.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How does the able Senator from Alabama explain the fact that, not once, but on numerous occasions when the issue arose as to whether the Federal Government had any power to lease, the Secretary of the Interior, the very one who later reversed himself, by written instrument had said that that power vested in the State governments? How does the Senator explain the fact that on numerous occasions, not only in my State of California, but in other States of the Union where the Federal Government wanted deeded to it control over certain areas, it insisted upon receiving a grant from the legislature, or from the municipal body, as the case might be?

Mr. HILL. I will say to my friend that the late Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, was very frank about this matter when he appeared before the committee. He said that when he came into office he found in existence the policy that the submerged lands did not belong to the Federal Government, and that he followed that policy until he had the time and occasion to examine into it, but that when he examined into it he found that that policy, which some predecessor of his had adopted, was subject to such serious question that he urged that the Government, through the Attorney General of the United States, file suit in the Supreme Court to have the question adjudicated.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know why the Secretary of the Interior looked into the question?

Mr. HILL. I do not know why he looked into it. I know that one of his predecessors as Secretary of the Interior was Albert B. Fall. I believe that if he had been one of my predecessors in office, I would have looked into every policy I might have inherited from him.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know that this problem arose, so far as we can determine—and we certainly have committee reports which so state—because certain Federal lease applicants hoped to obtain valuable leases by an offer of perhaps 50 cents an acre?

Mr. HILL. Not at all. I will tell the Senator when this question really arose and became serious. It became serious when this august body—as it is often described—the Senate of the United States, passed Senate Joint Resolution 208. That joint resolution was passed in August 1937.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator tell me what the vote was?

Mr. HILL. It was passed unanimously.

Mr. LONG. What the Senator means is that it slipped through on the call of the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I do not mean that at all. I am not going to impute to the Senators from Louisiana who were here at that time any less diligence or alertness in the defense and protection of the rights of Louisiana than characterizes the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana today.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator tell me what action there was in the House on the same joint resolution when it reached the House?

Mr. HILL. As I recall, the House Committee on the Judiciary struck out the States of California and Texas, and reported the joint resolution relating only to the State of California. That was back in 1937. I believe that at that time the question was localized in the State of California. The House Committee on the Judiciary reported the joint resolution with that amendment, but the House did not act on the joint resolution.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A moment ago the Senator, in colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana, mentioned the fact that there was a precedent or a tradition on the part of the Federal Government to reserve to the States the right to lease certain submerged lands. He stated that at one time the policy was that such right resided in the States, but that that policy was changed by the late Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Mr. Ickes. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That is my understanding. The Senator can speak for himself so far as his own understanding is concerned, but that is my understanding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understood the Senator from Alabama, he stated that the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior which had been reversed or contested was that of the late and well-known Secretary of the Interior Albert B. Fall.

Mr. HILL. No; I did not say that. I did not say that it was his policy. I do not know whether he adopted it or not. I said that the late Albert B. Fall was one of Secretary Ickes' predecessors. Then I said that certainly if I had been a successor to Albert B. Fall, particularly where oil was concerned, I would have carefully examined any policy which had been adopted or approved or followed by Mr. Fall.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the Senator is saying that the policy prior to Mr. Ickes had been that of State leasing.

Mr. HILL. That is my understanding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that the Senator would also like to have the RECORD show that at one period in the history of this Nation the protection of the public rights, so far as oil reserves were concerned, was not too assiduous. In other words, such rights were not carefully guarded. There were such things as the Elk Hills lease and the

Teapot Dome oil case, all of which had something to do with the public interest and with the people's Treasury.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it any wonder that the late Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, should want to examine into any kind of precedent which had been established in former days, relating to the natural resources of the American people?

Mr. HILL. It was the most natural thing for him to do, and one for which I feel he deserves the commendation of the American people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is one which has earned him the commendation of the American people, because he will go down in American history as one of the great protectors of our natural resources.

Mr. HILL. I doubt if we have ever had, in the history of the United States, a more diligent and zealous watchman on the tower in behalf of the public interest of the people of the United States, than the late Harold L. Ickes.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator was discussing the reason why Mr. Ickes changed his mind. If he will look at page 235 of the printed hearings he will see, in Mr. Ickes' own words, the reason why he changed his mind. All this talk about going back and protecting the public interest had nothing to do with it. Mr. Ickes stated, as appears on page 235 of the record:

A man by the name of Uel T. McCurry came in. He was one of the early ones. He had filed. Then others came in, and I finally concluded that while I would not presume to pass on the law to determine whether or not the Federal Government had title, or the States' governments, there was enough doubt so that the courts, which after all are our tribunals to decide what the law is, should have a chance to pass upon this question.

It was on that basis, and on that basis alone, that I thought that the whole subject matter should go to the Federal courts for decision.

The Senator will notice that the previous paragraph relates to Federal applicants for leases in areas where, under State leases, oil had already been discovered.

Mr. HILL. I think there is no question about that. But had Mr. Ickes wished to do so, he could have held fast to the policy adopted by his predecessors, and continued to tell applicants for Federal leases, "We have nothing to do with it. We cannot grant you leases."

But what did he do? Being zealous in the public interest and devoted to the public welfare he began to examine the question, and when doubt was raised in his mind he sought to have the question judicially determined.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for one further question?

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator knows that Mr. Ickes was a very able attorney. On

December 22, 1933, Mr. Ickes wrote a letter, as an attorney, and referred to the law. He said in the letter:

It has been distinctly settled * * * that title to the shore and under water in front of lands so granted inures to the State in which they are situated * * * such title to the shore and the lands under water is regarded as incident to the sovereignty of the State * * *. The foregoing is a statement of the settled law, and therefore no right can be granted to you either under the Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437)—

He knew what the law was—

or under any public land law to the bed of the Pacific Ocean whether within or without the 3-mile limit. Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State.

Mr. HILL. Surely Mr. Ickes did not deny that law.

Mr. LONG. No.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Louisiana were to examine the files I am sure he would find that that letter was a form letter which had been made up before Mr. Ickes went into office. This was in the early months of Mr. Ickes' administration. When he first went into office he followed that policy, and he sent out this form letter. He assumed responsibility for it as the Secretary of the Interior. I do not know whether he wrote the letter. At any rate, he did not deny it. It went out under his signature. It went out under his signature just as a letter sometimes goes out of my office under my signature, or a letter goes out under the name of the Senator from Louisiana from his office, and in those instances we assume responsibility for such letters. He assumed responsibility for the letter. He said he was following the policy that had been laid down. I imagine it was a form letter. I do not believe it was carefully prepared. There is no telling how long before Mr. Ickes came into office it had been prepared.

However, he went into the subject and examined it. When he did so, as a good lawyer—and the Senator from Louisiana said he was a good lawyer—he had doubts about it, and he said, "I cannot sit here and be a trustee for the people of the United States and take this position if I am wrong about it. I must have the Government go to court and have the question adjudicated."

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

Mr. HILL. I am very happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from—

Mr. TOBEY. New Hampshire.

Mr. HILL. The truth of the matter is that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is so great and so able that we do not think of him in connection with any one State.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. He is a Senator of the United States.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator very much. In those terms I now speak. There are many cross currents floating around, and many smoke screens be-

fuddle some of us. Of course that is not very difficult to do, but I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama one question. Of course we are Senators of the United States, but, before we are Senators of the United States, I should like to say that one of the attributes we have as Senators is that of having a paramount duty, namely, that as Senators of the United States we are fiduciaries and trustees for the people of the United States.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. The very question before us is, Is this joint resolution in the interest of the people of the United States? The land has been described as land belonging to all the people. That being so, along comes the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who offers an amendment to give these billions of dollars to the cause of educating the school children of our country. Am I correct so far?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. TOBEY. Can the Senator from Alabama measure any higher degree of efficiency and justice than a vote for the Hill amendment to give this vast amount of money to the cause of education of our children, who are the choicest assets of America?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New Hampshire is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. Is it not about time that we do the one thing that is in our hearts, for the benefit of the whole Union, and the whole is greater than any part, though the greatest part is our child life—and not be influenced by the collusion between 48 attorneys general, who represent the most powerful lobby that has sprung up in our land? Ed Pauley and others of unsavory reputation have spent a great deal of money and have brought a great deal of pressure to bear on how Senators shall vote. I say to my colleagues: Wake up. See what is going on. Save these priceless assets for the welfare of the children of America. I can hardly wait to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I am very proud of the fact that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is one of the coauthors of this amendment. He is a cosponsor of the amendment with the Senator from Alabama, and other Members of the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. I am foursquare with the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there is no one I would rather see stand foursquare with me than the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I thank him for his timely and eloquent contribution.

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

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana has had the impression for a long time that those of us who favor the positions of the States are pictured as being spokesmen of the vicious oil lobby, which is supposed to be so dreadful. Now that the oil companies are on the side of

the Federal advocates in favor of Senate joint resolution 20, we are told that this lobby of the attorneys general of America is a terrible lobby and is made up of a group too terrible for anyone to be associated with it. Apparently we must be smeared in one way or another because we defend the position of the States. If we are to be smeared, it would be noted that among those who must share this smear are the American Bar Association, the Council of Governors, the Council of Mayors and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I listened earlier in the afternoon to the statement that those who support the position of the States were now immune from the oil lobby charge. I heard the Senator from Wyoming say there is no doubt that the oil companies are anxious that there be passed some such legislation as that now before the Senate. Let me make it perfectly clear to my good friend the Senator from Louisiana that the oil companies are interested in something happening here which will clarify the situation, so that they can produce oil. They know that when they produce oil, even with the severance tax which will be taken out of royalties, there will be billions of dollars left for the oil companies.

I say that the oil companies are putting their profits above any other kind of consideration, litigation, or legal principle. They say, "Let us drill for oil. If we have to give some of the profit to the so-called Hill Foundation for Education, we will give it, although we would rather have all of it."

Mr. President, let us get the oil lobby out of the picture. What they want is the oil. Oil is gold. When they get their hands on the gold they will get enough out of it and still have plenty to go around. They want to produce the oil. We are perfectly willing to let them produce the oil, but we want them to do what the Senator from New Hampshire said so brilliantly and so inspirationally, namely, we want this black gold that comes out of the ground to be shared by the school children of America, so that the school children may appreciate the wonders of this Nation through the education which will be theirs. There could be no finer purpose to which a program could be dedicated than the program proposed in the amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The oil companies would have to go a long way to do something as good for our country and at the same time get a good profit out of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, facetiously perhaps, that oil is not gold. The State of California has had experience in that connection, since

it is one of the great gold-mining States of the Union. It was gold that brought California into the Union. I will say that the policies of the Federal Government, particularly of this administration, have to all intents and purposes destroyed the gold mining industry in California. The policies of this administration have seized our tidelands which for a hundred years the people of California felt were as much a part of their State as some of our inland valleys, such as Sacramento and San Joaquin. The people of California have seen that policy extended to water resources.

I want the Senator from Minnesota to know that this is not a partisan question in California. Without exception, every congressional representative of that State, whether a Democrat or a Republican, all members of the State Legislature, whether Democratic or Republican, all State office holders, whether Republican, like the present Governor, Governor Warren, or Democratic, like the able Attorney General, Pat Brown, think that a great injustice has been done to our State and to the other coastal States of the Union. We do not believe the Federal Government has any right to use for education, or for any other purpose the revenues from these oil lands. To the contrary, we believe that the historic boundaries of the States should be restored to them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This play on words, this semantics about gold or what kind of gold, is not the issue. The fact of the matter is that the oil operators have not been able to do the drilling they want to do because of the situation now existing as a result of the Supreme Court's ruling. That situation is at a dead end, an impasse.

Of course, as the Senator has said, some of the oil operators have said, in effect, that they favor the passage of the joint resolution, so they can begin to drill for oil, but that they wish it to be crystal clear that the amendment of the Senator from Alabama will provide that when the production occurs, some of the "gold" from the royalties will go into a national fund which will be of help to education. I submit that such a fund will help Alabama, California, Louisiana, Texas, and Minnesota, among the other States.

I submit further that not a scintilla of evidence has been presented to the Senate and not sufficient evidence has been presented to the Supreme Court to negate the fact that the Federal Government has sovereign power and dominion over the submerged lands and the coastal lands or Continental Shelf, and has the right to exercise that power, including the exercise of sovereign rights, which include property rights.

Mr. President, this is a fundamental matter of national sovereignty. The

question is whether the people of the United States, who have the responsibility for the maintenance of sovereign power, and who must accept the duties of sovereign power, are to share in some of the benefits which accrue from sovereign power. That is the issue.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying to the Senator from California that if nothing worse ever happens to America than what has happened to the gold industry, we shall be doing all right.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know how the discussion regarding gold arose.

The first part of the preamble to Senate Joint Resolution 20 reads, as follows:

To provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Certainly we wish to have oil produced, particularly at this critical time. It is not of any interest to me whether the oil companies do well or do not do well. Of course, I want them to do well, in the sense that I want every industry in the United States to do well. However, aside from that, I wish to see oil produced.

Our interest in this matter is twofold: first, to have oil produced; and, second, when it is produced, to make certain, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] have pointed out, that it is produced at least in part for the benefit of all the people of the United States.

I am anxious to have education in my own State of New York advanced. I know the needs of the children and the teachers and the entire educational system of New York. However, I am equally interested in having the educational systems of Mississippi, Louisiana, California, Idaho, Nebraska, Arizona, New Mexico, and the other States advanced.

The money which will accrue if the Hill amendment is adopted—an amendment of which I am very proud to be a cosponsor—will advance education in the United States. A child who is educated in New Mexico is an asset not only to New Mexico but also to California, New York, Louisiana, and all the other States.

Mr. President, this country knows no State boundaries, so far as education or prosperity are concerned. This country has prospered because every part of it has prospered. One of the main reasons for its prosperity and advancement is that we have recognized the importance, the validity, and the necessity of education.

The amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from Alabama will aid education. I favor the amendment with all my heart and soul, and I hope

all my colleagues in the Senate will support it and will make it really a paying asset for all the people of the United States, not only the people of three units of government in the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from New York for the very able and fine contributions they have made. I wish to say how proud I am because of the fact that both these distinguished Senators are cosponsors of the oil-for-education amendment, or perhaps I may call it the oil for the lamps of learning amendment.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a list of the witnesses, and the organizations the witnesses represented, who appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in behalf of the oil-for-education amendment.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, those who propose this give-away legislation cannot, by the skillful manipulation of words, bamboozle the Congress and the American people into accepting the proposition that because the States have made mistaken claims and mistaken assumptions as to the ownership of this oil, the Nation is thereby obligated to hand them the greatest bonanza in history.

Mr. President, now that we have removed some of the false fronts and false labels from this give-away joint resolution, I think it is only fair that we should consider and analyze some of the arguments which have, in my opinion, been most unfairly advanced in support of the give-away proposal.

THE SOCIALISM GHOST

For example, it has been argued by men of great influence, and for whom I have great admiration and respect, that there is an element of socialism in the ownership by the Federal Government of the great oil resources which lie under the marginal seas and the Continental Shelf. With all possible respect to those who make this argument, my answer is that it is demonstrably absurd. From the very beginning the Federal Government has owned and controlled the mineral resources of the public lands. I have never heard it argued, and I do not believe that it could be seriously argued, that the provisions of the Federal Mineral Leasing Act are socialistic. On the contrary, private business has operated and prospered under that law. The whole history of the Federal Government's policies and operations under the act is a repudiation of any contention that Federal dominion over a great national asset is a form of socialism. Socialism is no more or no less socialism because the particular government involved happens to be that of one State or that of all the States. The sole question involved in this controversy is whether these particular re-

sources should remain the property of the Federal Government, which they are today, or whether they should be given to the three States. How can it be said that ownership of oil by the State of Texas, California, or Louisiana is private enterprise, while the ownership of the oil by the Federal Government is socialism? In either case it is a governmental unit which owns and exercises dominion over the oil. In either case it is a private enterprise, operating under a lease from either the State or the Federal Government, which will operate the business of producing, refining, and selling the oil.

I do not propose at this time to enter into any detailed discussion as to the proper method of leasing these lands. That is not the question with which I am dealing. I am talking about the basic principle of private enterprise. I assert—indeed, I do not believe that any man who has studied the question even casually can reasonably deny—that the only question involved is not whether private business shall withdraw the oil, but, rather, under what conditions shall it be withdrawn by private business? On the one hand, the proponents of the give-away joint resolution contend that it is socialistic for the Federal Government to retain its rights as adjudicated by the courts. On the other hand, the same proponents contend that there is somewhere a sinister plot on the part of private enterprise to obtain leases from the Federal Government under the Mineral Leasing Act. I submit in all fairness that they cannot have it both ways. Their whole argument stumbles over its own inconsistencies.

The whole issue of socialism is a phony issue—a goblin dressed up to frighten the American people into giving this oil to a few States which do not own it and to the particular private oil interests with which these States have allied themselves.

In fact, Mr. President, the entire argument advanced by the proponents of this give-away joint resolution is a fantastic procession of goblins and ghosts.

As I have said, Mr. President, one of the arguments which has been used against the amendment, and in support of the give-away joint resolution, is the one we hear time and time again when the old ghost of socialism is raised. I submit that it is no more socialism for the United States Government to develop its oil through private enterprise—through leases and contracts with private enterprise—than it is for a State to develop its oil through private enterprise and leases with private enterprise.

DECEIVING THE OTHER STATES

Another one of these Halloween creations is the argument that the Federal Government is using or will seek to use its rights in the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf to invade the boundaries of the States and take away the inland waterways. In dealing with the manner in which this give-away proposal has been misnamed the tidelands bill, I have already dealt in some degree with

this specious argument. Without this particular bugbear, it would have been impossible for the three States which seek the \$50,000,000,000 gift from the Federal Government to enlist under their banner so many of the officials, and particularly the attorneys general, of various States, from which the give-away joint resolution seeks to snatch valuable rights and resources. The officials in such States have been led to believe that somehow there hangs over them a threat upon the part of the Federal Government to invade the boundaries of the States and take away their harbors, their bays, their docks, and the resources of their inland waterways.

This argument is so false and so misleading that only the subtle and well financed propaganda of skilled advocates could ever have sold such a bill of goods. In the first place, the Attorney General on behalf of the United States has repeatedly and specifically disclaimed any ownership by the Federal Government of the tidelands and the inland waterways. The Federal authorities have repeatedly and affirmatively declared that the States possess, and have always possessed, the ownership in the inland waterways and their resources, and that the only power that the Federal Government may exercise is its constitutional authority respecting navigation and commerce on their waters. The declarations by the executive branch of the Federal Government have been sustained and affirmed by the unbroken line of decisions of the Supreme Court, up to and including the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases. But the proponents of the giveaway joint resolution say that is not enough for them. Why is it not enough, Mr. President? Because this whole campaign to get their hands on the oil of the marginal sea is built on confusing the marginal sea ownership with the ownership of the tidelands and inland waterways.

Their sincerity was put to an acid test in the House of Representatives when the give-away bill was under consideration. At that time Representative CELLER, of New York, and Representative MANSFIELD, of Montana, offered legislation in the nature of a substitute which would have had the Congress confirm by specific legislation the unchallenged title of the States to the resources of the tidelands and inland waterways. Those who want the give-away shouted down the offer.

So I contend that not only is the issue of the inland waterways a bugbear, but it is a bugbear in which the proponents of the giveaway proposal do not even themselves believe.

ATTACKING THE SUPREME COURT

I should like to discuss for a few moments another one of these goblins. That is the argument that this proposed legislation is necessary to thwart or frustrate a grab on the part of the Federal Government. Sometimes the proponents of the giveaway joint resolution are explicit about this, and sometimes they are a little vague; but when their

argument is analyzed, it boils down to the proposition that the executive branch of the Federal Government and the United States Supreme Court joined in a conspiracy to steal this \$50,000,000,000 worth of oil and gas from California, Louisiana, and Texas for the Federal Government.

While the proponents of the give-away joint resolution sometimes speak a little gingerly, when their guard is down it is perfectly clear that what they have really intended is an attack upon the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. President, I am the last man in the world, certainly one of the last in the United States Senate, who would ever argue that our courts are beyond criticism or that mistakes on the part of the judiciary cannot be corrected by the Congress. However, the present argument goes far beyond the question of conflicting legal viewpoints. In some instances it has almost seemed to amount to an attack upon the integrity and the competence of the United States Supreme Court. The argument is too preposterous to mention except for the purpose of showing the extent to which the proponents of the give-away are willing to go to get their hooks into this fabulous store of oil.

We may agree or disagree with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Certainly in the past there have been decisions of that body with which I did not agree. I have not hesitated to criticize the decisions. At no time, however, have I ever questioned the integrity or devotion to duty of the Court. When those who seek a fifty-billion-dollar gift from the Federal Government attack a decision of the Supreme Court, the highest judicial body in the Nation, as a Federal grab, I regard it as a shocking assault upon the integrity of the judicial process. A court exists to decide cases, and in any decision someone must lose.

Incidentally, the attack upon the Court is also an attack upon the Attorney General of the United States and the other Federal officials who defended the Government's ownership which was upheld by the Court.

I cannot refrain from mentioning the name of Mr. Justice Clark, who as Attorney General presented the Government's case so capably and effectively. No man loves the State of Texas more devotedly than does her native son, Tom Clark, who has brought to her such credit and distinction. I am sure it was painful to him—as, indeed, it is to me—to be found in opposition to her desires. But Tom Clark had a higher duty; namely, his duty to his conscience and his oath; and he lived up to his duty, regardless of sentiment or personal attachment. I do not think that even the most vehement supporter of Texas' claims will be heard to say that Tom Clark would participate in a sordid grab at the expense of the State he loves.

Who, then, is alleged to have instigated the grab? As I have said once or twice before in reply to inquiries, if there be guilt, then the guilt is chargeable to

the Senate of the United States, for, as I have said, the very issue now under consideration was squarely presented to this body on August 19, 1937, 14½ years ago. On that date, the Senate unanimously adopted Senate Joint Resolution 208, declaring that the oil resources of the marginal sea "are asserted to be the property of the United States." The resolution further undertook to authorize and direct the Attorney General to institute legal proceedings for the purpose of establishing the rights of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I repeat, this joint resolution passed the Senate unanimously, without a dissenting voice.

Who will rise to say that the Senate in 1937 was instigating a Federal grab?

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana had the impression that that was merely a measure which had slipped through on the consent calendar, before the representatives of the interested States knew what was involved. Can the Senator tell me how much debate there was on that resolution, and where I can find that debate?

Mr. HILL. I cannot tell the Senator how much debate there was on the resolution, but I can tell him that that resolution was acted upon unanimously by the Judiciary Committee; and as I recall, the Judiciary Committee of the Senate at that time consisted of 15 or 17 members; therefore, the committee, with 15 or 17 or perhaps even a larger number of members than that, at that time, acted on the resolution unanimously.

The Senator will recall that committees were larger at that time than they are now. The Senator will further recall that that was before the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act, when committees were somewhat larger. The resolution had to be introduced, it then had to go to the committee; it had to be acted upon by the committee, a committee consisting, as I have said, of 15 or 17 members, and it then had to be reported to the Senate. After submission of the report the resolution had to be placed on the Senate Calendar. It could not be passed by the Senate without the clerk at the desk rising to read it for the benefit, for the knowledge, and for the information of the Senate. California was at that time in the Union and had two Senators in the Senate. Texas likewise was in the Union and had two Senators. Louisiana was in the Union, also, and had two Senators here. As I said a little while ago, I am not going to impute to those Senators less diligence or less fidelity to duty or less devotion to the interests of their States, or being less active in looking out for the welfare of their States, than is the junior Senator from Louisiana today.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I believe at that time there was a Senator from California, Sheridan Downey, who referred to that bill as the "Nye hidden-ball" bill.

Mr. HILL. Of course, I have a very high regard for the former Senator from California. He served in this body, and I certainly would say nothing in any way unkind about him. But the Senator from Louisiana knows that he now certainly makes his living in part by being on the payroll in Washington, devoting, I think, all of his time to lobbying for the things which the Senator from Louisiana wants. So he is a paid lobbyist; and I use that term in no opprobrious sense. He has a right to be here.

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

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. LONG. The Senator knows, of course, that the position taken by former Senator Downey was exactly the position he took as long as he was a Member of this body, and it is the same position he took consistently in public life, from the moment the issue first arose.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator is correct, that former Senator Downey took the same position the Senator from Louisiana now takes. As I say, I would be the last man in any way to cast aspersions upon the former Senator from California. But we have divergent viewpoints. The former Senator from California held a viewpoint entirely different from that held by many other Senators.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator again give us the date of that resolution?

Mr. HILL. That was August 19, 1937.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And was the joint resolution passed after the time the Secretary of the Interior had inquired as to the Federal powers over these submerged lands?

Mr. HILL. That I could not answer specifically, but I would certainly think so; because the Secretary of the Interior had then been in office for more than 4 years. The Secretary of the Interior came into office in March 1933.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. And this was in August 1937. I cannot give the Senator a specific answer, but I think the joint resolution was passed after that time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it fair to say, I may ask the Senator, that the resolution was no secret, particularly since it was not acted upon by the Senate immediately after it was reported by the committee? Sometimes a bill or a resolution lies on the desk for a period of 24 hours or so, and then, the next day is called up and passed. That did not happen in this instance, did it?

Mr. HILL. That did not happen in this instance. This joint resolution went through all the regular and normal procedures for the passage of bills, and those procedures are fixed and established, in order that Senators may have due in-

formation and may have due warning as to proposed legislation which is to be considered. Every possible safeguard which the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has thrown around Members of the Senate, to insure their being properly informed on measures to be acted upon by the Senate, were met in this instance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not also true that in this particular period in the political history of our country, the conservation and utilization of the Nation's natural resources was a subject of public debate? The period of about 1937 was the period of TVA, the period of the development of our rivers and harbors, the period of a great deal of talk about the conservation of our oil resources, was it not? So I think it would surely be entirely inaccurate to assume that the joint resolution in question was passed merely as a hidden ball on a sneaker play. As a matter of fact, it was passed because the policy of the Government of the United States was one of protecting the people's interest in their natural resources.

Mr. HILL. The Government was particularly interested at that time in the conservation of the natural resources of the people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; and I assume that 96 Senators in 1937 had about as much information regarding those problems as we in 1952 have. I further assume that those 96 Senators, had they felt that they had been outmaneuvered, would have been back on the floor of the Senate the next day, as some of us were today in reference to a unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into yesterday, and would have protested to high heaven. I want to know whether the Record reflects all the facts connected with the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. HILL. Senators not only could have protested, but they could also have moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed. That is done frequently.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or they could have introduced a resolution the following day to repeal the action which they had taken on the previous day.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But where is the evidence?

Mr. HILL. There is no evidence, because no action was taken, other than the unanimous passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. LONG rose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from California, after which I shall yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say, apropos of the remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota, that there was, of course, a great deal of legislation coming before the Senate in those days. I think it was in that approximate period that a bill came up in the Senate to pack the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say again that my friend, the Senator from California, is practicing the new fine art which some intellectuals call semantics—"to pack the Supreme Court." As a matter of fact, that was the nice terminology used by Republican Members and certain others. The fact of the matter is that the President presented a plan for the reorganization of the Supreme Court, which this same body, which passed the joint resolution to establish Federal domain and jurisdiction over the oil lands—this same body that performed that wise action, wisely turned down the reorganization plan. One cannot follow both courses. He must admit that the body was correct at one time or the other, or at both times.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I may ask the Senator, what possible effect does he contend followed from a proposed law which passed one House and failed to pass the other? My impression is that we are arguing about nothing. It did not pass, it did not become law; it was merely passed by the Senate.

Mr. HILL. My friend astounds me.

Mr. LONG. It is like the case of Federal aid to education legislation which passed the Senate several times but which was never passed by the House.

Mr. HILL. My friend astounds me. Ninety-six Senators, two from Louisiana, two from California, two from Texas, two from each of the other States—what did they say? They said that in their opinion, these submerged lands belonged to all the people, and, therefore, they adopted a resolution seeking to get action by directing the Attorney General of the United States to assert those claims. The Senator has said that the property always belonged to the States. There could be no stronger evidence that many of the States at least thought the land did not belong to them than the fact that the Senators from those States permitted that resolution to be adopted.

Mr. President, I turn now to two considerations of national policy which must impel the Congress to retain the offshore oil for the people of the United States. Both of these policy considerations are embodied in the so-called oil-for-education amendment which I have offered for myself and 18 other Members of the Senate.

The first consideration of national policy is our national security. Can anyone be unaware of what is taking place in Iran—the oil lifeline of half the world? Surely none are so simple as to imagine that Russia in her schemes and her overtures to the Iranian Government has any other purpose than to get her hands on the oil that she now lacks for her huge war machine.

While we still hope for a safe solution of the Iranian oil crisis, we would be faithless guardians for our people if we did not, as prudent men, act on the as-

sumption that the oil of the Middle East might be lost to Western Europe and to us. In such case all free nations must look to this hemisphere. In such case our oil becomes not alone a national resource to be conserved and guarded for the future welfare of our children but a national resource which must be preserved by a watchful government, if our Nation is to survive.

A modern army travels not on its stomach but on oil. The Wehrmacht ground to a shuddering halt because of lack of oil. The American Air Force made its first great raids on the Axis against the Ploesti Oil Refineries in World War II and it kept up a steady attack until Hitler had no oil.

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

Mr. HILL. In a moment.

The vaunted Luftwaffe and the Japanese air force, what was left of them, stayed on the ground because they had no oil. Oil is strategic target No. 1 for the very simple reason that if a nation does not have oil it has neither offense nor defense.

The Federal Government, charged under the Constitution with the responsibility for national defense, must at all costs conserve its oil for our defense.

Our first Secretary of Defense, the able and tragic James Forrestal, who understood so well that oil was the sinew of arms, called the offshore oil our most priceless possession. With his long background of experience as wartime Secretary of the Navy, he strongly opposed the give-away bills which were the predecessors of the House-passed bill. If he were alive today, whether in public office or as a private citizen, I know his voice would be raised once again in warning that this oil must be preserved under Federal control.

The late Secretary of the Interior, the valiant Harold Ickes, who stood shoulder to shoulder with James Forrestal in the struggle to hold on to our country's precious undersea oil reserves went to his death fighting the attempt to grab off these irreplaceable resources.

As wartime Petroleum Administrator responsible for the petroleum supplies for our Armed Forces and our entire wartime economy, Harold Ickes realized perhaps more keenly than anyone else how vital these petroleum deposits of the Nation are to the security of the United States and the defense of our freedom.

The point I have just made has been made no better anywhere than in a recent editorial from the Atlanta Journal. It says:

While all this focuses the attention of the world on oil from foreign countries, the Congress of the United States attempts to fritter away one of our greatest potential sources of oil right here at home.

There is only one proper use for the offshore oil fields: That is, as a reserve for national defense to power the Army, Navy, and Air Force of this country, if and when other sources are depleted.

If we allow States and individual companies to chip away at this resource until it is lost, the time may come when we will

have committed national suicide for lack of the fuel to maintain our Armed Forces.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which has led the fight for national control of off-shore oil, has stated the case unanswerably:

Whether under the false cry of States' rights or the frank admission of private greed, no one must be allowed to exhaust today what may be indispensable to the Nation's existence tomorrow. Against any effort to put our fighting oil to any smaller purpose than the defense of the Nation, the only course is to fight.

It has come to light that in the conversations which took place between Molotov and Ribbentrop at the time the infamous deal was made between Russia and Germany, Molotov then and there served notice on Ribbentrop that Russia would consider that she had special areas of influence, and that the most important area of influence was that reaching south to the Persian Gulf, covering the great oil supply of the Middle East, on which Russia had her eyes even at that time.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Of course, oil is very important, but can the Senator from Alabama say that it is any more important than is uranium, or sulfur, or other things essential to fighting a war?

Mr. HILL. All those items, of course, are important. The main thing is that we keep our hands on the oil so that we shall have it for the security and defense of our country.

Mr. LONG. The Senator would not imply, would he, that the oil would not still be available if it were owned by the States?

Mr. HILL. The States do not have any obligation or responsibility for the defense of our country. That is not their obligation or responsibility. The States recognized that when they came into the Federal Union—and that was one of the main reasons for the formation of the Federal Union—that there might be a Federal Government with the responsibility of taking care of the defense of the country. How rapidly the States might permit the oil to be depleted and dissipated no man can know. The oil should be in the hands of those who have direct responsibility for the defense of the Nation.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator argue that the Federal Government should own all the oil, even that which is in private hands? The Government was never short of oil, with the Government owning only a small portion of it.

Mr. HILL. The oil in private hands and that which belongs to the Nation are two entirely different and separate propositions.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thought the argument had been made on the floor many times that it was desirable to have the oil pass into Federal control so that it could be developed and gotten out of the ground more quickly.

Mr. HILL. Not necessarily. I have never made any argument to that effect.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have heard that argument made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. The truth of the matter is that today there is a shortage of oil in the United States, and we should go ahead with the development of oil.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not the purpose to get more oil out of the ground—not to keep it in the ground, but to get it out?

Mr. HILL. The Senator's argument falls of itself. The States, if they had the oil, would perhaps proceed more rapidly with the depletion of it than would the Federal Government. If it is kept in the hands of the Federal Government, it can be controlled, with the responsibility of the Federal Government for the national defense always first in mind.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not a fact that vast oil resources of the Nation have been returned to State control so that the oil could be obtained more quickly than it could be if under Federal control?

Mr. HILL. The Federal Government could make leases as the States have done, but how many leases it would make and how rapidly the oil would be depleted would depend upon the needs of the Nation in connection with the defense of the country.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is not a corollary issue the question of to whom the benefit of oil production will accrue? To whom will it go? Are these benefits to go to only three States or four States or five States, or are the benefits to go to the people of all the States—to the people of the whole United States? It gets down to the point of whether a limited area of the United States is to participate in these great oil resources or whether the whole body of the people of the United States are to participate in them.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. He has well said what I have tried to say this afternoon.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not just as ridiculous to say that the States should possess the land underneath the water, beyond the low-water mark, as to say that the States should possess the right of airways and to the sky up above the land?

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator, certainly.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Pursuing the valid point made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] a few minutes ago, I want to invite attention to the fact that the report, not in one place but in several places, makes it very clear that the compelling reason for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 20, in the opinion of its advocates and in the opinion of the committee, is the immedi-

ate production of more and more oil. I read, for instance, from page 3 of the report, from the paragraph headed "Reasons for interim approach":

The compelling reason for interim legislation is the Nation's immediate, pressing need for development of new sources of supply of petroleum within areas under national control.

Likewise, I refer the distinguished Senator to the whole paragraph beginning at the bottom of page 4 of the report, entitled "The Nation's Need for Oil."

So, in the first place, it is perfectly clear that that objective will not be subserved unless the Federal Government can do a better job than the States are doing. Up to now, the record shows exactly the reverse, as was testified to by former Secretary Krug in his appearance before a Senate committee of the Eightieth Congress, I believe it was.

Likewise, the fact is that the matter at issue does not involve new oil reserves, as was the situation when the late Secretary Ickes came before the committee so many years ago and set forth the reasons why he believed there should be legislation. His first reason was that he thought a new reserve ought to be set up, with legislation to round it out, and to preserve it unimpaired.

Instead of that being the objective now, the advocates of Federal ownership have completely reversed their position and say, "Let us have Federal ownership in order to get immediate production."

An examination of the record shows clearly that the States have been much keener in their initiative, and have gone much faster into the production of oil, and that the distinguished Secretary of the Interior himself has paid tribute to the eager and effective way in which the States have proceeded along that line.

Mr. HILL. Of course, one of the purposes of the proposed legislation is that there may be development of the oil under the submerged lands. As the matter now stands, the whole development is held up. As I said a few minutes ago, we are now importing oil. There is a shortage of oil. I referred to the crisis in Iran, and what that crisis might mean to us. Surely the development of oil should go forward. More oil should be developed for the United States. But that does not mean that we should rush forward and proceed in such a way as to deplete the oil. It does not mean at all that we should disregard our responsibility to conserve the oil, having in mind always the needs for the defense of our country, and the fact that those needs must come first in our consideration.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Have we not gone quite far afield in the discussion of needs? I do not think there can be any question that oil is a great asset and that it will be needed by our country. It seems to me that the important consid-

eration is one that was mentioned a few minutes ago by the Senator from Minnesota, namely, the question of benefits. Are only three States to benefit from what is unquestionably—or at least in my mind unquestionably—an asset of the entire United States? Or are the people of the entire country, of all the 48 States, to benefit from the asset, which I believe belongs to them, and which the Supreme Court of the United States has held belongs to them?

The question is not one of need, it is not a question of value, but it is a question of benefit. I think that when we attempt to debate anything else, we complicate the situation, and go very far from the straight line.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. He has put his finger on the basic, fundamental question, namely, whether the oil shall be used for the benefit of all the people, or shall be given away to three States. That is the whole question.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is not the question really to whom does the oil belong? Do we not any longer recognize title to property in America?

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will read the opinions in the cases decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, he will see to whom the oil belongs.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Which cases?

Mr. HILL. The cases of United States against California, United States against Louisiana, and United States against Texas.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I can cite 10 cases for every case the Senator can cite. Congress has passed quitclaim legislation by overwhelming votes, but it could not be made effective because the President vetoed it.

Mr. HILL. The President never did a better thing than to veto that bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. We still recognize that in this country there is such a thing as private title, and I propose to fight for that principle.

Mr. HILL. Whenever this question has been before the court, the court has decided that the oil belongs to the United States—to all the people of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want the Senator to repeat that, because the Senator from Maryland has said that for every case the Senator from Alabama can cite, as giving the Federal Government dominion and sovereignty over the submerged lands, the Senator from Maryland can cite ten on the other side. I should like to know the number of cases there have been which resolve this issue. I thought the Senator from Alabama had cited the entire record.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There are 52 in toto, I may say for the information of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Maryland is wholly and entirely in error, if I may say so. The cases he refers to

begin with the Alabama case of Hagen against Pollard, which dealt with the question of ownership of soil in inland navigable waterways.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. That case did not go to the question of land under the sea.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no question about that.

Mr. HILL. Even Mr. Justice Reed, of the Supreme Court of the United States, who dissented in the California case, and did not agree with the majority opinion, said in his dissent that it was in that case for the first time that this question had been adjudicated.

The Chief Justice of the United States, in the case of Toomer against Witsell, again said that the States had never owned the submerged land.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that advocates of the quitclaim theory have been erecting a man of straw? What they say is that the Federal Government is trying to take land between the low-water mark and the high-water mark, land underneath bays, land beneath rivers, land beneath inland lakes. Is it not true that by decisions of the Supreme Court, such land has been declared to be the property of the States; and that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, shall be enacted, all title to those lands will be given to the States? The issue is simply as to who owns the submerged lands in the marginal sea between the high and low water marks. Is not that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Illinois is absolutely correct.

I know he has been engaged in work with a very important committee which is preparing legislation for the extension of the National Production Act. We have been all over this matter this afternoon. I desire to be courteous to all Senators, but we have been over this particular subject time and again. I am delighted the Senator has raised the question, because he has stated it so clearly.

The other cases—some 52 or 53—all deal with the soil beneath inland navigable waters. The question of soil in the marginal sea was raised for the first time in the California case. There the Court held that the land and the oil belonged to the United States, to all the people, and not to the State of California.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I might point out another straw man which I believe the Senator from Maryland has inadvertently created.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I can assure the Senator from New York that it was not inadvertent. It may have been in error.

Mr. LEHMAN. If he wishes to set up a straw man, he is very welcome to do

so, but the Senator from Maryland is talking about the field of private title. I do not think there is any question of private title involved in this whole matter.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I may say to the Senator that the Supreme Court vote was 4 to 3, and 3 Judges voted against what is here proposed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Not insofar as private title is concerned.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. They did not even—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York. I wish to say that I am delighted to have any questions asked, but I desire to allow the Senator from New York to finish what he has to say. I have held the floor for some time, and we have been over this very question. I am sorry my distinguished friend from Maryland has been engaged with a very important committee.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I was before the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HILL. The Senator was before the Committee on the Judiciary, but we have been over all this matter.

As the Senator from New York has said, and made clear, all the decisions of the courts have held that soil under the inland navigable waters belongs to the States, whereas each and every decision of the Supreme Court on the question of soil under the marginal sea holds that the soil belongs to all the people of the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is a clear case of dominium as between the two equals?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Only the Federal Government can determine the defense needs for oil. Only the highest experts of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force in collaboration with the technicians of the Interior Department can weigh the fluctuating supply and demand of oil. They are the ones who must weigh the chances in Iran, they must determine how easily and how soon the great Middle East pipeline may be sabotaged; they must evaluate the availability of the tankers of the western allies; they must decide how much oil can safely be diverted from the Western Hemisphere to Western Europe should middle-eastern oil fall to Russia. This sort of thing cannot be done by State governments. No one would even dream of State governments doing this job.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure that it is not the impression which the Senator wants to create, but he worries me by that statement, because, after all, whatever oil is produced from the tidelands, whether it be under the sovereignty of the States or the Federal Government, is only a small part of the oil needed for national defense. The Senator says that the only ones who can determine that question are those in the Federal

Government. The overwhelming percentage of the oil produced in this country is not produced from tidelands. The Senator worries me greatly for fear that in the future someone may point to his statement and say, for the very reasons which the Senator is now enunciating, that the Federal Government should have control of all the mineral resources in the interior of the country as well.

Mr. HILL. I can allay the Senator's fears. He need have no fear along that line.

So far as concerns oil which belongs to the Government of the United States, it should be the great reserve for the defense of our country. Those who can best determine how the oil can be used for the defense of our country are in the Armed Forces of the country, in the Department of the Interior, and in the service of other branches of the Federal Government.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does not the Senator beg the question when he says that the oil belongs to the Government of the United States? It is true that the Court has said that, but the Congress has said that it does not. It has legislatively reversed the Court.

Mr. HILL. No. The Congress has not legislatively reversed the Court, because under the Constitution of the United States, before the Congress can reverse the Court the President must sign the legislation reversing the Court, or the legislation must pass over the President's veto by a two-thirds vote in both Houses of Congress.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I realize that.

Mr. HILL. The House of Representatives refused to pass the bill over the veto of the President of the United States. The House of Representatives thereby refused to reverse the Court.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will not the Senator admit that the present effort is an attempt to establish who has title? That is the purpose of this measure.

Mr. HILL. This effort is an attempt to overrule the decision of the Supreme Court. The Senator is correct. It is an attempt to obtain for 3 States that which the Supreme Court has said belongs to all 48 States.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is not a question which involves only three States. It is true that at the moment there are only three States in which oil in submerged lands is involved. However, the same general doctrine of paramount rights, of divesting the States of ownership of the tidelands which they have held since the beginning of the Constitution, will apply to every one of the coastal States in the Union, and to some of the interior States as well.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true that we have fallen into the bad habit of speaking of tidelands, but I am sure that my good friend from California realizes that the tidelands are not an issue in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] or that of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. This cannot be repeated too often. Title to the tidelands between low-water mark and high-water mark, title to submerged lands underneath bays, title to submerged lands underneath rivers, and title to submerged lands underneath inland lakes belongs to the States, both under the decisions of the courts and under the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, which the Senator from Alabama and a number of other Senators have also sponsored.

The issue simply is as to where title lies with respect to the submerged lands seaward from low-water mark. On three occasions the Supreme Court has said that such title rests in the Federal Government. That is the issue. There is no use bringing in the tidelands issue, or the inland water issue.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Illinois is absolutely correct.

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

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

I am glad that the Senator from Illinois has made the observation which he has made. We have tried to say what the Senator from Illinois has said this afternoon. We have tried to say it several times. I am delighted that the Senator has said what he has said. Sometimes it requires iteration, reiteration, and damnable reiteration. I am glad that the Senator has reiterated it.

I now yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I am sure that the Senator knows that it is entirely possible that the Supreme Court might reverse the theory upon which it was held that the States own this property as a matter of State sovereignty. The Justice Department argued that that theory was not sound, and that, being unsound, it should not be extended. The Supreme Court was willing to go along with the Justice Department that far.

Mr. Perlman, the Solicitor General, testified before our committee that he did not think the Court would reverse itself. Yet, as the Senator knows, he is the man who went before the Supreme Court and asked it to overrule the famous separate-but-equal doctrine dealing with racial relations. The court has announced that doctrine in many cases.

If anyone wishes to rely on the proposed amendment to protect the States with respect to inland waters—I refer to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators, I presume including the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I

invite attention to the fact that the amendment has not been enacted. If such amendment is to be enacted, the Senator from Louisiana would like to protect coastal waters as well.

Mr. HILL. The Solicitor General of the United States, in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, took the very firm position that the soil under inland navigable waters belongs to the States. The Supreme Court of the United States has taken that position for more than 100 years, in some 53 decisions. The present Supreme Court of the United States, speaking in the California case, in the Louisiana case, and in the Texas case, has taken the same position. Now we have before the Senate the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming, in which a number of other Senators join, affirming those decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. I do not know how there could be any more nearly complete and unanimous support and acceptance of the proposition that the ownership of the soil under inland navigable waters is with the States.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator cannot rely on the States being protected by an amendment which has been only offered, but never enacted. The Senator well knows that the same Solicitor General who testified before us has been urging the Supreme Court to reverse itself on other matters. The doctrine under which the States own the beds of their navigable streams not only with regard to inland waters, but in regard to other navigable waters, has now been partially overruled.

Mr. HILL. As I have said, every Supreme Court decision without a single exception, has been to the same effect. There have been some 53 decisions, beginning with the case of Pollard against Hagen, which was an Alabama case. Every one of those cases, including the California case, the Texas case, and the Louisiana case, has affirmed, declared, and proclaimed the proposition that the ownership of the soil in the inland navigable waters is in the States. Now the Senate of the United States has adopted this amendment, without any opposition, as the unanimous view of the Senate.

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

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana, but if he would permit me to proceed with my speech I would appreciate it very much.

Mr. LONG. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows my high regard for him. Wrong as I think he is in this matter, I still have the highest regard for him.

Mr. LONG. I have the highest regard for the Senator from Alabama. He knows that I hold him in the very highest esteem.

The first case which deals with submerged lands and title to them was

not Pollard against Hagen, but Martin against Waddell, in 1842. In that case the Supreme Court used the language which clearly indicated that the then Supreme Court certainly thought that the States owned the beds of all navigable waters. I quote from the language of the Court:

And when the people of New Jersey took possession of the reins of government, and took into their own hands the powers of sovereignty, the prerogatives and regalities which before belonged either to the Crown or the Parliament, became immediately vested in the State.

I should like to quote the preceding paragraph:

For when the Revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the general Government.

The Senator from Alabama will recognize that the language of the decision referred to all navigable waters, not merely inland waters. It is true that the case involved Raritan Bay, which is an arm of the sea. However, the Court stated that the States owned the beds of all navigable waters. That principle was later followed in the Pollard case, an Alabama case, which announced the additional doctrine that new States came into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. HILL. Alabama got the same rights that Massachusetts, Virginia, and the other States had.

Mr. LONG. Yes. That was the Pollard case. It is Pollard against Hagan. It stated that the sovereignty which existed for original States applied also to the new State of Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should observe that the only thing in life that is certain is death. However, if anything would seem to be certain under our present constitutional form of Government, it would be that just as the States have had the ownership of this land under navigable waters for all these years, under all the decisions of the Supreme Court, and as now confirmed by the amendment, the same States will continue to have such ownership. I think that when the Senator leaves this body the ownership will still be in the States where it is now.

Mr. LONG. I trust that the same situation will be true with respect to the marginal sea.

Mr. HILL. I cannot conceive of how that could be true, Mr. President, because the Supreme Court, with which the Senator from Louisiana now takes such a strong opposing view, has held generation after generation to the proposition that the soil under the inland waters belongs to the States. I would say all members of the Supreme Court hold that opinion, except that one of the Associate Justices, Mr. Justice Jackson, did not participate in the decision because, as Attorney General, he undoubtedly had something to do with these cases.

▲ TWO-EDGED WEAPON FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. President the oil-for-education amendment offers a two-edged weapon for national defense.

During the present emergency the royalties from this offshore oil may be used for the urgent needs of national defense.

Once these needs are met, once the sinews and muscles of our war machine are sufficiently strong that Russia must prudently pause, it is our proposal that the royalties from this oil should then be used in all the States for educational purposes. For we cannot longer neglect the education of our children if we expect as a Nation to remain intelligent enough to recognize international danger and to be able to preserve our freedom. As the United States Commissioner of Education, Hon. Earl James McGrath, said recently:

Life does not stop while we build the Nation's military strength. Children are born and grow up. They go to school and to college. You cannot put a generation into educational cold storage and then later put them into an educational hothouse.

The necessities of the long pull before us are not merely military essentials. There are equally basic essentials in nonmilitary areas. To provide the essentials in all areas is our continuing objective. Only thus can we meet the demands of the long pull which lie before us—a period in which the preparedness of the Nation must be at hitherto undreamed-of peacetime levels, which at the same time the basic essentials of life and growth must be provided for all our people, including all the children.

We face a future world where in terms of sheer quantitative manpower our children may be outweighed 4 or 5 to one. It may be even 10 to 1 if the Soviet manages to consolidate the Continent of Asia. And as we analyze why we have not already been overwhelmed by the totalitarian tide, the most fundamental answer is that we have had the foresight for over a century to invest more of our national wealth in the education of our children than any other nation.

I suggest that America's organizational and productive capacity—which is the root of our own security and is the last great hope of the free world today—is the direct result of two mighty American inspirations about education. The first of these inspirations was public support for free schools with good educational standards, first dreamed of and fought for by Thomas Jefferson and later accomplished in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by Horace Mann, of Brown University, Rhode Island, and our second inspiration was the policy of dedicating revenues from our public lands to education.

THE CRISIS IN OUR SCHOOLS

Several months ago when we introduced the oil-for-education amendment on the floor of the Senate, I tried to indicate that this precious heritage of education for all our people was in danger of becoming a myth. At that time I cited the dilapidated condition of our schools, the huge increases in our child population, and the alarming exodus of our inadequately paid teachers from the teach-

ing profession into better paying pursuits.

Last month Mr. T. M. Stinnett, executive secretary of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, called the conditions in our schools a public school scandal. Addressing a conference on that subject at Boston he said:

It is a scandal born of public neglect, public confusion, and public fear.

Then Mr. Stinnett named these seven neglects around which it centers:

Too few schoolrooms to house children decently; too few teachers, many overworked, overloaded teachers in overflowing classrooms; unsafe, unsanitary, obsolete classrooms; inadequately prepared teachers; too few recruits for teaching; too little money to fulfill basic requirements.

This current school year the Nation's educational system is struggling under the highest enrollment of students ever recorded—more than 33,000,000 elementary, high school and college students. Elementary school enrollment jumped by nearly a million last year, and a million the year before as the wartime baby crop began to enter school. The United States Office of Education estimates that 1,700,000 additional students will enter school this fall. A veritable tidal wave of 6-year olds will hit the schools over the next 5 or 6 years, at which time we will be faced with a new surge of first graders. Whether the Korean conflict had anything to do with it, the fact remains that instead of leveling off the birth rate increased again this year. Heaven knows how we are going to educate those children. I suggest that the answer will lie in how capable we prove ourselves of taking care of those vast numbers that are already in school, or are of school age.

There are over 26,500,000 children in our public elementary and secondary schools alone. There will be over 32,000,000 before this year's crop of babies is even ready for school in 1958.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Illinois, a distinguished Member of this body, and a former distinguished professor at the University of Chicago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the problem of numbers arise primarily from the fact that in the thirties we had a low birth rate because of the depression?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And that beginning in approximately 1940 there was a very large increase in the birth rate—unexpected, but very real—and as a result there has been an enormous increase in the number of children going to school? Those increased numbers of school children are just beginning to reach the high schools, and the increase will continue as the younger children who were born in the years of the higher birth rate come of school age.

Mr. HILL. That is entirely correct. The Senator from Illinois has spoken with authority on this matter and has

spoken so truly in depicting the situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have been listening to the Senator's dissertation and his very eloquent and informative discussion of the problems of education. I rise merely to state how refreshing it is to hear in this body his constructive, thoughtful approach to one of the most significant problems of our day. We have had too much badgering of one another, too much investigation of various aspects of our Government, too many charges and countercharges on a political basis.

So I say that this afternoon the people of the United States are being given a treat, in the sense that they are hearing one of the most able and distinguished Members of this body, one who has been a friend of the children of America and a friend of education and health in America, again sound the clarion call for better educational standards for the children of the United States.

I would not be honest with myself or with my convictions if I did not stand here today and tell the Senator from Alabama that we are grateful for his interest in this subject and his profound knowledge of it. How the parents of America must be rejoicing at this hour to know that they have in the Senate a champion of education.

If the amendment in the nature of a substitute, sponsored by the Senator from Alabama and other Senators, can be adopted, there will be a new day for education in the United States, and that will do more for the cause of peace in the world and to keep our Government clean and to establish honor and morality in America than will a great many of the investigations and charges and countercharges of which so much has been heard.

The Senator from Alabama is emphasizing the positive and the constructive. I venture to say there will be many glad hearts in the United States when the word goes forth, through the press and over the radio, that at last the Congress is back doing business for all the people, including the little people and the children of America, who are our heritage.

So I am delighted that I am here this afternoon to hear the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very kind and generous words. I particularly appreciate them because the record shows that there is not a stronger or more devoted champion of the cause of education or the cause of our children than the Senator from Minnesota.

POOR EDUCATION HURTS CHILDREN AND NATION

Mr. President, what are the results both to our children and to the Nation of these serious inadequacies in school

buildings, equipment, teacher supply, and operating funds? A recent 48-State survey by the New York Times revealed that 3,500,000 elementary and high-school students—one out of eight pupils in the public schools—are suffering an impaired education, an increase of a half million in 12 months. Are these and the 4,000,000 children who are of school age, but are not enrolled in any school, to join the ranks of the 750,000 men who were rejected for educational reasons in World War II—more than the number of men who fought in combat divisions in the entire Pacific area? Are they to join the ranks of the more than 300,000 young men who have been found educationally unfit for service in the Armed Forces since Korea?

The only way that we are going to be able to stop this appalling waste of manpower is to halt the deterioration of our school system and then to improve that system.

Now that we have stated the increased enrollment figures, the problems they reveal are frighteningly obvious. Ever since the depression to which the distinguished Senator from Illinois referred—and I remind you, Mr. President, that was 20 years ago—school construction has failed to keep pace with the demand for classroom facilities. This has been true for three reasons: First, as the Senator from Illinois said, the depression years; second, the ban on construction during World War II; and, third, the awaited drop in building costs after the war did not occur, as we all know. As we know, that drop in building costs did not occur, with the result that many buildings which had been planned and dreamed of were not constructed.

The result of this 2 years of delay is obvious today to every parent and teacher, to every State and local government; in fact I do not believe any citizen is unaware of it.

Miss Selma Borchardt, vice president of the American Federation of Teachers, in testimony before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, urged enactment of the oil-for-education amendment, and declared that "the Nation's schools face their most severe crisis in our country's history."

Educational conditions in many communities are almost unbelievable. Thousands of children are attending class in apartment houses, hotel and school basements, empty stores, garages, churches, quonset huts, and trailers. A recent New York Times survey found children in one community attending class in a morgue. What a pleasant memory they will have of their alma mater.

The superintendent of schools in Fairfax County Va., just across the Potomac, almost within the shadow of the Nation's Capitol, recently told a House education subcommittee of large numbers of children going to school in family-unit apartments where all rooms are used for classes including, of all places, bathrooms.

Even with the use of such facilities, many communities have had to resort to half-day and even one-third day ses-

sions. An estimated 400,000 boys and girls are not getting a full school day. Imagine, if you will, what this does to the morale of the children, the parents, the teachers, and the communities. Schooling lost is schooling gone forever, for a child is 6 years old but once. In other words, Mr. President, once 60 golden seconds of educational opportunity are lost, they can never be regained.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to my friend, the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Alabama remembers a statement which was made at the time when Dr. Fine, educational editor of the New York Times, testified before the committee.

Mr. HILL. Yes, and I hope the Senator from New York will refer now to that statement.

Mr. LEHMAN. Dr. Fine testified that it was perfectly evident that one could delay the building of roads for a year or two or three years, and although there would be a temporary loss to the people, the lapse in the road-building program could easily be made up; but that a year or two or three years lost from a child's education could never be made up; it would be lost forever for the child and for the entire generation.

Dr. Fine's statement made a very deep impression on me, as I believe it did on all of us.

Mr. HILL. Yes, it did; and I thank the Senator from New York for recalling that particular testimony.

Mr. President, I do not suppose there is any one in all the United States who has more completely dedicated himself to the cause of education and has more definitely concentrated his efforts in an endeavor to obtain the facts to be used to obtain education for our children than has Dr. Fine. As the Senator from New York has said, Dr. Fine's statement came with impelling force, coming as it did from so devoted a servant to the cause of public education. Dr. Fine's statement was a most impressive and effective one.

These words by Dr. Walter Maxwell, secretary of the Arizona Education Association tell the story for community after community:

Numerous times I have seen children lined up in front of a school house door, marching in to take their places in the school after the first shift marched out—just like the changing of shifts in factories.

The United States Office of Education and the New York Times report that one out of every five schools in the country is obsolete, a fire hazard or a health risk. As Dr. Benjamin Fine, educational editor of the New York Times, told the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a few days ago, when he urged adoption of the oil-for-education amendment:

This figure does not include the hit-or-miss contraptions now used as schools on an emergency basis.

SIX HUNDRED THOUSAND NEW CLASSROOMS
NEEDED

These two reports show that during the next 7 years the country will need to build 600,000 classrooms at a cost of \$20,000,000,000. At today's prices a classroom costs from \$30,000 to \$35,000. Of the classrooms, 222,000 would be used for the increased enrollment, 126,000 would be used for replacements, and 252,000 to reduce the existing backlog. Again let Dr. Fine speak:

This means, in effect, that the Nation must build at least 80,000 classrooms a year for the next 7 years. The year 1950-51 was the peak year for building schools in this country—40,000 classrooms were constructed at a cost of \$1,200,000,000. Even at this tremendous rate the Nation is meeting only about one-half the buildings needed to meet current needs and wipe out the backlog.

As to the toll of inflation on school construction, let Dr. McGrath speak:

Spiraling costs have affected the schools seriously. For example, \$1,000,000 spent for school construction last year purchased only about as much plant as \$568,000 could have bought at the end of World War II, or as much as \$446,000 could have purchased in 1940.

As a result, our overstuffed, badly housed schools face an unprecedented period of shortage. It is doubtful that even one-half of the 80,000 classrooms needed in 1952 will be constructed. School systems everywhere are sending out SOS signals.

Mr. President, if the Nation's school construction needs are converted into dollar costs at the 1951-52 going prices, they show that more than \$7,000,000,000 must be spent just to erase the backlog of construction needs. If the total construction needs were taken care of—erasing the backlog in the next 7 years and meeting the new needs—then the total cost would be about \$19,509,000,000 for the 7 years.

But vastly more important than the bricks and mortar are the people who prepare our children with knowledge and teach them to think.

The school teacher is the central figure in the education process. For many hours of the day we entrust our minds and the character of our most precious resource—our children—to the teacher. We look to the teacher to mold the children for the responsibilities of manhood and womanhood. Inevitably the character and influence of the teacher are woven into the character of the entire Nation.

Yet we are guilty of shocking neglect of our teachers. We have never given them the recognition, the appreciation, and the financial security they deserve. Poorly paid even before World War II, their situation is much worse today. Their earnings have not kept pace with earnings in general. Rising costs have forced thousands upon thousands of teachers from the classrooms, out of financial necessity; and they are still leaving. The drain is greatest among our best-trained teachers. Teachers with emergency certificates are becoming less the exception than the rule. Teacher-training colleges cannot even begin to meet the huge demands for teachers from the dwindling graduating

classes, as young people abandon their teaching ambition in the face of economic necessity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield at this point?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. During the discussion of the program the Senator from Alabama recalls so well, namely, the program under the amendment for Federal aid for school construction, I heard a statement to the effect that between 1950 and 1960 the enrollment in the New York City elementary and secondary public schools would increase by a larger figure than the total enrollment in the Philadelphia schools.

Mr. HILL. As I recall, that was the testimony before our committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thought, in a capsule sort of way, that indicated the nature and the dimensions of this problem. The Senator now has an amendment before the Senate which will strike a mighty blow for the liberation of education, by releasing the energies of our people and the capacities of our people in the work of rebuilding the educational structure. It seems to me inconceivable that we, as Members of this body, could turn aside this golden opportunity to get the substance which we need so much, namely, the financial resources, to be equitably distributed among the peoples of the United States for the purposes of the education of their children. I do not think the Senate has ever had a more wonderful opportunity to show that we really believe in equality of treatment and fair play, and that we really have a sense of values as to the life, particularly the educational life of our children, than in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator. I do not want the Senator to forget that he is one of the coauthors and one of the strongest sponsors of this amendment, along with the distinguished Senator from New York and other Members of this body.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not want the public to forget that it was the Senator from Alabama who came at least to the Senator from Minnesota and to other Senators, to ask that we join with him, and that he gave us this privilege. I am glad that we joined with him. He deserves the honor and the credit, but I, at least, am glad to be a cosponsor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I want to associate myself, if I may, with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Minnesota. There is no man in the Senate who has given of himself with greater devotion, greater skill, or greater effectiveness to the cause of education and, as a matter of fact, to all good causes, than has the Senator from Alabama. I am very happy indeed to be a cosponsor of this amendment, which I hope will prevail.

Mr. HILL. I wish to thank the Senator. I deeply appreciate his kind words.

Now, Mr. President, as water cannot rise higher than its source, a class cannot be better than the teacher of the class; and we have no deficiency more serious than the lack of properly trained, properly prepared teachers, adequate in

number to meet the swollen enrollments about which we have been speaking.

TEACHER SHORTAGE ACUTE

The result is that our public schools face a dangerous teacher shortage. Some States are feeling the shortage far worse than others, but all are affected. To meet the swollen enrollments we need at least 105,000 new elementary school teachers each year, and we are training only 35,000. Enrollment in teacher-training classes fell off another 16 percent this year, and teachers are leaving the profession in greater numbers than at any time since World War II. The drop-out rate from the average teaching staff is 12 percent, exactly twice the normal rate. Not only that, but a large percentage of our teacher graduates are failing to take up teaching; they cannot afford to teach. I want to place in the RECORD, following my remarks, a very revealing article by Dr. Samuel Engle Burr, Jr., chairman, department of education, American University, here in Washington, that appeared in the Sunday Star on February 17, 1952.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HILL. Dr. Burr's article was based on a survey of teacher graduates from that institution since the fall of 1947. The survey reveals that only 55 percent of the graduates in education actually hold teaching jobs and 25 percent are working in some field other than that for which they are especially trained. The article lists the following as among the types of employment at which some of the young men who prepared for the teaching profession are earning their livelihood—public relations counsellor, grocer, importer and distributor of books, curios and art materials, magazine sales promotion representative, statistical draftsman, producer of training films for industrial use, payroll clerk, music cataloger in a library.

It appears that all these types of employment pay better salaries than does teaching or offer other advantages such as greater opportunity for advancement, better working conditions or employment in a favored locality. Here is demonstrated once again how sadly we have neglected our teachers. We have failed to make teaching the honored, respected, financially secure profession that we expect it to be and that it must be.

Let Dr. Burr speak:

It seems a peculiar paradox that young people who want to teach, who are capable of doing good teaching work, and who have taken education courses to prepare themselves for certification as teachers should find it advantageous to enter other fields in an era when there is an acute shortage of teachers.

All the national surveys of education indicate that several thousands of additional teachers are needed today. Teachers' agencies and placement bureaus are begging for the names of people who can qualify for teaching jobs. But one-quarter of the young people whom we prepare for this important work choose other kinds of employment because they can't afford to teach. The need for larger financial income drives them out of teaching and into other fields.

Other colleges and universities throughout the United States report conditions similar to those among the education graduates of American University.

I want to call your attention to the results of a survey by the Beta Field Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa as reported by Mr. Adolph Unruh in the November 1951 issue of the Phi Delta Kappan. The question studied was, "How many male teachers in the city and county of St. Louis, Mo., find it necessary to supplement their regular income from teaching by doing other kinds of work?" The survey revealed that only 8 percent of the male teachers supported themselves and their families by teaching alone. Ninety-two percent hold supplementary jobs or their wives work or they have some income which is independent of their earnings in the field of education.

The article lists over 100 kinds of employment performed by these male teachers in addition to regular teaching. It is interesting to note the wide range of jobs that these men are performing after school is over in the afternoon, for as long as an 8-hour shift. And it would seem that few of the outside jobs bear any real relationship to their specialized work as a teacher or to their specialized training for their profession.

The jobs vary from bowling alley managers to frozen custard stand operator to short order cook. Fifty-two percent reported that they felt the extra hours detracted from their effectiveness in teaching. I want to place the entire article in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

TEACHER SALARIES MUST BE INCREASED

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the only way that we will be able to meet the unprecedented demand for teachers and the cry for competency in the classroom is to halt the alarming drift away from the teaching profession and to train more teachers. This means that we will have to stop regarding teaching as a second-class profession and pay our teachers adequately.

We have gone into considerable detail in our discussions of the pressing needs of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools but actually they can be stated very simply. They are:

First. Seven billion dollars in new schools just to erase the backlog of needs. Nineteen billion five hundred thousand dollars if we are to erase the backlog and meet the new needs.

Second. Five billion dollars more a year for current operating expenses.

Third. One hundred and five thousand more teachers a year for at least the next 6 or 7 years.

It has long been clear that many local communities which have in the past almost wholly borne this financial responsibility can no longer do so, even when they tax themselves to the limit.

In order to gain a little better idea of what the income from the Nation's undersea oil and gas resources could mean to the 48 States, I asked Dr. McGrath to do a little figuring for me. I pointed out earlier in my remarks that the estimates of the oil and gas deposits off the coasts

of California, Louisiana, and Texas fixed the value of the reserves at about \$50,000,000,000 at present prices. I pointed out that these were very conservative estimates and that there are strong suspicions among petroleum geologists that this undersea wealth may be far more valuable. But I asked Dr. McGrath to assume that the \$50,000,000,000 is correct and that he not take into consideration in his figures the possibility—and the probability—that the Federal Government would be able to secure a higher return for the American people on these resources through higher royalties. I also asked that he not take into account in his figures the likelihood that the price of oil and gas will increase as the world's petroleum supply is depleted. I want to read now from a letter which I have received from Dr. McGrath:

If the total amount of royalties from estimated oil deposits in the Continental Shelf were applied to construction costs for elementary and secondary education, for public schools in all the States, these royalties (calculated at 12½ percent of \$50,000,000,000) would cancel out the accumulated backlog of needs, and enable the States and their communities to concentrate on meeting the new needs which each year brings. Any man whose family has been plunged into debt because of protracted illness or other family crisis knows what it would have meant to him if an unexpected legacy had wiped out all accumulated debt and permitted him to start fresh, meeting the current expenses of family life without having to struggle along under the burdens of the past. Application of the oil royalties to the accumulated backlog of school construction needs would have the same sort of effect for the school children of the Nation and the thousands of local communities with their millions of taxpayers—reprieve from an almost insupportable backlog of accumulated needs, in order that, with a clean slate, they can face the future with assurance.

Actually, of course, the royalties would come in over a longer period of time than the 7 years here under discussion. If that portion of the royalties which came in amounted to (say) \$1,750,000,000 during the 7 years, that would be an appreciable lift; and it would mean that about \$4,500,000,000 would come in during the following years, to help meet the needs in those years. In any case, it would mean that the States and school districts could expect financial help for school construction which, over the years, would be equivalent to the writing off of the accumulated burden of unmet needs as of the present year.

I want to place in the RECORD, following my remarks, a copy of Dr. Fine's statement before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs together with a series of six articles by Dr. Fine in the New York Times reproduced in a pamphlet entitled "Why Our Public Schools Are in Serious Trouble."

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

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. HILL. Anyone who will take the time to read the statement by Dr. Fine and these articles will get a picture of how desperate and compelling is the need of our schools, and how badly and how desperately these funds are needed for the education of our children.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely want to say to the Senator that, some 15 years

ago, voices were raised in this land which told about the dangers which were looming upon the international horizon, the possibility of war. Those voices called upon the American people to prepare for the day when the onslaught would come, but in the Halls of Congress, as in other places, those voices went unheard. Nothing happened until December 7, 1941, when World War II was upon us. I think the Senator from Alabama today has raised his voice of warning as to the dangers which lie ahead—I mean the dangers to public education—and believe me, Mr. President, unless the voice is heeded, unless the warning is given some credence and some reception, we are going to face a problem in the field of education which no amount of emergency action will be able to take care of. There is no way of overestimating it. I hear my colleagues and others talk about the shortage of steel; we talk about the shortage of aluminum; we even talk about the shortage of building material; but the shortage that is really gnawing at the vital strength of America today is the shortage of educational program facilities and teachers for America's youth. Here is an opportunity literally to discover a mine of wealth to remedy the shortage. If we discovered a uranium mine for our atomic energy program and did not use it, we would be impeached for our failure to assume our responsibility. Here is a discovery which the Senator from Alabama is explaining, a great resource that can be used for something which is more important than is any development of atomic energy, and we are closing our eyes to it unless we accept the proposals which are made here.

I feel strongly, Mr. President, that we are being almost prophetic in what we are saying today. Some people will point their fingers at us and say, "Where were you and what did you do when that call was sounded, when that alarm was made?"

The alarm has been made, Mr. President, and no one can deny the facts; they are a matter of factual objective evidence.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator suggests, it will be another case of too little and too late.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With human resources.

Mr. HILL. Yes; with our most precious resources—all our hopes, all our dreams, all our strength, all our might, all our purposes, all our power and leadership for the years which lie ahead.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his contribution.

NEEDS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Now let me turn briefly to the situation in our colleges. Contrary to the trend in the elementary and high school, our colleges and universities have this fall suffered their second consecutive drop in enrollment. The New York Times reports the student loss this year at 250,000, a 10-percent drop from last year. Besides the draft and the drawing to a close of GI education programs, there is a third reason. Our birth rate in the depression years was, as is always true in depressions, quite low. The depression babies are now en-

tering the colleges. Today, we have a situation in our colleges and universities that is just the opposite of what it will be a few years from now when the tremendous crop of war and postwar babies are ready for their training as our doctors, lawyers, teachers, engineers, chemists and as leaders in other professions and business. When that period arrives we must have colleges ready to receive them. It is our duty to keep alive our facilities for college training. I am willing to agree that a certain amount of economizing in tight times is not only necessary but encourages efficiency in any institution, whether it be a college, a business, or a government. But we must be most careful that we do not cripple vital functions. Colleges today train most of the people who will someday be our leaders.

All our colleges are having serious financial trouble, whether they are State institutions, land-grant colleges, the large private universities or the small college. The New York Times survey to which I referred shows that half our independent liberal arts institutions are operating in the red. The colleges that are hardest hit are the small colleges with enrollments under 500. They may be small colleges for women or city colleges without a campus. These are the kind that too often do not have the endowment of a large private college and, of course, do not have the tax support of the State institutions. But if you will look through Who's Who in America and pick at random the names of the men and women whom you regard as important on the national scene you will be surprised at how many received their educations in these small colleges. I invite you to look at the Congressional Directory and see how many of our colleagues in both Houses of Congress received their education in such institutions.

The larger colleges are having serious difficulty in receiving funds from the sources which have supported them in the past as estate and inheritance taxes no longer make it possible for rich people to give large support to such institutions. The downward trend of college enrollment means that tuition, so often the backbone and the mainstay of so many of our higher institutions, is dwindling.

In a desperate effort to overcome deficits many colleges and universities have hiked tuition rates making it increasingly difficult for many fine young men and women to go to college. Doubtless these increases will render it impossible for many to have a college education. I want to place in the RECORD an article from the February 7 issue of the New York Times telling of tuition increases at Columbia University up to 25 percent this fall. This means, as the article says, that students entering Columbia this fall will be paying exactly twice the amount charged 7 years ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the picture of the financial plight of higher education throughout the Nation was eloquently presented to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

by Dr. Robert L. Stearns, president of the University of Colorado, as he urged adoption of the oil-for-education amendment. Dr. Stearns is a member of the executive committee of the American Council of Education, for which he spoke. The council is composed of 976 colleges and universities and 145 associations of school systems and allied educational groups.

Describing higher education's need for additional revenue, Dr. Stearns said:

The need is far greater than current sources of revenue can supply.

I can conceive of no greater purpose than to devote the income from one great natural resource to the further development of our greatest natural resource—our educable youth, your children and mine.

A college is much more than bricks and mortar, ivy and campus. It is essentially the sense of tradition, the pride of excellent teaching over the years that distinguishes the good college from the mediocre one. Once again, I remind you that if this world stays in its present uneasy state and our colleges and universities will have to have help if they are to survive and be able to support the war and postwar baby population which this September has overrun the first grade.

As we speak of these conditions—and I shall not detain the Senate much longer—I want to invite attention to one fact.

LESS FOR SCHOOLS THAN IN 1932

Despite the record amount for schools this year, in terms of 1952 dollars, the percentage of national income that goes for public elementary and secondary schools is considerably lower than it was 20 years ago.

Although the mounting expense of running the public school system is criticized in some quarters, education does not get so much of the national income as do some of the luxury items.

In 1939, for example, we spent \$2,289,000,000 for all public school costs. In the same year of 1939 we spent almost that much for tobacco; more than that by one-third for alcoholic beverages. That was more than a decade ago. Our performance today is even worse. In 1949 we spent \$5,000,000,000 on schools. In the same year of 1949 we spent \$8,000,000,000 for alcoholic beverages, \$4,500,000,000 for tobacco, \$2,000,000,000 for amusements alone—almost three times as much for luxuries as we did for education.

Can we honestly say our pride in education, our respect for the teaching profession, our concern for our children, are all we claim they are?

Mr. President, I have thus far devoted myself to an exposé of the false arguments espoused by the proponents of the give-away bill and I have tried to set forth for you the size of the educational problem which confronts these United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator has placed some very interesting figures in the RECORD. Do the figures in each instance include public elementary and secondary schools and colleges?

Mr. HILL. I have used a great many figures, and some of them are limited to public schools. Others are over-all figures of what we are expending, and include public and private schools. If the Senator from California should have occasion to honor me by looking up these remarks, I think he will see whether the figures are limited to elementary and secondary public schools or whether they apply to all education, including both public and private schools.

I now turn to an explanation of our oil-for-education amendment. While it, like other legislation, is not a panacea it will go far toward curing the financial crisis in today's education without placing a further burden on the back of the taxpayer. I should like to answer some of the questions on the purpose of this amendment which have been raised by other Senators and by educators, parents, teachers, and citizens in every State in the Union. I report with pleasure, Mr. President, that I have been gratified at the great show of interest in this measure as reflected in my mail. I was well aware that the serious problems of education were weighing heavily on the minds and hearts as well as on the pocketbooks of our citizens. The mail that I am receiving shows how widespread and acute is this concern. The concern is also shown in the widespread editorial commendation of the amendment that has appeared in daily newspapers in every section of the country, including such well-known journals as the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the Atlanta Journal, the Denver Post, the St. Petersburg Times, the Birmingham News, and the Washington Post.

Brief hearings were held before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the morning of February 7. At these brief hearings some 40 great national organizations appeared and urged adoption of the oil-for-education amendment. I want to place in the RECORD a list of the witnesses and the organizations represented at the hearings. Other organizations both local and national have advised me of their active efforts in support of the amendment but could not attend the hearings.

A HISTORIC NATIONAL POLICY

I want to emphasize again that the oil-for-education amendment proposes no new departure into uncharted seas. It is simply a continuation of one of our oldest and wisest national policies—the use of revenues from public lands for educational purposes.

From the earliest beginnings in colonial times many of the colonies earmarked public lands for the establishment and support of schools. The earliest case was in Virginia in 1618. Colleges started with the aid of land grants in the various colonies include Harvard in Massachusetts, William and Mary in Virginia, Yale in Connecticut, Princeton in New Jersey, and others in South Carolina and Georgia.

After the American Revolution we were faced with a situation which was similar in some respects to the present demands of the three coastal States for the national property in the submerged lands

lying beyond the low-tide mark. Individual States laid claim to the territories west of the Appalachians. In 1780 the Congress passed a resolution, containing a pledge that these western lands would be disposed of for the benefit of all States. In 1785 and 1787 ordinances were passed by the Congress which specifically set aside every sixteenth section of the public lands west of the mountains for the establishment and maintenance of schools. In speaking of the ordinance of 1787 Daniel Webster declared:

I doubt whether one single law of any law-giver, ancient or modern, has produced effects of more distinct, marked and lasting character than the ordinance of 1787. . . . It set forth and declared it to be a high and binding duty of the Government to support schools and advance the means of education.

Many of the great State universities were started with the aid of the public lands dedicated to education by the ordinances of 1785 and 1787. In the next three-quarters of a century the demand for increased facilities for educational advancement resulted in the passage by Congress of many additional laws setting aside not just one section in each township but two and then four sections for school purposes.

FRUITS OF THE POLICY

In order to give a better idea as to what these vast new public lands under the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean could mean to elementary and secondary schools in each State, every one of which is in serious need of financial help, let us take a look at the present-day value of each State's elementary and secondary school endowment derived from grants of Federal land. I want to place in the RECORD at the close of my remarks a tabulation showing the value of such endowments for each State. It will be noted that the wise use of these public lands resources for education means today an endowment of almost a billion dollars for the elementary and secondary schools of our Nation. This is money that does not add to the burden on the taxpayer. The oil for education amendment offers the means by which the value of these endowments may be vastly increased.

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

(See exhibit 6.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a report showing State by State the number of acres of Federal land granted for educational purposes and showing the wide range of educational purposes for which such grants were made. It will be noted that huge grants were made to the States not alone for elementary and secondary schools, but for universities, colleges, and other great institutions of higher learning.

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

(See exhibit 7.)

Mr. HILL. The use of public land resources placed us on the road to realizing the dream of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, and other great statesmen of our early

history of a great system for the dissemination of knowledge. John Quincy Adams advocated giving to the cause of education, and in the later years of his life he said that one of his great regrets was that we had not followed the policy of dedicating more public lands to the cause of education.

Mr. President, I am confident there is not a Senator here to whose mind does not come the story of the Morrill Act, the land-grant act, under which our great land-grant colleges were established in various States. In the State of Alabama we have the Alabama Polytechnic Institute of which we are very proud. It is a land-grant college that has been developed as a direct result of the Morrill Act. We know that the passage of that act and the fruits of that act, through the establishment of land-grant colleges, were so beneficial to the people of the United States that Congress passed many subsequent acts making additional grants and endowments to land-grant colleges and institutions founded under land-grant acts.

Mr. President, I ask to have placed at the end of my remarks a table showing grants that have been made to land-grant colleges.

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

(See exhibit 8.)

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

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was there not a very significant precedent in the Morrill Act, in that not only was each State given 30,000 acres, if there was that quantity of public land lying within a particular State, but also that States which had no Federal land within their borders were given scrip for public lands in other States?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I sought to state that a few minutes ago, but I wish very much to thank the Senator from Illinois for emphasizing the fact. The States which contained public lands took a position somewhat akin to the position of coastal States as to submerged lands, in that they desired to get all the land for themselves. But Congress in its wisdom said that public lands which went to the cause of education should go to the cause of education in all the States. So, for States which did not contain public land, scrip was issued on public land in other States. The scrip was salable, revenue was derived from it, and the revenue went to States without public lands, as well as to States with public lands.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true, for example, that the State of Louisiana did not have any Federal land within its borders, but that the Federal Government shared public land in other States with the State of Louisiana?

Mr. HILL. As I recall, the Senator is correct. The State of Louisiana was one of the States which had within it no public land, so Congress in its wisdom—and it was a wise course that Congress pursued—gave to the State of Louisiana its fair share of benefits from pub-

lic lands, as it did to States which contained public land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it of record that the State of Louisiana then protested against receiving its share of the proceeds of land in other States, such as Wyoming or Colorado? Did the State of Louisiana say, "We believe we should have revenue only from land within the borders of Louisiana," or did she accept the free donation by the Nation?

Mr. HILL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that my understanding of history is that the State of Louisiana not only did not protest and say, "Take this gift away from us," but that the State of Louisiana very enthusiastically reached out, accepted, and took unto herself the gift, which has been very beneficial to the cause of education in the State of Louisiana.

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

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I have just read with considerable interest the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama and other distinguished Senators. I am in doubt as to provisions of the Senator's amendment with reference to funds which are proposed to be provided as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education. Is there in the Senator's amendment any provision which would specifically guarantee that such grants in aid would be expended and administered solely in accordance with the laws of the several States which would receive the grants?

Mr. HILL. There is nothing in the amendment to that effect, because, as the Senator knows, the amendment does not go into the details or machinery of distribution of funds, but I think there is a splendid guaranty in the fact that the Senate of the United States has twice, within recent sessions, passed general Federal aid bills. I may say to the Senator from Florida that I was one of the sponsors of those bills, and in writing them we were very careful to make certain that funds would be expended through State systems and agencies. The Senate passed both bills by very large majorities, on the theory that the funds should be so expended.

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

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I well recall that the Senator from Alabama was one of those who, together with the Senator from Florida, insistently urged that there should be included in the bills he has mentioned, which passed the Senate, a provision guaranteeing to each State that in the case of the grants made to it by the Federal Government, its own administration, under its own laws, should be meticulously preserved. I am wondering why the Senator has not thought it wise to place a similar guaranty in his amendment.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator from Florida that before there is any distribution of the funds involved, further action will be required.

I wish also to say that not only is there the fine precedent of the two bills I have

already mentioned, but there are many, many precedents in other laws to which I have referred, such as the Morrill Act. Funds have been going to the various States from the Federal Treasury for years, and as we know, under the acts the administration of schools has been entirely in the hands of States and State agencies. There has been no attempt in any way on the part of the Federal Government to interfere with State administration or to establish, directly or indirectly, anything that might smack of Federal control.

As I recall, the only requirement in the act is that at such schools there shall be military training. As we know, most of our great institutions today, whether land-grant colleges or non-land-grant colleges, require military training.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield further?

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator feel that the omission of provisions in the amendment guaranteeing to the States that their own control of their systems of public education shall be preserved under the system proposed to be followed offers a very difficult problem for the States in that the Senator, by his amendment, proposes to set up a huge pool of money before there is any distribution, and subsequently the decision as to the conditions governing distribution among the States is to be made?

Mr. HILL. As the Senator knows, the amendment creates a council of 12 members, 4 to be appointed by the President of the Senate, 4 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 4 by the President of the United States. It shall be a bipartisan commission. Of the 12 members, 6 shall be members of the Republican Party and 6 shall be members of the Democratic Party. They are to make reports, and those reports are to come to Congress. Their report, when it comes before Congress, will cover many of the things the Senator from Florida has suggested.

Mr. HOLLAND. To press one part of my question, does not the Senator think that the pool which would be created would cause States which desired to function under their own laws to be confronted by a handicap, in that pressure of all kinds will be brought by those who were interested in the schools to settle on almost any terms offered by the Federal Government?

Mr. HILL. No; I do not think so at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Federal Government has not shown itself to be very considerate of the rights or convictions of States in many matters affecting schools or the public-school system.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator need have no fear at all on that basis. As I have said, every precedent sustains the principle of full and complete State control and authority.

Furthermore, I will say to the Senator from Florida that when the report is submitted Members of the Senate from the various States will be here. My good friend from Florida will be here. He will no doubt be nominated without

opposition, and that amounts to election in Florida. I hope to be here. We shall do just as we did in connection with the general Federal-aid-to-education bill. We will take care of the situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am trying to be comforted—

Mr. HILL. If I could think in terms along the line of the Senator's thought, would that be persuasive with the Senator?

Mr. HOLLAND. That would comfort the Senator from Florida a great deal, if the amendment were enacted.

Mr. HILL. We cannot enact an amendment with comfort. We must enact it by votes.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator expects to get the vote of the Senator from Florida for the use, for general purposes throughout the Nation, of funds which come from lands which are believed by the Senator from Florida to be the property of the States in which they lie, he had better resign that hope. The Senator from Florida has been trying to get some comfort from the assurances on the part of his distinguished friend from Alabama that at some time in the remote future, when it is hoped that both the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Florida will still be here, we shall be able to meet the persistent drive, which is made each time a Federal-aid-for-education bill is under consideration in the Senate, to insert terms and provisions which would deny full plenary control by the States of their own public schools. The Senator from Florida is trying to gain comfort from the Senator from Alabama, and assurance that we shall still be able to fend off such a drive, particularly when a big pool of money is involved. The Senator knows the pressure which would be brought to cut the melon immediately so as to make it available.

The Senator from Florida cannot share the comforting feeling which evidently animates the heart of his good and benevolent friend from Alabama, whose interest in the public schools is so well known, and who has heretofore insisted that the sanctity of State control be preserved. The Senator from Florida cannot help expressing his regret that the Senator from Alabama has not seen fit, in this particular amendment, to continue the assurance of security to the several States by endeavoring to assure the continued preservation of their independence in the control of their public-school systems.

Mr. HILL. If this amendment went into questions of the distribution of funds, the modus operandi, and the machinery and procedure, the Senator would certainly find that provision in the amendment. But the amendment does not take that step. It does not go that far. However, I wish to comfort the Senator with the assurance that in view of the past action of the Senate, in view of all the various laws involving Federal aid which we have previously enacted, he can feel pretty sure that that provision will be in the law when the Congress finally acts.

What I am seeking to do this afternoon is to give some comfort to the millions of children in the 48 States who

desperately need some help in the matter of their education, who so desperately need better, less crowded, more modern, and more adequate school-rooms, and better trained and more adequate teachers to teach them. I am trying to give those children some comfort. Along with trying to give them some comfort, I will give the Senator all the comfort I can by assuring him that if we can have these revenues dedicated to the cause of education, we will make certain that the funds are expended with the full administration in the hands of the States.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry that the distinguished Senator cannot go further in giving his assurance than to say that he feels that the Senator from Florida may be pretty sure that the action which the Senator from Florida regards as absolutely necessary would be taken by a subsequent Congress.

To leave that matter for the time being, perhaps the question I have in mind has been covered in the statement of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, in which case I regret raising the point again, but will he state for the record, if he has not already done so, the purpose of subsection 4 of section 1 of his amendment, which provides as follows:

(4) It shall be the duty of every State or political subdivision or grantee thereof having issued any mineral lease or grant, or leases or grants, covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf to file with the Attorney General of the United States on or before December 31, 1952, a statement of the moneys or other things of value received by such State or political subdivision or grantee from or on account of such lease or grant, or leases or grants, since January 1, 1940, and the Attorney General shall submit the statements so received to the Congress not later than February 1, 1953.

Mr. HILL. The purpose is what it appears to be on its face. There is nothing hidden or covert. The purpose is to enable the Federal Government to know how much revenue has gone to the States from leases or grants of land out in the sea.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the purpose of this subsection and of the collating of the facts for which the amendment calls through the reports covering operations since January 1, 1940, to hold the States and their various subdivisions accountable to the United States Government for proceeds received since that date?

Mr. HILL. As I recall, in its decisions the Supreme Court did not hold them accountable for past proceeds. But it would certainly be a matter of interest and, I might say, a matter of concern, for the Federal Government, as the owner of the lands, to know just what revenues had been derived from them.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is the recollection of the Senator from Florida that the

Supreme Court decisions dealt solely with the revenue received by the States from the submerged lands within their State boundaries, whereas the amendment now offered by the distinguished Senator relates to a much larger tract and covers at least, as I understand, all operations within the Continental Shelf. It would seem, therefore, that when the Senator from Alabama refers to the accounting date as January 1, 1940, he is perhaps laying the predicate for a much more remote accountability from the States with respect to those lands than even the Supreme Court in its hostile opinions has required of the States. For that reason the Senator from Florida would like to have his distinguished friend state for the record very clearly what is the purpose of that section, if he will be gracious enough to do so.

Mr. HILL. As I have said to the Senator, the purpose of that section is that the Federal Government, the owner of the lands, may know how much revenue has been derived from such lands by the States. When we get that information we shall know how much revenue has been realized. That information might even be available to the Secretary of the Interior, in connection, among other things, with future leases or further disposition, or further action on the part of the Secretary of the Interior. It might also be of interest to the Congress.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it a part of the purpose of the distinguished Senator, through the procurement of such information, to hold accountable the several States which have issued leases to the Continental Shelf outside State boundaries back to 1940?

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator have in mind the filing of suits for the recovery of such revenue?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have in mind either the filing of suits or any other method of holding the States accountable. The Senator will recall that this amendment is offered as an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 20 very substantial sums will be required to be paid to the States for the continued operation of such leases as lie within the boundaries of the States, namely, 37½ percent of the royalties. Of course, the Federal Government will have the handling of that 37½ percent.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida would like to know if it is in the mind of the Senator from Alabama that he is laying the predicate for holding back such funds until the States can recompense the Federal Government for such sums as are shown to have been collected by the States from operations outside the State limits, extending back to 1940.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I had not had that thought until he put it in my mind just now. I had not indulged that thought in any way. It had not occurred to me until the Senator put it into my mind.

If Congress decides that this property belongs to all the people, perhaps that would be the fair thing to do. I do not know whether the Senator is suggesting that or not. I had not had the thought until the Senator suggested it. He put it into my mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will further yield, it seems to me that the very fact that the Senator is favorably entertaining that suggestion should be cause for greater alarm on the part of those who are interested in preserving the rights of the States.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Florida that I did not say that I was entertaining it favorably or otherwise. I said I had not had the thought until he suggested it to me.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator, but I understood him to say that perhaps Congress would decide that to be a fair way to dispose of the matter.

Mr. HILL. I said I wondered whether the Senator from Florida was suggesting that perhaps it would be the fair thing to do. I was throwing out that thought.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield once more I wish completely and with finality to disabuse the overcredulous mind of the Senator from Alabama on that particular point.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Florida. I believe he has made himself clear on the point.

EDUCATION'S BIG CHANCE

Mr. President, as has been suggested time and time again, we are given the opportunity—and this one, I can assure you, really does knock but once—to devote the Nation's wealth under the sea to our children. Such a dream as this oil-for-education proposal can come alive only when we have such a stupendous sum as \$50,000,000,000.

I have mentioned some objectives for study by the National Advisory Council. Actually, if they were to call me before them I would say to them but one thing—and I say it now. I would quote to them the words of that great Frenchman, L'Enfant, whose genius turned a swamp into the most beautiful of all American cities, the city of Washington. You remember that he said:

Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood.

Sometimes, Mr. President, we have seen men more frightened by opportunity than by failure. In brief moments of quiet, amidst the struggles and frustrations of daily problems, we dream of great things that might be. We have our large hopes and our vain imaginings, but they seem so unreal that often we are ashamed to speak of them. Instead, we treasure them as little private refuges from life's disappointments.

How often have all of us thus dreamed of some vast bonanza which would give us the bricks and the mortar, the men and the women, the institutions and the instrumentalities to offer our children what they really need.

Then, like Aladdin, we rub the lamp, and the genie is before us tugging to do our will. But, instead of seizing the moment, we hesitate, and the will, enfeebled by the very magnitude of the challenge, quails before success and loses the golden, never-to-be-repeated chance.

Such is the classic history of failure. Let us not fail now. We have rubbed the lamp, and the genie is before us, saying, "Masters, I will build your schoolhouses. Masters, I will give your teachers a living wage. Masters, I will save your colleges. Masters, I will endow you with generations of trained and capable intellects. Masters, I will give you the alchemy of a strong and successful democracy. I am here to serve you."

Senators, our answer must be: Serve and serve well.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The present revenue from submerged land, according to the latest estimate, is \$30,000,000. Calculating it on a per child basis it would amount to 90 cents per child a year. Does the Senator from Alabama believe that he could do all the things he says he could do with that amount of money?

Mr. HILL. If there were not billions of dollars involved, and if there were only the measly sum of \$30,000,000 involved, we would not see the Senator from Louisiana fighting as desperately as he has been fighting and trying to get his hands on this oil for the State of Louisiana.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It has been estimated by the Secretary of the Interior, who is the responsible official charged with the matter, and knows something about it, that the most that could be gotten out of it would be about \$100,000,000, which was one-third of the estimated Federal aid when the matter was proposed for the first time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when I started my speech, immediately after I said "Mr. President," the Senator from Louisiana asked me that same question. He said that there was a good estimate that there were approximately 15,000,000,000 barrels of oil there. In terms of money it would amount to \$40,000,000,000. I quoted from the report of the committee and I quoted from Dr. De Golyer, who is perhaps the most outstanding geologist in the country. As I say, the Senator from Louisiana would not be here fighting as hard as he is fighting, speaking as he is speaking, interrupting as he is interrupting, and struggling and working as he is struggling and working unless there was involved a whole lot of revenue on which the Senator from Louisiana is trying to get his hands.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course a poor State like Louisiana could use three or four million dollars for educational purposes in behalf of its own school children, and that is where most of its revenue goes anyway. I suggest that a different situation is involved in producing oil many

miles from shore than producing it in the uplands. It would cost perhaps as much as a half million dollars or a million dollars to drill one well offshore. The same well would perhaps cost \$20,000 to drill anywhere in the United States proper. We must consider the enormous cost of drilling wells and we must have in mind that many instances it is not economically feasible to produce oil from some wells. It is only the best wells that would be economically feasible when they are drilled in the open sea.

Mr. HILL. I repeat that the estimates show some 40 billion dollars' worth of oil. There may be much more oil than that. Mr. President, that is what this fight is all about—\$40,000,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. McFARLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield the floor?

Mr. HILL. I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

Statement of—

Benjamin Fine, education editor, New York Times, page 3.

Robert I. Stearns, president, University of Colorado, representing the American Council on Education, page 53.

O. A. Knight, vice president of the CIO and president of Oil Workers International Union, CIO, representing his own organization and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, page 61.

T. C. Carroll, president, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, representing his own brotherhood and also the following 18 organizations: Switchmen's Union of North America, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, American Train Dispatchers' Association, International Association of Machinists, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, Railroad Yardmasters of America, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Hotel and Restaurant Employees' and Bartenders' International Union, National Organization Masters, Mates and Pilots of America, National Marine Engineers' Association, International Longshoremen's Association, page 65.

George D. Riley, member of the National Legislative Committee, American Federation of Labor, page 67.

Selma Borchardt, vice president, American Federation of Teachers, page 68.

J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel, the National Grange, page 71.

Angus McDonald, assistant legislative representative, National Farmers Union, page 73.

Wallace J. Campbell, director, Washington office, Cooperative League of the United States of America, page 74.

W. D. Johnson, national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors, page 76.

John J. Gunther, legislative representative, Americans for Democratic Action, page 76.

George R. Nelson, grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, A. F. of L., page 78.

C. B. Blankenship, legislative director, Communications Workers of America, CIO, page 79.

Rhoads Murphey, Friends Committee on National Legislation, page 81.

Julia Bennett, director, American Library Association, page 81.

M. D. Mobley, executive secretary, American Vocational Association, page 82.

John W. Edelman, Washington representative, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, page 83.

Letter from Howard A. Cowden, president, Consumers Cooperative Association, and resolution of the association, page 84.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Sunday Star of February 17, 1952]

AMERICAN EDUCATION SUFFERS BECAUSE THEY CAN'T AFFORD TO TEACH

(By Samuel Engle Burr, Jr., chairman, department of education, American University)

Joe was a student in our education classes at the university. He was graduated with an A. B. degree in June last year. The other day he came into my office and sat down in the chair at the side of my desk. After the usual exchange of greetings, he said: "I feel a bit like apologizing to you, Professor. You see, I'm not teaching, I have accepted a Government job."

As our conversation continued it developed that Joe still has an interest in teaching. He enjoyed his experience as a practice teacher last year and would seek a position in the teaching field now, other things being equal. But other things—salaries in particular—are not equal. His job with the Government pays him about \$1,000 a year more than he could hope to receive as a beginning teacher in this area. Joe has a wife and they have a baby, so salary is an important element in his consideration. Money, in this case, talks with an extremely loud voice.

TRUCK DRIVER'S CASE

Joe is just one of many similar cases. I was walking recently across Massachusetts Avenue near our campus, I saw a light delivery truck stop at the curb. The driver was Bob, who had been in our classes a couple of years ago, preparing to become a teacher of physical education and a high school coach. When I asked him what he was doing, he replied: "Well, my chief job is driving this truck. But on the side, I sell some of our company's products. In time, I guess that I'll develop into a regular salesman."

Bob went on to explain that his pay for selling is on a commission basis: No sales, no pay. So the assured income from driving the truck was a desirable guaranty in the beginning. Now he has progressed to the point where his commissions equal his pay as a driver.

One and one-half years after his graduation, his driver's pay plus his commissions on sales give him a total income which exceeds that of some college professors who have doctor of philosophy degrees and 10 years of professional experience.

"There was a high school principal who offered me a job that sounded fine, except for the salary," Bob said. "Now I'm making as much money as that principal does." I believe his summary of the situation is entirely accurate.

TEST PILOTS AND GROCER

Here are some of the things other young men who prepared in our classes for the teaching profession have become: Air Force test pilot, public-relations counselor, secret service operative, grocer, importer and distributor of books, curios and art materials; magazine sales promotion representative, statistical draftsman, producer of training films for industrial use, payroll clerk in a Government department, music cataloger in a library. It appears that all of these types of employment pay better salaries than does teaching, or offer other advantages,

such as greater opportunities for advancement, better working conditions, or employment in a favored locality.

Not all of our renegade education students have been married men with families to support. Some women who have done work in our education classes have found it advantageous to turn to other fields after graduation.

Some of them have done secretarial work, rather than teaching. Even in these cases, the salary differential was not in favor of professional education.

FIFTY-FIVE PERCENT ARE TEACHING

In order to determine, with a reasonable degree of accuracy, the present employment status of our graduates, we recently mailed questionnaires to 126 of them. These were young men and women who, since the fall of 1947, enrolled in our advanced courses in education, who did practice teaching under our supervision, and who received their bachelor of arts or bachelor of science degrees from us.

At the time of this writing, 87 replies have been received. We have some personal knowledge about five or six others who have not returned the questionnaires.

It appears, from this survey, that about 55 percent of our recent graduates in education actually hold teaching positions; 10 percent are housewives who are not employed outside their homes; another 10 percent are graduate students. And 25 percent have accepted positions in some field other than that for which they were especially trained.

PECULIAR PARADOX

It seems a peculiar paradox that young people who want to teach, who are capable of doing good teaching work, and who have taken education courses to prepare themselves for certification as teachers should find it advantageous to enter other fields in an era when there is an acute shortage of teachers.

All the national surveys of education indicate that several thousands of additional teachers are needed today. Teachers' agencies and placement bureaus are begging for the names of people who can qualify for teaching jobs. But one-quarter of the young people whom we prepare for this important work choose other kinds of employment because they can't afford to teach. The need for larger financial incomes drives them out of teaching and into other fields.

Our university is not alone in finding such a development. Other colleges and universities throughout the United States report similar conditions. Recently, a study was made in the city and county of St. Louis, Mo. The question studied was this: How many male teachers find it necessary to supplement their regular income from teaching by doing other kinds of work? The results have been reported by Adolph Unruh in the November 1951 issue of the Phi Delta Kappan. According to Mr. Unruh, only 8 percent of the male teachers support themselves and their families by teaching alone; 92 percent hold supplementary jobs, or their wives work, or they have some income which is independent of their earnings in the field of education.

For generations, America has put its faith in education. Our public-school system is one of the great bulwarks of our form of government and of our way of life. It is through the schools that good citizenship, patriotism, and the other American virtues are developed. Of course, the schools do not stand alone in this. The home and the church have their parts to perform in the educational picture also. But America must continue to have good schools, merely to survive in today's world. It must have excellent schools, if we are to make progress.

Schools cannot be much better than the teachers who serve in them. In order to maintain the standards of our schools or to raise these standards, it should be our

duty to attract good people to teaching. We should make the field of education a highly desirable one for our best young people to enter. One way to accomplish this is to make teaching worth while from the financial point of view.

If we are to put education in its proper place in our national scheme of things, we must remove the condition that now prevails—the condition under which they can't afford to teach.

EXHIBIT 3
CAN MEN AFFORD TO TEACH?
(By Adolph Unruh)

How many men in the teaching profession in St. Louis City and County find it necessary to supplement their regular income for teaching? This was the question on which the committee on research of Beta Field Chapter decided to base this year's pursuit of the ideals of research, service, and leadership. These three concepts have always been a challenge to any professional man; they challenged us in the field chapter of Phi Delta Kappa.

A letter with post card for reply was mailed to every man teacher in the public schools in St. Louis City and County, excluding administrators or supervisors whenever recognized from the descriptions of their positions in the directory. Inquiries were sent out to 700. Ten were invalidated because the 10 men had been drafted or had left teaching. Three hundred and thirty-six cards were returned properly executed, representing half of the men teaching in the area. Forty-three men replying taught in elementary schools, 50 in junior high schools, and 243 in senior high schools.

TABLE I.—Types of income

Types of income	Number of men	Percent
1. Salary only.....	27	8
2. Supplementary work: vacation jobs; wife works; all combinations except independent income.....	198	59
3. Supplementary work and independent income.....	111	33
Total.....	336	100

As shown in table I, 92 percent of the men have supplementary income. Fifty-nine percent of the 336 men teachers replying, supplement their salaries by taking other types of work. Another group of 33 percent have some sort of independent income, ranging from a few dollars to \$14,000 annually; we have no information as to the sources of these independent incomes.

Can men stay in teaching if it is necessary to subsist solely on a teacher's salary? The fact is that only 8 percent of the men teaching in public schools of the area did so. Twenty-seven men out of 336 men replying live on their salaries only.

KINDS OF WORK

Some men work after school hours as much as an 8-hour shift, from 4 o'clock in the afternoon until midnight. Others depend on the summer vacation to take up the financial slack. In addition to the work which the men undertake, 112 of the men reported their wives were working and supplementing the family income. The range of salaries for the wives was reported from \$17 to \$4,700, with a median salary of \$2,000. In some instances the wives also have independent incomes.

Schoolmen work at over 100 different kinds of employment. Here is a list of the jobs, demonstrating the resourcefulness and ingenuity of the men seeking additional employment.

Types of positions held and work performed in addition to regular teaching: Adult education; after-school program; anything available; architect; Armed Forces instruction; bakery; bank teller; bartender; beer bottler; bookie; bookkeeping; bowling alley manager; boys' work; broker; bus driving; cabinet work; camp counseling; camp director; carpentry; caterer; chemical worker; checker, grocery store; choir director; clerk; coaching, sports; construction work; defense work; drafting; driving bus, school; driving lessons; engineering; entertainment; factory worker; farming; filling-station attendant; frozen custard stand operator; game room supervisor; gardening; GI subsistence; hod carrier; hotel keeping; insurance; insurance adjuster; instruction, dancing; instruction, driving; interior decorator; interviewing; laborer; landscaping; library work; life-guard; lodge secretary; machine operator; machine shop work; maintenance; military training; ministerial; mortuary; music director; National Guard; National Guard camp; Naval Reserve; Navy training; newspaper work; office work; organist; own business; pattern making; personnel work; photography; piano tuning; playground supervision; playwriting; printing; private summer school; proofreader; radio repair; real estate manager; real estate salesman; recreation; referee in sports; retail credit reviewer; sales, counter; sales, investment; sales, retail; short-order cook; show work; stock clerk; summer camp promotion; teaching, college; teaching, night school; teaching, summer school; theater work; timekeeper at track; time office clerk; tool and design; trade; tutoring; waiter; welding; worker, sheet metal; writing; YMCA work.

WORK PERFORMED IN ADDITION TO REGULAR TEACHING

Forty-three percent of the total income of the men in elementary schools came from sources other than teaching. (See table III.)

TABLE III.—Extent of supplementing salaries

	Elementary teachers	Junior high teachers	Senior high teachers	Total
Supplementary income.....	\$87,903	\$105,840	\$452,132	\$645,875
Salaries.....	138,970	172,820	937,753	1,249,543
Total income.....	226,873	278,660	1,389,885	1,895,418
Percent supplemented.....	43	38	32	34

For junior high-school men, 33 percent of the total income was derived from sources other than regular salaries, and for men in the senior high schools the figure was 32 percent. Thirty-four percent of the total income of all the men teachers reporting did not come from teaching.

It may be of interest also to see the total picture of the types of income by instructional levels. (See table 4.)

One-third of the men who work outside of their school job spend over 12 hours a week at it. The men work from 1 to 50 hours per week outside their regular employment.

Fifty-two percent of the men reported that they felt their work detracted from their effectiveness in teaching, while 36 percent felt that the work they did would not decrease their efficiency in teaching. Ten others had no answer for this question. One is led to suspect from the replies that work outside regular teaching beyond 12 hours per week is a real handicap.

In answer to the question as to whether they would get outside work if their salaries were adequate to support them, 82 percent

of the men replied they would quit their outside work under such conditions. Only 10 percent of the responses indicated their wives would continue working if their husband's salaries were adequate.

TABLE IV.—Types of income by instructional levels

Types of income	Elementary teachers	Junior high teachers	Senior high teachers	Total
1. SALARY				
(a) Range....	2,400-4,400	2,400-4,800	2,000-5,500	-----
(b) Median....	3,000	3,200	3,978	-----
(c) Mode.....	3,200	3,100	4,700	-----
(d) Number....	43	50	243	336
2. INDEPENDENT INCOME				
(a) Range....	25-3,000	100-5,325	50-14,000	-----
(b) Median....	500	800	2,500	-----
(c) Number....	10	23	82	115
(d) Percent of group....	23	46	34	-----
3. SUPPLEMENTING WORK DURING SCHOOL TERM				
(a) Range....	125-4,560	100-1,700	60-6,500	-----
(b) Median....	500	500	700	-----
(c) Number....	32	36	153	221
(d) Percent of group....	74	72	63	-----
4. VACATION WORK				
(a) Range....	100-1,200	100-1,500	50-5,500	-----
(b) Median....	300	300	400	-----
(c) Number....	33	27	144	204
(d) Percent of group....	77	54	59	-----
5. WIFE'S SALARY				
(a) Range....	1,000-4,500	200-3,200	75-4,700	-----
(b) Median....	2,400	2,000	2,000	-----
(c) Number....	18	23	71	112

What did the men think would be an adequate salary? Men in elementary education now drawing a median of \$3,000 estimated an adequate salary at \$4,500. The same figure was given by junior high school teachers now averaging \$3,200 in salary. Senior high school men now averaging \$3,978 set an adequate salary at \$5,200. Some of the men do live on their salary, and their estimate of an adequate salary ranged from \$3,500 to \$8,000 with a median at \$5,000. Unsolicited comments were interesting: "Standard of living is below, of necessity, others in the community." "Teaching is a good job for a woman whose husband has a good income." "I can't afford to get married on my salary."

Are children worth the full time of professionally trained teachers? Parents who want better opportunities for their children must underwrite those opportunities. The education system which is equal to the challenge of these times will occupy the full time of professional people.

Statisticians have figured out the per pupil cost of instruction in nearly every school system. Few of them know the per teacher cost of living in any given community, based on an adequate living standard with educational, professional, and personal needs. There may be separate needs for men teachers and women teachers. Several such studies should be carried on in each State, and from such studies may come real justification for a new budget and a new salary schedule. The research committee of Beta Field Chapter believes there is room for an enlarged, thorough study of both need and income. Perhaps Phi Delta Kappans will find the answer to the question, "Can men afford to teach?"

EXHIBIT 4

STATEMENT OF DR. BENJAMIN FINE, EDUCATION EDITOR, THE NEW YORK TIMES, BEFORE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, ON BEHALF OF OIL FOR EDUCATION AMENDMENT TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20, FEBRUARY 7, 1952

Senator HILL, members of the committee, I am happy to testify here this morning before you. Although I am not an expert on oil, I have delved into the problems of our schools and colleges. And it is to that subject that I intend to speak. American education is in grave danger. I have but recently completed a Nation-wide survey to find out what has happened or is happening to our school system. The schools are in serious trouble.

Crisis is an overworked term. When it is used often enough it loses its impact. We just shrug our shoulders and accept it. The impact is no longer there. Yet we must be realistic. We cannot, ostrichlike, bury our heads in the sand and do nothing.

Is there a crisis in education? I could spend hours giving a first-hand picture—conditions that I saw with my own eyes as I have visited schools in the North, South, East, or West—that would convince you, if further evidence is needed, that our schools and colleges need help.

Said President Truman: "Our public-school system faces the greatest crisis in its history."

Said the American Federation of Teachers: "The Nation's schools face their most severe crisis in our country's history."

Said the American Federation of Labor: "A financial crisis exists in the schools and colleges of this country."

Said United States Commissioner of Education Dr. Earl J. McGrath: "The tidal wave of children bearing down on our schools bids fair to overwhelm us."

I could go on and on, citing testimonials. But I won't. I don't think they are really necessary. I think that anyone who has visited our public schools and our colleges in many sections of the country have seen at first hand—as I have—that the educational system is sick.

Education today is at the crossroads. This is truly the midcentury. We can take our choice: ahead lies the democratic road, with freedom, liberty, happiness as the goal. Or we can starve our schools and colleges and take the road to despair, uneasiness, and eventual ruin.

I believe strongly in our system of education. Our liberal arts colleges, our free public schools, our privately supported institutions, all have their part to play in making democracy grow and flourish. We are engaged in a desperate struggle today, a struggle for our very existence. We are building a mighty arsenal—untold billions will go into making our country powerful enough to ward off any blows that may be thrust upon it.

But I am convinced that arms alone, no matter how powerful, are not enough. For today we are engaged in a different kind of battle, a battle that requires more than tanks and guns, ships and airplanes or even atomic bombs. We are engaged in a battle over men's minds. We are fighting an ideological war. In a war of ideas, it is necessary to reach the minds of men. If we are to win the war and then win the peace, we will need to convince men and women everywhere that the democratic way of life is the best way; that our vaunted freedoms are more than hollow shells. And we must convince peoples in all parts of the world that in a democracy they will find the freedom to live, to grow, to rear their children, to walk upright and unafraid.

And by contrast we must show what it means to be enslaved by the Communist system. We must explain in terms so that

all can understand the degradation, the fear, the slavery and the tragedy that follows the Communist way of life. Although strong armies are important, a strong belief in democracy is just as vital. An informed people will be friendly toward our world. Education can play a significant role in defeating the spread of communism. That our schools and colleges are important most people readily concede. But that they do not get the support they need is not as easily admitted. Here is the stark, unhappy truth: Our educational systems, from lower grades through our nationally known universities, are not getting adequate financial support. It is criminal to neglect our schools and colleges now, when we need them most. Of course, our defense budget has soared, and we must pare down nonessentials. But our schools and colleges are essential; they are more essential today than ever before in our long, proud history.

Of one thing can we be certain: As long as we maintain a strong system of education we will remain a free nation. An educated citizenry will be ready to live and die, if necessary, to keep communism from our shores. An educated, informed citizenry will want to build a stronger, better land, where equal opportunities for all will be the accepted way of life.

Where are we now? Let us all ask that question of ourselves, ask it soberly, in humility. We must be careful not to give up all we hold precious. There are mighty problems ahead. We will need, as never before, educated men and women to help solve those problems. At mid-century, we can honestly ask: What's wrong with American education?

I have just completed a Nation-wide survey to find out. Each of the 48 State commissioners of education were reached in this study.

In each of the 48 States, the New York Times key correspondents made an on-the-spot survey of school and college conditions. As the wealth of material began to flow across my desk, I suddenly realized that once again the Nation's public schools are in serious plight. The warm-mobilization program has taken its toll. Danger signals are flying everywhere. Too often they are not heeded. Many of the advances made in the last few years have been wiped away. An unwholesome deterioration has set in.

The schools are caught in a dangerous pincer movement. These major factors are involved: Increased enrollments, inflationary costs, lack of building materials, inadequate funds, and an acute teacher shortage. Can we afford more money for our schools in time of national emergency? My answer is a resounding yes. Money spent for education today will make us a stronger Nation, a more unified Nation, a Nation that will really become a bulwark of the democratic way of life, of the American traditions of freedom and liberty for all.

Most of us believe in education—in the abstract, not the concrete. Most of us will support education if it costs the other fellow something, not us. Education is such an intangible word. You can't see it, really. You can't weigh it, or put it in a bread basket and cart it home with you. We believe in education, yes; that is in the American tradition. Like Coolidge's sin, everybody is for more education. Reminds me of the story told of the hermit who lived in the Palisades. One Sunday afternoon he found a pocketbook after the picnickers had left. He threw out all kinds of paper, green and yellow, till he came to the bottom of the bag. He came up with a few coins and in great glee cried out: "Coppers, coppers." He could bite into the coins. We are spending millions of dollars for tangible things—for roads, for subways, for tanks and planes—they are tangible; but we are starving our children's

minds; you can't see inside a child's mind unless you have imagination. Now I am not even suggesting that we should spend less for our defense materials—the educational world is pretty much behind that program. But I am saying that it is not a question of tanks versus textbooks. I insist that we can have both. I insist that we need both if we are to remain strong and free.

Nothing is more important than our schools and colleges today. We cannot exist in the twentieth century with nineteenth century classrooms. We have taught men to fly in the air like birds, to swim under water like fish, but we cannot walk upright and unafraid on the earth like men. That is why we need stronger schools—to teach men to walk upright and unafraid.

It is tragic to find in a survey I made not long ago of 5,000 students of high-school age, that 95 percent said they would choose teaching as a last resort; they place medicine, dentistry, law, engineering, business, any or all professions, above teaching. A survey conducted recently by the school of education at Indiana University showed similar results—just about 4 percent of the high-school graduates had any interest whatsoever in teaching.

Why? Why do our young people boycott teaching? It is because the community has not been able to give education the financial support that it needs to be a top-ranking profession. Education is still a byproduct in American life. It is a luxury, sometimes even a marginal luxury.

But I don't want to give a discourse on the importance of education. I would be carrying coals to Newcastle were I to do that. All of you believe in education, all of you understand its value. All of you, too, would agree with the father of the public schools who said more than a century ago: "Schoolhouses are the first line of our defense." But believing all that, I must now recount a few of the weak spots in our educational system. These, I repeat, are conditions that came out of my recent survey, and I refer to February 1952, not last year or the year before that. These conditions are with us now, today, and unless we are careful, for a decade to come.

1. STUDENT ENROLLMENTS

Increased birth rates are jamming our schools beyond capacity. We are gaining children at the rate of 1,000,000 a year. Indeed, Dr. McGrath estimated that next year alone there will be 1,700,000 more children in our schools than there were this year. From about 25,000,000 elementary and high school children in 1950, we will have close to 35,000,000 in 1960. Nor is the end yet in sight. This year, you may have read, the birth rate has increased again—it has not leveled off, as had been expected. The Korean conflict may have had something to do with it; whatever the cause, the Nation's parents are working diligently to keep our schools filled with little children.

What does that mean? It doesn't take a professional educator or an amateur prophet to read the signs. It means more teachers, more equipment, more buildings, more money. No one is more important than our children. Yet we read that in some States as high as 30 to 40 percent of our young men are rejected today because of physical or educational deficiencies. This is a national disgrace. In World War II, 750,000 men were rejected for educational reasons alone—more than the number of men who fought in the South Pacific area.

In the words of that eminent educator, Dr. Willard E. Givens, executive secretary of the National Education Association: "What our Nation does about the education of the young determines whether we are developing national stamina or committing slow suicide." Is this simply an alarmist's point of

view? Not at all. It represents the considered judgment of educator and civic-minded statesmen everywhere.

2. TEACHER SHORTAGE

The Nation's public schools face a dangerous teacher shortage. We need at least 105,000 new elementary teachers each year, and we are training but 35,000. In 10 years, at the present rate, we will have a shortage of 700,000 teachers. And to make the situation worse, fewer students are entering the teachers' colleges—there has been a drop of 16 percent over last year.

The Times survey showed that every State, almost without exception, suffers from a teachers' shortage. Nothing quite as serious as this has hit the public schools in a generation. To make matters worse, the teachers are leaving the profession in greater numbers than any time since World War II. Then 350,000 of our best teachers left, never to return. Normally the schools can figure on a drop-out rate in the teaching staff of 6 percent. Now it is 12 percent—just double normal. For various reasons, about 100,000 teachers leave the profession each year. Of course, there is a normal rate of attrition of these teachers who retire, die, or become otherwise incapacitated. But over and above that, teachers are leaving to get higher paying jobs elsewhere. I would estimate that about 50,000 teachers are leaving annually because they are dissatisfied with the teaching profession. Add that number to those who refuse to go into teaching at all, and couple that with the increased enrollment, and you have a mighty serious problem.

Again I want to quote our educational commissioner: "The blunt fact is," warns Dr. McGrath, "unless we do something drastic, and immediately, to relieve the teacher shortage, a whole generation of American boys and girls will be short-changed in their right to obtain a fundamental education."

What will keep teachers in their classes? What will induce more of our brighter high school or college graduates to select teaching as a profession? Better working conditions, for one thing. And higher salaries, for another—money is not the sole consideration, of course, but it can become mighty important if you have to support a family. The teachers make, on the average, about \$60 a week. That is all over the United States, and includes that \$100 a week pay that some communities in New York pay. That means that many teachers get far less than \$60—as low as \$20 or \$25 a week. In some States teachers get from \$10 to \$15 a week. What can you get for that money? Your guess is as good as mine.

Except that I've seen the teachers that have been hired at these fantastically low salaries. Some have never gone beyond high school. Others are embittered, lost souls who are still living in the horse and buggy days. It is tragic to watch some of the teachers at work. They are making mental, emotional, and intellectual cripples of their charges. They rule with an iron hand and an incompetent mind. I saw one teacher grab a little 6-year-old tot, who accidentally spilt a glass of milk during luncheon time, shake the very life out of her, while the other children sobbed in fear. Then the teacher turned to me with a smile and said proudly: "I never spank 'em. I only shake 'em." Or the teacher who told her class of children during the civics period: "The men have ruined the Nation—but wait till the women get the right to vote." I could give you countless examples, but why go on? If you plant corn you will get a crop of corn. If you plant wheat, you will get wheat. And if you pay a teacher \$12.50 a week in the year of 1952 you will get children who are cheated of their democratic birthright.

3. BUILDINGS

The steel shortage has hit the schools a terrific wallop. There simply are not enough schools being built to take care of the grow-

ing enrollment, let alone replace obsolete, poorly equipped buildings. Almost unbelievable conditions exist in many communities. Even though more steel has been allocated to the schools this quarter than last, the crisis is growing. One out of every five schools in the country is obsolete, and the figures may be even more startlingly tragic by the end of the year. During the next 7 years, the Times study showed, the country will need to build 600,000 classrooms—but we won't get anywhere near that figure. What is the result? Children go to school in church basements, in cellars, in attics, in garages, in private homes, in firetraps, in abandoned inns. Why, I even saw children going to school in a morgue and undertakers parlor. Imagine, 8 years from now, when they have their class reunion. They will attend the reception of public school 8, the morgue. I saw a civics book with the 1899 imprint—those children don't know who won the Spanish-American War.

It is serious. To quote Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower: "To neglect our school system would be a crime against the future. Such neglect could well be more disastrous to all our freedoms than the most formidable armed assault on our physical defenses. Where our schools are concerned, no menace can justify a halt to progress."

The story is told of Rip Van Winkle, Jr. Envious of his father's fame and his 20 years of sleep, young Rip set off for the woods. He fell asleep, but for 100 years—five times better than his old man. When he awoke, he staggered to the road; to his astonishment, he found it was hard dirt that hurt his bare feet. Soon a strange monster, without any horses, came roaring at him. He dashed into the ploughed field to escape the noisy animal, but again he was dumfounded. A smoke-belching monster roared at him, without wheels, going on tracks. Young Rip dashed wildly to the top of the hill, threw himself under a tree, when a huge bird, roaring like thunders flew overhead. Frantic with fear, Rip dashed down the hill and saw a little red schoolhouse in the distance. He rushed to it, opened the door, threw himself on the bench, peacefully—nothing changed.

4. FINANCIAL SUPPORT

It costs a lot of money to run the country's school system. This academic year we will spend about \$5,000,000,000 for the operating expenses, and another \$1,000,000,000 for buildings. This is an increase of about 10 percent over the previous year—but it is an illusory increase. Inflation has eaten away the increase.

Yet the record amount spent for schools this year, in terms of 1952 dollars the percentage of national income that goes for public elementary and secondary schools is considerably lower than it was in the depression years. In 1933-34 we spent 4.32 percent of the national income for public school education. But in 1949-50, the last year available, the Nation spent only 2.57 percent.

Education does not get as much of the national income as do some of the luxury items. In 1950 the people of this country spent for alcoholic beverages \$8,100,000,000; for tobacco products, \$4,409,000,000; and for cosmetics, \$2,291,000,000. In other words, about \$15,000,000,000 for these three luxuries and a third of that amount for the education of 25,000,000 boys and girls of school age.

Money is reflected in teachers' salaries. On an average of \$60 a week will not get the best minds to go into teaching in any serious way. We must provide more money for education—if we spent as much as we did during the depression years of the thirties, on a relative basis, we would have mighty fine schools today.

Now, here's the problem: Where is the money? The local communities are in trouble—they have taxed real estate just

about as much as it can stand. If we go much higher locally we'll reach the law of diminishing returns. The States are in financial straits too. They are finding it difficult to make ends meet, and still provide schools with the funds necessary. And the Federal Government, you gentleman know, is running at a pretty substantial deficit. It is going to be difficult to extract much Federal funds in these days.

MONEY IS AVAILABLE THROUGH OIL

Fortunately, we do have a solution. It is a once-in-a-million answer to a difficult problem. Why not use the royalties from the Nation's undersea oil resources for our schools and colleges? This is probably the answer to a maiden's prayer that you read about in fairy books. The money is available, and it will not add to our tax burdens. I believe that the oil royalties will give us the opportunities to build better schools, to pay our teachers more, to strengthen the school systems and college programs from one end of the country to the other. If this amendment is passed, children for generations to come will rise and call you blessed. It takes imagination and vision, it takes courage and inspiration, to take this bold pioneering step. As Senator HILL has said: Oil for the lamps of learning. The money is there, right before us. We must not permit it to evaporate; we must not dissipate it. Nothing is more important than good sound schools and colleges. We need not fear the Communist menace if we are a well informed, educated, literate people.

No matter how trying the times, no matter how desperate our manpower shortage, we must not drain our classrooms and campuses dry. We dare not adopt a short-sighted policy in regard to the young men and women in our colleges and universities, in our elementary and high schools.

Let us face the future firm in the conviction that the democratic way of life is worth preserving; that freedom is worth saving; that spiritual values are worth defending, and that the democratic traditions are worth dying for, if need be.

Our schools and colleges need our financial support, if they are to survive the present crisis. I am pleading with you not to let them down. Thirty million boys and girls, young men and women, are at stake. Let us give them the kind of education of which a democratic Nation can be proud. We have the opportunity in our grasp. We must not let it slip away and forever after be lost.

WHY OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS ARE IN SERIOUS TROUBLE

(A series of six articles by Benjamin Fine, education editor of the New York Times, reprinted from the New York Times)

REARMING SAPS SCHOOL GAINS AS ROLLS AND COSTS STILL SOAR

Once again the Nation's public schools are in serious plight. Eighteen months of defense mobilization have taken their toll. Danger signals are flying everywhere, but often are not heeded. Many advances made in the first 5 years after World War II are being swept away.

The schools, like other aspects of civilian life, are beginning to feel the effects of the Korean conflict. As a result, they face a gloomy year. Many educators are worried lest the gloom continue for another decade.

Reports from State commissioners of education, correspondents of the New York Times in each of the 48 States, and interviews with leading educators all point to a downward trend.

The schools are caught in a pincers. Four major factors are involved: Increased enrollments, inflationary costs, lack of building materials, and an acute teacher shortage.

EDUCATORS BACK DEFENSE

Each is leaving its imprint on the schools, and on the children, too. It is not a question of tanks versus textbooks. Educators everywhere wholeheartedly support the Government's defense program. They applaud its efforts to make our democracy strong enough to withstand the challenge of Soviet communism.

They say their problem is not one of more ABC's or more airplanes. They insist our economy is strong enough to provide both. Moreover, they insist that it is just as true today as it was a century ago, when first proclaimed by Horace Mann, that schoolhouses are the first line of our defense.

In the last year it appears schools have made few advances and many backward steps. A number of communities report unexpected setbacks. Over the Nation 3,500,000 elementary and high-school children—one out of eight pupils in the public schools—are suffering an impaired education because of inadequate facilities. A year ago a Times study showed 3,000,000 children were being deprived of an adequate education. Thus there has been an increase of half a million in 12 months.

Incompetent teachers, poorly equipped classrooms, inadequate buildings, and poor supervision combine to cheat these hundreds of thousands of young people. The number of pupils on double sessions is growing steadily. An estimated 400,000 boys and girls are not getting a full school day—some are attending school even on triple-session schedules. They go half a day, or a third of a day. What this does to the morale of the children, the parents, the teachers, and the community is easy to imagine.

Educators emphasize that a child deprived of his schooling will be unable to regain the years lost—a child is six only once. One cannot postpone the growth of a pupil as one might postpone the building of a road or a garage.

This comment by Dr. Walter Maxwell, secretary of the Arizona Education Association, is typical: "At numerous schools I have seen children lined up in front of a schoolhouse door, marching in to take their places in the school as the first shift marched out—just like the changing of shifts in factories."

COSTS PROVIDE HEADACHES

Inflationary costs are a headache everywhere. School officials are haunted by rising prices. Everything they buy has gone up 50 or 100 or even 200 percent. Teachers are insisting they get their share, too. Cost-of-living bonuses have been handed out, but not fast enough, the teachers complain, to keep pace with rising food prices. As a result, morale in many communities is poor. Last spring the 500 teachers of Pawtucket, R. I., went on strike for several months, closing all of the city's schools. They won part of the increase they sought—but at a serious cost to the schooling of their pupils.

In other communities the struggle for higher salary schedules goes on in the board rooms rather than on the picket line. The New York City teachers recently ended a year-and-a-half boycott of extra-curricular activities. Judging from the reaction of their spokesmen, they are far from happy at the compromise salary increases.

But the salary issue is only part of the educational picture. Competition has arisen from higher-paying Government jobs, war-related positions and the demand for skilled and semiskilled workers in various industries. More teachers are leaving the profession today than at any time since World War II, when 350,000 departed, never to return.

Frequently the community must employ substandard, unqualified teachers because trained personnel are lacking. Many school systems report they are scraping the bottom of the barrel.

A smoldering discontent is detected. Never before have the schools been under such attacks. Frequently the controversy is artificially contrived, dishonestly designed to wreck the free public school. But there is enough discontent to make thoughtful educators and civic-minded citizens take stock.

The schools are in need of greater financial help—and they are unable to get it. Many communities already allocate a substantial part of their tax funds for the schools. Oftentimes real estate is taxed almost to the danger point. But education costs more today than ever before—and the money frequently is not there to spend.

ENROLLMENT A RECORD

Enrollment is at its highest peak. The Times survey indicates that the 1951-52 school enrollment is 26,525,115—representing a growth of 826,194 in a year. Most of this growth has occurred in the elementary grades, and more particularly the first grade. The private and parochial schools will add another 3,000,000 children or more, thus bringing the total elementary and secondary enrollment close to 30,000,000.

Moreover, the school rolls are going to increase for at least 8 years, more likely 10.

Next year—1952-53—the schools will enroll 1,700,000 more children than were registered this year. This is a tremendous number to absorb, particularly since most of the classrooms already are overcrowded. The peak will not be reached before 1957-58, if by then, at which time it is estimated the enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools will exceed 32,000,000, an increase of 6,000,000 over that of today.

Educators are deeply disturbed by this condition. Typical is the view voiced by Dr. Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education:

"The tidal wave of children bearing down on our schools bids fair to overwhelm us. We simply are not building enough new schoolhouses or training enough new teachers to meet the situation. We can't go on from year to year on the present makeshift basis without seriously undermining our whole public-school system.

"Unless the American people are prepared to take positive action to remedy these deficiencies, millions of children will continue to get a makeshift education."

Today many thousands of children are attending classes in school basements, apartment-house basements, empty stores, garages, churches, inadequate private homes, and even trailers. What is more, one out of five of the regular schools is either unsafe or obsolete.

BUILDING PROGRAM DELAYED

The defense program has played havoc with building plans. Even though the Nation spent a record \$1,200,000,000 for school construction in 1950-51, the communities were unable to keep pace with the number of children reaching school age. And in 1952, educators warn, steel and other critical materials will stymie the construction of many badly needed schoolhouses.

More than 1,000,000 school teachers are now employed, 46,000 more than last year. But with more than 1,000,000 children to be added each year for the next several years, the teaching rolls also will have to rise steadily. However, teacher-training institutions are not preparing enough men and women to do the job. All but four States report a teacher shortage even this year. They now could use 71,886 elementary and 15,121 high-school teachers.

Despite the need for teachers, young people seem to shy at entering the profession. The teacher colleges report a decrease this year of 16 percent in their entering classes. This means, in effect, that 4 years from now, when the school rolls will have increased by

more than 5,000,000, there will be fewer trained teachers.

Although the number of teachers holding substandard or emergency certificates has decreased by 5,053, there are still 66,354 of them in the school system. For example, 8,500 of the 24,600 teachers in Missouri are on emergency certificates, and South Dakota reports 1,796 of its 7,159 teachers do not hold regular licenses.

But the substandard certificates tell only part of the story. The National Education Association estimates that of the 600,000 elementary teachers in the public schools 300,000 do not hold college degrees—the minimum standard. Of this number, the NEA says, at least 100,000 are so inadequately prepared as to make their continued presence in the classroom dangerous to the mental and emotional growth of America's youth.

SLIGHT RISE IN SALARIES

The Times survey shows that teachers' salaries have risen slightly from an average of \$3,097 to \$3,290 annually. This \$193 increase, or \$3.71 a week, has been eaten up, the teachers declare, by increased living costs and higher taxes.

New York State, with an average annual teachers' salary of \$4,500, leads the country, followed by the District of Columbia with a \$4,300 average and California with \$3,967. Mississippi again is at the bottom of the list, paying its teachers an average of \$1,475 a year. Arkansas is next to Mississippi with \$1,700, and South Carolina is third from the bottom with \$2,130.

Six States pay some teachers less than \$20 a week—Mississippi, South Carolina, Kentucky, Iowa, Georgia, and Missouri. Ten others pay a minimum of \$20 to \$25 a week.

For the country as a whole, the public schools cost just a little more than \$5,000,000,000, a slight increase over that in 1950-51. Two States—New York and California—spend more than \$500,000,000 each. Because of spiraling costs, the funds needed to operate the public schools have risen higher than ever before. Educators complain, however, that the money they get cannot buy as much as their funds of as recently as 2 years ago.

Once more the effects of the Korean conflict can be seen in the classrooms of every community in the United States.

With Congress in session the NEA and other school organizations again will seek Federal aid for the public schools. One Member of Congress who has advocated a Federal-aid bill—Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama—asserted that the strength and security of the United States against aggression were bound inexorably to education. In a statement to the Times he observed:

"Education has given us the widespread, high level of intelligence and general competency by which we have built history's most perfect example of democratic government and preserved it against the winds of alien ideologies. We face a long period of international tensions and big armaments that may last perhaps for 5, 10, or even 20 years. In terms of sheer numbers of people our potential enemies hold a heavy advantage and our intelligence sources tell us that Russia and her satellites are feverishly working to train large numbers of skilled workers, instructed by industrial experts taken out of East Germany since the last war.

"We must fix our educational sights accordingly and insure that every American boy and girl has the opportunity for maximum development of his or her capabilities. Only in this way can we meet the need for more scientists, more engineers, more chemists, more physicists, more technicians, more skilled workers of every kind, more nurses and doctors and leaders in other professions and business."

The status of public school education, in contrast to conditions a year ago, as shown by regions in the Times survey, follows:

NEW YORK AND MIDDLE ATLANTIC

A heavy influx of young children has burdened schools in this region, and with no signs of relief in sight. Both New York and Pennsylvania report the largest enrollment increases. The registers of all the States and the District of Columbia have increased about 200,000. In face of the need for additional schools, all States report difficulty in obtaining building materials. Even so, most States are pushing school-building programs. New York intends to spend \$150,000,000 this year, compared with \$109,000,000 last year.

Salaries in this area are among the best. No State except Delaware can get a sufficient number of elementary teachers. Pennsylvania cannot obtain enough qualified secondary, as well as elementary school teachers. The region employs more than 10,000 teachers who hold substandard certificates, an increase over last year.

NEW ENGLAND

New England offers a contrasting picture as regards teachers' salaries. Three States—Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island—pay their teachers more than the national average, the other three do not. The salaries of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont are not much better than those in some of the southern States.

Only Connecticut, Massachusetts and Vermont record large enrollment increases. Almost all the States report conditions are better than a year ago, and the number of teachers on substandard certificates has decreased. All but Rhode Island need additional teachers, largely in the elementary grades—Massachusetts and Connecticut need 500 elementary teachers each.

SOUTH

Conditions in the South, although steadily improving since World War II, are still poor. Enrollment has been increasing in some States but tapering off in others. The problem is largely one of improving school services and raising teacher standards. Absenteeism and school drop-outs also are serious issues.

Many southern teachers are on emergency licenses, although in some States the number has decreased in the last year.

However, a large number of Southern pupils receive an impaired education. In Arkansas, Alabama, and Kentucky, 50 percent of the pupils are affected by substandard teachers, inadequate buildings, and double sessions. The lowest salaries in the country are paid in the South. Some teachers in Mississippi receive \$500 a year, in South Carolina \$600, and in Kentucky \$640. All States in the region fall below the national teacher's salary average.

SOUTHWEST

Enrollment increased in all States, with Texas showing a gain of 29,000 in a year. All States report conditions are either better or same as last year. Texas, however, has not increased its teaching staff despite its enrollment gain.

Salaries in New Mexico and Arizona are above the national average. Arizona, with \$3,800, ranks fourth. Only Arizona reports it can obtain all the teachers, both elementary and secondary, it needs.

MIDWEST

School conditions are generally reported as improving in the 12 States in the region. Enrollment is on the upswing, due in large part to growth of defense industries, particularly in Michigan.

Some glaring contrasts are evident. Michigan pays its teachers an average annual salary of \$3,700, seventh highest in the Nation, and Illinois, with \$3,600, is near the top 10. But North Dakota with \$2,162, South Dakota with \$2,185, and Nebraska with \$2,200 are forty-sixth, forty-fifth, and forty-fourth, respectively, in the national standing. Although in many States the number of substandard teachers is negligible, approximately one-third of Missouri's, one-seventh of South Dakota's, and one-eighth of Michigan's teachers hold substandard certificates. Large numbers of pupils are receiving secondary or impaired schooling.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN

The postwar birth rate is evident in the Rocky Mountain public schools. Colorado reports an enrollment increase of 5,000, Utah 7,000, Wyoming 3,000 and Nevada 3,000. Con-

sidering the total number of pupils in each State, the gains are significant.

With the exception of Utah, where about one-tenth of the teachers hold emergency certificates, the problem of substandard teachers has been largely solved. Utah is making improvements. The average salaries range from \$2,900 in Colorado to \$3,316 in Nevada. All report they can obtain secondary, but none can get elementary teachers.

NORTHWEST

Montana and Idaho have approximately the same number of teachers, 5,225 and 5,020, respectively, but Idaho has 16,000 more pupils. Idaho needs both elementary and secondary teachers while Montana needs only elementary. Both have many emergency teachers. There is a big difference in teachers' salaries. Montana has an average of \$3,415, Idaho, \$2,639.

FAR WEST

Teachers' salaries in the Far West are among the highest in the country. California, with a \$3,967 average, is second nationally and Washington, with \$3,690, is ninth; while Oregon, with \$3,650, is tenth.

California now has 63,800, the second largest staff in the country. The number of teachers on emergency certificate increased 7,600. Oregon has 1,800 of its 12,350 teachers on substandard licenses. All need elementary, but Washington also needs secondary teachers.

The Times study shows serious school problems in every section of the land. It also shows that not enough attention is paid to these problems. Soaring enrollments, fewer buildings, a shortage of teachers and a lack of money to keep pace with school needs have combined to bring another educational crisis.

While this crisis is not yet in the acute stage, our system of free public education may be endangered unless the schools receive more financial support.

SUMMARY OF CURRENT CONDITIONS IN NATION'S SCHOOLS

The present status of total teaching staff, emergency teachers, average annual salary and student enrollment for elementary and secondary schools, as reported throughout the Nation, follows:

	Number of teachers employed		Total student enrollment in public schools		Number of teachers with emergency certificates		Average annual salary	
	1951-52	1950-51	1951-52	1950-51	1951-52	1950-51	1951-52	1950-51
MIDDLE ATLANTIC								
New York.....	84,700	81,500	2,070,000	1,995,000	2,800	2,850	\$4,500	\$4,200
New Jersey.....	32,875	23,062	724,920	682,897	2,908	1,554	3,750	3,515
Pennsylvania.....	63,510	61,161	1,654,000	1,602,000	1,950	523	3,230	2,952
Delaware.....	2,050	1,931	47,405	45,448	38	50	3,710	3,654
District of Columbia.....	3,483	3,429	96,722	94,584	429	377	4,300	3,883
Maryland.....	13,436	12,495	369,958	348,497	2,035	2,014	3,841	3,586
NEW ENGLAND								
Maine.....	6,400	7,000	159,000	158,247	125	110	2,370	2,200
New Hampshire.....	3,136	3,100	73,500	72,600	215	490	2,880	2,750
Vermont.....	2,670	2,642	63,300	60,000	333	458	2,555	2,410
Massachusetts.....	25,750	25,396	625,000	618,889	300	3,355	3,493
Connecticut.....	12,458	11,501	307,900	283,563	631	680	3,700	3,500
Rhode Island.....	4,200	3,978	97,120	97,250	150	266	3,350	3,100
SOUTH								
Virginia.....	22,800	19,900	645,000	625,000	2,150	2,500	2,900	2,750
West Virginia.....	16,247	16,244	431,450	443,135	1,242	1,770	2,900	2,446
North Carolina.....	28,625	29,900	910,000	907,192	2,500	600	2,900	2,812
South Carolina.....	17,000	17,144	513,000	503,000	454	475	2,130	1,930
Tennessee.....	23,500	22,889	685,000	675,634	1,200	1,866	2,330	2,343
Georgia.....	25,225	24,000	787,580	782,952	670	1,000	2,400	2,020
Alabama.....	23,350	22,240	695,000	681,007	1,000	3,396	2,400	2,062
Mississippi.....	16,616	16,510	560,115	533,000	300	500	1,475	1,460
Arkansas.....	13,550	13,775	440,000	426,000	1,200	2,250	1,700	1,750
Louisiana.....	19,266	17,000	490,000	483,202	1,085	900	3,100	3,050
Kentucky.....	19,763	19,371	563,398	551,201	3,217	3,500	2,350	1,925
Florida.....	18,746	17,894	555,785	527,000	2,700	1,730	3,083	2,998
SOUTHWEST								
Oklahoma.....	19,600	18,867	519,750	499,311	350	3,167	2,800
Texas.....	46,640	46,042	1,478,150	1,449,114	1,100	1,188	2,900	2,939
New Mexico.....	6,100	5,273	155,500	150,000	50	50	3,540	3,006
Arizona.....	5,551	5,683	162,628	161,328	3,800	3,700

	Number of teachers employed		Total student enrollment in public schools		Number of teachers with emergency certificates		Average annual salary	
	1951-52	1950-51	1951-52	1950-51	1951-52	1950-51	1951-52	1950-51
MIDWEST								
Ohio.....	47,000	44,824	1,247,563	1,247,205	2,300	4,408	\$3,200	\$3,130
Indiana.....	26,000	23,900	714,000	690,000	700	1,000	3,450	3,250
Illinois.....	47,800	47,300	1,252,961	1,204,000	329	1,550	3,600	3,525
Michigan.....	41,000	39,000	1,100,000	1,066,000	5,000	4,500	3,700	3,500
Wisconsin.....	22,413	21,358	523,400	510,200	2,500	2,500	3,175	3,044
Minnesota.....	21,500	21,577	530,154	507,028	390	550	2,900	2,790
Iowa.....	27,488	22,088	491,000	477,720	493	493	2,967	2,689
Missouri.....	24,600	25,056	666,161	650,000	8,500	8,990	2,450	2,576
North Dakota.....	6,537	6,349	114,488	112,917	100	700	2,162	2,018
South Dakota.....	7,159	7,059	118,175	116,000	1,796	1,529	2,185	1,975
Nebraska.....	12,623	13,000	227,879	227,000	607	650	2,200	2,150
Kansas.....	17,892	17,563	345,000	325,030	21	175	2,775	2,558
ROCKY MOUNTAIN								
Wyoming.....	2,876	2,873	62,700	59,000	65	90	3,050	2,820
Colorado.....	10,500	10,477	237,090	232,655	650	830	2,900	2,892
Utah.....	5,855	5,033	163,437	156,407	570	739	3,170	3,038
Nevada.....	1,378	1,323	33,000	31,148	5	11	3,316	3,271
NORTHWEST								
Montana.....	5,225	5,086	112,456	107,456	625	735	3,415	3,090
Idaho.....	5,020	5,100	128,500	125,000	556	950	2,639	2,439
FAR WEST								
Washington.....	17,200	15,501	423,000	404,000	615	1,455	3,690	3,360
Oregon.....	12,350	11,491	293,030	272,215	1,800	1,800	3,650	3,368
California.....	63,800	61,123	1,855,000	1,735,291	7,600	6,655	3,967	3,667
Total United States.....	1,003,768	959,978	26,525,115	25,698,921	66,354	71,407	\$3,290	\$3,097

TEACHER SHORTAGE IS STILL A PROBLEM—105,000 MORE ARE NEEDED IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS YEARLY, BUT THEY GET ONLY 35,000—RURAL AREAS WORST HIT—CITIES, EXCEPT NEW YORK, ALSO ARE FEELING PINCH—SITUATION GRAVE, EDUCATORS WARN

This Nation's public schools face a dangerous teacher shortage. Although a minimum of 105,000 new elementary teachers are needed annually, only 35,000 are being trained. This means that within 10 years a shortage of 700,000 teachers will confront our schools.

With elementary school enrollment rising 1,000,000 a year, the teacher shortage will grow increasing acute. And to make the situation still worse, fewer students are entering the teachers' colleges this year than last.

Reports from virtually every State in a Nation-wide survey by the New York Times shows that school systems cannot get enough elementary teachers. Periodic warnings have been sounded by educators, but nothing has happened—the shortage continues.

Although the shortage is found everywhere, it is most acute in the rural areas, in the South, Midwest and Far West. But even the larger cities (with the exception thus far of New York) have begun to feel the shortage. Nothing quite as serious as this has hit the public schools in a generation.

THE NEEDS ANALYZED

To provide enough teachers to take care of the tremendous increase in elementary enrollment over the next 10 years—and to cover ordinary losses through death, resignation and retirement—the Nation will need at least 105,000 new teachers annually. There are 600,000 teachers employed in the elementary schools. The drop-out rate is 12 percent, or 72,000. The 1,000,000 additional children will require another 33,000 teachers annually. However, the teachers' colleges are supplying about 35,000 teachers annually.

Factors that have contributed to the teacher shortage include the increased pupil enrollment, the fact that teachers are dropping out of the profession faster than they are being replaced, and the attractiveness of opportunities in other fields.

"The blunt fact is," warned Dr. Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, "unless we do something drastic—and immediately—to relieve the teacher shortage, a whole generation of American boys and girls will be short-changed in their right to obtain a fundamental education.

"The thinner you stretch your available teaching staff to cover the unprecedented and inexorably increasing enrollments in our public schools, the less chance there is for a teacher to do a competent job of teaching. It is the child who inevitably suffers. And when the child suffers, the Nation suffers."

A critical need also exists in many parts of the country for the replacement of under-trained teachers. Of approximately 600,000 elementary school teachers in service, about one-half, or 300,000, measure up to the minimum requirement of a college degree. Two hundred thousand have completed 2 years of college; the education profession recognizes the necessity for retaining them, and steps have been taken to help them improve their academic training. However, 100,000 are so woefully undertrained as to make necessary their replacement at the earliest possible moment.

CONDITIONS IN HIGH SCHOOLS

At the high school level only small increases in total enrollment are foreseen until 1957. At that time, according to Dr. Ray C. Maul, research associate of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, a phenomenal increase may be expected. By 1960 the total high school enrollment will be at least 8,500,000, or one-third more than at present.

The country needs 48,000 qualified candidates each year to replace high school teachers who leave the profession for all reasons. By 1960 the annual need will approach 70,000.

The problem at the high school level is not total numbers of available qualified candidates. There is, however, an unbalanced distribution of the candidates among the various high school teaching fields—there are more social studies teachers than can be employed, while there continues to be a shortage of candidates for teaching home economics, girls' physical education, and library service.

Only 17 States require a college degree for the elementary school teaching certificate, 4 require 3 years of college, 1 State requires 2½ years, 16 require 2 years, 2 States require 1½ years, 7 ask for 1 year, and 1 State—Nebraska—does not require any college preparation.

Dr. Willard E. Givens, executive secretary of the National Education Association and generally recognized spokesman for the public schools, stressed that no nation either in peace or war can afford to neglect its home base—it must be particularly concerned

about health, competence and morale of its people.

"The main source of the continued strength and capacity of the American people," Dr. Givens said, "is to be found in our children and youth. What our Nation does about the education of the young determines whether we are developing national stamina or committing slow suicide."

One of the leading reasons for the grave teacher shortage, Times correspondents and education commissioners agreed, is the low pay of teachers. On the average, the classroom teacher gets about \$60 a week—the range goes from \$10 to \$125. In Mississippi, for example, where there are 16,000 teachers, only 105 get \$4,000 or more a year, while 4,243 get less than \$1,000.

In Mississippi, a sheet metal worker averages \$378 a month, a truck driver or plumber \$360, an electrical worker \$207, policemen and firemen, \$230, while teachers average \$122 (yearly average \$1,475).

It may seem unfair to take the poorest-paying State for comparison, but the Times survey showed similar disparities in the other States. Figures prepared by the New Jersey Education Association show that between 1939 and 1950 the per capita income of New Jersey residences increased 126 percent; in the same period average salaries of teachers increased 66 percent.

OTHER DETERRING FACTORS

Low salaries alone do not keep potential teachers from the profession. Teachers object to poor working conditions, to inadequate training facilities, to social pressures, and to a negative attitude on the part of the public. Teachers want to be a part of the community, but frequently find that they are not permitted to be active citizens. Some cities still refuse to employ married women teachers and require women to resign if they get married while in service.

The shortage is about evenly divided over the Nation. The Pennsylvania State Education Association, which has a membership of 55,000, reports that in its State the shortage is mostly in rural sections. Pittsburgh needs teachers for kindergarten and primary classes; it also needs specialists in the fine arts and crafts, in home economics, and for the mentally retarded.

In New York State there is a shortage of 750 teachers in elementary schools outside this city. The State education department expects this shortage to increase to about 1,150 in the current school year and to 1,750 in the 1952-53 year. The shortage is most

acute in suburban regions, which have been growing much faster than the cities in recent years. The main problems are in the Nassau, Westchester, Buffalo, Rochester, and Syracuse areas.

Shortages are growing in New England. Maine reports a shortage in the elementary division, particularly in the rural areas. Here, as elsewhere, the officials are up against the problem that teachers seek employment in the major cities or surrounding communities, which offer the best salaries and working conditions. By the time the cities and towns get their pick, the supply becomes exhausted before the rural areas are reached. It is estimated that 500 additional teachers could be used in Maine.

Connecticut, too, could use 500 additional teachers for the elementary schools. Massachusetts reports that its shortage is greatest from kindergarten through the first three grades. The State commissioner of education, Dr. John J. Desmond, pointed out that there is a trend in his State (it is found elsewhere) toward hiring liberal-arts-college graduates and retraining them for elementary teaching through special courses at teacher-training institutions.

REPORTS FROM THE SOUTH

Every Southern State reported a teacher shortage. Dr. Dowell J. Howard, Virginia superintendent of instruction, noted that 3,700, or 27 percent, of Virginia's 13,829 elementary teachers were not properly certificated for the grades they are teaching.

Fifteen percent of Virginia's teachers, or 2,119, hold local permits or emergency licenses. Most of the local-permit holders are high-school graduates only. North Carolina needs 3,000 qualified elementary teachers. Each summer the newspapers of the State carry want ads calling for teachers—mostly elementary teachers in rural areas. Georgia is in dire need of qualified teachers. The standard teaching requirement in Georgia is based on a bachelor's degree. Last year 44 percent of the State's 24,618 teachers had training below that level.

Florida will need 1,000 new elementary teachers each year for the next 4 years, plus replacements for those who for various reasons leave the teaching profession each year. A similar story comes from Texas. The shortage exists in urban as well as rural areas.

On the west coast the teacher shortage is a major problem—caused in large part by the influx of people to Washington, Oregon, and California. Mrs. Pearl A. Wanamaker, superintendent of public instruction in Washington, estimated that elementary schools in her State could use 1,050 more teachers right now, and the secondary schools 550 more.

Both Oregon and California reported growing teacher shortages. For the 1951-52 academic year, Oregon is issuing 1,800 emergency and substandard certificates. In California, the shortage exists at the elementary level and in specialized field—teaching the mentally retarded, physically handicapped, and in fields such as women's physical education, agriculture, and industrial arts. Last year the State had 7,600 teachers on emergency substandard certificates.

The teacher-shortage problem cannot be solved over night, educational spokesmen agreed. But they are concerned over the lack of interest in teaching among students and the public generally. A recent survey in Indiana showed that only 2 percent of a sampling of 4,000 high-school students were definitely committed to teaching as a profession, while another 2 percent thought they might enter the field. The vast majority of bright students in Indiana and elsewhere are staying away from teaching.

QUALIFIED TEACHER NEEDS BY STATES

Needs for qualified teachers in elementary and secondary schools have been estimated by the States as follows:

	Number of additional qualified teachers needed	
	Elementary school	Secondary school
MIDDLE ATLANTIC		
New York.....	3,000	500
New Jersey.....	2,800	100
Pennsylvania.....	900	1,000
Delaware.....	38	38
District of Columbia.....	290	90
Maryland.....	2,296	468
NEW ENGLAND		
Maine.....	200	75
New Hampshire.....	250	35
Vermont.....	240	125
Massachusetts.....	500	0
Connecticut.....	500	228
Rhode Island.....	0	0
SOUTH		
Virginia.....	1,500	300
West Virginia.....	1,159	100
North Carolina.....	3,000	0
South Carolina.....	320	4,940
Tennessee.....	1,000	200
Georgia.....	1,000	300
Alabama.....	6,891	1,111
Mississippi.....	1,900	100
Arkansas.....	1,000	500
Louisiana.....	450	150
Kentucky.....	3,033	434
Florida.....	2,700	100
SOUTHWEST		
Oklahoma.....	200	75
Texas.....	2,500	1,300
New Mexico.....	80	20
Arizona.....	0	0
MIDWEST		
Ohio.....	200	0
Indiana.....	700	100
Illinois.....	1,000	200
Michigan.....	5,000	200
Wisconsin.....	3,000	0
Minnesota.....	1,000	200
Iowa.....	444	49
Missouri.....	7,900	600
North Dakota.....	500	0
South Dakota.....	1,603	193
Nebraska.....	700	100
Kansas.....	0	0
ROCKY MOUNTAIN		
Wyoming.....	75	25
Colorado.....	2,500	0
Utah.....	300	50
Nevada.....	50	25
NORTHWEST		
Montana.....	277	180
Idaho.....	540	360
FAR WEST		
Washington.....	1,050	550
Oregon.....	1,800	0
California.....	5,500	0
Total United States.....	71,886	15,121

SHORTAGE OF STEEL HITS SCHOOLS HARD—ALLOTMENTS BY DPA FAR LESS THAN REQUESTED TO MEET BASIC REQUIREMENTS—MAKESHIFTS USED WIDELY—RAPIDLY RISING ROLLS PRODUCE CLASSES CALLED TOO BIG FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING

The steel shortage has hit the Nation's schools a terrific wallop.

Faced with soaring enrollments, overcrowded conditions and increased need for classrooms, the school systems are unable to build. Lack of adequate schoolhouses is listed as the No. 1 educational headache from one end of the country to the other.

Almost unbelievable conditions exist in many communities. Enrollments rising nearly 1,000,000 a year over the country, coupled with inflationary costs and the inability to get priorities on critical materials, have joined to make an alarming condition. Despite the efforts of highly placed educational officials, the steel needed for school construction cannot be obtained in quantities necessary to keep pace with student growth.

One out of every five schools in the country is obsolete—and this figure does not include the hit-or-miss contraptions now used as schools on an emergency basis.

During the next 7 years, a study by the New York Times shows, the country will need to build 600,000 classrooms, at a cost of \$20,000,000,000 (a classroom at today's prices costs from \$30,000 to \$35,000). Of the classrooms, 222,000 will be used for the increased enrollment, 126,000 will be for normal replacements and 252,000 to reduce the existing backlog. This means, in effect, that the Nation must build at least 80,000 classrooms a year for the next 7 years.

This will not be possible by any stretch of the imagination. The year 1950-51 was the peak year for building schools in this country—40,000 classrooms were constructed at a cost of \$1,200,000,000. Even at this tremendous rate, the Nation was getting only about one-half the buildings needed to meet current needs and wipe out the backlog.

LITTLE CONSTRUCTION THIS YEAR

But what about this year? Or the immediate years ahead? Judging from present indications, the Nation's school-building program will bog down seriously. It is doubtful if even the current inadequate rate of construction will be continued through 1952. The increased demands of the defense program for critical metals—steel, copper, and aluminum—make it appear unlikely that the needs for new school construction can be met in any substantial degree.

Under allotments made to the United States Office of Education by the Defense Production Administration, materials can be granted for the most part to buildings actually under way.

Few new schools will be built during 1952, unless more steel is made available. A report from Dr. Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, tells the story graphically. For the quarter beginning July 1, 1951, his office submitted an estimate of 192,000 tons of steel for basic requirements for all educational purposes. The amount allotted was 100,000 tons.

The difficulty was increased further when the last quarter allotment was made known—it was smaller than that for the third. Basic requirements totaling 196,000 had been requested—and 94,000 tons were assigned. After a vigorous appeal from the education office, 10,000 tons were added.

Bad as last year's situation was, this year's tends to be worse. Education allotment for the first quarter of 1952 is 97,000 tons, less than 38 percent of estimated total requirement of 225,000 tons.

According to Dr. McGrath, the first quarter is particularly critical for school construction because postponements then will mean the loss not merely of those months but of an entire school year.

Dr. McGrath stressed that with an allotment of 97,000 tons for elementary and secondary school buildings, priority will be given for construction now under way. The green light will be given also to communities that have serious overcrowding in elementary and secondary schools. It will continue to be necessary to defer approval of new buildings where the purpose is primarily to eliminate obsolete structures.

This is what has happened thus far: of 2,259 schools under construction in 1951, critical materials were allotted to 1,528; materials were not available for 831. Of the 1,001 applications for projects on which to begin construction during the fourth quarter of 1951, critical materials were allotted to 36—materials were not available for 915. Out of 3,260 applications for last year, steel went to 1,624 projects, and 1,636 were turned down.

WARNS ON WEAKENING SCHOOLS

Commenting on this situation, Dr. McGrath declared:

"No person questions that, in this period of international crisis, the requirements of the military and defense production for steel and other critical material should be met. But it is also imperative that we permit no further weakening of our public-school system.

"We can't put our youngsters in educational cold storage for the duration. Education must be obtained on a year-by-year basis. If a child is given second- or third-class education, or no education during his formative years, the handicap will remain for his entire lifetime. The education of our young people must remain squarely in the forefront of any long-term program for the defense of democracy. Otherwise we run the risk of losing one of the goals for which we are fighting."

Spiraling costs also have affected the schools seriously. For example, \$1,000,000 spent for school-building construction last year purchased only about as much plant as \$568,000 could have bought at the end of World War II or as much as \$446,000 could have purchased in 1940.

CLASSES MEET IN HOMES

As a result, our understaffed, badly housed schools faced an unprecedented period of shortage. It is doubtful that even half of the 80,000 classrooms needed in 1952 will be constructed. School systems everywhere are sending out S O S signals. They are utilizing every conceivable space to keep schools open. It is not unusual to find children attending school in private homes, church basements, store lofts or in one case observed by this writer, a section of an undertaker's parlor. Supplies, equipment, and textbooks are lacking in many schools.

State after State reports impaired educational facilities because of inadequate buildings. In Illinois, for example, the lack of steel and other critical materials is preventing the construction of a number of school buildings. Approximately 13,000 students in Illinois are enrolled in schools where double sessions are necessary, while 7,500 are attending schools in buildings that are definitely inadequate.

Pennsylvania likewise reports a serious building shortage, even though \$35,000,000 was spent for new buildings during the 1950-51 school year and \$40,000,000 will be spent during 1951-52. In this State it is estimated that 8,500 pupils will suffer an impairment in school this year because of double sessions or part-time instruction.

Elsewhere the situation is just as serious. Officials report that the building situation in Arizona is steadily worsening. There, as elsewhere, the same story is repeated: during the war, buildings could not be erected because of the shortage of materials. After the war, many school systems thought prices were going to drop and so considered it poor business to build until construction costs went down.

EIGHTEEN JERSEY PROJECTS DELAYED

Some States, such as New Jersey, declare that a substantial proportion of the students are suffering some impairment in their schooling because they are enrolled in classes too large to permit effective teaching.

In New Jersey 18 projects, including new schools, additions, and annexes, representing a total cost of \$4,257,225, are being held up by lack of steel or other critical materials. Unless more steel is allocated during the first quarter of this year, 31 additional building projects, representing a total cost of \$12,000,000, will not get started.

Despite a large building program, Maryland has been unable to keep pace with its still growing school enrollment. Now standing at 369,958, the enrollment is the biggest in the State's history. In the next 3 years it is expected to go to 437,000. Classes are being held in shifts and in stores, churches, basements, and other rented space.

Because of lack of funds, Alabama is not planning a general school-building program. A very limited amount of building commission funds is available for critical emergency school building needs. A survey is now being made to determine building needs with the hope that some provisions will be made to finance construction of school plants needed. As a result, Alabama officials report that 300,000 pupils are seriously in need of adequate housing. To do a half-way adequate job, the State would have to spend \$300,000,000 for school buildings.

WESTERN ROLLS ARE RISING

Reports from the Midwest and far West indicate that a huge building program will have to be started immediately if the enrollment increases are to be absorbed. A school building program is under way in Wisconsin. Most rural schools were constructed before 1900. It is estimated that \$234,000,000 must be spent in the next 20 years to provide adequate facilities. Lack of steel and other critical materials has crippled some of the current construction—about 25 projects are now being held up pending Federal priorities. During the current school year 24,000 pupils attended schools in substandard classrooms.

A school building survey, conducted by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, is in progress in Colorado, where the effect of lack of steel is beginning to be felt. Fifty-six thousand pupils will suffer impairment in their schooling this year as a result of inadequate buildings or double sessions. In the neighboring State of Utah, 15 new plants are underway or committed, mostly in defense areas or such major cities as Salt Lake City and Ogden. In a half-dozen school systems, gymnasiums and auditoriums are doubling as classrooms, while three towns utilize church structures.

And on the West Coast, the Times' study found that Washington's pupil school classrooms were more crowded than ever before. Construction has lagged consistently behind enrollment, in spite of a \$40,000,000 bond issue approved by the voters.

NEEDS OF WASHINGTON

Attendance State-wide in Washington jumped 19,000 this year over last, but only 350 new classrooms were made available. School officials say they need 3,000 more classrooms. The total cost of the building program in the next 10 years, assuming funds are available, is estimated at \$300,000,000. Because of the classroom shortage 42,000 pupils now are receiving instruction in temporary portables or in makeshift classrooms in basements, corridors, or other space not intended originally for classroom use.

In Oregon school administrators warn that a lack of steel and other critical materials has definitely slowed down the building program. If more steel is not available soon a considerable number of students will be on double sessions next fall. Similarly, California, now in the midst of a building program costing \$200,000,000 a year, cannot keep pace with its growing enrollment. The lack of steel for school construction has become serious in parts of California. A study indicated that California needed one-half of the

entire amount of steel allocated to the entire country for school-building purposes.

There does not seem to be an easy way out of the dilemma. The schools need more steel and other critical materials. So do hospitals and other welfare agencies, Government authorities retort. And, of course, the defense needs must come above all the others. Educators are hopeful that the Government will find some way to provide the schools with enough material and equipment to prevent the children from getting cheated.

INFLATION AFFECTS OUTLAY ON SCHOOLS—DECLINING DOLLAR VALUE PUSHES INCREASED OPERATION COSTS STILL HIGHER OVER NATION—RESISTANCE TO TAXATION—REVISION IS SOUGHT FOR ARCHAIC LEVYING—BONDS FOR BUILDING FACE LOCALITY OPPOSITION

It costs a lot of money to run the country's school system. More buildings, more teachers, more equipment, more supplies, and more children give school administrators a continuous headache as inflation diminishes what available funds can accomplish.

The New York Times survey, which obtained data from the 48 States and leaders in American education, shows that this year the public schools will cost the taxpayers about \$5,000,000,000 for operating expenses and \$1,000,000,000 for buildings. This is an increase of nearly \$400,000,000 in operating expenses, but it is illusory because of the inroads of inflation.

For the Nation as a whole the estimated expenditure for a pupil in average daily attendance increased from \$206 in 1950-51 to \$216 in 1951-52. However, the National Education Association notes that the purchasing power of the \$216 in prewar dollars is about \$115.

New York, with an expenditure of \$325 for each pupil, leads the other States and is followed by New Jersey with \$312. Other States spending more than \$275 include Oregon, Wyoming, Montana, and Delaware. Mississippi is at the bottom of the list with \$88. States spending \$150 or less are Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

LESS OF INCOME FOR SCHOOLS

Despite the record amount spent for schools this year, in terms of 1952 dollars, the percentage of national income that goes for public elementary and secondary schools is considerably lower than it was in the depression years. In 1933-34, according to United States Office of Education figures, 4.32 percent of the national income was spent for public school education. But in 1949-50 (last school year available) the country spent only 2.57 percent.

Although the mounting expense of running the public school system is criticized in some quarters, education does not get so much of the national income as do some of the luxury items. For example, in 1950 the people of this country spent \$8,100,000,000 for alcoholic beverages, \$4,409,000,000 for tobacco products and smoking supplies, and \$2,291,000,000 on cosmetics and beauty parlor services.

During the comparable period (1950-51) they spent \$4,836,213,084 for the upkeep of the public schools. In other words, about \$15,000,000,000 went for these luxuries and a third of that amount for the education of 25,000,000 boys and girls of school age.

Informed educators observe that the \$6,000,000,000 expended for the operation of schools and construction of buildings during 1951-52 will buy about half that amount in goods and services, measured in terms of the 1939 dollar. In many communities the schools take the lion's share of tax moneys, but even then the costs mount more rapidly than the funds allocated.

NEW MONEY SOURCES SOUGHT

Various suggestions have been made for financial assistance to the schools. More State aid is sought in many communities. Bond issues and increased tax millage keep many citizens aware of the needs of their schools.

The controversial issue of Federal aid to the public schools is still one of the must items on the agenda of many school organizations. The National Education Association intends to continue its fight to get a bill enacted in the present session of Congress. But the prospect for the measure does not appear too bright.

School financing is complicated by inflation. The teachers are constantly seeking higher salaries to compensate for cost-of-living increases. The cost of all materials and equipment used by the schools has gone up sharply, sometimes double or more 1940 prices. Here is the way Dr. James L. McCaskill, director of the NEA Division of Legislation and Federal Relations, puts it:

In 1950-51 the average salary for public school instructional staff members was \$3,080; the average employed person was earning about \$3,200, or 4 percent more. However, in 1939 the average teacher's salary of \$1,420 was 12 percent higher than that of employed people in general. If teachers' salaries were in the same relative position to those of all other employed persons today as they were in 1939, they would average \$3,580, or \$500 above their 1950-51 level.

If the education dollar continues to shrink, warns Dr. McCaskill, this Nation will be unable to obtain the teaching force and build the schools required to give adequate education to the growing number of school children.

CONDITIONS FACED BY STATES

States everywhere, according to reports from the New York Times correspondents, are finding the growing school costs burdensome, yet somehow they must continue to meet them.

Vermont is a typical State in this connection. The operating expenditure for public schools is about \$13,000,000 and is increasing about 10 percent annually. Resistance to bond issues for school buildings is becoming apparent; some communities bring up such proposals three or four times before they are accepted.

Local school taxes in Vermont have increased by a third in recent years and, since they are largely levied on property, the increase is becoming burdensome. State aid for education has increased, but does not absorb the major financial pressure. State or Federal aid for school buildings is generally felt necessary if the needs for school housing are to be met.

Three years ago the New Jersey public-school budget was in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000. Now it is close to \$200,000,000. Of the \$531,000,000 collected in taxes in New Jersey in 1950 to maintain governmental services more than a third was used to pay for the education of children. About 85 percent of this amount was realized by locally imposed property taxes, the remainder by State aid distributed among localities.

Some States find that an archaic tax structure is at the bottom of their educational troubles. For the most part, schools draw their funds from property taxes rather than general taxes. Several educators have proposed that the tax structure be overhauled and modernized in light of current needs.

RISING BUDGETS IN MIDWEST

Serious problems arise when the operating budget for schools mounts too rapidly. For example, the total operating expenditure for public schools in Wisconsin in 1951-52 was \$117,000,000, in 1950-51 it was \$108,350,000, and the year before it was \$91,000,000. School taxes are separate items and they have

increased greatly. An archaic property tax carries 75 percent of the school costs in the State.

In the last session of the legislature the Wisconsin Farm Bureau, a member of the joint committee on education in Wisconsin, introduced a selective 2-percent sales tax bill, the proceeds of which were to be used for school purposes to relieve the property taxpayer. It was badly defeated. There is some resistance to bond issues because of high construction costs and shortage of materials. The disposition is to "make do" until this situation straightens out.

Minnesota reports that its school expenditures have more than doubled since 1941. In that year the total for maintenance was about \$46,000,000; this year it is estimated at \$125,000,000. Educational needs account for more than half of all legislative appropriations.

In Kansas \$85,000,000 is available for the public schools this year, an increase of \$12,000,000 over the previous year. Most communities have approved bond issues for new school buildings by substantial majorities.

FACTORS IN VIRGINIA INCREASE

School expenditures have risen rapidly throughout the South, although this section as a whole does not support its public schools as liberally as some other areas.

In Virginia the total operating outlay for 1951-52 is estimated at \$85,000,000 whereas 5 years ago it was \$52,000,000. For the biennium starting July 1 the State board of education is asking for \$91,303,675 from the State's general fund for school operations—an increase of 33 percent over 1950-52.

The reasons cited by Virginia for this projected increase—and these reasons hold true elsewhere—are expected enrollment increase of 112,000 in 2 years, need to obtain 500 more teachers, and necessity for paying better salaries to attract and hold good teachers.

West Virginia, with a total operating budget for schools of \$70,000,000, finds that resistance to bond issues is increasing, particularly in rural areas. For several years, all schools have levied the maximum allowed for counties; 39 of the 55 counties have approved excess levies permitted by the constitution.

School budget difficulties are aggravated by an archaic tax structure, especially unequal assessed valuations. According to the State tax commissioner, real estate is assessed at only 32 percent of the appraised valuation.

Kentucky is having difficulty because of its increased school budget. There is definite resistance in communities to bond issues for buildings. Only 4 of 10 localities voting on a special school building fund tax in the November election were successful. School budget problems are aggravated by a generally low assessment of real property and an assessed valuation maximum tax rate of \$1.50 on \$100.

The situation is appreciably better on the West Coast than in the South. California, with a total operating budget of nearly \$500,000,000, has had success with almost all the bond issue elections. School taxes have gone up generally in recent years, both in total amounts collected and in rates. On the whole the citizens of Oregon have been generous in the financial support of their schools. School taxes have increased 400 percent since 1940-41.

The State of Washington, with a current operating budget of about \$100,000,000, is preparing for a huge enrollment increase within the next 10 years. A \$40,000,000 bond issue for school buildings was approved by the voters in 1950. Generally communities with pressing school problems are forced to resort to special levies because of a constitutional provision limiting taxes to 40 mills on each dollar of assessed valuation, the valuation to be 50 percent of the prop-

erty's true and fair value. School officials feel this limit is outmoded and should be revised.

Rising operating expenditures do not necessarily mean more money for the schools in terms of purchasing power, the Times study shows. Frequently the additional funds are barely enough to keep pace with the increased costs for school operation and maintenance. Inflationary costs have played havoc with the normal operation of the schools.

COST OF OPERATING NATION'S SCHOOLS

The current operating expenditures of the public schools compared with cost a year ago are estimated by States as follows:

	Total operating expenditure	
	1951-52	1950-51
MIDDLE ATLANTIC		
New York.....	\$590,000,000	\$563,000,000
New Jersey.....	196,000,000	170,000,000
Pennsylvania.....	314,842,579	297,506,508
Delaware.....	11,046,455	10,906,200
District of Columbia.....	22,135,400	21,211,447
Maryland.....	89,068,221	74,322,145
NEW ENGLAND		
Maine.....	26,000,000	26,438,670
New Hampshire.....	15,100,000	15,600,000
Vermont.....	13,000,000	11,481,314
Massachusetts.....	153,240,585	134,381,130
Connecticut.....	70,000,000	65,130,000
Rhode Island.....	22,100,000	20,429,018
SOUTH		
Virginia.....	85,000,000	80,194,839
West Virginia.....	69,679,519	58,344,398
North Carolina.....	122,000,000	121,000,000
South Carolina.....	62,000,000	54,000,000
Tennessee.....	80,450,000	76,451,451
Georgia.....	77,757,830	76,807,674
Alabama.....	76,000,000	73,000,000
Mississippi.....	40,000,000	39,074,159
Arkansas.....	40,000,000	40,000,000
Louisiana.....	91,000,000	89,095,580
Kentucky.....	62,755,055	63,000,000
Florida.....	82,000,000	78,842,461
SOUTHWEST		
Oklahoma.....	83,677,000	80,000,000
Texas.....	254,000,000	255,828,000
New Mexico.....	28,330,000	26,984,653
Arizona.....	31,213,889	30,500,000
MIDWEST		
Ohio.....	270,000,000	244,628,651
Indiana.....	150,500,000	141,457,000
Illinois.....	288,000,000	273,000,000
Michigan.....	250,000,000	240,000,000
Wisconsin.....	117,000,000	108,350,000
Minnesota.....	125,000,000	115,000,000
Iowa.....	117,000,000	100,433,225
Missouri.....	103,000,000	98,837,035
North Dakota.....	23,942,130	21,433,000
South Dakota.....	39,800,000	27,871,880
Nebraska.....	44,200,000	41,000,000
Kansas.....	85,000,000	73,000,000
ROCKY MOUNTAIN		
Wyoming.....	16,400,000	14,270,806
Colorado.....	55,000,000	48,357,800
Utah.....	28,300,000	27,578,644
Nevada.....	6,516,352	6,241,840
NORTHWEST		
Montana.....	25,500,000	23,651,144
Idaho.....	23,700,000	20,642,955
FAR WEST		
Washington.....	97,466,000	93,000,000
Oregon.....	73,104,839	65,661,290
California.....	475,000,000	410,208,167
Total.....	5,213,525,854	4,836,213,084

GRASS-ROOTS MOVE ON TO AID SCHOOLS—5,000 CITIZENS' GROUPS HAVE BEEN ORGANIZED IN LAST FEW YEARS TO IMPROVE FACILITIES—EDUCATORS PRAISE ACTION—SURVEY, HOWEVER, NOTES THAT ATTACKS ON SYSTEM ARE GROWING ACROSS COUNTRY

As never before in the past, the citizens of this country are concerned about their pub-

lic schools. Throughout the Nation local citizens' groups are being founded to work for better school facilities for all the children.

Within the last few years an estimated 5,000 citizens' organizations, consisting of every segment of the community, have been organized. This is a genuine grass-roots movement and has its origin in the desire of the community to provide better schools for its youth.

The New York Times survey, which reached each of the forty-eight State commissioners of education, and obtained on-the-spot reports from Times' correspondents in each State, found that the participation and interest of the public in the schools is nationwide. Because more money is being requested, and because conditions have deteriorated in many instances as a result of increased enrollments, the public has been placed in a position where its aid is needed.

Educators cite the tremendous growth of citizen interest as one of the most encouraging developments of the last 5 years. They recognize that the closer association that is established with the local school authorities, the better education the children will receive. School officials stress that there is no more effective channels through which the Nation can strengthen and develop the entire structure of our public-school system than through citizen participation.

The citizens' movement receives support and impetus from the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, headed by Roy E. Larsen, president of Time, and consisting of national leaders of all walks of life. The commission, which will hold its annual conference in St. Louis next Friday and Saturday, works closely with 1,600 local citizens' groups. These groups are in the forefront in their own communities in the campaign for improved schools.

THREE ELEMENTS ESSENTIAL

New citizen groups are being formed almost every day. The commission has found that these three elements in the formation and program of such groups are essential: First, that the group be fully representative of the people in the community; second, that it interest itself in the over-all school program rather than in any one particular aspect in its study; and third, that while maintaining its independent view, it cooperate fully with school authorities.

In thousands of communities these new citizens' committees have brought the responsible people of the community closer to the school administrators. It has brought them closer to the schools themselves and has helped solve some of the vexing problems of our day. Mr. Larsen puts it this way:

"The outstanding fact is that these well-organized, representative groups have provided an effective channel for the tremendous and ever-increasing interest of responsible citizens in the improvement of their local schools. It is a phenomenon on the American scene in which educators are taking great hope."

Various national groups, such as the American Legion, the National Congress for Parents and Teachers, the Junior Chamber of Commerce, and others have taken an active interest in the plight of the schools. At its session last month, the 160-man board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers unanimously adopted a resolution that said that "business enterprises must find a way to support the whole educational program effectively, regularly, and now."

Frequently the citizens' groups, whether on a local or State level, have proved successful in drawing the attention of the public to the school needs. For example, Florida's minimum foundation program, which put a floor under the funds given to educa-

tion, was the result of a citizens' committee work. The passage of the Florida program resulted after a 2-year study by the citizens' committee.

Illinois boasts a large number of citizens' school committees, most common of which is the advisory committee in agricultural education. Last year 216 schools had at least 1 of these groups. Others have been organized to raise funds and plan buildings. Many young persons have been brought in through school-district reorganization in the State, and they have been working on school boards advising on various problems. There are more than 500 citizens' committees, of which half have been successful in raising funds for bond issues. Considerable enthusiasm exists in the State for school projects, and there is no trouble getting people to serve on committees.

Virtually every community in Michigan has established a citizens' committee. These are fostered by the area studies program adopted by the State legislature in 1949, which is designed to encourage the people of any area to make a thorough study of educational conditions and needs. Boards of education have been active in setting up these groups to educate the citizenry toward acceptance of school improvement projects.

More than 50 citizens groups are at work in northern California in the interest of better public schools. Many of these are associated with the National Citizens Commission for Public Schools, and are composed of members representing the professions, labor, industry, education, and other segments of the community.

In almost every area of Washington State citizens' committees have been established to work with school officials. Most are successful. Getting out the vote on school levies has been one of the toughest obstacles for citizens' committees to overcome—the special elections seldom draw anywhere near the votes a general election does when national, State or county officials are on the ballot.

ATTACKS ON SYSTEMS GROWING

Despite the vast citizen interest some segments of the community are opposed to the school programs and to public schools generally. A concerted attack is being made on the Nation's school system. Many communities are in the midst of controversies at this moment. In others, the critics of the public schools have sowed seeds of distrust and have occasionally disrupted the community and harmed the schools.

Reports from correspondents of the Times indicate that attacks on the public schools appear in few sections, but the number of these attacks is growing rapidly. For the most part, the criticism is dishonest and is used to cloak ulterior motives. Sometimes the objective is to reduce taxes. At other times it is to "return to the three R's." Still again, the criticism is leveled against a teacher or superintendent who may be considered too "progressive."

A counterattack against those who attack the schools dishonestly has been spearheaded by the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, an affiliate of the National Education Association. In a recent pamphlet, *Danger, They're After Our Schools*, the commission warns that our American public schools are in serious danger. The pamphlet, which was sponsored by several national groups, declares that a Nation-wide campaign is underway that threatens to wipe out many of the advances the schools have made in the last 50 years.

"This is something quite apart from the honest effort of parents, teachers, and other civic-minded citizens to improve school programs and facilities," the educators warn. "In contrast to valid criticism and genuine concern for our children's well-being, that is a malicious campaign. It is so cleverly dis-

guised that honest citizens are taken unaware."

M'GRATH SCORES REACTIONARIES

Dr. Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, declared that the opposition to modern education is being stimulated by the more reactionary elements who are against any development in education that broadens its scope to serve more genuinely democratic needs. He added:

"The appeal to ignorance and prejudice, in all its ugliest manifestations, is being used to discredit this form of modern education, together with the same sort of 'smear campaign' that is increasingly being directed, within our body politic, against almost any form of liberal opinion."

Four basic arguments are used by those who attack the public schools: The three R's—reading, writing, and arithmetic—are being neglected; the schools use Communist-influenced textbooks or employ subversive teachers; too much money is paid for the upkeep of the schools, and the schools have failed to teach properly. These arguments are exploited and frequently misused.

For the last 2 years, major attacks on the public education system have been under way in both Pasadena and Los Angeles, Calif. The pattern has been the same in both cases. First a self-appointed committee involving relatively obscure citizens mounted an attack on the familiar grounds of Red influence, poor training of pupils, frills like vocational courses, allegedly heinous combination of history, geography, and economics, and an asserted return to the three R's. In Pasadena the original committee, led by an osteopath, resulted in the temporary defeat of a badly needed school bond issue (subsequently approved) and the dismissal of Dr. Willard E. Goslin, superintendent, in November 1950.

In Los Angeles the campaign has developed more slowly. A citizen school committee, headed by a film studio construction worker, was formally incorporated in May 1950, several months after its first appearance. It has urged citizens to sign this creed:

"I think these subjects should be emphasized: reading (use of phonetics from the beginning); spelling (more drill), handwriting, grammar composition, arithmetic drill (in early grades), history, geography and literature, with the last three taught as separate subjects. I believe in more classroom discipline, report cards with grades, standard tests for promotion."

If put into practice, the above suggestions would turn the educational clock back a good half century.

Mrs. Pearl A. Wanamaker, superintendent of public instruction in the State of Washington, believes there is a "deliberate campaign" to discredit public education in that State. She says it apparently is part of a movement gaining Nation-wide momentum. The bulk of the criticism—and the most effective—has been from taxsaver groups that constantly issue statistics showing how much the schools are costing the public.

The name of the National Council of American Education, and its director, Allan A. Zoll, is mentioned frequently by the Times correspondents. This is the organization that has been charged by the National Education Association as being dishonest in its criticism of the public schools, and disruptive in its purposes.

For example, in the campaign leading up to a school board election last summer at Ferndale, a suburb of Detroit, the president of the school board was defeated. A Zoll pamphlet, *Progressive Education Increases Juvenile Delinquency*, was tucked under the windshield wipers of automobiles parked near a school during a prelection meeting of the parent-teachers' association.

Evidence exists that some of the material used in attacks in other States are showing up in Florida. Edward Henderson, executive secretary of the Florida Educational Association, warned that "Florida is the next target." He said he has been informed that representatives of Mr. Zoll's group were coming this way. School officials are now making an effort throughout the State to alert the public of the impending attack.

ENGLEWOOD ATTACK BEATEN

Nearer home, attacks on the public schools have been made in Englewood, N. J., and Scarsdale, N. Y., and Port Washington, Long Island. The public schools of Englewood were under attack last winter and spring in a movement headed by Frederick G. Cartwright, Englewood resident, said to be a financial supporter of Mr. Zoll. A public meeting arranged by the Englewood Anti-Communist League, of which Mr. Cartwright is the founder and president, had Mr. Zoll as one of its speakers. After his speech, Mr. Zoll promised to return to Englewood to conduct an investigation of alleged "Red" infiltration in the schools.

Counter-attack has been swift and vocal in Englewood. The Cartwright movement was stopped in its tracks by the formation of the Englewood Citizens Union, an organization of about 100 militant citizens. This group has representatives at all meetings of the Board of Education to stymie any statements or moves the Cartwright group might make. It furnished free legal aid to teachers who had been named by Mr. Cartwright.

Since 1949 the Scarsdale schools have faced vitriolic organized attacks. The attacks have been based almost exclusively on charges that books by known Communists and by left-wing followers have been placed on school library shelves and sometimes used as textbooks, that Communist sympathizers have been allowed to lecture in public schools, and that the board is derelict in not investigating the entire faculty to determine loyalties.

Scarsdale voters are on the side of the board by overwhelming numbers. No member of the opposition has been elected to the board. One of the opponents who ran was defeated for board membership by a vote of 1,150 to 40.

The organized school attacks may cause temporary harm, but the Times study shows that in the long run the general public comes to the defense of the public schools wholeheartedly. The free public schools are in the American tradition.

DOUBLING OF FUNDS FOR SCHOOLS URGED—EDUCATORS FAVOR TEN BILLION FOR NEW BUILDINGS, HIGHER PAY FOR BETTER TEACHERS—TO MAINTAIN STANDARDS—MORE CENTRALIZING AND SMALLER CLASSES ADVOCATED IN STRESS ON INDIVIDUAL PUPIL'S NEEDS

The war mobilization program has left its impact upon the Nation's public schools.

Decreased purchasing power, increased enrollments and a shortage of qualified teachers have combined to check the gains made soon after World War II. Many pressing problems still exist and are getting worse.

Reports from the 48 States, in a survey made by the New York Times, indicate that the schools now have difficulty in getting and keeping competent teachers. A program to induce young persons to become teachers is essential if standards in the teaching profession are to be improved. The public generally must accept responsibility for the financial support of a strong school system.

The Nation's State education commissioners list the 10 most pressing needs that confront the schools today. If put into practice, the 10-point program would cost considerable money. Some educators estimate that education should receive about twice what it spends now—a total of \$10,000,000,000 for operating expenses instead of the \$5,000,000,000 it now gets.

PRESSING NEEDS ARE LISTED

The pressing needs, as listed by leading educators, are:

1. More and better school facilities, new buildings to accommodate the rise in enrollment and to replace obsolete schools.
2. More and better teachers, to eliminate those now serving on emergency certificates who cannot meet accepted standards, to reduce the high pupil-teacher ratio, and to meet the needs of the rising enrollment.
3. More financial support for education, particularly from the local community, so that new buildings can be constructed, additional teachers acquired, salaries raised and needed improvements made.
4. Better salaries for teachers and administrators, to attract personnel to the field and to meet the competition of the higher wages offered by private industry and business, as well as to offset the rising cost of living.
5. The reorganization and consolidation of school districts, particularly in the rural areas, so that children in all areas can receive an adequate education.
6. Smaller classes to reduce pupil-teacher ratio and to insure that the individual needs of all pupils are not overlooked.
7. Special services for "exceptional" children—the retarded and the gifted.
8. More supplies so that children can get the full benefit of the school curriculum.
9. More and better school transportation in rural areas to improve attendance and curb dropouts.
10. Better working conditions for all school employees.

There are other problems, of course, but these are the foremost ones. The educators recognize that, because of the priority taken by our defense needs, many of the "musts" listed by the profession will have to wait. But they are worried lest the wait be long, and that in the meantime the schools will suffer irreparable damage.

WELFARE AIDS SUGGESTED

The Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association holds that the welfare of pupils and the welfare of teachers are so closely bound together as to be practically identical. Therefore, it believes that, to provide the best education for children, these conditions are essential:

1. The employment of adequately trained teachers, with much attention given to the work during the probationary period.
2. The adoption of a policy against discrimination in any manner on account of grade level or subject taught, marital status, age, sex, creed or color.
3. A teacher-pupil ratio of 1 to 25 based upon persons actually engaged in teaching and total student enrollment.
4. A single salary schedule for classroom teachers providing a minimum salary of \$3,200 for teachers with a bachelor's degree and salaries of at least \$8,000 for teachers with 5 years of training and 15 years of experience.

In many instances, teacher morale is lower now than it was a year ago. This reacts upon the students who might plan to become teachers. Perhaps the lowered morale is partly to blame for the fact that the teachers colleges this year have enrolled 15 percent fewer freshmen than a year ago.

On the question of teacher morale, Dr. Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, holds that the primary cause of our inability to attract more young people to the teaching profession, and hold them, is our failure to pay them enough. He warns that until we can establish better salaries, it is doubtful that we shall be able to secure the full complement of qualified teachers we so sorely need.

However, there are factors other than the economic that cause teachers to abandon their profession. Many teachers are over-

worked to the point where they can no longer take it.

Others are unwilling to accept the limitations on their personal freedom imposed by certain communities. Still others find that conditions in many school systems act to curb their natural enthusiasm and zeal for doing a good job.

"There is no doubt that really thorough-going research into the teacher shortage is long overdue," observes Dr. McGrath. "Such a study should explore all phases of the matter—economic, social, and psychological—and attempt to uncover the root causes. We need to know all the reasons why people go, or do not go, into teaching and why they stay or leave it. We need to know what makes a good teacher and what makes a bad teacher. And we need to know what can be done to develop the morale of the profession so that those who enter it will have no cause to regret their choice."

On the whole, the States agree as to the most pressing needs in the education profession. They agree with Delaware that more funds for schools are imperative. The unified school legislative committee in Delaware, which comprises 20 lay and professional groups interested in education, stressed that a change in the tax set-up was needed so that more funds can be provided.

Many educators say more State aid, or some form of Federal aid, is the answer. Practically all teachers, principals, and officials of the State board of education are convinced that more State aid is the key to the solution of all major educational problems in New Jersey.

AID FOR HANDICAPPED URGED

Without greater appropriations to construct new schools, employ more teachers, or pay higher salaries, no important improvement in education can be realized in New Jersey or elsewhere.

Educators in Massachusetts say the teacher shortage, need for more adequate salaries, need for new buildings to take care of enrollments where they have increased, and the replacement of antiquated buildings are the most pressing needs for the improvement of education in their State. Dr. John J. Desmond, Jr., Massachusetts State commissioner of education, called also for more equality of education, so that the handicapped would have an equal chance with the healthy to learn how to be self-supporting.

Out of seven representative superintendents in North Carolina polled on the question of their schools' most pressing needs, five listed "more funds" and the other two said "more superior teachers who set the standard for teaching in the school." According to Thomas D. Bailey, State superintendent of Florida, teachers and school buildings are the two most pressing educational needs. It will require \$45,000,000 to bring the Negro school buildings and facilities up to the standard of schools for white children. Based on the United States Supreme Court decision concerning education for Negro children, Florida can expect to be called upon to meet this expenditure in the near future. Other Southern States are in a similar position.

The most pressing problems faced on education in Texas are mounting enrollments, the building shortages, scarcity of qualified teachers and insufficient school funds on the local level. Factors pointing up these problems are reactivation of military installations, speeding up production of defense industries, and a climbing birth rate. Texas is still trying to catch up with its building program after the building dearth during the war period. The problem is becoming acute with scarcity of materials, and high costs.

Several Midwestern States list reorganization and consolidation of the small districts as their most pressing school need. Nebraska is typical in this respect. There are

nearly 7,000 school districts in the State. Enrollments, it is found, do not justify the large number. For the sake of economy and a better educational program, redistricting is found to be necessary. The State has never recognized the necessity of having properly qualified teachers for the elementary grades. High-school graduates with no college training are still permitted to teach under certain conditions.

Similarly, the most pressing need for the Montana public school system is the consolidation of many school districts. Authorities of the Montana Education Association point out that Montana is a State of vast spaces and small population. Consolidation is dependent to a considerable extent upon the highways.

There is no one answer to all the problems raised by the educators. Before the schools are improved, the needs will have to be examined locally and the necessary funds obtained. Dr. Worth McClure, executive secretary of the American Association of School Administrators, one of the most influential school groups in the country, points to the serious difficulties caused by lack of money to meet fast-growing enrollment and offset rapid increase in costs as an immediate problem to be considered.

"More teachers will cost more money," he notes. "Teachers' salaries, always behind the rise of living costs, are now falling further behind than ever. Everything the schools use costs more than it did before Korea. There is evidence that the substantial increase in the national budget made necessary by national defense is beginning to dry up State and local sources of school support."

Despite the growing problems faced by the schools, educators everywhere are confident that the educational facilities will be strengthened rather than weakened in the immediate years ahead. They point to the tremendous interest taken by the public, as evidenced by the hundreds of citizens' school committees throughout the country, as proof that people everywhere are ready and willing to support the free public schools. Strong schools will strengthen our democratic traditions.

EXHIBIT 5

[From the New York Times of February 7, 1952]

COLUMBIA TUITION RAISED UP TO 25 PERCENT—MEDICINE AND DENTISTRY GOING FROM \$750 TO \$825 A YEAR; OTHER SCHOOLS \$600 TO \$750—HIGHER COSTS TO BE MET—NEED FOR ADEQUATE FACULTY PAY CITED BY DR. KIRK; HARDSHIP FUND FOR STUDENTS PLANNED

Tuition rises up to 25 percent will take effect in Columbia University's 17 schools and departments next fall. The trustees approved the increases, the third in a decade, at their regular monthly meeting Monday afternoon.

The fee for each point or unit, of academic work will go from \$20 to \$25. The schools of medicine and dentistry will charge \$825 a year in place of the present \$750, and full-time students at all other schools will pay \$750 instead of \$600.

Full-time students are those matriculating for a degree. Normally they may take up to 38 points of work each year, but are charged for only 30.

Dr. Grayson L. Kirk, vice president and provost of the university, announced the new rates yesterday, saying that they were necessary in view of mounting operating costs. He said the trustees took the action "with great reluctance" but deemed it essential to the enduring interests of the university.

Teachers College, affiliated with Columbia, but operating under a separate corporation, is expected to follow the university's example within 10 days. Dr. William F. Russell, president of the college, said that rising costs necessitated an increase from \$20 to \$25 for a point of work.

NO RISE NOW AT BARNARD

Barnard College, also individually incorporated, raised its tuition to \$800 a year in 1950 and contemplates no further increase at the moment, a spokesman said.

Dr. Kirk gave assurances that a \$3,600 annual salary would be established as the minimum for full-time instructors at Columbia and that salary adjustments would be made for higher ranking teachers.

"Columbia employs far too many instructors at \$3,000 and \$3,300 at the present time," the vice president declared. In view of rising living costs, he said he felt that many faculty salaries were inadequate.

If enrollment continues at the present level, the tuition increases will bring the university an additional \$1,000,000 a year. Dr. Kirk indicated that this amount might go far toward eliminating the deficits and averting impairment of the educational program.

Expressing the hope that the additional funds would make possible a more liberal support of the student scholarship and fellowship programs, he said that a hardship fund for students would be established.

Including a \$40 university fee, it will cost \$790 a year for study at the following schools: Columbia College and the Schools of Business, General Studies, Architecture, Journalism, Library Service, International Affairs, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Engineering, Public Health, Law, Painting and Sculpture, Dramatic Arts, and Dental Hygiene.

RATE DOUBLED IN 7 YEARS

Students in 1952-53 will be paying exactly twice the amount charged 7 years ago. After an increase from \$10 to \$12.50 a point in 1935, the tuition remained constant until 1946, when the fee was raised to \$15. It became \$20 in 1948.

Dr. Kirk explained that this was in keeping with expenses, which, he said, had nearly doubled in recent years. Endowments, he added, are worth only half as much as they were before the war because of the declining value of the dollar.

In a statement to students Dr. Kirk declared:

"Columbia, like all other private colleges and universities, has been affected by the continuing effects of the inflationary trend. Faculty salary adjustments, needed to meet rising living costs, have been inadequate, and deferred maintenance of our physical plant has assumed undesirable proportions."

With the possible exception of Harvard, Dr. Kirk said, Columbia was as well off financially as the other Ivy League schools. These also include Princeton, Yale, Cornell, Dartmouth, Pennsylvania, and Brown. Yale and Princeton have announced tuition increases for the coming year both going from \$600 to \$750.

EXHIBIT 6

Values of Federal land grants for elementary and secondary schools

[Data for the 1949-50 school year]

Code	Continental United States	Endowment funds	Acres unsold	Income from permanent school funds
Total.....		\$828,123,681	30,964,118	\$29,462,546
01 Alabama.....		4,163,600		236,400
02 Arizona.....		3,000,000	6,700,000	450,000
03 Arkansas.....		4,260,954		115,419
04 California.....		16,845,000		3,101,538
05 Colorado.....		15,290,390	2,838,184	900,000
06 Connecticut.....		2,144,332		86,500
07 Delaware.....		2,000,000		75,000
08 Florida.....		6,505,754		297,409
09 Georgia.....				
10 Idaho.....		19,372,810		1,044,481
11 Illinois.....		948,955		57,000
12 Indiana.....		21,461,161		760,186
13 Iowa.....		4,854,124		129,178
14 Kansas.....		12,009,861		221,711

Values of Federal land grants for elementary and secondary schools—Continued

[Data for the 1949-50 school year]

Code	Continental United States	Endowment funds	Acres unsold	Income from permanent school funds
15 Kentucky.....		\$2,315,675		\$138,938
16 Louisiana.....		3,015,056		38,118
17 Maine.....		614,472		75,883
18 Maryland.....				
19 Massachusetts.....		5,000,000		153,000
20 Michigan.....		7,216,104		500,000
21 Minnesota.....		154,000,000		3,500,000
22 Mississippi.....		1,036,515		62,000
23 Missouri.....		3,372,000		190,763
24 Montana.....		25,000,000		1,900,000
25 Nebraska.....		12,000,000	1,700,000	1,190,956
26 Nevada.....		3,685,581		100,000
27 New Hampshire.....		59,723,000		1,500
28 New Jersey.....		14,790,896		468,000
29 New Mexico.....		29,060,000	7,000,000	3,412,847
30 New York.....		9,851,390		310,000
31 North Carolina.....		2,397,845		36,772
32 North Dakota.....		31,832,675	1,014,825	1,075,000
33 Ohio.....		4,600,000		270,600
34 Oklahoma.....		53,191,270	303,109	1,331,575
35 Oregon.....		10,667,375	700,000	225,606
36 Pennsylvania.....		2,996,699		75,000
37 Rhode Island.....		414,732		12,500
38 South Carolina.....				
39 South Dakota.....		28,000,000	2,275,000	968,631
40 Tennessee.....		2,512,500		150,750
41 Texas.....		150,311,245	1,042,000	3,345,850
42 Utah.....		6,000,000	2,500,000	500,000
43 Vermont.....		1,120,218		37,000
44 Virginia.....		18,112,532		315,000
45 Washington.....		48,964,385	1,800,000	1,400,000
46 West Virginia.....		1,000,000		40,000
47 Wisconsin.....		13,254,955		274,495
48 Wyoming.....		24,500,000	3,091,000	1,180,000

EXHIBIT 7

Federal grants of land for educational purposes, by State and purpose

	Acres granted
Alabama:	
Seminary of learning.....	46,080.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands).....	911,627.00
Agricultural college scrip.....	240,000.00
University.....	46,080.00
Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute.....	25,000.00
Industrial School for Girls.....	25,000.00
Vocational and other educational purposes.....	1,625.19
Total.....	1,295,412.19
Alaska Territory:	
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36, reserved (estimated).....	21,009,209.00
Agricultural college and school of mines, certain secs. 33, reserved (estimated).....	336,000.00
Agricultural college and school of mines.....	2,249.95
Agricultural college and school of mines.....	100,000.00
Total.....	21,447,458.95
Arizona:	
University.....	46,080.00
University.....	200,000.00
Deaf, dumb, and blind asylum.....	100,000.00
Normal schools.....	200,000.00
Agricultural and mechanical colleges.....	150,000.00
School of mines.....	150,000.00
Military institutes.....	100,000.00
Common schools, secs. 2, 32, 16, and 36 (or indemnity lands).....	8,093,156.00
University.....	160.00
University.....	2,876.71
Total.....	9,042,272.71

Arkansas:	<i>Acres granted</i>	Kansas:	<i>Acres granted</i>	Montana—Continued	
Seminary or university	46,080.00	University	46,080.00	Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	<i>Acres granted</i> 5,198,258.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)	933,778.00	Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	2,907,520.00	Observatory for university	480.00
Agricultural college scrip	150,000.00	Agricultural college	90,000.00	Biological station for university	160.84
Total	1,129,858.00	Experiment station, agricultural college, normal school, and public park	7,507.53	Fort Assiniboine, for educational institutions	2,000.00
California:		Agricultural college	7,682.00	Total	5,686,978.84
University	46,080.00	Total	3,058,789.53	Nebraska:	
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	5,534,293.00	Kentucky:		Agricultural college	90,000.00
Agricultural and mechanical colleges	150,000.00	Agricultural college scrip	330,000.00	Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	2,730,951.00
Total	5,730,373.00	Deaf and dumb asylum	22,508.65	University	46,080.00
Colorado:		Total	352,508.65	Total	2,867,031.00
Agricultural college	90,000.00	Louisiana:		Nevada:	
University	46,080.00	Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)	807,271.00	Mining and mechanic arts	90,000.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	3,686,618.00	Seminary of learning	46,080.00	University	46,080.00
State agricultural college	160.00	Agricultural college scrip	210,000.00	Common schools, certain secs. 16 and 36, and lieu lands	2,061,967.00
State agricultural college	1,600.00	University and agricultural college	211.56	Total	2,198,047.00
School of mines	200.00	Total	1,063,562.56	New Hampshire: Agricultural college scrip	150,000.00
Biological station	160.00	Maine: Agricultural college scrip	210,000.00	Total	150,000.00
Total	3,824,818.00	Total	210,000.00	New Jersey: Agricultural college scrip	210,000.00
Connecticut: Agricultural college scrip	180,000.00	Maryland: Agricultural college scrip	210,000.00	Total	210,000.00
Total	180,000.00	Total	210,000.00	New Mexico:	
Delaware: Agricultural college scrip	90,000.00	Massachusetts: Agricultural college scrip	360,000.00	University	111,080.00
Total	90,000.00	Total	360,000.00	Saline land (university)	1,622.86
Florida:		Michigan:		Agricultural college	100,000.00
Seminaries of learning	92,160.00	University	46,808.00	Deaf and dumb asylum	50,000.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)	975,307.00	Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)	1,021,867.00	Reform school	50,000.00
Agricultural college scrip	90,000.00	Agricultural college	240,000.00	Normal schools	100,000.00
Total	1,157,467.00	Total	1,307,947.00	School of mines	50,000.00
Georgia: Agricultural college scrip	270,000.00	Minnesota:		Blind asylum	50,000.00
Total	270,000.00	University	92,160.00	Military institute	50,000.00
Idaho:		Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	2,874,951.00	Common schools, sections 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	4,355,662.00
University	46,080.00	Agricultural college	120,000.00	University	200,000.00
University, Moscow	50,000.00	Total	3,087,111.00	Deaf, dumb, and blind asylum	100,000.00
Agricultural college	90,000.00	Mississippi:		Normal schools	200,000.00
Normal schools	100,000.00	Jefferson College	23,040.00	Agricultural and mechanical colleges	150,000.00
Scientific schools	100,000.00	Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)	824,213.00	School of mines	150,000.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	2,963,698.00	Seminary of learning	23,040.00	Military institutes	100,000.00
University	606.40	Agricultural college scrip	210,000.00	Common schools, secs. 2 and 32 (or indemnity lands)	4,355,662.00
Total	3,350,384.40	University	23,040.00	Agricultural college	54,868.41
Illinois:		Agricultural and mechanical college	46,080.00	Eastern New Mexico Normal School	76,667.00
Seminary of learning	56,080.00	Industrial institute and college for girls	23,040.00	Regents of University of New Mexico for archaeological purposes	218.13
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)	996,320.00	Total	1,597,893.00	Regents of Agricultural College of New Mexico	2,039.70
Agricultural college scrip	480,000.00	Missouri:		Total	10,307,870.10
Total	1,522,400.00	Seminary of learning	46,080.00	New York: Agricultural college scrip	990,000.00
Indiana:		Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)	1,221,813.00	Total	990,000.00
Seminary of learning	46,080.00	Agricultural college	330,000.00	North Carolina: Agricultural college scrip	270,000.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)	668,578.00	Total	1,597,893.00	Total	270,000.00
Total	714,658.00	Montana:		North Dakota:	
Iowa:		University	46,080.00	University	86,080.00
University	46,080.00	Agricultural college	140,000.00	Agricultural college	130,000.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)	1,000,678.62	Deaf and dumb asylum	50,000.00	Deaf and dumb asylum	40,000.00
Agricultural college	240,000.00	Reform school	50,000.00	Reform school	40,000.00
Total	1,286,758.62	School of mines	100,000.00		
		Normal schools	100,000.00		

State	Category	Acres granted	Acres granted	Acres granted	
North Dakota—Continued	School of mines	40,000.00			
	Normal school	80,000.00			
	Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	2,495,396.00			
	Total	2,911,476.00			
Ohio:	Seminaries of learning	69,120.00			
	Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)	724,266.00			
	Agricultural college scrip	630,000.00			
	Total	1,423,386.00			
Oklahoma:	Normal schools	300,000.00			
	Oklahoma University	250,000.00			
	University preparatory school	150,000.00			
	Agricultural and mechanical college	250,000.00			
	Colored agricultural and normal university	100,000.00			
	Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	1,375,000.00			
	Institutional purposes, certain secs. 13 and 33	669,000.00			
	Total	3,094,000.00			
	Oregon:	University	46,080.00		
		Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	3,399,360.00		
Agricultural college		90,000.00			
University		85.42			
Total	3,535,525.42				
Pennsylvania: Agricultural college scrip		780,000.00			
	Total	780,000.00			
Rhode Island: Agricultural college scrip			120,000.00		
	Total		120,000.00		
South Carolina: Agricultural college scrip			180,000.00		
	Total		180,000.00		
South Dakota:	University	46,080.00			
	University	40,000.00			
	Agricultural college	160,000.00			
	Deaf and dumb asylum	40,000.00			
	Reform school	40,000.00			
	School of mines	40,000.00			
	Normal schools	80,000.00			
	Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	2,733,084.00			
	Total	3,179,164.00			
	Tennessee: Agricultural college scrip			300,000.00	
Total			300,000.00		
Texas: Agricultural college scrip			180,000.00		
	Total		180,000.00		
Utah:	University	46,080.00			
	University	110,000.00			
	Agricultural college	200,000.00			
	Deaf and dumb asylum	100,000.00			
	Reform school	100,000.00			
	School of mines	100,000.00			
	Normal schools	100,000.00			
	Blind asylum	100,000.00			
	Common schools, secs. 2, 16, 32, 36 (or indemnity lands)	5,844,186.00			
	University purposes	60.54			
Total	6,700,336.54				
Vermont: Agricultural college scrip			150,000.00		
	Total		150,000.00		
Virginia: Agricultural college scrip			300,000.00		
	Total		300,000.00		
Washington:	University	46,080.00			
	Agricultural college	90,000.00			
	Normal schools	100,000.00			
	Scientific schools	100,000.00			
	Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	2,376,391.00			
	Total	2,712,471.00			
West Virginia: Agricultural college scrip			150,000.00		
	Total		150,000.00		
Wisconsin:	University		92,160.00		
	Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)		982,329.00		
	Agricultural college		240,000.00		
Total		1,314,489.00			
Wyoming:	University	46,080.00			
	Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	3,470,009.00			
	Agricultural college	90,000.00			
	Deaf and dumb asylum	30,000.00			
Total	3,636,089.00				

NOTE.—These data have been taken from School Lands: Land Grants to States and Territories for Educational and Other Purposes. U. S. Department of the Interior, General Land Office, Information Bulletin, 1939 series, No. 1. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1939.

EXHIBIT 8

TABLE 19.—Land-grant funds of 1862 (first Morrill Act) and other Federal land-grant funds, for year ended June 30, 1950

Location of institution	Land-grant funds of 1862								Other Federal land grants					
	Condition of fund			Balance on hand July 1, 1949	Receipts		Total columns 5-7	Disbursements			Balance on hand July 1, 1950	Unsold land (value)	Amount of fund, not including unsold land	Income, 1949-50
	Amount of fund, not including unsold land	Unsold land			Income on invested funds	Income from rentals, rights, deferred payments, etc.		Salaries	Facilities	Total				
(1)	(2)	Number of acres	Value	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Grand total	\$46,966,795	597,929	\$16,127,576	\$368,526	\$1,283,505	\$158,664	\$1,810,695	\$1,125,445	\$373,291	\$1,498,736	\$311,959	\$7,539,780	\$21,990,911	\$685,719
Total white	46,578,574	597,929	16,127,576	367,899	1,256,728	158,664	1,783,291	1,068,041	373,291	1,471,332	311,959	7,539,780	21,990,911	685,719
Total Negro	388,221			627	26,777		27,404	27,404		27,404				
Alabama	253,500				20,280		20,280	20,280		20,280				
Arizona	65,995	150,000	300,000	4,415	1,597	5,751	11,763		800	800	10,963	496,080	894,646	49,262
Arkansas	132,667				6,633		6,633	6,633		6,633				
California	891,417	480	4,800	140,019	24,019		164,038		\$140,019	140,019	24,019		116,733	3,995
Colorado	602,528			19,873	17,723	4,528	42,124	39,593		39,593				
Connecticut	135,000			63,391	4,082		67,473			67,473				
Delaware	84,381				1,400		1,400	1,400		1,400				
Florida	182,329				7,750		7,750	7,750		7,750			68,337	1,233
Georgia	242,202			2,575	6,155		8,730	5,250	800	6,050	2,680			
Idaho	1,200,851	48,240	482,401			39,262	39,262	3,516	35,746	39,262		904,576	4,066,326	129,017
Illinois	649,013				32,451		32,451	32,451		32,451				
Indiana	340,000			4,649	9,352		14,001	13,968		13,968	33			
Iowa	546,943				16,537		16,537	16,537		16,537				
Kansas	557,121	4,000	30,000	14,736	13,211	200	28,147	10,000		10,000	18,147			
Kentucky:														
White	165,000				8,645		8,645	8,645		8,645				
Negro	23,925			627	1,256		1,883	1,883		1,883				
Louisiana	182,313				9,116		9,116	9,116		9,116			136,000	5,440
Maine	118,300				5,915		5,915	5,915		5,915				
Maryland	132,400				3,310		3,310	3,310		3,310				

¹ Of this amount \$120,625 was transferred to other functions than facilities of instruction.

² Of this amount \$119,825 was added to the principal.

³ This amount was transferred to North Georgia College, Dahlonega, Ga.

TABLE 19.—Land-grant funds of 1862 (first Morrill Act) and other Federal land-grant funds, for year ended June 30, 1950—Continued

Location of institution (1)	Land-grant funds of 1862											Other Federal land grants		
	Condition of fund			Balance on hand July 1, 1949	Receipts		Total columns 5-7	Disbursements			Balance on hand July 1, 1950	Unsold land (value)	Amount of fund, not including unsold land	Income, 1949-50
	Amount of fund, not including unsold land	Unsold land			Income on invested funds	Income from rentals, rights, deferred payments, etc.		Salaries	Facilities	Total				
		Number of acres	Value	(3)			(4)				(9)	(10)	(11)	
Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology	\$73,000				\$3,650		\$3,650	\$2,100	\$1,550	\$3,650				
University of Massachusetts	146,000			\$928	7,300		8,228	3,144		3,144	\$5,084			
Michigan	1,059,071				74,181		74,181		74,181	74,181				
Minnesota	25,807,929	26,240	\$131,203		566,637		566,637	566,637		566,637				
Mississippi:														
White	98,575				5,914		5,914	5,914		5,914		\$141,213	\$8,473	
Negro	96,296				12,592		12,592	12,592		12,592				
Missouri	520,987	20,164	80,656		21,181	\$1,014	22,195	22,195		22,195			122,000	7,320
Montana	728,608	65,835	658,352	2,707	16,396	12,663	31,796	12,047	2,831	14,878	16,888	\$402,356	292,563	9,240
Nebraska	699,375	3,994	71,930	34,219	11,611	4,577	50,407			50,407	50,407	112,696	320,149	20,621
Nevada	136,210	300	651	146	3,479		3,625	3,020		3,020	605	46,080	66,133	1,654
New Hampshire	80,000				4,800		4,800		4,800	4,800				
New Jersey	116,000				5,800		5,800	5,800		5,800				
New Mexico	724,024			7,081	15,548	35,977	58,606		55,135	55,135	3,471			
New York	688,576			34,429	34,429		68,858	34,429	34,429	68,858				
North Carolina	125,000				7,500		7,500		7,500	7,500				
North Dakota	1,925,248	16,207	182,069	14,562	61,906		76,468		3,132	3,132	73,336			
Ohio	524,177			65	31,490		31,555	31,492		31,492	63			
Oklahoma												1,607,373	5,193,438	157,922
Oregon	214,840	421	1,524		5,855		5,855	5,855		5,855				
Pennsylvania	500,000				25,000		25,000	25,000		25,000			17,000	1,020
Rhode Island	30,000				1,807		1,807	1,807		1,807				
South Carolina:														
White	95,900				5,754		5,754	5,754		5,754				
Negro	95,000				5,754		5,754	5,754		5,754				
South Dakota	624,227	86,850	868,500		18,924	24,248	43,172	43,172		43,172		829,497	208,076	14,391
Tennessee	400,000				12,235		12,235	12,235		12,235				
Texas	209,000			2,328	10,450		12,778	8,450	858	9,308	3,470			
Utah	346,795	39,553	98,882		8,468	4,852	13,320		13,320	13,320				
Vermont	122,000				7,320		7,320	7,320		7,320				
Virginia:														
White	344,312				7,960		7,960	7,960		7,960				
Negro	173,000				7,175		7,175	7,175		7,175				
Washington	2,858,969	62,692	2,507,678		71,634	9,903	81,537	81,537		81,537		3,330,582	7,055,362	184,342
West Virginia	125,300			11,620	3,738		15,358			15,358	15,358			
Wisconsin	303,410				5,690		5,690		5,690	5,690			234,065	7,330
Wyoming	449,981	72,893	10,728,930	10,156	11,895	15,689	37,740	20,309		20,309	17,431	350,540	3,058,870	84,459

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the last interrogation which was propounded to the Senator from Alabama pointed out that these great values are found out under the open sea. Those were the words of the Senator from Louisiana. Whatever the estimate may be, whether it be the large estimate made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] or the small estimate made by the Senator from Louisiana, it is an estimate of values which the Senator from Louisiana says will come from the open ocean.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Wyoming referred to the small estimate made by the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not mean that.

Mr. LONG. It is the estimate which was made by the Secretary of the Interior, who is charged with the responsibility of knowing something about the subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course I did not mean that the Senator from Louisiana considers the matter a small one, nor that he made the estimate. I recognize the fact that the estimate he used was made by the Secretary of the Interior. I want to emphasize the fact that the Senator from Louisiana himself stated that these great values come from under the open ocean. This is the very argument that is made in support of

Senate Joint Resolution 20, the measure now before the Senate. I should like to compliment the Senator from Alabama for the presentation which he has made in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator from Wyoming has misunderstood my position. What I said was that drilling in the open sea, particularly in water as much as 50 or 100 feet deep, where platforms and derricks must be erected and perhaps even living quarters, a very good oil field must be discovered if it is to be practicable to produce oil from it. A well which produces only 10 barrels a day, which is the average for the Nation's wells as a whole, would not be feasible for production; it must bring in a substantial amount of oil, perhaps 200 or 300 barrels a day, rather than a well that would bring in only 10 barrels a day. What I said was that in many instances fields which would be valuable in the continental United States would not be of great value on the Continental Shelf.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the point which the Senator from Louisiana was making. The point I am making is simply that the Senator's statement is a frank acknowledgment of the fact that here we are dealing with the open sea. The basis of our argument is that the open sea is under the jurisdiction of the

Federal Government as an attribute of its external sovereignty. Such has been from the very beginnings of our history as a Nation.

However, Mr. President, I was paying my tribute to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for the very excellent presentation he has made here.

PROPERTY OF ALL THE PEOPLE

Mr. President, the time has come for us to continue to pay diligent attention to the development of our human resources. These human resources are to be found not alone in the coastal States, but in all the States.

The point of the legal argument which was made in the Supreme Court, and was sustained by the Supreme Court, and the point of the argument which those of us who support this measure make, is that the mineral resources of the lands submerged by the open ocean belong or appertain to all the people of all the States of the Union. There can be no question about that.

The State of Florida was acquired by purchase by the Federal Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I interject just three words at this point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HOLLAND. What a bargain.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With that statement I completely agree. However, let me say that although it was a great bargain, the State of Florida has never resisted accepting any of the grants-in-aid

which it receives from the Federal Government.

FEDERAL AID IN DEVELOPMENT OF STATE

Yesterday the Senator from Florida was telling us about the developments along the coast of Florida, developments of which I am proud. I have visited the beach at Miami. I have enjoyed the hotels at Miami. I have flown to Miami in airplanes supported and maintained by Federal subsidy. I have landed at Florida airports built and maintained by Federal appropriations. Oh, I boast about Florida, just as the Senator from Florida boasts about it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator from Florida will pardon me for a moment. He has opened up the point, and I am glad to take advantage of it.

Yesterday the Senator from Florida was talking about the terrible Federal Government, this "ogre," as he describes it, this Uncle Sam who carries in his right hand a dagger with which to cut the throats of the States. The Senator from Florida at that time was drawing a terrible picture, a picture quite contrary to the actual facts. He was discussing what a terrible abuse it would be of the rights of the people of Florida were they to have to obtain permits from the Federal Government to develop water-front property.

PERMITS REQUIRED UNDER EXISTING LAW

At that time I called attention to the statute enacted in 1899 which gives to the Corps of Engineers complete jurisdiction over all constructions in the navigable waters of the United States, including even inland navigable waters. Mr. President, I think I should read the statute into the RECORD at this point. It is section 403 of title 33 of the United States Code, dealing with navigation and navigable waters. It is codified from section 10 of the act of March 3, 1899:

SEC. 403. Obstruction of navigable waters generally; wharves, piers, etc.; excavations and filling in.

The creation of any obstruction not affirmatively authorized by Congress, to the navigable capacity of any of the waters of the United States is prohibited—

Mr. President, this includes the drilling platforms in the open ocean, to which the Senator from Louisiana referred a moment ago.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator has no doubt of it; it very definitely does.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

I read further from section 403—

and it shall not be lawful to build or commence the building of any wharf, pier, dolphin, boom, weir, breakwater, bulkhead, jetty, or other structures in any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, navigable river, or other water of the United States, outside established harbor lines, or where no harbor lines have been established, except on plans recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War; and it shall not be lawful to excavate or fill, or in any manner to alter or modify the course,

location, condition, or capacity of, any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or enclosure within the limits of any breakwater, or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States, unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War prior to beginning the same (March 3, 1899, ch. 425, sec. 10, 30 Stat. 1151).

Mr. President, yesterday I sought to check upon the debate which I thought must have occurred in the Fifty-fifth Congress when that statute was passed. It was carried in the Rivers and Harbors bill of 1899, enacted on March 3, 1899, a time before it became so popular to denounce the "encroachments" of the Government of the United States. Today it is very popular to describe the Federal Government almost as an enemy of the people, although the people of no State of the Union are without benefits derived from the Federal Treasury.

NO PROTEST AT TIME OF ENACTMENT

I obtained some information about this matter, not all of which I shall undertake to reveal tonight. However, I do not wish the debate today to close without having some of this material in the RECORD. In reading the debates in the Fifty-fifth Congress on the Rivers and Harbors bill of 1899, I do not find a single line by any Member protesting in any way about this provision.

No Member of Congress asserted at the time this provision was enacted that it would be an abuse of power and would adversely affect the people of the States. As a matter of fact, the history of Florida and other coastal States shows it has not adversely affected them.

I found another most interesting thing, namely, that a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Oregon, who made a 5-minute speech, was a little resentful because his State did not receive as much of an appropriation as he thought it should receive in the Rivers-and-Harbors bill. So he made a tabulation which showed that the bill called for appropriations of approximately \$28,600,000 for development of the rivers and harbors within the States of the United States, and that of that amount, some \$24,000,000 was given to States who were represented, fortunately, upon the Commerce Committee which then had charge of the measure. I myself thought that charge probably was not particularly sound, because it appears that 20 coastal States received appropriations. Seven coastal States were represented on the committee, and one of those States was the great State of Florida—the State which was such a bargain to the United States when we acquired it; and a bargain, indeed, it was.

The appropriation of Federal money for the State of Florida, to develop harbors or rivers or at least aids to navigation in that State, amounted to \$1,209,199.80.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Wyoming mean to suggest that the people of the State of Florida are not contributing their fair share of the taxes

which pay for all these public improvements?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, not at all. The Senator from Louisiana should not try to divert or distort the discussion.

My point merely is that those who are trying to picture the United States Government as an enemy of the States and as an enemy of the people, a Government which is trying to encroach upon them, cannot find themselves sustained by the record. I am also trying to show that the operation of the law clearly requires that permits be obtained from the Corps of Engineers before any construction can be undertaken, even in navigable inland waters, and even on those lands which we acknowledge belong to the States, because of navigation.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the basic difference between us is that those of us who take the States' side feel that the Federal Government's activities in the field of interstate commerce, navigation, and public improvement, to which the Senator refers, do not require that the Federal Government own the submerged lands along the States' shores.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes, I know that; but I also know that those who are supporting the position which the Senator takes have been arguing day after day—I am not talking of those who are arguing on the floor; I am talking about the argument which has been distributed repeatedly to the governors and the attorneys general and the citizens of interior States—they have been claiming that this terrible dragon of the Federal Government is about to reach into the interior States to seize lands which belong to the States. Their argument is, "See the way they tear our property from us. Tomorrow they will be tearing yours from you."

OPEN OCEAN ALWAYS UNDER FEDERAL SOVEREIGNTY

My answer is that the open ocean has always been under the sovereignty of the Federal Government, and never under the power of any State government. My answer is that the coastal States, even those which are now seeking to deprive the Government of its external sovereignty over the open ocean—those who are supporting this give-away bill—have been the beneficiaries of the exercise of power by the Federal Government in the form of appropriations from the Federal Treasury as well as in many other fields.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, certainly he knows that the Federal Government has never engaged in issuing leases or in regulating the production of oil and gas from the submerged lands on the Continental Shelf.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. LONG. And the Senator knows that the States have been acting in that field of endeavor for many years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I want to show the Senator the record of his State of Louisiana. Under this bill, which became law on March 3, 1899, Louisiana received \$878,115.75. The very law which requires that permits must be obtained from the Federal Government

was included in a rivers and harbors bill appropriating Federal funds, out of the Treasury of the United States, to build or improve rivers and harbors within 20 of the coastal States, and a number of interior States as well.

DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Now, what I rose to say when I was diverted by the question was that I was very happy indeed that the Senator from Alabama made his magnificent contribution to the debate on the submerged-lands issue. By the cultivation of our human resources we can do more, I am firmly persuaded, than can be done by even our military power to advance to the cause of human liberty and freedom in the United States and in the world.

The greater progress we make in education, the stronger this Nation will be. It is strange, in this crisis in the progress of humanity, when a totalitarian, absolute and dictatorial power seeks to promote a world revolution, that we are having here in the United States Senate a debate over the distribution of the wealth found under the lands submerged by the open ocean. One of the things which threatens our very existence as a nation is the fact that there is too great a passion for easy money, too great a passion to make profit out of the crisis of the Nation—profit in the manufacture of the tools of war, which can only be used for destruction and which will not produce a single constructive result.

The amendment of the Senator from Alabama is constructive. It goes to the very basis of the progress of humanity. All of us can take great pride in the historic fact that from the very beginning of this Nation, our States and our Federal Government have been willing to devote a substantial part of their substance to the promotion of education. It is a sorry thing to know that education is languishing now while we are piling all our resources into this terrible arms race, which may be in preparation for a third world war.

AMENDMENT, A CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE

I believe, of course, that we must defend ourselves. The Senator from Alabama believes that defense must be maintained. In his amendment, in the very first section, he provides that the money, during the national emergency, may be used as the Congress shall declare.

I was not one of those who joined with the Senator in offering his amendment. He was good enough to extend the invitation to me to become one of the sponsors, but I felt that the submerged lands measure had to be acted upon in committee. However in the Interior Committee I offered an amendment to S. J. Res. 20, which provided that 50 percent of the revenues from the submerged lands should be devoted to the reduction of the national debt, and 50 percent should be devoted to education throughout the States.

The Senator's amendment, in its first section, makes it clear that if this becomes a law, the Congress will have the right to use whatever portion of these funds it may desire to use for payment on the national debt, or for appropriations for national defense; but the time

will come when this arms race will come to an end. I am convinced that the time is coming when the principles of America for the promotion of human liberty and the development of human abilities will have won the struggle for the minds of men; and when it has done that, the Senator's amendment will, in my judgment, be one of the most effective contributions to that great victory for peace which the world so sadly needs.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator for his kind words. I particularly desire to express to him my appreciation of all the help and encouragement and support which he has given in the advancement of this amendment. The Senator, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, occupies a most important and strategic position, particularly so far as this amendment is concerned; and surely no one could have been finer or could have been more helpful or could have given greater assistance or greater encouragement for the writing of this amendment into the law than has the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. On behalf of myself and, I am sure, on behalf of the other 18 sponsors of this amendment, I wish to express to him our deep thanks and appreciation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very grateful to the Senator.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has introduced and offered as an amendment a modification of Senate bill 940. I am going to ask unanimous consent that I may present for publication in the RECORD as part of this debate the various reports which were received by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, regarding the Senator's bill.

REPORTS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS ON S. 940

The first of these reports is the report of the Department of Justice, dated March 22, 1951; the second, the report of the Department of the Interior, dated March 23, 1951; the third, the report of the Secretary of Defense, Gen. George C. Marshall, dated March 27, 1951, and the fourth, the report of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, dated July 26, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the items, by unanimous consent, may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, March 22, 1951.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your letter of February 23, 1951, requesting the views of the Department of Justice relative to the bill (S. 940) "To confirm and establish the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources."

The proposed legislation would attempt to confirm in, and release and relinquish to, the several States all right, title, and inter-

est of the United States in and to all "lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands . . ." The phrase "lands beneath navigable waters" would be defined so as to include not only all lands beneath inland navigable waters, but also all such lands, both submerged and reclaimed, underlying the ocean, extending seaward to a line three geographical miles from the shore or to the seaward boundary of a coastal State where such boundary extends seaward beyond three geographical miles. There would be excepted from the operation of the measure all lands acquired by the United States by cession, grant, quitclaim, or condemnation, lands to which the United States is entitled under the laws of the respective States, and lands held for the benefit of Indians. An exception would also be made with respect to the activities of the United States in connection with control of navigation, flood control or the production or distribution of power. The question as to the ownership of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf, seaward of the boundary of any coastal State, would be reserved for subsequent determination by legislation or judicial decree.

The Department of Justice is strongly opposed to the enactment of the proposed legislation.

This measure has as its objective the nullification of the decisions of the Supreme Court in *United States v. California* (332 U. S. 19), *United States v. Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699), and *United States v. Texas* (339 U. S. 707). In those cases the Supreme Court held that the respective States do not own the lands underlying the ocean adjacent to their shores and that the power to control the development and disposition of the mineral resources situated in such offshore lands is vested in the United States and not in the coastal States. As a consequence, the proposed legislation, notwithstanding its broad scope and its use of language implying a confirmation or quitclaim, would constitute an outright gift or transfer to the three coastal States of valuable resources which belong to the people of all of the States. The Supreme Court has held that the three coastal States involved in the litigation do not and never have owned these resources. They belong to all of the people of this country. Section 1 of the bill, therefore, misstates the facts and the law, as found and determined by the Supreme Court.

This Department has consistently opposed bills of this character introduced in earlier Congresses (see H. J. Res. 225, 79th Cong.; S. 1988, 80th Cong.; and S. 1545, 81st Cong.). During the present national emergency, when the very existence of this country may well depend on the proper conservation and development of its petroleum resources, it is all the more important that the United States should not, by action of this type, attempt to abdicate its rights and responsibilities in the tremendously valuable submerged ocean lands adjacent to its shores. Indeed, in view of the reasoning employed by the Supreme Court in the offshore litigation, this Department entertains a grave doubt as to the validity of a measure designed to surrender to certain States those rights and dominion of the United States which are held as incidents of its national sovereignty, since, as the Court pointed out in the California case, "the State is not equipped in our constitutional system with the powers or facilities for exercising the responsibilities which would be concomitant with" such rights and dominion (332 U. S. 19, 35).

In view of the opposition of this Department to S. 940 as a whole, no discussion of particular provisions thereof seems necessary. However, it may be mentioned that section 6 of the bill, which would save for future determination any issues between the

United States and the respective coastal States as to the ownership and control of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf outside of State boundaries, would appear to serve no useful purpose. A similar provision appeared in S. 1545, Eighty-first Congress, with which S. 940 seems to be identical. However, in the recent decisions in the Louisiana and Texas cases, referred to above, the Supreme Court disposed of these issues adversely to the claims of those coastal States.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report, since the enactment of the bill would not be in accord with the program of the President.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
Deputy Attorney General.

UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1952.
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs
Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: We have received your letter of February 23 requesting a report on S. 940, a bill to confirm and establish the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

This measure is applicable not only to lands and resources underlying bays, harbors, and other navigable inland waters, but also to lands and resources of the Continental Shelf beneath the portions of the open ocean that are within the exterior boundaries of the coastal States.

With respect to lands and resources beneath bays, harbors, and other navigable inland waters, the Federal Government has not asserted, and does not now assert, any claim. In order to provide more certain assurances in this respect, the Department of Justice, the National Military Establishment (now the Department of Defense), and the Department of the Interior jointly drafted a bill relative to this subject and submitted it to the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses. That bill was introduced in the Eightieth Congress as S. 2222 and H. R. 5529, and in the Eighty-first Congress as S. 2153. Under the provisions of the draft of legislation proposed by the executive branch of the Government on this subject, the United States would quitclaim to the States any interest or title which it may have in and to lands and resources beneath bays, harbors, and other navigable inland waters or within areas covered and uncovered by the tides.

However, with respect to the lands of the Continental Shelf beneath the open waters of the sea contiguous to the shore line of the United States, this Department knows of no reasonable justification for making a gift of them, together with their oil and other resources, to the coastal States within whose seaward boundaries they are situated. On the contrary, as the President said in his message on the state of the Union delivered to the Congress on January 4, 1949:

"We must adopt a program for the planned use of the petroleum reserves under the sea, which are—and must remain—vested in the Federal Government."

The Supreme Court of the United States, in *United States v. California* (332 U. S. 19), in *United States v. Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699), and in *United States v. Texas* (377 U. S. 707), decided the question of the respective rights of the United States, on the one hand, and of the coastal States,

on the other hand, in and to the submerged coastal lands. The Court's decisions were favorable to the Federal Government. In my judgment, the national interest requires that all the lands and the incalculable resources thus determined to be assets of all the people of the United States shall be held by and developed under the supervision of the Government for the benefit and security of all the people.

For the reasons set out above, this Department is opposed to the enactment of S. 940.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that enactment of S. 940 would not be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, March 27, 1951.
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs
Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your recent request for a report by the Department of Defense with respect to S. 940, a bill to confirm and establish the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

We have reviewed the Department of Interior's report, dated March 23, 1951, with respect to this bill and concur wholeheartedly in the views set forth therein.

For the reasons set forth in the Department of Interior's report, the Department of Defense is opposed to the enactment of S. 940.

The Bureau of the Budget reports that the enactment of S. 940 would not be in accordance with the program of the President.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1951.
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Interior and
Insular Affairs Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On March 7, 1951, you requested the views of the Department of Defense with respect to Senate 940, a bill, "To confirm and establish the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources."

By letter dated March 27, 1951, the Department of Defense, in response to your request, concurred wholeheartedly in the views set forth in the report of the Department of Interior dated March 23, 1951. The Department of Defense continues to adhere to these views. However, it is requested that the following additional comments be considered by your committee with respect to this and similar legislation.

The Department of the Navy has substantial portions of land which are occupied for military and naval purposes and which have been improved by the erection of permanent buildings and other structures, including filling in, at a cost to the Government of many millions of dollars. For reasons hereinafter explained the Government as a proprietor has never actually acquired title to these lands, although in most, if not all cases, it has occupied and improved them with the tacit consent of the State or its successor in title.

Normally, when the Navy Department acquires waterfront lands it acquires title to the high-water mark only. This is because title of the upland owner usually extends only to the high-water mark. (In a very few States which have by statute changed the common law rule, the riparian owner's title extends to low-water mark.) Although the Government's title does not usually extend below high-water mark, the Navy Department in the development of water-front lands for naval purposes, has nevertheless appropriated and filled in or otherwise improved large areas of adjacent waters. This practice probably has been followed throughout the years, but because of the emergency of 1939 and the war which followed these improvements were accelerated, and as a result a very substantial part of the Navy Department's shore facilities are on lands to which the United States does not actually have title.

No serious difficulty is presented with respect to improvements which have been erected on areas created by normal accretion because according to the common law rule the Government, as the riparian owner, has acquired title to such accreted areas. However, the situation is different with respect to filled-in lands, that is, lands which have been artificially created. Except where specially provided by State statute, title to such lands would not pass to the Government as the proprietor of the adjacent upland, as in the case of accretion, but would remain in the State as the original owner of the submerged area.

As indicated above, the use and occupancy of such lands has not, except in rare instances, been protested by the States or municipalities claiming title thereto. Moreover, no serious trouble in that respect is anticipated because of the Government's right to condemn lands in the event satisfactory agreement cannot be negotiated. However, enactment of the subject bill in its present form would make the Government's rights and interests in the land more uncertain and more insecure because the bill expressly releases and relinquishes unto the States all right, title, and interest that the United States may now have in such lands and improvements.

If the subject bill or similar legislation should be considered favorably, it is recommended that a savings clause to meet the problem set forth above be included. With respect to S. 940, it is recommended that the following language be substituted for subsections (a) and (b) of section 4:

"All lands and resources therein or improvements thereon which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State or its successor in title (and all lands and resources therein or improvements thereon which are occupied and used by the United States for any constitutional purpose, provided that no State or person shall be deprived of any right under existing law to claim and receive just compensation for such use) or which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians."

With respect to S. 1540, it is suggested that the following language be added in section 3, page 4, line 2, after the words "or group of Indians or for individual Indians": "or which the United States may now use for any of its constitutional purposes, provided that no State or person shall be deprived of any right under existing law to claim and receive just compensation for such use."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this supplemental report.

Sincerely,

DANIEL K. EDWARDS.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am hopeful that some votes may be taken

on the pending measure this week. I have asked Senators who are interested in the joint resolution and in the amendments about voting tomorrow. I find that we shall be unable this evening to work out a unanimous-consent agreement to vote tomorrow, but I am hopeful that at some time tomorrow such an agreement can be obtained.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator tell us why we cannot agree to vote tomorrow on one amendment? Would there be any objection to that?

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to my friend from Louisiana, as I have told him before and as I have told the majority leader, that we do not want to cause any delay in this matter. The Senator from Alabama and his 18 cosponsors have consumed very little time. Most of the time up to now has been consumed by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and by the distinguished Senator from Florida—

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Alabama is overlooking a few other distinguished Senators.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill has to consume time; but up to now most of the time has been consumed by those who favor the quitclaim bill. I have been the only one of the 19 sponsors of the amendment who has had anything to say.

Mr. LONG. The Senator knows there have been a good many early recesses. On Monday the Senate recessed at about 1:30 o'clock. There would have been ample time for two or three Senators to make substantial speeches, but not one cared to go forward at that time.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps if the Senator from Louisiana had advised the majority leader that there was someone who cared to speak, the Senate would not have recessed so early; I do not know.

Mr. LONG. If any Senator had wanted to talk he would have been privileged to do so. Senators have not been foreclosed.

Mr. HILL. I know that up to this time no sponsor of the pending amendment has done anything in any way to delay the matter. I think some Senators who advocate the quitclaim bill let splendid opportunities go by, as indicated by the Senator from Louisiana. They were within their rights, of course, but I want to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that there has been no delay on the part of the sponsors of the pending amendment.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator realizes that we would be able to get a much better attendance on the floor of the Senate if we could agree to some limitation whereby we could come to a vote, because Senators would arrange to be present in order to vote. They might not otherwise be in the Chamber. There has been a complaint today with reference to something that happened by unanimous consent when many Senators

were absent. They were absent because they thought there would not likely be any vote.

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator. If Senators who want to vote and are anxious to vote will restrain themselves in their speeches and their questions that will make for expedition.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hardly think the comment of the distinguished Senator from Alabama is wholly fair when it is recalled that the Senator from Alabama whose amendment is a perfecting amendment to the measure which is pending, abstained and declined and almost refused to propose his amendment until after both of the amendments which are offered in the nature of substitutes had been offered and fully debated. The Senator from Florida himself suggested earlier in the debate that he thought it was timely to proceed with perfecting amendments, but the distinguished Senator from Alabama had not chosen to do so until after long arguments had been made and completed on two long substitute amendments, both of which come after the amendment of the Senator from Alabama. He has not been willing to propose or to debate his amendment until after the other amendments had been offered and debated. So, I think it is hardly fair to lay blame on the advocates of the substitute amendments, when in deed and in truth the amendment sponsored and offered by the Senator from Alabama is a preferred amendment that comes before the substitute amendments.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not seek to put blame on the distinguished Senators who are sponsoring the quitclaim bill. If I led the Senator from Florida to think I was blaming him, I am sorry. My amendment was not in order until the other amendment was out of the way. When it was out of the way, I offered the amendment for myself and 18 other sponsors. The RECORD will show that up to this time there has been no talking by the sponsors of the "oil for education" amendment except myself. The speaking has been done by other Senators. The Senator from Florida consumed, I think, about 5 or 6 hours.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida occupied the floor exactly 3 hours yesterday and an hour and a half today, and at least half of that time he was answering questions of other Senators—

Mr. HILL. I think the RECORD will show that I did not interrupt him a single time.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. I regret the fact that the distinguished Senator did not favor me with an interruption.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think these colloquies are very helpful, but they should be objected to on account of lack of time. I am not blaming any Senator, but I hope we can work out an agreement which will provide a time

at which we can come to a vote. I do not want to deprive any Senator of his opportunity to speak.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would the Senator be agreeable to proposing a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Friday upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama and his associates?

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought that after the distinguished Senator from Alabama had time to talk with his colleagues as to the length of time, I would propose such a unanimous-consent agreement, but he told me that he could not agree this evening. I thought after a quorum call in the morning we could come to some agreement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Are we to understand that the Senator from Alabama is not willing to set a day for voting upon his amendment?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama is not willing to set any time now for voting on the amendment. I said to the Senator from Florida, who consumed 5 hours of time yesterday and today by his speech, that I would cooperate with him and with the majority leader to see if we could get a vote at a reasonable time.

In addition to the Senator from Alabama, there are 18 Senators who are co-authors of this amendment, so I am not at this time in a position to agree, and cannot and will not agree, to a time for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his expression. It clarifies the situation.

RECESS

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

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 27, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 26 (legislative day of March 24), 1952:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Clarence H. Adams, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1956.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

B. Bernard Greidinger, of New York, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father John McGowan, Chaplain, United States Navy, offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, Almighty God, who governs the universe in a supreme and universal providence, conducting the course

of nature with unerring wisdom and rectitude, and influencing the minds of men to serve the gracious purposes of Thy providential government of the world.

We invoke Thee, who are the source of all wisdom and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgments decreed, to assist with Thy wisdom the deliberations of our legislators, so that Thy wisdom and Thy justice shall shine forth in their proceedings, and in the laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may direct our ways in the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and in this way perpetuate the blessings of equal liberty under the law.

Enable them we beseech Thee, O Lord, by Thy powerful protection, to discharge their duties with diligence, honesty, and courage. Teach them that law, to be right and rational, must be conceived, not for selfish aims, and serving solely the interests of time, but devised in justice and charity, in the vision of the destiny of men to everlasting life with Thee.

Let them be mindful of Thy fatherhood, as the principle which unites men together in a common family under Thy protection and care, so that as the citizens acknowledge their trust in Thee, they will therein know their unity in a common brotherhood under God and their laws. Amen.

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

THE LATE FRANK CLAGUE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce to my colleagues in the House of Representatives the death of Hon. Frank Clague, from Redwood Falls, Minn., who served with distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives from March 4, 1921, to March 3, 1933. He passed away on March 25, 1952.

I had the privilege of serving with Mr. Clague for 8 years. He was a man of unusual ability who enjoyed the highest respect of his colleagues. I considered him as one of the outstanding Americans in public life. It can be said about Mr. Clague that he was the type of American whose word was as good as his bond.

Mr. Clague served as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and also as a member of the Appropriations Committee while he had the opportunity of representing the Second Congressional District of Minnesota in this body. Those of my colleagues who had the privilege to serve with Mr. Clague respected him for his high character and unusual soundness of opinion in accordance with American ideals.

Frank Clague was born in Warrensville, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, July 13, 1865. He was 87 years old at the time of his death. He moved to Minnesota in 1881 and taught school at Springfield, Minn., from 1886 to 1890; he studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1891 and commenced practice in Lamberton,

Minn., the same year. He was prosecuting attorney of Redwood County, Minn., from 1895 to 1903, and was a member of the State legislature and the speaker of the house of representatives from 1903 to 1907. He also served in the Minnesota State Senate. He was district judge of the Ninth Judicial District of Minnesota from 1919 to 1920, at which time he was elected as a Republican to the Sixty-ninth Congress. He retired voluntarily in 1933 and resumed the practice of law in Redwood Falls, Minn.

We extend our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Frank Clague, who survives her husband, and we join with a host of friends to express our sorrow in the departure of a good friend and an outstanding American.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I join in the sentiments expressed by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. The death of Frank Clague has brought sorrow to the hearts of all Minnesotans and to the Members of this House who were fortunate enough to serve with him. Frank served the people of our State and of my congressional district particularly, in many capacities. His career of public service began in 1886 when he was a school teacher. After he became a member of the bar, he was prosecuting attorney of Redwood County for 13 years during which time he was also a member of the State house of representatives where he served as speaker. He was a member of the State senate from 1907 to 1915 and served as judge of the ninth judicial district for a year before he resigned to run for Congress. He assumed this heavy obligation not because of the personal benefits to be derived but because of the contribution he felt he could make to the welfare of his community, State, and Nation. After six terms, he did not seek renomination but remained in Redwood Falls where he practiced law and continued to assist our people with his sage advice and through his great unselfish spirit.

Mr. Speaker, to know Frank Clague was to respect and admire him. He was most sincere and had the capacity for true and abiding friendship. He never disappointed anyone who placed confidence in him. Frank had an abundance of sound, common sense, and he was always faithful to the principles in which he believed. There was never any ostentation about him. He was a man of absolute integrity. His unflinching kindness made him beloved by all who knew him. The people of Minnesota and of my district in particular have lost an able friend, and we all suffer a deep personal sorrow at his passing. Mrs. Andersen joins me in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Clague in her great loss.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from Minnesota in expressing deep sadness of the announcement of the death of Hon. Frank Clague, of Redwood Falls, Minn., who served as a Member of the House from March 4, 1921, to March 3, 1933.

I enjoyed knowing Mr. Clague for many years, both while he was a Member of Congress and upon his retirement from Congress. In fact, seven counties of my congressional district was a part of the old second district which Mr. Clague represented so ably prior to the Reapportionment Act of our legislature realigning the congressional districts.

Mr. Clague was highly respected and admired by everyone who knew him, both in public life and in private life. While a Member of the House he served as a member of the Agriculture Committee and also on the Appropriations Committee. He was a fine lawyer, an able judge, an intense patriot and with a strong character he had both an outstanding career and a host of loyal personal friends. I shall always remember with tenderness his kindness to me.

I do extend to his beloved wife my deepest sympathy and sorrow in the passing of her devoted husband.

NAVY CHAPLAINS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pride that I heard Father McGowan give the very fine prayer today. His home is in Lowell, Mass., in my congressional district, and he comes from a very fine respected Catholic family who live there.

Commander McGowan is stationed at the present time at the Bethesda Naval Hospital. He is a Navy veteran of 9 years' service and saw much active fighting in the Pacific during World War II, as well as recent service in the Korean conflict.

ARE WE BETTER OFF TODAY?

Mr. MASON. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the genial gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK], in an extension of remarks on Monday, made quite a point of the fact—and it is a fact—that today our people have twice as many dollars in their pockets after paying their taxes as they had back in the Hoover days. The inference was that our people are twice as well off. Let us see if that is so.

When one changes \$3,000 into 6,000 half-dollars, is one better off? That is exactly what we have done with our dollars since 1940. An article in the current issue of the Reader's Digest points out that a man earning \$3,000 in 1940 must earn \$6,072 today to enjoy the same standard of living as he did in 1940. A \$5,000 man in 1940 must get \$10,542 today; a \$10,000 man in 1940 must get

\$22,850 today; a \$25,000 man in 1940 must get \$76,332.

What the genial gentleman from Massachusetts did not point out is the fact that our people—while they have twice as many dollars in their pockets—are paying today just 12 times as much in taxes as they did in 1940.

In 1940 Uncle Sam collected \$5,000,000,000 in taxes. That was the peak tax load up to that time. Today Uncle Sam is collecting \$60,000,000,000 in taxes—12 times as much as he did in 1940. That is a 1,200-percent increase in 12 years, or an average yearly increase in the tax load of 100 percent for the 12-year period.

AMENDING FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 586, Rept. No. 1646) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5767) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum resale prices and which are extended by State law to nonsigners, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. It shall also be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the text of the bill (H. R. 6925) as a substitute for the committee amendment to the bill H. R. 5767. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING WAR CLAIMS ACT

Mr. SABATH (on behalf of Mr. DELANEY), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 587, Rept. No. 1647) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3719) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for unpaid compulsory labor and inhumane treatment of prisoners of war and for other enemy violations of the Geneva

Convention respecting prisoners of war. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 588, Rept. 1648) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6839) to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MALKA DWOJRA KRON

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 899, an act for the relief of Malka Dwojra Kron, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Malka Dwojra Kron and Tauba Kron shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Malka Dwojra Kron and Tauba Kron."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID YEH

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3668, an act for the relief of David Yeh, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "1923" and insert "1943."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YURIKO TSUTSUMI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 761, an act for the relief of Yuriko Tsutsumi, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Yuriko Tsutsumi, the Japanese fiancée of Sgt. (1c) Alfred A. Wetmore, a citizen of the United States presently serving in the United States Armed Forces, and that the said Yuriko Tsutsumi shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Yuriko Tsutsumi is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sgt. (1c) Alfred A. Wetmore, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yuriko Tsutsumi, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yuriko Tsutsumi, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Yuriko Tsutsumi as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR
CONDUCTING CERTAIN PERSONNEL IN-
VESTIGATIONS

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1635)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
EDWARD H. REES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
FRANK CARLSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment inserts a new section which provides that all findings, records, and reports made or compiled by the Civil Service Commission under the bill shall, upon the request of any committee of Congress, be made available to such committee. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: These amendments make clerical changes which are rendered unnecessary by the action of the conferees on amendment No. 1, and the House recedes.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
EDWARD H. REES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous conference report signed by the three conferees of the Senate and the three conferees of the House.

There was but one question in conference: The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] which was adopted in the Committee of the Whole by a close vote and afterward in the House. This amendment provided that all findings, records, and reports made or filed by the Civil Service Com-

mission under this bill should be made available to the committees of Congress upon the request of such committees.

The Senate conferees were strongly opposed to the amendment. Under those circumstances the House conferees receded and yielded.

I understand that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] who proposed the amendment intends to offer a bill incorporating not only this amendment but covering also other agencies.

I think there is no opposition to the conference report.

I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], author of the amendment which was stricken out in conference.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House I offered the amendment to which the distinguished chairman of the committee has referred, which would provide:

All findings, records, and reports made or compiled by the Civil Service Commission under this act shall be made available to the committees of the Congress upon the request of such committees.

When this was taken out of the bill in conference I had intended to offer a motion to recommit with instructions that the conferees insist upon the amendment. I have since been advised, however, that were this amendment in the bill undoubtedly the bill would be vetoed. I recognize the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and their need to handle more important matters than the routine check on Federal employees. To prevent any chance of a veto of the bill I will not offer the motion to recommit with instructions but I am today introducing a bill which will accomplish the purposes of the amendment, making these files available to the appropriate committees of the Congress upon request by those committees. I feel that since the House adopted the amendment when the bill was before us, the committee undoubtedly will send it back to the floor, it being the will of the House that such legislation be enacted as demonstrated by its previous adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. 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. 36]

Baring	Carrigg	Dollinger
Battle	Case	Doughton
Boykin	Chiperfield	Doyle
Buchanan	Combs	Flood
Buffett	Dingell	Gamble

Gathings	Kearns	Powell
Gavin	Larcade	Prouty
Granger	McCarthy	Sasscer
Grant	Mack, Ill.	Sheehan
Hand	Martin, Iowa	Stockman
Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, Calif.	Sutton
Hart	Mills	Tackett
Hays, Ark.	Morano	Taylor
Hébert	Morton	Velde
Hedrick	Murdock	Weichel
Hollfield	Murray, Wis.	Welch
James	Nelson	Wickersham
Jenison	Norrell	Wood, Ga.
Johnson	O'Konski	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Wednesday next, following the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge enactment of the omnibus social-security bill, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL].

The object of this bill is to move further in the direction of banishing the paralyzing fear of insecurity now inherent in our highly organized, mechanized, and interdependent economy.

It would do this first by increasing the level of social-insurance benefits. Then it would grant protection against permanent and total disability, and against temporary disability. It would also encourage the rehabilitation of the disabled.

This bill proposes to extend the coverage of social security to numerous groups of our citizens who are not now covered, including members of the Armed Forces, farm owners, farm workers, domestics, and certain groups of Government employees. The total additional number of our people estimated to be covered by the provisions of this bill is eleven million.

Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill is to grant social-security protection to more of our citizens and to assure all participants in the social-security system that, as far as is possible and practicable, they are to be protected against the hazards which constitute the basic ingredients of insecurity—injury, chronic illness, and old age.

We, as a representative democracy, are engaged in a critical struggle with Communist aggression and with the spread of Communist ideology. We combat the aggression by building up our allies and by strengthening our own military strength. We halt the spread of

Communist ideology by showing that our democracy is dynamic enough to institute the social reforms necessary to assure our people of, in the words of our great Declaration of Independence, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The woefully weak position of communism in our country, following the great depression of the late twenties and early thirties, is due entirely to the faith our people have in our democracy, and our ability, as demonstrated in the early days of the New Deal, to meet and solve these pressing social problems.

Our greatest bulwark against the growth of the Communist ideology is to continue to perfect our social-security system, to increase its benefits, and to broaden it to include more and more of our citizens. This bill is a step in the right direction, and should have as much, if not greater, priority than all other legislation designed to combat the spread of an evil, totalitarian doctrine.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7176) asking appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; and pending that motion Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7176, the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1953, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] is entitled to recognition for 1 hour and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for 1 hour.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, let me first take time to thank the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior bill for the friendliness they displayed throughout the consideration of the measure. I wish in addition to congratulate the clerk of the committee, this being his first year with us. He has done a very good job.

Mr. Chairman, we are in here again with an appropriation bill for the Interior Department. The budget recommended \$626,000,000; the committee allowed \$492,000,000, a cut of \$137,000,000; in other words, a 21 percent cut below

the budget recommendation and \$36,000,000 below last year. My only regret, as I said here a year ago, is that the bill is not \$2,000,000,000, because every dime in this bill is spent in America and its possessions no matter in what part of the world they lie; I repeat, every dollar in this bill is spent on America and her possessions around the world.

As you travel by train on the Pennsylvania Railroad to Philadelphia or New York, you pass near the Glenn Martin airplane factory near Baltimore, a factory that cost perhaps \$25,000,000, \$30,000,000, or \$50,000,000—I do not know the exact amount—but that little box there houses 25,500 employees; yet America's possessions all the way from the Statue of Liberty to Guam are covered in this bill; and, I repeat, all we are spending on it is \$492,000,000.

They say we are spending a lot of money. Let us look at the Interior Department and make a few comparisons. Back in 1939 the National Park Service, an arm of the Interior Department, supervised 20,000,000 acres and they had 8,000 employees, and in 1939 15,000,000 visitors went to the parks. Last year the National Park Service had under supervision 23,000,000 acres, yet they had only 5,000 employees with which to do the job, a cut of 3,000; and the number of visitors to the parks increased to 36,000,000.

In making that cut did we harm or injure the National Park Service? Yes; because today in the Yellowstone Park they do not have men enough to put on the gates to collect the \$3 fees from drivers of vehicles entering the park; that is how low, how far we cut them. I repeat, there are not enough employees in the Park Service today to put men at the gates to collect fees and relieve the congestion there.

Take a look also at the Fish and Wildlife Service up in Alaska. Thirty years ago when the population of that Territory was only 50,000, mostly natives, there were 230 enforcement officers on the Federal payroll looking after fish and wildlife. Today in Alaska there are but 20 enforcement officers and including natives and soldiers there are a million people up there, three-quarters of them are carrying guns—and only 20 people enforcing the fish and wildlife laws of the Territory. We have fewer people there than the State of Rhode Island employs in similar service, a place where there are no caribou, no moose, no deer, or anything like that. There are more people on the State payroll of Rhode Island enforcing the fishing and hunting laws of that State than the Government of the United States has in the whole of Alaska.

The fishing industry up there in Alaska takes \$160,000,000 annually out of Alaska. Up until about 3 years ago they had about 200 boats up there fishing for sockeye salmon. But last year they had 700 boats. There was nobody up there to stop them from encroaching on the laws and taking out the fish by the millions as they are on their way to the spawning grounds. This gives you some idea as to just how fast they are going to do away with the salmon industry, the biggest industry in Alaska today. That

industry is coming to an end much faster than it came to an end in the United States. But that is what we have going on today.

Now, let us consider reclamation. In 1939 there were 6,960 people on the payroll having to do with reclamation. Last year, and right now, we have on the payroll 13,661. We have spent almost \$2,000,000,000 on reclamation, building huge dams all over this Nation; yet with all the huge dams that we have built for power, reclamation, irrigation, and everything else, we have only added 6,000 people to that payroll.

This does not mean anything to me because there is nothing in this bill practically for the people of Ohio. But I still have enough love in my heart for this country, and I say to you that every dollar you take out of this bill somewhere from Maine to California the people are going to suffer, and I really mean suffer. You can do what you want to with what is in this bill, but may I say that every time you cut this bill, it is a hand in destroying the soil, the trees, and water of this Nation.

Let us take the Indian Bureau. In 1939 there were 14,000 employed in the Indian Bureau. Today there are 14,000 employed in the Indian Bureau. In 1939 there were only 23,000 children going to school on the various Indian reservations. Today there are 33,000 children going into those schoolrooms. Just think of that—11,000 more than in 1939. I say we should be thankful that the Bureau of Indian Affairs is doing such a good job in putting those children into schoolrooms.

Just consider for a moment the damage we do the mines and the streams by cutting this bill. I can remember the Pocono Mountains, for instance. As a boy I was raised in the foothills of those mountains. I have seen the lumber barons rob and loot our forests clear across the Nation, from Pennsylvania to California. There are not many stands of timber left in this Nation, only those few perhaps on the west coast. That is why I am asking in this bill that you protect your forests, your streams, and everything of that nature. Please leave these things in the bill.

Members will get up here on the floor and talk about public power destroying the incentive of private industry. They will tell you that private industry does not want to invest its money. Let us see just what public power has done to one utility in California.

The Shasta Dam was built out there as a great reservoir to catch the water of the Sacramento River coming down from the mountains. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is expanding now their facilities, their corporation, their utilities, to the extent of \$1,250,000,000. They are spending more money on expansion than United States Steel, General Motors, or some of the other big corporations in this country. That applies to just one utility out there in California. Yet we would be led to believe that the building of the Shasta Dam or public power is going to harm private utilities and private industry.

I am happy to be here this afternoon presenting this bill to you. I again tell

you that as time marches on please do not cut it because the committee has already cut it 21 percent. I think this bill has been cut more than any other bill that will come in here from the Appropriations Committee. I again repeat, it is \$35,000,000 below last year's bill, it is \$122,000,000 below the budget, and every dime you take from here on out of the bill will be taking away from the streams, the trees, oil, gas, ore, or whatever it may be. You will be taking away from America.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I desire to compliment every member of this committee, as well as our very able executive secretary, Mr. Carson Culp, who rendered valuable service to the committee. He is a tireless worker and very sincere in everything he does. Every Member of Congress knows that without an efficient secretary the Members of Congress would be greatly handicapped. We are especially fortunate in having such a fine secretary.

I also wish to pay my compliments to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. He is one of those fellows who has ideas of his own, and he fights for those ideas. I hold the gentleman in the highest esteem, as he well knows. With all the differences that he and I have, in the final analysis we generally come out pretty close together.

Now Mr. Chairman, our committee has reduced the budget request for the Department of the Interior approximately 21 percent, and we made those cuts where we were sure they would do no harm, however, we should have made greater cuts in personnel than we did. We just heard the gentleman from Ohio make the remark that we should be spending \$2,000,000,000 a year for the development of the great West and the preservation of our natural resources. Well, I want to say that I, too, wish we could afford to spend \$2,000,000,000 a year for the development of that great area lying west of the Missouri River, because there is where the future for our coming generations will depend, those who want to farm; those who want to get into business. There is where most of them will go to find work and find land that is still cheap enough so they can afford to buy it. We should be spending more money to conserve that which our children must have in the years to come, such as our great natural resources, our minerals and metals, and the precious soil that we are letting go to waste, so that they will have a happy, prosperous life, such as we have enjoyed, because the population is increasing by over 2,000,000 a year, and we simply will not have enough acres under cultivation to take care of the growing population in the years to come. But we cannot afford to spend more money than we are now spending for those things today. I hope the time will come when we will not spend so much on all these other things for which we are spending billions upon billions today here and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, we, as you know, made quite a substantial cut, as the report shows, in the reclamation items. That

was mainly due to the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation had a great unobligated and unspent balance from previous years. It seems that there are too many head men in the Department of the Interior who are more concerned about spending millions upon millions for power production and transmission lines than they are for reclamation and irrigation.

Of course, I would be the last to criticize any bureau for not spending money which they should not spend.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the able gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I hope when it is recovered and turned back to the United States Treasury we will not send it to Europe, Africa, or Asia, or some other distant part of the world.

Mr. JENSEN. I hope so, too, believe me.

Mr. SHORT. As the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio, pointed out, every dollar of this money is spent for and on America or her possessions.

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly right. Another substantial cut was made in the budget request for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau of Indian Affairs came in with a budget request of over \$122,000,000, which is over \$48,000,000 more than the Indian Bureau had to spend last year. The committee felt that long steps by leaps and bounds could not be justified.

Mr. Dillon Myer, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, attempted to justify the amount, and some of it, I think, was justified, especially the trade schools which he had recommended for the Indian children. Instead of teaching them to make tomahawks, boats, rings and bracelets and the like, we are now teaching them every kind of trade. So there is some additional money in the bill for that purpose.

There is about \$1,000,000 in this bill over and above last year for soil and moisture conservation on the Indian lands. I have contended for years, as many of you know, that until we build up the productivity of the soil on the Indian reservations the Indian problem is going to continue to become worse and worse as the years go by. So we finally put in approximately \$3,000,000 in this bill for soil and moisture conservation.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Will the gentleman tell me why we should not give these Indians full citizenship and dissolve the reservation treaties? How many generations are we going to go before we cease to consider them Indians and consider them American citizens?

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad the gentleman has brought up that subject. If we continue in the future as we have been going in the last 100 years, we will never emancipate the Indians. Actually there are one or two tribes that are not able to take care of themselves with the help of the States and the local people, with the exception of health and education. I am happy that the State

of Montana has set up an Indian commission to look into the Indian problem and make recommendations to the Congress as to how we can best and most quickly emancipate the Indians in the State of Montana.

In this bill, not at the request of the Bureau of Indian Affairs but at the committee's insistence, we have placed \$150,000 to set up a planning committee. This committee will be composed of people who know the Indian problem and how to solve the Indian problem. They will not be employees of the Indian service as such. We are going outside the Indian service to employ a sufficient staff to make investigations and report to the Congress and to the respective States.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to yield to the able gentleman.

Mr. D'EWART. I think that is in accordance with the desires of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the House. We have worked toward that end for a number of years, and we think there is an opportunity to get out of some of the functions, to get out of some of the States, and to get out some of the tribes. Certainly, I think, your committee ought to be commended for setting up this fund for this study. I hope the studies will be productive of a way to get these people away from wardship, and on their way to end wardship, and treated the same as everyone else. It is a good idea, and our committee will be glad to cooperate with you in every way that we can in carrying out this effort.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman from Montana who has taken a great interest in the problems of the Indians, and I know that every Member of the House has great confidence in what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about the trust islands which were mandated to the United States under the United Nations Charter. Along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] I took a trip to the Trust Territories of the South Pacific. There are some 125 islands, that are inhabited in an area 1,000 miles wide by 3,000 miles. There we have the supervision over some 60,000 South Pacific Islanders who are the finest people I have ever met. They are deeply religious. They ask for nothing more than a chance to live in their own native way, and in harmony and peace with the world. We spent 12 days there moving from one island group to another, and it was very interesting and informative. The High Commissioner is former Senator Albert Thomas of Utah. He lives in Honolulu. He has an assistant administrator on each island group, and they have personnel to the extent of about 300 people working there and in Honolulu headquarters.

The Japs were in control of those islands for many years, as you well know, after World War I, and then shortly after Pearl Harbor the Japanese Government took over complete control of the life and property of all those people, and when we invaded and took back the

islands, many of the islands were almost leveled to the ground as a result of our gunfire and bombing. So, we have quite a problem there. The first thing they want is to get their land back. After we get the land back to the original owners, their problems and our problem will be about 90 percent solved. We must be careful because, unless we are careful, the first thing we know, we will have another Indian Bureau set-up on our hands, which will mushroom and could soon cost us untold millions of dollars per year. That is why the committee made a very substantial cut in that item.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. In 1946, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORR] and a number of other colleagues and I were out in that part of the world. We visited a number of cemeteries on isolated islands particularly one on Kwajalein and one on Iwo Jima. The one on Iwo Jima was quite a large one. What has happened to them?

Mr. JENSEN. I must be frank with the gentleman; we did not go into that matter; since most of the bodies of soldiers engaged in the Pacific theater were laid to rest in the Punchbowl Cemetery in Honolulu.

Mr. Chairman, I am informed that several gentlemen from Minnesota propose to bring up the question of the proposed Minnesota lines. During the hearings, one of the gentlemen admitted that the rate for this power will be higher than 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. He admitted that it might go up 60 or 70 percent on account of the inflation of construction costs. This would be a minimum, but even then would closely approach 10 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The proposed rate of 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour is greatly inadequate to repay the bill. It is proposed to build 550 miles of transmission line from Garrison Dam and 250 miles from Fort Randall. I have been informed by neutral electrical engineers that the power as delivered on a circuit this long is not economical by any stretch of the imagination.

At the end of such a long extension some power would be there, but it would come in waves or surges, as they call it, to the point where motors could not maintain continuous operation. Lights would flicker and possibly burn out. Power from this source alone could not be dependable. Steam plants would have to be added at additional cost to the contract price and rates would have to be made in accordance.

Moreover, I should like to submit for the RECORD, a letter to Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation, dated September 18, 1951, from Louis A. Pick, lieutenant general, Chief of Engineers, in which General Pick refuses to concur in the interim rates already approved by Straus and the Department of the Interior. These rates were set up without consultation with the Army engineers, although the Army engineers constructed the dams at which the power is generated. General Pick refuses to concur in the allocation of costs on which the capital base of 5.5 mills is based.

None of these dams will be in operation for some time to come. In the meantime, it is my guess that when the whole truth is known, the farmers of Minnesota will not be interested in Reclamation Bureau power.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1951.

Mr. MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. STRAUS: I have had an opportunity to examine the recent testimony by officials of the Bureau of Reclamation in support of a request for an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for planning and construction of reservoirs for flood control in the Kansas River Basin. Included with this testimony is a memorandum of March 10, 1950, from the Commissioner of Reclamation to the Secretary of the Interior regarding the establishment of rates for sale of power from Federal projects in the Missouri Basin, including the projects now being constructed by the Corps of Engineers. There is also included a tabulation giving a tentative allocation of the total estimated cost for the project, with estimates of repayment, including facilities to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. This table appears on page 514 of the printer's proof of the testimony referred to above.

I am not familiar with the basis for the allocations set forth in this tabulation and am unable to find that the Corps of Engineers was ever consulted in its preparation. We are, of course, primarily concerned with the figure of \$1,289,951,000 given as the non-reimbursable allocation to flood control and navigation, because of the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers for these functions and because we are not aware of the basis used in obtaining the allocation figure used. This allocation to flood control and navigation should, of course, include any allocations to flood control in reservoirs of the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Corps of Engineers has not received any complete information in this respect. Furthermore, we cannot identify the total estimated cost of \$4,670,363,000 used in the tabulation and cannot determine whether it includes the cost of the navigation project.

There are certain other features of this allocation which the Corps of Engineers considers doubtful pending further information on the basis of the figures used. The part of the cost allocated to power indicates that in all probability only the direct-power costs, or a part of those costs, for main river dams like Fort Peck, Garrison, Oahe, and Fort Randall have been charged to power and that, apparently appropriate parts of the joint costs for these projects have not been allocated to power. The question here involved has an important bearing on power allocations and rates.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate because the Corps of Engineers is unable to concur with the allocation presented in the testimony, and because I feel that publication of a tentative allocation of this kind may tend to give it an official status which is not warranted and which may be premature insofar as consideration of power rates is concerned.

As you know, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers have been engaged since 1947 in joint efforts to arrive at an appropriate allocation of costs of the entire Missouri Basin project, but these studies have never been completed. Because of the joint responsibility of our two agencies, under existing law, for prosecution and operation of the Missouri River Basin project, I feel that unilateral cost allocations made by one agency without full consultation with the other are likely to

be confusing and make more difficult the official division of costs which must be prepared eventually. I propose, therefore, that our two agencies agree to expedite and push to a conclusion our joint efforts to arrive at an accurate allocation of cost for the project, and that we issue to our respective field offices responsible for work in the Missouri Basin the instructions necessary to complete this procedure.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS A. PICK,
Lieutenant General, Chief of Engineers.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I have had occasion to go before the Appropriations subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and I never expect to be used any more courteously than I was by that group. Notwithstanding the long hours they had spent in hearings they gave me an audience and heard me at length. I do not know how I can express my feeling of gratitude any more appreciatively than to say that I have never been used better.

I have also been very appreciative of the work of the committee dealing with Interior appropriations. I think our chairman made a fine statement this morning in talking about how he would like to build those things that so closely touch the people of America.

In cutting an appropriation bill for the Interior Department any cut that is made is not economy, for when we cut an appropriation bill for this department we take away future earnings of this Government and cut out revenue-producing enterprises we very badly need. Out in my particular section my people were interested in some development of the Missouri Valley. Minnesota has one of the highest cost power rates of any State in the Union, due to being located in a high-cost fuel area. We have been hampered very much over the years because of our inability to produce power at a rate cheap enough to provide industrial and agricultural expansion to the extent enjoyed by other areas located closer to fuel-producing areas. When our people heard of this Missouri Valley development their hopes were raised and they thought they saw an opportunity where they might receive part of the benefit of this development such as is taking place in the Northwest at Bonneville, in the South on the Tennessee Valley, and in the Southwest through the dams that have been put in by the Bureau of Reclamation.

When the Minnesota people came down here a year ago they were told in the Senate that they should see what they could do about getting together with public and private power and see what could be worked out to the best advantage. They went home and held meeting after meeting. This year they came before the committee with a united front. When they heard that the Bureau of the Budget had approved this item for the building of a transmission line it gave them a feeling of confidence, for somehow people seem to feel that when they can secure that approval they have overcome one of the big hurdles. So it came as a great disappointment

to them and a great disappointment to me when this particular item was stricken out of the bill.

This particular item about which we are talking eventually will cost \$54,000,000, but the \$54,000,000 will all be repaid by the users plus 3 percent interest. In addition it will bring power in to Minnesota that will be distributed throughout the southwestern part of the State, an advantage they never have had before. It will mean that in the development of that country there will be greater earnings, and who can profit by those earnings any more than the United States Government through the collection of internal revenue? So on top of a loan, which is repayable with 3 percent interest, revenue will be collected by the Treasury of the United States from the earnings of the people in that particular area.

It will do another thing that is very badly needed. It will encourage production. Production of what? The production of agricultural products and agricultural resources and that sort of thing which we presently talk of in terms of surpluses. But by the time this item is built and transmission lines are completed, we may be faced with an entirely different situation, a situation in which consumers will be trying to find some place from which to get food and fiber.

I appreciate this opportunity to bring before the Members of the House this particular problem and I hope some future consideration can be given to the matter.

This project was initiated by the Senate in 1951. The Minnesota REA cooperatives and the private utility companies appeared at that time; the REA's in favor of the project, the power companies requesting that no action be taken until a complete study has been made. The Senate did not act favorably on the proposal primarily because the project had not been included in the President's budget message to the Congress, and also because a coordinated plan had not been developed.

Statements on the floor of the Senate were to the effect that the REA's and the private utilities in Minnesota should undertake a joint study of the Minnesota project in an effort to agree on a plan whereby Missouri Basin hydroelectric power could be made available to the people in the most economical manner possible.

This year the Bureau of Reclamation project for Minnesota has been included in the Bureau of the Budget message; likewise the REA's and the private utility companies this year have agreed upon a plan in support of the project. This joint plan is in response to the request of the Senate and was arrived at after months of study and joint discussions. It is a plan which will utilize the present and planned facilities both of REA's and the private companies in a manner which will require a minimum expenditure on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation, and will result in the most practical and economical means of making hydroelectric power available in an area already included in the original over-all Missouri Basin project previously approved by the Congress.

The proposed 230,000-volt transmission line in Minnesota is not initiating a new program inasmuch as lines previously have been authorized to points in North and South Dakota which are now under construction or have been completed. This line is an extension of previous authorizations and would simply close and complete a high-voltage loop making possible utilization of power that will be generated at previously authorized hydroelectric facilities in the Missouri River Basin.

Careful coordination of the engineering studies that have been made of the problem by the cooperatives, the private power companies and the Bureau of Reclamation reveal that for technical and economic reasons it is necessary that the proposed "back-home" transmission line be built by the Bureau for the following reasons:

(a) This line will integrate areas served by three large private power companies, 20 REA cooperatives, and many municipalities. It is essential that this large area, with its divergent interests, have a central medium through which over-all integration of all power facilities will be accomplished.

(b) Under the plan proposed Federal investments will be limited to this one line, thus providing over-all economy.

(c) It will provide for full use of all existing generating and transmission and distribution facilities.

(d) It will provide the basis for intelligent planning for future development of added facilities that will become necessary to meet ever-growing demands for power.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, most Americans have just taken inventory of their own affairs and know that their own income taxes have reached a devastating level. After making these sacrifices, the taxpayer is entitled to ask: "How is Uncle Sam, the recipient of this huge take, faring?"

Official reports show that the administration ended the first 8 months of the present year over \$7,500,000,000—\$7,520,481,692, to be exact—in the red. So the Treasury officially reported on March 4. The Treasury also reported that at the end of February the national debt was well over \$260,000,000,000—an increase of more than \$4,500,000,000 in a year.

The Treasury Department estimates that the interest on the national debt alone next year will cost the taxpayers well over \$6,000,000,000. This is nearly twice the cost of all Government expenditures 25 years ago.

We talk familiarly these days of billions, but few minds can grasp any real conception of what nine zeros following a figure actually signify.

Here is one way that has been used in gaging what a billion dollars means: If a firm had started in business with a billion dollars in capital in the year our Saviour was born—1 A. D.—and, if it had been managed so poorly that it lost \$1,000 each day, by now—1952—the business concern still would have enough capital left from the original investment to continue operations for nearly another 1,000

years—until 2939 A. D., to be exact—going on losing \$1,000 every single day.

So when we fight to save a billion dollars from unnecessary waste or from falling into the clutches of a special-privilege clique or the mink-coat gang, it should not be visioned as just an insignificant one-eighty-fifth of what Mr. Truman has asked us to spend this year. It is a colossal sum of money any way one may look at it. Every billion or substantial fraction of such an astronomical amount saved is well worth the long hours that we of the so-called economy bloc spend in striving for cuts in the appropriation bills.

The box score so far on the four appropriation measures recently approved by the House is as follows:

We cut the President's demands in the third supplemental bill by \$101,414,682; in the Treasury and Post Office bill by \$76,580,000; independent offices, \$724,471,415; and Labor and Federal Security, \$200,167,893. Total savings on the first four appropriation bills, one billion plus \$102,633,990.

Let us redouble our efforts rather than be discouraged that we have saved only something over a billion dollars, so far.

The committee has done well in reducing this Interior bill by some \$133,000,000, but I hope we can cut it down even further.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, during the past few years that I have been a Member of Congress every few weeks I have heard on the floor of the House some kind of speech deploring the plight of our Indians. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs in the House and also as Congressman representing a district that has a large Indian population, I have received hundreds of communications from all over the country along the same line. Many of the statements concerning Indians demand to know how much longer the Federal Government is going to continue to pour out millions of dollars for the relief or supervision of the Indians, or they damn the Indian Bureau for maintaining the Indians in a type of bondage simply to perpetuate jobs for an overgrown bureaucracy.

Virtually every year when this appropriation comes up for debate many sincere and well-meaning Members make statements along the line that they would like to appropriate increased amounts of money for the poor Indians but they hesitate to make such appropriations because they have heard that most of the money appropriated simply goes to pay salaries and expenses of the bureaucrats in the Office of Indian Affairs.

Unless one studies the exact nature of the services rendered to the Indians by the Bureau of Indian Affairs it is very easy to draw that conclusion. During the past few years that I have been chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs I have spent considerable time digging into the exact services that are rendered and whether or not the Indians are getting full benefits from the moneys appropriated. I am convinced that as of today the Indians

are receiving full value for the money appropriated and that when this House seriously cripples appropriations for the Bureau of Indians Affairs it is vitally affecting the lives of several hundred thousand American Indians. I would like to tell you why this is true.

Out of the estimated 13,000 personnel provided for the Bureau this fiscal year, over one-half, or approximately 7,500 were for the health, education, and welfare services rendered to the Indians. A major share of this is accounted for by teachers in 338 day and boarding schools; doctors, nurses, and orderlies in 68 hospitals and clinics; and the facilitating personnel such as ward attendants, matrons, janitors, cooks, and other kitchen help, bus drivers, and operators of utility plants who are necessary to keep the health and educational institutions in running order. Any reduction in personnel in these funds simply means less education or poorer health services available to the Indians, and they already have a pitifully low health standard in comparison to the general population.

Approximately 3,700 personnel out of the total of 13,000 were employed for the job of assisting Indians in the development and management of their resources and in training them to assume full managership of their lands and other resources. As long as the Federal Government has a trust responsibility under numerous statutes passed by Congress over a long number of years for some 56,000,000 acres of Indian land and approximately \$150,000,000 of trust funds, it must adequately supervise the management of these resources by the Indians in order to fulfill the trust. These personnel are employed in forest and range work, fire suppression, in rendering extension and soil and moisture conservation assistance, the maintenance of irrigation systems, the repair and maintenance of roads and trails, the handling of thousands of real-estate transactions, the probate of estates, the disbursement of tribal funds, the control of noxious weeds, and maintenance of buildings and utilities.

Included in the total of approximately 13,000 employees on the Bureau's rolls, almost 1,700 are paid from tribal and special funds which do not come out of the pockets of the taxpayers. These employees are engaged in a variety of activities, including the operation and maintenance of irrigation and power systems, the operation of sawmills, the administration of trust lands and funds, the management of forest and range resources, and the operation of school farms. Several of the tribes are paying almost the entire cost of the services rendered by the Bureau to their members. Outstanding among these are the Osage Tribe in Oklahoma, the Klamath Tribe in Oregon, and the Menominee Tribe in Wisconsin. The Bureau is working with additional tribes who by reason of large recoveries from claims are now in a position to assume some of the cost and more responsibility for resource development and management.

The 1952 appropriation provides for 1,300 personnel employed in the con-

struction of new buildings and utilities, most of which were schools and hospitals and small road and irrigation projects.

Only about 600 personnel are employed in general administrative work, which includes those positions of superintendents, area directors, the Commissioner and his staff, accountants, bookkeepers, and general administrative people who are required to keep a large organization operating efficiently.

Of the total of over 13,000 personnel employed to operate this intricate job, only about 280 are located in Washington. The rest are in the field, where direct services are rendered to the Indians.

When you consider the magnitude of the job involved and the problem of training these people to manage their own affairs, I do not think the number of personnel employed is out of line, especially when you consider the responsibilities that Congress itself has imposed upon the Bureau.

Another factor that I would like to bring out is that over 57 percent of the Bureau employees are Indians.

Gentlemen, any time you eliminate these personnel you are not just denying salaries to bureaucrats, as many have charged; you are denying essential services to Indians—services that are supplied to the rest of the population by Federal, local, and State governments and public and private organizations. As I have indicated before, I have heard many times in the past that if you were sure the Indians were getting the benefits from this money you would not hesitate to appropriate much more than has been appropriated. It is a little confusing to me just how you would have the Indians receive these benefits. You certainly would not suggest that they be given cash. If this were possible we could assume that they were completely competent to manage their own affairs and there would be no need for any kind of services.

I am afraid that it simply boils down to having to continue to render these services by employing personnel until the Federal Government is able to divest itself of that responsibility.

I, for one, am highly encouraged by the progress that has been made in the past 2 years in withdrawing supervision from Indians. The Indian Bureau has recently completed legislative proposals that will soon be considered by my committee to withdraw supervision completely from some 30,000 Indians in California and 2,000 in western Oregon. A programming operation has been set up in the Bureau for many other tribes, and I am confident that we can make real progress in getting out of business. Even those tribes that are least able to take care of their own affairs are starting to think and work with the Bureau in terms of a definite program which will culminate in Federal withdrawal.

The Bureau has speeded up its program of turning over its school responsibilities to State and local school districts and is rapidly analyzing all of its functions to determine which can be as effectively administered by some other agency, local, State, or Federal. The Commissioner has stated that it is his

policy to turn over those functions that can be operated as effectively and as cheaply by some other agency, as rapidly as possible.

While the total job is one that cannot be done overnight, I am personally convinced that we do have a sound start and one that will permit the Indians to assume the full responsibilities and benefits of citizenship.

To do this withdrawal job, however, will cost money and I am very unhappy that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to reduce the budget estimate that was submitted by the President to this Congress from \$122,350,000 to \$74,201,426. It is apparent that the committee, in reviewing this estimate and in reviewing the over-all requirements of Government, decided that this was the proper amount for the administration of Indian affairs. I have no quarrel with the committee on how it arrived at this amount for Indian affairs and I do have great respect and confidence in the committee. However, I do say to you that the day would be much nearer when the Federal Government could withdraw from Indian affairs if the full amount had been granted.

Adequate financing is one of the first requirements of sound business. To my mind we have never adequately financed our operations on Indian affairs. Most of the money appropriated has been for the operation of very inadequate schools and hospitals. Consequently, after more than 100 years we still find ourselves a long way from the ultimate goal. When we are now starting to see some real, progressive steps in the right direction I hope that this House will not decide to hamstring the progress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman made a very clear, concise, accurate, and instructive statement about the Indians.

In the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan we have the Ottawas and the Pottawattamies, and they apparently do not belong to any of these organizations. Has the gentleman any idea how long it will be before these Indians will have the same privilege as citizens that we have?

Mr. MORRIS. I would say that with some of them it will be quite a long while before they can be fully assimilated into our society and have all the rights of citizenship. Everyone who is familiar with the question knows that release from wardship will have to be done regionally, because some tribes are more advanced than others. Some will be released from Federal supervision in the very near future, in 2 or 3 years, perhaps, while as to others it will take many years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why are we wet-nursing or treating them like children in a kindergarten, then? The Federal Government has been doing this for many years.

Mr. MORRIS. We are carrying out solemn treaties that we have made with them, and we have not done a very good job.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then we had better pursue another policy.

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

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, as usual the chairman of our subcommittee [Mr. KIRWAN] and the ranking minority Member [Mr. JENSEN] have pretty thoroughly covered the major portions of the requests of the Interior Department for its annual appropriations.

And, as usual the full membership of the subcommittee worked in harmony, generally speaking. To say that we did not have some differences of opinion, at times, would not be quite correct.

However, I believe I am safe in saying that the hearings on this bill were the most harmonious that I have ever experienced since being a member of the subcommittee.

I regret to say that on account of being a patient in the hospital at the beginning of our hearings I was unable to hear the testimony of witnesses who testified from January 15 to January 23, inclusive.

As has already been pointed out the budget estimates for fiscal 1953 were \$626,001,800, the committee recommended \$492,434,763, or a reduction of \$133,567,037, or a 21-percent reduction of the budget estimate.

Those bureaus suffering the greatest cuts were the Bureau of Reclamation, the Indian Bureau, and the Office of Territories. Those three bureaus asked for and were budgeted for almost two-thirds of the entire amount in the whole Interior Department appropriation. This amount, however, was reduced by \$121,983,537, which gave them \$297,950,863 out of the total of \$492,434,763 for the whole Department.

Certainly the amounts granted Bonneville Power Administration is generous to say the least.

Sandwiched in between Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Indian Affairs you will find the Bureau of Land Management which gets less than it got last year by \$257,605 and \$700,000 less than the budget estimate.

The functions of the Bureau of Land Management are important in this great land of ours. It seems to me that the 737,000,000 acres of our public lands in the United States and Alaska in the interest of conserving forest, range, mineral and water resources are mighty important.

Then, you will observe—if you look closely, that squeezed in between the Territories and the Bureau of Reclamation are four other small bureaus, but mighty important ones—the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, National Park Service, and Fish and Wildlife.

While it is true that the committee gave these little fellows practically what they asked for, it is also true that they are beginning to show how necessary they are in our national economy. Certainly the big three should not have a monopoly or strangle hold on all the money the Department of the Interior gets.

Why bless your hearts, if it was not for the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines where would this country be in times of national distress? I do not mean to say that the big boys are not necessary. They are.

There is no one in this House who has deplored the treatment of our Indian population more than I. There is no one who has tried to see that proper medical care and hospitals are provided for them. Yet year after year we get the same old morbidity and death-rate stories. And they still get more appropriations each year.

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

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

Mr. JENSEN. While the gentleman is on the subject of looking after the health of the Indians, may I say that during the 6 years he has been on the committee we have turned over the job of looking after the health of the Indians to him, and he has really done a job. We never question his position when it comes to the health of the Indians, because we know he has looked into it thoroughly.

The committee has also turned over the job of looking after the Bureau of Mines to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He spends a lot of time on that. Therefore, I have nothing but praise for the gentleman from Pennsylvania, not only for that but for all the things he does in the committee.

Mr. FENTON. I certainly appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa. I only wish I were half as good as he says.

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

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's praise of the Geological Survey. It is an ideal Federal agency, and I compliment the committee for being courageous enough to give them a little more money to handle their big job.

Mr. FENTON. I thank the gentleman.

As far as reclamation is concerned I am sure that in many ways a good job has been performed, especially in irrigation. Yes, even in water-power projects that produce power where private industry cannot or will not do so, where necessary.

But we will have to watch those two healthy young offspring of old man Reclamation, namely, Southwest and Southeast Power. Those who believe in private enterprise will do well to read what our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] said before this committee last year—April 23 to be exact—on this subject.

It is encouraging to note, however, that there is a gradual resistance to this trend of reclamation domination in the field of electric energy.

Much could be said about the National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife but I will defer it at this time. Both agencies are very necessary and deserve a little more attention than they have received in the past.

I would like to talk to you today, however, about two agencies that are not only doing a great piece of work for this

country but who are as vital to our economy and existence as the blood in our bodies is vital to our lives.

I refer to the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines. These two agencies are not local in character but extend up and down and across our entire country and Alaska.

There will not be time for me to fully discuss them but I have prepared a short statement on the Geological Survey and a detailed account of the Bureau of Mines activities which I will extend in my remarks, should my time run out.

I will also place in my remarks a list of the various Bureau of Mines facilities with a brief outline of the functions performed. I would advise you, my colleagues, those of you in whose districts these Bureau of Mines facilities are located to see for yourselves just what work the Bureau is performing. I am sure you will agree with me that they are doing a fine job.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The services performed by the Geological Survey have never before been in such demand. I feel that the usefulness of the Geological Survey is just beginning to be appreciated as a result of the demonstration of the effect of its work on our national economy.

Its program of topographic mapping has been and must continue to be greatly accelerated under present conditions to meet the numerous and specific demands growing out of the defense program. In addition to the military requirements for mapping, which have been formulated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, there is insistent demand for maps for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, for exploration for mineral supplies, and for use in our great industrial expansion. It is impossible for the Survey, with its present facilities, to fully meet all these demands, and its program must therefore be organized on a strict priority schedule to supply first the maps most urgently needed.

With the present shortages of mineral supplies the Survey's program of mineral investigations becomes of the utmost importance. This program continues to turn up or appraise new mineral discoveries which are of vital importance to the economy of the country. It is highly important that the Survey continue its program of research to develop the basic principles of ore deposition, which must guide any successful exploration for new sources of supply. Likewise there is an active demand for a continuation of investigations of regional geology pertinent to exploration for oil and gas, which has been of great service to the industry.

In view of the experience of recent years where shortages of water supply have been repeatedly brought to the public attention in various parts of the country, the general utility and usefulness of the Survey's program of water investigation has been amply demonstrated. The intelligent development of our water resources must be dependent in larger degree upon a firm determination of the basic data supplied by the Geological Survey both with regard to surface and underground sources.

The Survey supervises the administration of the mineral leasing laws on the publicly owned lands of the Nation. The present active demand for minerals and for oil and gas has greatly expanded the mineral development on the public lands and has thrown an ever-increasing burden on the Survey for its services, both in the classification of the public lands and in the administration of the leasing laws.

I, therefore, feel that it is in the public interest for the Congress to support this agency which has a long record of commendable service.

**NATION'S INDUSTRIAL MIGHT STRENGTHENED BY
BUREAU OF MINES**

Mr. Chairman, all of us realize that the economic strength and the military might of this Nation have been built upon a firm foundation of minerals and mineral fuels—iron, copper, lead, zinc, aluminum, cement rock, coal, oil and natural gas, to cite but a few. We know that it was the ability of American industry to convert mineral raw materials into weapons and munitions in seemingly endless volume that brought about the downfall of the Kaiser a generation ago and of Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo within the past decade. We know that our industrial productivity is today the chief element of strength in the free world, the principal factor that deters the men in the Kremlin from launching an all-out effort to make themselves masters of the human race.

What many of us do not realize—in fact I did not myself until after a great deal of observation and study—is the extent to which our industrial strength is constantly being bolstered by the work done by the Federal Bureau of Mines. This Bureau was established in the Department of the Interior in 1910, to promote health, safety, economy, efficiency and conservation in the mineral and related industries. Described by law as a bureau of mining, metallurgy and mineral technology, from the beginning it has gone about its work efficiently and quietly. About the only time it gets into the headlines is when it participates in rescue and recovery operations and conducts an investigation after a mine disaster. Such disasters, moreover, are becoming less frequent as State mining officials, mine operators and miners themselves apply more generally the methods of accident prevention that the Bureau has developed.

Those of us who come from mining regions, as I do, are of course familiar with the phases of the Bureau's work that directly affect the industries of our own States and districts. For instance, because anthracite mining is the backbone of my part of Pennsylvania, I have always followed Bureau of Mines activities which promise to help the anthracite industry. Also, as a physician, I always have tried to keep in touch with the Bureau's efforts to reduce health and accident hazards, not only in anthracite- and bituminous-coal mines, but in mines and plants throughout the mineral industries. Later I shall call your attention to a recent Bureau study that promises to benefit every person who has to undergo a surgical opera-

tion for which a general anesthetic is given. However, there are many other phases of the work of the Bureau of Mines with which I was unfamiliar until it became necessary for me to look into them as a member of the subcommittee which has to pass first upon its request for appropriations.

When I undertook to study the work of the Bureau of Mines in considerable detail, as I conceived it my duty to do, I was amazed at the breadth of its field. I was both astonished and gratified, moreover, not only by the magnitude of its accomplishments but also by the high esteem in which the Bureau of Mines is held in scientific and technologic circles not only in this country, but throughout the world. Indeed I have become increasingly convinced that dollar for dollar, none of the money that we vote here buys more benefits for the people of the United States than the modest appropriations of the Bureau of Mines.

A TECHNICAL BUREAU

The Bureau of Mines is a technical bureau, and as such it engages in scientific, technologic and economic research and investigations. It performs considerable fundamental research, a great deal of background research, and some applied research or development. Many of its studies are carried on in cooperation with colleges and universities, private research foundations, and industrial concerns. In selecting problems for study, the Bureau always has been careful not to duplicate work being done by other public or private agencies. Its findings are published for the benefit of the industry and the public as promptly as possible.

From the beginning, the Bureau has acted in accordance with the conviction that Government research should be confined to that which private enterprise will not or cannot undertake or cannot do so well, and that in which secrecy is necessary for reasons of national security. Its studies are intended to supplement those undertaken by other agencies, not to supplant or duplicate them. When a process has been developed to the point where industry is willing to take it over, the Bureau steps out and turns to another problem. When working on a problem which other agencies also are attacking, the Bureau maintains close touch with them to assure coordination and avoid duplication of effort.

The work of the Bureau of Mines falls naturally into three major commodity groups—health and safety, fuels and explosives, and metallic and nonmetallic minerals. Its organization, both at Washington headquarters and in the field, is set up accordingly. A few years ago, to assure closer contact with the mineral industries in various parts of the country, and to make it possible to meet the special needs of various sections more effectively, the Bureau was reorganized on a regional basis. The United States, including Alaska, was divided into eight regions, and a ninth, known as the foreign minerals region, was established to be responsible for the Bureau's activities outside the country.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

I am discussing the Bureau's health and safety activities first for several reasons. In the first place, this phase of its work most closely touches my own professional experience. Then, too, the present Director, Jack Forbes, has been engaged in safety work practically all his life, and especially since he joined the Bureau of Mines as a first-aid miner back in October 1914. Also, as a result of the terrible disaster at West Frankfort, Ill., last December, in which 119 men lost their lives, all of us are keenly conscious of the problem of safety in the mining industry. Then, too, if you look back into the record, you will find that the biggest factor in the decision of the Congress to establish the Bureau of Mines was a series of disastrous coal-mine explosions during the early years of the century.

Right here, before getting involved in a discussion of what the Bureau has done to promote health and safety in the mining and other mineral industries, let me point out that in these industries, at least, safety work is not shut off in a watertight compartment. The Bureau's safety men are not and never have been a bunch of long-haired theorists. When the study of preventing mine disasters was begun—and it was begun in the Geological Survey a few years before the Bureau of Mines was established—the men conducting it had a theory that in nearly every instance, the safe way to do a job is also the efficient and the economical way. Experience bore out that theory. In consequence, while the Bureau's safety men are specialists, they also are practical mining men and engineers. They never think of safety in a vacuum. That is why their educational and training methods have proved so successful in making men safety-conscious over the years.

Let me give you a few examples. When the Bureau of Mines was established, miners worked with open lights or safety lamps. An open flame of any kind is dangerous in a coal mine. A safety lamp, in which the flame is surrounded by wire gauzes so that gas outside it will not become ignited, gives poor light. So, for that matter, did the old-time open lights. Recognizing this problem, the Bureau encouraged various manufacturers to develop an electric cap lamp that would be safe for use in explosives atmospheres. They tested the lamps that the manufacturers submitted, making suggestions for changes in design, until one was developed which would not ignite a gas-air mixture. Then the Bureau designated lamps that met these standards as "permissible" and authorized an approval plate to be affixed to them. Today permissible electric cap lamps, which have been improved over the years, are used in the coal mines of all progressive operators. Not only are they safer than the open lights that they have replaced, but they also give more light. The result is that they enable a miner to work not only more safely, but also more effectively.

One the Bureau's first acts was to open the experimental coal mine at Bruceton, Pa., a few miles outside of Pittsburgh.

There it was proved for the first time that bituminous-coal dust, when raised into a cloud in mine air free from gas, will explode violently and spread an explosion. Scientists in this country and abroad had known for some time that a coal-dust explosion could be caused under such conditions in a steel gallery, but they doubted that it could in a mine. Further experimentation at Bruceton—and I am compressing the work of years—demonstrated that mixing enough rock dust with the coal dust would make it nonexplosive. More research, occasionally branching off into blind alleys, resulted in the development of effective methods of rock dusting. Through repeated demonstration explosions to which State mining officials, mine operators, and miners were invited, and through the publication of reports and handbooks, the Bureau gradually convinced the industry of the need for and effectiveness of rock dusting.

Meanwhile, the Bureau also studied sources of ignition of gas or coal dust. I have mentioned lights already. Other common sources of ignition in coal mines were explosives and electric arcs or sparks. When the Bureau was established, most coal-mine blasting was done with black blasting powder. This is an extremely dangerous explosive. For one thing, it takes only a spark to ignite it. For another, it burns with a long, hot, and relatively slow flame which not only will ignite gas readily, but will stir up a cloud of coal dust and ignite it in the absence of gas. Dynamite, which is safer than black powder to transport because it requires a blasting cap or detonator to set it off but which also produces a hot flame, was another explosive commonly used in coal mines. Tests showed that dynamite was only slightly less hazardous than black blasting powder.

The Bureau did not stop with demonstrating the dangers of black blasting powder and dynamite. By further experimentation, it determined the properties required for an explosive that would be safe for use in coal mines—such things as chemical composition, sensitivity, and above all the quickness, length, and temperature of the flame emitted at the instant of detonation. These standards were published as schedules, and explosives manufacturers were invited to meet them. Explosives passing the rigorous tests were designated as "permissible." The conditions under which they could be used safely—maximum weight of charge, incombustible stemming, electrical firing, and so forth—were scientifically determined. Then the information was made available to the mining industry.

Other Bureau research resulted in the development of standards for constructing and maintaining electrical equipment so that it could not ignite gas. This led to the preparation of other permissibility schedules, and the discovery of the exact conditions under which permissible electrical equipment could be used safely. Ventilation standards for coal mines were established also, as the result of other research, and they were made available to the industry. These included such items as the volume of

air required, methods of assuring that enough air would reach the innermost working places of a mine, and precautions against the accumulation of dangerous quantities of gas.

So complete have been the Bureau's studies of the cause and prevention of mine explosions, and so conclusive have been its findings, that today there is less excuse for a widespread explosion than for any other kind of mine disaster. We still have such disasters, as witness those at Centralia, Ill., in 1947, and at West Frankfort, Ill., last December. There is, however, one big difference between the explosion disasters of the early years of the century and those of today. Then, explosions occurred because people did not know how to prevent them. Today, widespread mine explosions occur only because someone has violated known principles of safety. The reasons that conditions differ in this way is the research done by the Bureau of Mines, supplemented by the educational and training programs of that Bureau. Moreover, because of the inspections made by the Bureau under the Coal-Mine Inspection Act of 1941, to which I shall refer later, both operators and workmen know exactly what hazards exist in a mine.

Please do not misunderstand me. I do not mean that we can be completely free from coal-mine explosions in the foreseeable future. A few years ago one occurred in a mine that had been given a clean bill of health by both Federal and State inspectors. Owing to a derangement of the ventilation in one section, a body of gas accumulated and was ignited either by an arc or spark from a trolley locomotive or by a defective safety lamp. There were 310 men in the mine, but because it was well rock-dusted, the explosion was confined to a small area and only 11 lost their lives. This contrasts strikingly with the Centralia explosion, which had no survivors, and the West Frankfort explosion, which killed 119 men, all but 5 of those working in the affected sections. If the operators of the mine that I have been talking about had not followed the Bureau's recommendations regarding rock-dusting, the explosion undoubtedly would have spread through a great part of the mine and the disaster would have ranked among the great catastrophes of coal-mining history.

The other day Mr. Forbes told me that he is greatly disturbed because his inspectors' reports show that too many mine operators are spraying rock dust on the floors of their mines without first cleaning out accumulations of coal dust and fine coal. That was what happened at West Frankfort, and the result was that when the shock wave that travels in front of an explosion threw the mine dust into the air, the incombustible content was too low to prevent ignition. The same condition, he said, prevails in a good many other coal mines today, and where it does the threat of disaster is always present.

Although it takes a major explosion to make headlines and arouse people—I regret to say—to the need for doing something to increase mine safety, falls of roof and coal year after year cause

more fatalities than any other kind of coal-mine accident. For instance, the five major explosions in 1951 caused only 20 percent of the year's coal-mine fatalities, and adding the toll taken by localized explosions brings the proportion only to 21 percent. During the same year, falls of roof and coal were responsible for 46½ percent of the 790 coal-mine fatalities.

Roof-fall accidents attract little attention from the general public because they are isolated happenings, taking one or two lives at a time here and there throughout the coal-mining States. You could almost count on your fingers the roof-fall accidents that appear on the list of major disasters—those causing five or more fatalities—in the entire statistical history of American coal mining. But if the public pays little heed to this type of accident, the Bureau of Mines watches it as a cat watches a mouse hole. Moreover, the Bureau is acting to cut down the toll.

This action is more complex than it appears, because the problem is complex. Far too little is known of the basic physics involved in the driving of mine openings. Bureau of Mines physicists, using the most modern instruments of scientists, are conducting fundamental research in quest of the answer. Some of this research is conducted in operating coal mines, and some of it in laboratories at the Eastern Experiment Station at College Park, Md. Meanwhile Bureau engineers are attacking the practical problems of roof support. The work of the scientists and of the engineers is closely coordinated.

One result that already has been achieved is the introduction to the coal-mining industry of a method of roof support known as roof-bolting. The Bureau freely admits that it did not originate roof-bolting. This method of roof support had been used for years in the mines of the St. Joseph Lead Co. where the stopes are too high to permit the use of timbers. However, the Bureau did adapt this method of roof support for use in coal mines, it determined the conditions under which it can be adopted safely, and it now assists mine operators in carrying out experimentation to determine whether it is adapted to the conditions in their particular mines, if so, and the proper techniques to use. There are still a number of unanswered questions regarding roof-bolting, which is why the Bureau is conducting extensive research on roof control. Partly, as I have said, this research is designed to determine the basic physics governing the behavior of mine roof, and partly to develop more effective technique of roof support not only by roof-bolting, but also by the use of timbers.

Haulage accidents, except in bad disaster years like 1951, usually stand second only to falls of roof and coal as a cause of coal-mine fatalities. The Bureau has recently begun a program of intensive research designed to reduce the hazards involved in moving coal from the working face to the surface. This involves study of the design of locomotives, mine cars, shuttle-cars—which are rubber-tired, self-propelled vehicles,

powered by electricity, used for transporting coal in a growing number of mines—and various types of conveyors. It also involves research on track and roadway design and maintenance, and investigation of the conditions under which haulage equipment of all kinds is operated and maintained.

The Bureau's studies of both roof-fall and haulage hazards are being aided by analysis of reports of hundreds of fatalities due to falls of roof and coal and to haulage accidents. A little more than 2 years ago the Bureau was able to begin investigating all coal-mine fatalities, not to fix the blame but to determine the exact circumstances under which accidents occur. Prior to that, it had been in a position to investigate only major disasters. The data gained already have proved useful in improving the Bureau's educational and training courses by spotting the unsafe conditions and practices that most frequently cause fatalities.

Education and training has been one of the Bureau's most effective means of reducing the frequency of accidents in the minerals industries from its earliest days. During its nearly 42 years, the Bureau has given first-aid and mine-rescue training to about 2,000,000 persons in the mining and allied industries, and has trained more than 18,500 instructors to teach the Bureau's first-aid course. Within the past few months, the Bureau's first-aid course has been strengthened by including the Holger-Nielsen method of artificial respiration, without, however, abandoning the prone pressure and Sylvester methods because at times one or the other is the only method that can be used inside a mine. In addition, the Bureau has encouraged first-aid and mine-rescue contests, in which teams from various mines and plants compete for prizes offered by local interests. Experience has shown that first-aid training is one of the most effective methods of implanting safety consciousness, and competitions keep team members constantly alert to increase their proficiency. The national first-aid and mine-rescue contest at Columbus, Ohio, last summer, the first held since 1931, was arranged by the Bureau in cooperation with several State mining departments, coal- and metal-mine trade associations, and mine workers' organizations. The teams sent to Columbus were winners of State and mining district elimination contests, and the competition was as keen as that in a World Series or an Army-Navy football game.

The Bureau also conducts two coal-mine accident-prevention courses. One of these is intended for miners, and includes instruction in recognizing and avoiding the hazards likely to be encountered in their daily work. The other, more technical, is designed for supervisors and those aspiring to become supervisors. About 35,000 men have completed the course for coal miners since it was revised in 1947, and about 13,000 have completed the course for supervisors since its revision in 1948. Similar courses are offered for metal-mine employees and officials, and for petroleum industry workmen and su-

pervisors. In addition, there is a metal-mine accident-prevention course, which was completed by nearly 800 employees during the 12 months ending last June 30, and a similar course for employees of mills, ore-dressing plants, and smelters is ready for initial tryout. In addition, short courses in the prevention of roof-fall and haulage accidents were offered for the first time last year.

As an example of the type of dedicated public service that is being rendered by the employees of the Bureau of Mines, I should like to point out that many of these classes are conducted by Bureau engineers and coal-mine inspectors on their own time, with no thought of extra compensation. Drawing inspiration from their chief's example, these men actually live and breathe safety.

Another major method used by the Bureau of Mines to reduce the accident toll of the mining industry is the inspection of individual coal mines, under the Coal-Mine Inspection Act of 1941. The inspectors use the Federal Mine Safety Code, formulated in consultation with representatives of the industry and the miners' union, as a yardstick in bituminous-coal and lignite mines, and the safety standards for anthracite mines, prepared by Bureau experts, in the anthracite mines of Pennsylvania. They examine a mine for hazardous conditions and practices, observing a complete cycle of operations, and prepare a report which lists the hazards observed, with specific recommendations for their correction. Safety improvements since the previous inspection and any commendable safety features also are cited.

The act under which its inspectors operate does not give the Bureau any authority to enforce their recommendations. They can only make recommendations, which are transmitted to the State mining department, the operators, the mine workers' organization, and the joint industry safety committee. A summary of many of the reports is published in newspapers circulating in the county where the mine is situated. In addition, letters calling attention to serious hazards are sent to the president of the mining company and the head of the State mining department concerned. The theory on which the act was based is that publicizing the facts about hazardous conditions would generate enough moral suasion to bring about their correction. In a measure, this has been the case. During the first nine calendar years of Federal inspection, 1,437 men were killed, or 1.13 per million man-hours of exposure, in the anthracite mines of Pennsylvania, compared with 2,046, or 1.61 per million man-hours during the preceding 9 years—a reduction of 30 percent both in the number of fatalities and in the fatality rate. The experience in bituminous-coal and lignite mines was similar, although percentage-wise the reductions were smaller—10 percent in total fatalities, and 18 percent in the fatality rate per million man-hours.

As a matter of fact, the all-time low in fatalities per million man-hours of exposure, 0.90, was attained in 1950. Last

year, owing to the six major disasters, the rate increased to an estimated 1.06. Even this unfavorable rate, however, compares very favorably with the rate of 2.02 fatalities per million man-hours in 1910, the year the Bureau was established, and with the 1.54 fatalities per million man-hours in 1941, the last year before Federal inspection was fully effective. These figures are for all coal—bituminous, lignite, and Pennsylvania anthracite.

In spite of the decreases both in the number of fatalities and in the fatality rate per million man-hours, and in spite of thousands of major safety improvements that have been made in the Nation's coal mines during the years of Federal inspection, we are still far from having our mines in safe condition. Director Forbes recently pointed out that during the fiscal year 1951, Federal inspectors reported an average of 19 unsafe conditions and practices in the mines they inspected, and that 49 percent of the reports made during that year showed serious hazards that were uncorrected. Included among these hazards to which the Bureau's inspectors vainly called attention were those that led to the disaster at West Frankfort just before Christmas, and others that could well cause further disasters.

The Bureau's efforts to safeguard the health of workers in the mineral industries include research upon the development of methods of controlling harmful gases, fumes and dusts. One phase of this work involves developing and applying standards for the approval of respiratory equipment such as dust and gas masks. In this connection, while looking into the history of the Bureau of Mines, I discovered that this agency, back in 1917, performed the first research done in this country on war gases and methods of protecting our troops against them. In quarters on the campus of the American University here in Washington, it developed the first military gas masks made in the United States, and continued to handle problems of gas warfare until 1918, when the work was transferred to the War Department unit that ultimately developed into the Chemical Warfare Service. When this transfer was effected, both the President and the Army were lavish in their praise of the service rendered by the Bureau, whose scientists and technologists had a head start because of the work they already had done on developing devices to give protection against explosives and poisonous gases found in mines.

As part of its work on dusts and gases, the Bureau yearly analyzes many thousands of air samples in its laboratories at Pittsburgh. Many of these are collected by the Federal coal-mine inspections in the course of their regular duties. Others are collected in mines, tunnels and plants at the request of the operators seeking advice on establishing ventilation adequate to provide plenty of pure air and on the type of masks to provide employees exposed for short intervals to harmful dusts, fumes, or gases. In this connection, I might note that the Bureau of Mines early recognized the carbon monoxide content of automobile exhaust gases and recommended

effective precautions against exposure to this deadly gas.

When we passed the Interior Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1948, we included an item to enable the Bureau of Mines to begin combating fires in inactive coal deposits, that is, coal deposits not now being worked. Money has been appropriated for this purpose every year since; through fiscal year 1952, which ends next June 30, these appropriations total \$1,463,000. With this money, the Bureau has controlled or begun the attack upon 21 such fires. Nine of these have been on private property, and the rest on the public domain. With the money spent thus far, about 120,000,000 tons of coal have been saved from destruction, at a cost to the Government of less than a cent a ton. At current prices, it is believed that this coal, when mined, will be worth about half a billion dollars. This, it seems to me, is one of the best investments of taxpayers' money that we ever have made.

Five of the fires that have been brought partly or wholly under control are in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania. Controlling these fires means not only the conservation of an irreplaceable natural resource, but also protecting property and, which is more important, the lives and safety of people living over the coal beds that were burning.

Fire, however, is not the only threat to the anthracite mining industry upon which the economy of my part of Pennsylvania is based and which is important to a large part of the Northeast where this premium fuel finds its largest markets. Water is even more menacing. Unless the flooding of mines by water flowing in from the surfaces at times of heavy rainfall and seeping in from the surrounding and overlying strata can be halted, the industry is doomed, and with it the economic base of the entire region. The problem is too big for the individual companies, too big for the localities, too big, even, for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The Bureau, in cooperation with the operating companies and the Commonwealth, has been studying this problem for several years, and I am informed that within the next 2 or 3 years it will be ready to recommend a solution. This solution, which may involve a tunnel system, central pumping stations, or a combination of the two, probably will require the expenditure of Federal funds. In view of the importance not only to the anthracite region but to the Nation itself of conserving our limited reserves of this premium fuel, however, that expenditure, likewise, will be a profitable investment.

FUELS AND EXPLOSIVES

Its research upon all phases of the extraction, treatment, and utilization of our mineral fuel resources—coal, petroleum, natural gas, and oil shale—has earned the Bureau of Mines a most enviable reputation among scientists and fuel technologists not only in this country, but throughout the world. The results of the Bureau's studies, made available to the industry as rapidly as feasible, have helped immeasurably in enabling the United States to assume world

leadership in fuel technology and to gain and maintain the high state of mechanization that is at the heart of its industrial greatness.

Having lived all my life in the Pennsylvania anthracite region, I am especially interested in the work the Bureau is doing to help the anthracite mining industry. That concerned with fire and flood control I already have mentioned. I should like to call attention, also, to the splendid way in which the Bureau is cooperating with the industry in efforts to develop efficient methods for mechanized mining of anthracite. Because the beds are steeply pitching and the coal is hard, the machinery designed for use in the bituminous-coal fields cannot be used in the anthracite. However, through engineering studies and tests conducted in operating collieries, the Bureau has demonstrated that machines for anthracite mining need not be cumbersome and unduly expensive, and manufacturers are beginning to be convinced that there is a waiting market for such equipment.

Naturally I take great pride in and expect great things from the Bureau's anthracite research laboratory at Schuylkill Haven. I am happy to be able to say that I was largely instrumental in its construction. I trust that the handicapped which was placed upon its operation during the present fiscal year by an unfortunate personnel ceiling will be removed after July 1, and I am confident that the research program that has been planned for the laboratory will prove of great benefit not only to the anthracite region, but to the Nation as a whole. I am especially interested in the studies of gasification of anthracite for the production of synthetic liquid fuels, and in those of its use as fuel for extracting manganese from open-hearth slag, which the Bureau has scheduled.

That the Bureau has done more work on bituminous coal than on anthracite over the years is only natural. There is a lot of bituminous coal, and it is spread pretty much all over the United States, from Pennsylvania to the State of Washington and from Texas to Michigan. On the other hand, virtually all the anthracite in this country is concentrated in central Pennsylvania. Recently the depletion of our best deposits of coking coal and the unprecedented growth of the steel industry have caused the Bureau to give special attention to methods of upgrading coals not commonly used for metallurgical coke, so that they can produce blast-furnace fuel when coked either alone or in blends.

One recent achievement along this line has been the development of a process of coal preparation known as kerosene flotation. So successful has this proved in laboratory and pilot-plant tests that the first plants to use this process, already have been built and put into successful service by private industry.

The Bureau's studies on the combustion of coal, however, go much further back. In cooperation with the electric power industry, it developed a method of burning powdered coal, a common industrial practice today. Its scientific and technologic studies, moreover,

played an important part in reducing the quantity of coal required to generate a kilowatt-hour of electricity from a little more than 5 pounds at the turn of the century to a little more than 3 pounds in 1929 and about a pound today, with the most efficient stations using less than a pound. This increase in the efficiency of burning coal is one of the reasons why the cost of electricity, unlike that of most commodities and services, has remained fairly constant during the past few years.

Over the years, the Bureau of Mines has collected and published analyses of most of the coals found in the United States. The information given includes such items as fixed carbon, volatile matter, ash, moisture, and heating value. While these compilations are made primarily to enable the Government to buy coal on the basis of rigid specifications, they have proved beneficial to all purchasers of coal.

I have mentioned the Bureau's studies aimed at improving mining methods in the anthracite region. Similar studies are being made continually in the bituminous-coal and lignite fields of the Nation, and not only the coal-mining industry but the American people as a whole are reaping the benefit. While our coal resources are tremendous, they are not unlimited. This is true especially of the high-grade coking coals on which our steel and other metallurgical industries rely. For this reason, we cannot afford indefinitely to continue leaving about half the coal in the ground when a mine is abandoned, which students of mining now estimate that we have been doing since the first coal mine was opened in the early 1700's.

Coal left behind in an abandoned mine cannot be considered a resource, because in most instances its subsequent recovery is impossible both technically and economically. Timbers decay, the roof caves, water seeps in and floods the workings, and in consequence both engineering problems and the costs forbid reopening of the property. Recognizing the importance of recovering as much as possible of the coal in the ground before a mine is abandoned, the Bureau from the beginning has conducted studies of methods that will attain this objectively, safely, and economically. Some of these are made in the Bureau's shops and laboratories; even more of them are made in operating mines. The results of these studies, made available over the years in Bureau publications, in technical articles published in the trade press, and in papers presented before scientific and technical societies have made an invaluable contribution to the increasing efficiency of this country's coal-mining industry. Studies of methods used successfully in recovering pillars in mechanized mines, for instance, are exerting a powerful influence for conservation of one of our most important natural resources.

A large part of our coal reserves west of the Mississippi River is in the form of lignite. Now, lignite is the lowest rank of coal, containing a great deal of moisture. Its heating value is correspondingly low. In addition, it slacks

or crumbles upon exposure to air, and it is prone to spontaneous combustion. In consequence, lignite has been used thus far only in the areas where it is found, and as a result our vast resources of this natural resource have been utilized only on a most limited scale.

For years the Bureau of Mines has been studying the problems involved in greater utilization of lignite. It has made great strides. It has discovered how to make gas from lignite, and this gas is of a type that can be used not only for domestic heating, but for reducing iron ore. With further treatment it could be used as a source of synthetic liquid fuels. In addition, the Bureau has developed a method of producing char and coal chemicals by heating lignite without burning it, somewhat as coking coal is carbonized in a coke oven. This process has developed to the point where a utility company and an aluminum company have decided to use it to provide fuel for the power plant to supply electricity for an aluminum plant being built in Texas. Thus lignite, thanks to processes developed by the Bureau of Mines, is able to compete with natural gas in the heart of the gas country. This represents an outstanding accomplishment.

Turning to another great mineral fuel resource, we find that oil men often refer to the Bureau of Mines as the father of petroleum engineering. Although the first well drilled for petroleum, the famous Drake well, was completed in western Pennsylvania in 1859, the oil industry did not begin its phenomenal growth until around the turn of the century. When the Bureau of Mines was established, oil production was still a hit-and-miss matter. Little or nothing was known about the effect of well spacing, rate of flow and the proportion of the oil in the ground that ultimately could be recovered. Neither was much of anything known about the chemistry of petroleum.

When the Bureau began to publish scientific and technologic reports on its research projects, it encountered skepticism from the industry. Gradually this skepticism was overcome and the industry was won over so completely to belief in the value of research that today individual companies spend far more on it than the Bureau does. The Bureau's studies have covered virtually the entire field of petroleum production and refining, from well drilling to turning out the maximum volume of the most wanted products. A large part of its service to the oil industry today consists of assembling and correlating data obtained by the larger companies and making it available to the entire industry. That it is able to do this is largely because of the confidence, the fruit of years of experience, which the companies have in the Bureau. They long ago learned that they could impart company secrets to the Bureau with no fear that they would be made known to their competitors. Largely because of the missionary work done by the Bureau, the oil industry is a leader in pooling scientific and technical discoveries. At the same time, the Bureau serves as the research department of the smaller companies, which

cannot afford to maintain research and engineering facilities of their own. Big and little oil companies alike look upon the Bureau's publications and reports in the petroleum field with respect.

Years ago the Bureau of Mines developed a standard method of analyzing crude oils on a comparable basis which, with minor modifications, is used today. The importance of this lies in the fact that petroleum is not a uniform substance which can be expressed by a universal chemical formula. Instead, the chemical composition of crude oils from various fields varies widely. For instance, that found in my own and neighboring States, known as Pennsylvania-grade crude, yields more and higher-grade lubricants than oil from any other region. On the other hand, crudes from other areas may yield unusually high percentages of aviation gasoline, or jet fuel, or some other petroleum product that may be urgently needed. Victory in World War II, for instance, was aided materially by the Bureau's discovery that some American crudes previously considered unsuitable could be used for making high-octane gasoline for military planes.

What the industry calls unitized operation of oil fields, which means co-operation of various well owners to withdraw oil no faster than the rate which will bring about maximum recovery under the conditions existing in the producing sands, was first advocated by the Bureau. It is today a general practice, because the oil companies have been convinced that following it will mean a greater return, in the long run, to competitive concerns with wells in a single field than would the early practice of each company getting out as much oil as it could as fast as it could. To the Nation, depending more and more upon petroleum products in peace and war, the spread of this practice has in effect meant a substantial increase in its oil reserves.

Another Bureau of Mines activity which has increased our usable petroleum reserves substantially is its research on secondary recovery. Secondary recovery means forcing the oil in depleted producing formations to the wells by such methods as injecting natural gas, air, or water into the sands. The effect of such operations is to restore the pressure that originally made the formations productive. In some instances, the use of secondary recovery methods will make a depleted field produce more oil than it did during its original or primary productive period. In recent years, upon the advice of the Bureau, gas has been pumped back into newly discovered natural reservoirs as the oil was withdrawn, so as to maintain the pressure and increase the percentage of oil that can be recovered without recourse to secondary recovery.

Incidentally, it is interesting to know that one of the fields where secondary recovery methods have been and are being used with gratifying results is the Bradford field of Pennsylvania, one of the oldest producing fields in the United States.

The availability of natural gas over a large part of the country is due not a

little to pioneering by the Bureau of Mines, and today the Bureau conducts research that is of the utmost value to the natural-gas industry. When the Bureau began its petroleum and natural-gas work around 1912, an oil field could be recognized from afar by the flare of natural gas being vented to the air and burned because no market was available. This waste of a natural resource shocked the conservation-minded officials and technologists of the Bureau, the more so when their studies disclosed the part that natural gas plays in forcing petroleum to the surface. Over the years, the Bureau has studied the problems involved in transporting natural gas over long distances, including methods of protecting pipelines from corrosion and preventing them from becoming clogged with hydrates that would be precipitated if the temperature of the gas fell below the dew point.

As in other fields, Bureau of Mines research on petroleum and natural gas is confined principally to that which private industry will not or cannot undertake, either because it requires operation on a national scale or because it promises no immediate return. Among other things, the Bureau conducts studies of the thermodynamics of hydrocarbons, research that is so fundamental that I shall not even try to explain it. These studies are definitely long-range, and after Pearl Harbor the first thought of the Bureau was that they could be recessed for the duration in order to permit concentration upon problems that appeared more directly connected with prosecution of the war. This opinion was reversed when it was learned that the Armed Forces needed the data obtained by these studies so badly that if the Bureau dropped them, the Army and Navy would have to set up research units to resume them.

We all know about the use of helium for inflating the blimps that did yeoman service in guarding our convoys against enemy submarines during World War II and the great airships with which the Navy experimented in the 1920's and the early 1930's. I wonder, however, if all of us are aware that the Bureau of Mines is the sole producer of helium, and that since it first undertook to extract this light, inert gas from the natural gas found in certain fields in the Southwest its cost has been reduced from \$2,500 a cubic foot to slightly over a cent. It is interesting, too, to note that the Bureau has developed methods by which it is producing helium with a purity of 99.995 percent, considerably above the 99⁴⁴/₁₀₀ percent purity with which the advertisements for Ivory soap have made us familiar.

The Bureau of Mines is the only civilian agency of the Federal Government that conducts research on explosives and on the explosive hazards of industrial dusts, fumes, and gases. The value of this work to the national welfare would be hard to exaggerate. I have mentioned already the part played by the Bureau in developing permissible explosives for use in coal mines, and the contribution that this has made to coal-mine safety. I also have mentioned the discovery of the explosibility of bi-

tuminous-coal dust and the development of effective methods of rendering it inert by mixing the proper proportion of rock dust with it.

Because by far the greatest user of nonmilitary explosives in this country is the mining and quarrying industry, the Bureau from its earliest days has been studying explosives for use in noncoal mines and quarries from the viewpoint of safety and efficiency. Liquid-oxygen explosives, for instance, which have found a wide field of usefulness in open-pit mining, were first introduced into this country by the Bureau of Mines. Chemical and physical studies of other commercial explosives have made it vastly easier for mine and quarry operators to select those which not only will involve the least risk of accident, but which also will produce the desired results most economically. For instance, blasting ore that must be crushed to fine size in the process of beneficiation presents problems entirely different from those presented in blasting stone that is to be used as building material. Also a much greater volume of toxic fumes can be tolerated in quarrying and open-pit mining than in underground operations.

Besides studying explosives for nonmilitary use, the Bureau of Mines at various times has engaged in special research for the Armed Forces. This work, of course, can be discussed only in the most general terms, but I assure you that it has proved most valuable. In addition, during the two World Wars, the Bureau of Mines was responsible for licensing and controlling the use of nonmilitary explosives. To its efforts in this direction can be attributed much of the credit for our freedom from sabotage by the use of explosives during World War II, which is freshest in our memory. Incidentally, during World War II this work was under the immediate direction of Jack Forbes, who is now Director of the Bureau.

The Bureau's studies of the flammability of dusts, fumes, and gases have become increasingly important in recent years, as many substances formerly found only in laboratories have been utilized in industrial processes and in anesthetics. Besides determining the flammability of such substances and the conditions under which they will form explosive mixtures with air or oxygen, the Bureau has developed practical methods by which their ignition can be prevented, and by which the force of an explosion can be vented so as to cause minimum damage if one occurs. The importance of this work can be realized when we remember that not only wood and grain dusts, but the powders of many metals, including magnesium, aluminum, and other supposedly nonflammable substances, will form explosive mixtures with air under the right conditions.

We all remember the terrible disaster at Texas City, Tex., a few years ago, caused by the explosion of a shipload of ammonium nitrate fertilizer. The Bureau of Mines, after that disaster, was called upon to study the conditions under which this type of fertilizer would explode. It determined by exhaustive

experimentation that ammonium nitrate fertilizer can be detonated by heat alone, under certain conditions, and developed practical recommendations for storing and transporting this substance in such a way as to minimize the danger.

Just recently the Bureau has released a report which is of especial interest to me as a physician, which is important to every person who may have to undergo a surgical operation for which a general anesthetic is used, and which illustrates the great practical value of the Bureau's research in the field of explosives and explosions. It embodies the results of a thorough study of the ignition hazards presented by the accumulation of static electricity in hospital operating and delivery rooms where anesthetics are administered. The study was undertaken, at the request of cooperating hospitals, as the result of a number of operating-room explosions in eastern hospitals, some of them fatal to patients. The report not only sets forth the hazards, but it presents clear, concise, simple, and practical recommendations for avoiding them. It would be impossible to overestimate the value of this single study, which potentially benefits every person in the United States. And this, remember, was only one of the innumerable studies that the Bureau of Mines is conducting continually.

Equally incalculable are the benefits that may be expected to flow from fundamental research on the phenomena and nature of flame upon which the Bureau has been engaged for a considerable time. These studies are difficult if not impossible for a layman to understand. However, they already have proved of great value to other scientists engaged in similar research, and they have contributed heavily to the development of effective measures for reducing the risk of explosions and fires not only in mines, but in plants ranging all the way from oil refineries to dry-cleaning establishments.

METALLIC AND NONMETALLIC MINERALS

The scientific, technologic, and economic research and investigations in the field of metallic and nonmetallic minerals carried on by the Bureau of Mines through the years have proved of inestimable value not only to the mining and metallurgical industries, but to the Nation itself. Between 1912 and 1915, for instance, the Bureau played an important part in making radium available in this country for the treatment of cancer. At that time carnotite and other radium-bearing ores from Colorado were being shipped abroad for treatment by a patented process. In cooperation with the National Radium Institute, the Bureau developed methods for treating the ore, including much that previously had been discarded as low grade. Later, it assisted in designing and operating a plant at Denver, Colo., where radium was extracted at a cost of less than \$40,000 a gram, compared with the then prevailing market price of from \$100,000 to \$120,000 a gram for imported radium.

The Nation's world leadership in the production of molybdenum, a ferro-alloy metal now high on the strategic list, and America's attainment of virtual self-sufficiency in potash likewise are due

largely to pioneer investigations by the Bureau of Mines. Back in 1914 and 1915, the Bureau investigated deposits of molybdenite in Arizona, California, Colorado, and the State of Washington, and wulfenite deposits in Arizona. The results of these investigations, and of metallurgical studies on the treatment of the ores, resulted in the establishment of a small molybdenum-mining industry. Subsequent studies by the Bureau and others disclosed the value of molybdenum in imparting strength and hardness to steel. The potash studies were conducted under a 5-year program authorized by the Congress as a result of the shortage of this fertilizer mineral experienced in World War I. By the early 1930's private industry had become interested enough to undertake potash mining operations. Although normally the United States continued to import considerable potash, during World War II the domestic industry was able to meet all demands with little increase in price.

Because its field is Nation-wide, the Bureau has been able to contribute substantially to the improvement of mining and metallurgical methods not only by publishing the results of its own research, but also by familiarizing the industry as a whole with improved methods and equipment used in various parts of the country. In instance after instance companies have appealed to the Bureau to help them in solving knotty problems, the Bureau in return asking—and receiving—permission to make the results available to the industry as a whole. In consequence, the advance of mining and metallurgical technology in the United States has been more rapid than it otherwise could have been. This stood the Nation in good stead when our entry into World War II made an endless flow of metals and minerals imperative for our very survival, and it is standing it in good stead today when we are arming ourselves and our allies in the hope of averting world war III or, if that cannot be done, of putting ourselves in a position to win it.

From the passage of the Strategic Materials Act of 1939 until the establishment of the mineral-exploration program now being administered by the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration, the Bureau of Mines carried on thousands of exploration projects in search for deposits of strategic and critical metals and minerals. The Bureau specialized in forlorn hopes, of source. It conducted its exploration projects in areas where private industry was unwilling to operate. Often the results were negative, but in many instances previously unknown ore deposits were disclosed. Most of these were marginal or submarginal, but this does not particularly disturb the Bureau, which is strongly aware that the waste rock of today is likely to be the commercial ore of tomorrow. Occasionally the Bureau's exploration projects disclosed large ore bodies that could be exploited immediately; the great San Manuel copper deposit of Arizona is one of these.

The Bureau's metallurgical research, carried on sometimes alone but often in cooperation with industry or with educational institutions and private research

organizations, likewise has strengthened the Nation both economically and militarily. It has contributed, for instance, to the developments as a result of which ore containing less than 1 percent of copper is now yielding most of our domestic supply of that strategic metal, whereas not so long ago ore containing less than 5 or 6 percent copper was discarded as waste rock.

The Bureau's most dramatic metallurgical development in recent years have been the development of ductile titanium and ductile zirconium. After learning how to produce ductile titanium, which is a corrosion-resistant metal half as heavy and twice as strong as steel, the Bureau provided samples to industrial concerns and research organizations, asking them to find out what it could be used for. The results were encouraging, so much so that private industry has taken up production of the metal. The Bureau is now seeking a less expensive method of producing it—titanium metal still is costly—and also is studying its alloys. It is quite possible that titanium stands today where aluminum did early in the century, when it was still a rare metal.

The Armed Forces have shown considerable interest in ductile titanium, and also in ductile zirconium, another corrosion-resistant metal. Zirconium metal has not yet gotten into commercial production, but last year, at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of Mines doubled its capacity for producing it. Zirconium likewise is now expensive, but continued research may be expected to bring down the cost, and new uses undoubtedly will be found as this happens and the supply becomes more ample.

Vanadium is a ferro-alloy metal that stands high on the strategic list. Research now being conducted by the Bureau promises not only to increase our supply of this metal but also to lead to a more abundant and less costly supply of fertilizer for the west. A satisfactory method of mining extensive deposits of vanadium-bearing phosphate rock has been worked out, and the Bureau is now studying methods of producing phosphoric acid from the ore, while recovering vanadium as a byproduct. The development of a satisfactory process will benefit the Nation by utilizing a now dormant natural resource and by adding to the supply of vanadium for the steel industry. Without recovery of the vanadium, incidentally, the phosphate deposits could not be worked under present economic conditions.

Manganese is another metal indispensable for steel production. We obtain all but about 10 percent of our requirements from abroad, and we simply cannot get along without it. We have vast deposits of manganese ores within our borders, but unfortunately virtually all our domestic resources are low grade. The Bureau of Mines, together with the steel industry, is vigorously seeking to develop methods for mining and treating our domestic deposits so as to obtain a manganese product that will be acceptable to the industry. The problems both of mining engineering and of metal-

lurgy are formidable. Nonetheless, considerable progress has been made toward their solution, and there is no reason to doubt ultimate success.

During World War II, the Bureau of Mines developed a method for producing pure manganese metal electrolytically from low-grade ores. Pure manganese metal is something that few people, even few metallurgists, have ever seen. The customary form in which manganese is added to a steel melt is as ferromanganese or spiegeleisen. However, tests conducted by cooperating steel companies showed that electrolytic manganese could be used effectively as ferromanganese or spiegel. Indeed a small quantity of it is now being produced commercially.

Under authorization of the Congress, the Bureau is now constructing a pilot plant at Boulder City, Nev., where various methods will be tried in an effort to produce a manganese product acceptable to the steel industry from ore from the big deposit at Artillery Peak, Ariz., where the Bureau has been developing a satisfactory mining method, and from other low-grade deposits.

In cooperation with the steel industry, the Bureau has been studying the utilization of another great potential source of manganese—open-hearth steel furnace slag—and already has demonstrated that this is technically feasible. The Bureau and the industry now are cooperating to make the process economic. The reason that steel-furnace slag is a rich potential source of manganese is that this metal serves a double purpose in steel-making. It is a scavenger as well as an alloy metal. It is essential as a deoxidizer, and it has no known substitute as a desulfurizer. The result is that of the 12 to 14 pounds of manganese used in making each ton of steel, about 5 pounds is lost in the slag. The slag itself is a waste product; but the manganese it contains could be a tremendous factor in waging an all-out war. Recovery of that manganese, moreover, would be a decidedly conservation measure in peacetime, once an economical way of obtaining it has been devised. Incidentally, it pleases me to know that anthracite is being considered as fuel for the special-type blast furnace to be used in the process, a development that would help my own part of Pennsylvania as well as helping to conserve our coking-coal resources.

The Bureau of Mines does not confine its research to metals, however. Sheet mica and block talc are two non-metallic minerals essentials for much electrical and electronic equipment, and our resources of both of these materials are far lower than our requirements. The Bureau has been conducting research on these two commodities, and it has discovered that mica can be produced synthetically from plentiful raw materials. There is still considerable work to be done before it will be possible to produce synthetic mica in sheets of the size required, but progress toward that end is being made and in view of the record, I am confident that success lies ahead. Other experiments are in progress looking toward the development of a feasible method for making talc

blocks out of powdered talc of grades with which we are well endowed. Here again, my confidence in the Bureau of Mines, based on study of its record over the years, forces me to predict ultimate success, possibly much sooner than anyone now believes possible.

ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL STUDIES

Although the economic and statistical research conducted by the Bureau of Mines is closely integrated with its scientific and technologic research and its educational and training activities, I have chosen to discuss it separately because I wish to emphasize its importance to the mineral industries, to the various agencies of Government and to the American people. The Bureau is the principal source of data on which the decisions of which mineral commodities should be purchased for the national stockpile, and how much of each. Its data, at the present time, are basic to the Government's programs of price control and allocation of materials, so far as these deal with mineral commodities. The decisions as to which minerals to include in the program of Government aid to private industry in exploration for new reserves also are based upon data regarding production, imports and consumption of mineral commodities gathered by the Bureau of Mines.

The Bureau of Mines relies upon industry for a great part of the information on which its public reports, including the authoritative minerals yearbook, and its confidential reports for the Munitions Board and the various other agencies concerned with industrial mobilization are based. That the necessary data are freely given, with no fear that the bureau will publish or otherwise use them in such a way as to disclose information regarding the activities of individual companies that might aid their competitors, speaks volumes for the reputation for integrity that the bureau has earned over the years.

Not only do the Bureau's economic and statistical studies assist industry and other Government agencies in programming their activities. The data obtained also guide the Bureau itself in deciding where to place most emphasis in its scientific and technologic research, and which problems should be deferred to a given time. Its statistics on fatalities and injuries in the mineral industries, moreover, indicate the hazards requiring most emphasis in its education and training programs.

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

To give industry the know-how to provide suitable substitutes for petroleum, Congress in 1944 authorized the Bureau of Mines to conduct continuous, long-range research in the production of motor fuels and other products from coal and oil shale. This program will eventually provide industry with engineering and cost data needed to develop a synthetic liquid fuels industry aimed at supplementing the Nation's oil reserves and conserving its petroleum resources.

During 1951, development of processes for producing liquid fuels from coal and oil shale reached the point where Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman

recommended the establishment of a few commercial plants by private industry, with such Government assistance as is available under existing legislation.

Various phases of research on the production of synthetic liquid fuels from coal are now in progress at Louisiana, Mo., Bruceton, Pa., and Morgantown, W. Va. Study of the gasification of lignite at Denver, Colo., and Grand Forks, N. Dak., also promises to be of value in the development of a coal-based synthetic liquid-fuels industry. The Bureau and the Alabama Power Co. also have conducted underground coal gasification experiments at Gorgas, Ala.

Oil-shale research is conducted at Rifle, Colo., where the Bureau operates an experimental oil-shale mine and an oil-shale demonstration plant that has successfully produced shale-oil gasoline and Diesel fuel. Laboratory research also is under way at the Petroleum and Oil-Shale Experiment Station at Laramie, Wyo.

To convert American coals to oil, the Bureau has been working on two basic processes: The direct hydrogenation or Bergius-I. G. Farben process; and the gas synthesis or indirect Fischer-Tropsch process. These processes are complementary rather than competitive, and the liquid products that each is best adapted to produce range all the way from heavy fuel oils for ships and industry to jet fuels and aviation gasoline.

The Bureau's \$10,000,000 coal hydrogenation demonstration plant at Louisiana, Mo., was designed for pressures up to 10,300 pounds per square inch in two major operations. There are: Liquid-phase hydrogenation, which converts the liquefied coal to gasoline and byproducts. Basically, the design of this plant follows that of the German units that supplied virtually all of the aviation gasoline used by the Nazi air force during the war. Many improvements developed in American research laboratories have been incorporated.

Improved results in producing synthetic liquid fuels by coal hydrogenation were obtained during 1951 at this plant. In one test, 2,600 tons of Kentucky coal were converted to 336,000 gallons of synthetic oil for vapor-phase processing to high-octane gasoline.

Many important chemicals can be produced through coal hydrogenation. A single 30,000-barrel-a-day plant could increase the Nation's benzene production 20 percent and at the same time contribute the following chemicals for defense: Toluene and xylene for aviation gasoline and explosives, tar acids for plastics, naphthalene for protective coatings, ammonia for fertilizer and explosives, together with sulfur and pyridine.

Two integrated test runs in the newly completed gas-synthesis demonstration plant at Louisiana, Mo., first of its kind in this country, were conducted last year. This plant includes a ton-per-hour oxygen-production unit, a gasification unit, a synthesis-gas-purification unit, and product recovery and refinery facilities.

In the gas-synthesis process, coal is converted to synthesis gas composed of

carbon monoxide and hydrogen, and this, in turn, is converted into oil by passing it over an iron catalyst. Synthesis gas accounts for about 60 to 70 percent of the cost of gasoline produced from coal by the gas-synthesis process. This fact points up the importance of reducing the cost of gas production. During a recent test run, more than 52,000,000 cubic feet of gas-synthesis gas was made and treated to yield synthetic fuel products.

Economical gasification of coal is the greatest problem remaining to be solved in connection with developing the gas-synthesis process to the point where private industry might be interested in adopting it for converting coal to oil. The Bureau first began studying this and other synthetic-fuels processes at Pittsburgh in 1928, but the present extensive research did not begin until 1944.

At Gorgas, Ala., gas generated by burning unmined coal was used to run a gas turbine as part of the second field-scale underground gasification experiment of the Bureau and the Alabama Power Co. This is an excellent example of the Bureau's cooperation with private industry.

For nearly 42 years the Bureau of Mines has been carrying out its mandate to conserve human and natural resources in the mineral and allied industries. They have been years ripe with achievement and rich with promise. Unceasingly, the Bureau has spread the gospel of safety, economy, efficiency, and prevention of waste. Because its precepts always are based upon exhaustive studies that have established their soundness, the industry receives them with growing respect. Because the Bureau has established and maintained a reputation for absolute integrity, companies time and time again have given it their most closely guarded secrets, secure in the knowledge that they were not in any way jeopardizing their competitive position.

Cooperation always has been the keynote of the Bureau's policy—cooperation with other Government agencies, cooperation with State departments working in its field, cooperation with schools and colleges, cooperation with all segments of industry, cooperation with workers' organizations. That this cooperation has borne fruit is shown by declining accident rates, growing efficiency in the extraction, treatment and utilization of metals, minerals and mineral fuels, and increasing use of plentiful mineral raw materials in place of scarce ones, not as inferior substitutes, but as equal, often superior, replacements.

One of the Bureau's most notable accomplishments has been to convince the mineral industries of the value of research. The fruits of this are seen in the elaborate research organizations that have been built up by individual companies and by various industry associations. The growing extent to which members of the mineral industries exchange technical data through papers presented before scientific and technical societies and through articles contributed to the trade and technical press illustrates the extent to which the Bureau's example of cooperation has been followed to the benefit

not only of the mineral industries but also of the economy and security of this Nation. These are a few of the reasons behind my conviction that, dollar for dollar, none of the money that we appropriate here buys more for the American people than the modest sums that we set aside for the Federal Bureau of Mines.

ALABAMA

Tuscaloosa: Established on a modest scale in 1920 and enlarged over the years, the Bureau's Southern Experiment Station on the campus of the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa carries on a broad program of research and investigation designed to help solve the mineral problems of the Southeast. This includes work on the raw-material problem of the area's iron and steel industry, such as finding more efficient methods of utilizing the brown- and red-iron ores of the district, especially the ores of high silica content which pose special beneficiation problems. Research on the preparation and carbonization of coal also is an integral part of the work here. A new flotation process developed at Tuscaloosa is now used commercially in several coal washeries of the Birmingham district. An experimental coke oven is used for testing carbonizing properties of southeastern coals. The engineering staff at Tuscaloosa has investigated rutile and ilmenite deposits and marked out several million tons of reserves in the Florida beach sands from which the new metal, titanium, can be extracted. The Tuscaloosa station serves as a focal point for mineral investigations and metallurgical research for several Southeastern States.

Birmingham: Headquarters for the health and safety activities of the Bureau in the Southeastern States is at Birmingham. All types of mines and mineral industry plants are served from Florida to Tennessee, such as coal-mine inspection, investigations of mine accidents and hazards, safety training and instruction, surveys of occupational health conditions, investigation and control of fires and explosions, and other activities for developing improvements in safety practices and conditions. The large coal and iron mines and plants surrounding Birmingham permit close contact cooperation with State agencies and other groups working toward safer industries.

Gorgas: A field-scale demonstration program at Gorgas is developing a satisfactory method of gasifying coal underground, which offers obvious economic advantages of utilizing bituminous-coal beds that could not be mined by conventional methods. This work has been going on for several years in cooperation with the Alabama Power Co.

In a third underground coal-gasification experiment started last year, electricity is being used to burn the coal, which permits all work to be carried on from the surface. In general, the results are superior to those obtained from previous methods. Designed to utilize thin and isolated seams of coal which cannot be mined economically by conventional methods, this experiment has attracted world-wide interest.

ARIZONA

Tucson: The bulk of the research by the Bureau of Mines on the treatment of copper ores has centered at its Southwest Experiment Station in Tucson, and results have been outstanding. In recent years a major project has been the concentration of mixed oxide-sulfide copper ores. Ores from many southwestern deposits have been the subject of various lines of attack, including both flotation and leaching processes. A major development from this research has been a catalytic oxidation method for the production of hydrometallurgical-grade sulfuric acid from sulfur dioxide gases, such as are available in abundance wherever sulfide ores are smelted. This has economic significance in the treatment of manganese ores as well as oxidized copper ores. An exploratory project of the Bureau of Mines, followed by much more drilling by a private company, has established a reserve of nearly a half billion tons of copper ore in Pinal County, Ariz. Investigation of the Artillery Peak manganese deposits by the staff at Tucson included core drilling and underground development. The results, supplemented by extensive exploration by private interests, have made the ore reserves of this large and important deposit known with a considerable degree of certainty. A pilot plant for treating the Artillery Peak manganese ores is now under construction. Bureau of Mines research on titanium began in 1933 at Tucson. The general purpose was to devise a practicable method of producing ductile titanium. After a critical survey of all previous work and a series of exploratory experiments the process involving magnesium reduction of titanium tetrachloride was selected as the most suitable for development. The project was then transferred to the laboratory at Salt Lake City, where better facilities were available for further research. In succeeding years the Bureau developed a successful method for producing ductile titanium and helped launch this new metal on its commercial career.

Phoenix: The Phoenix office supervises accident prevention and health activities in the metal-mining districts of Arizona and New Mexico, including inspection service for coal mines on Government-leased and Indian lands.

The Bureau representatives cooperate and provide leadership in programs to stimulate safe operation of small mines. Bureau cooperation extends to strongly established safety departments and associations of the larger mining companies.

ARKANSAS

Bauxite: Various research problems concerning bauxite—the principal ore of aluminum—are worked out in a laboratory and pilot mill at Bauxite. This plant was an outgrowth of the bauxite exploration by the Bureau of Mines starting in 1941. The results of tests on low-grade bauxite ores have indicated several possibilities of employing milling to advantage in combination with other processing methods. A recent report from the Bauxite laboratory describes a simple method for treating high-iron bauxite to recover a low-iron abrasive-

grade product and a high-iron product which is suitable for extraction by Bayer alumina plants. An investigation on the black sand residue of the Hurricane Creek alumina plant, Reynolds Metals, Arkansas, demonstrated that 100 tons of merchantable iron ore and 45 tons of low-grade ilmenite concentrates can be recovered per day as byproducts from the operation of this plant. Preliminary analyses indicate that the black sands associated with Arkansas bauxite contain more columbium than many of the materials now being considered as columbium ores. The drilling program of the Bureau of Mines in Arkansas has indicated 21,000,000 tons of comparatively high-grade bauxite, 36,000,000 tons of lower-grade bauxite, and 70,000,000 tons of bauxitic clay.

CALIFORNIA

San Francisco: A petroleum field office at San Francisco conducts research in petroleum production not only to improve the methods of developing and operating fields in California but also on the advancement of methods of introducing energy from the surface to drive oil to wells in fields where the natural energy is depleted. Both phases of the work increase ultimate recovery of oil. The San Francisco office, through its contact with Bureau establishments in other regions, is doing much to bring information concerning such methods to the attention of operators in California and in modifying the methods to suit the conditions. San Francisco is also regional headquarters for region III of the Bureau, covering California and Nevada.

Berkeley: Safety and health activities in all the mineral industries except coal mining in region III are directed through the Berkeley office. The scattered and isolated condition of the majority of mines and plants increases the difficulty of providing the Bureau's services. Bureau representatives cooperate with State agencies and with experts of the casualty insurance companies to eliminate hazards and to inform managers and employees on safe methods of working.

In addition a laboratory at Berkeley is equipped with a staff of scientific workers and special equipment for determining the thermochemical properties of metallic and other inorganic compounds. The results of studies made at the Berkeley laboratory have been published in Bureau of Mines bulletins, which are known and used by metallurgists and physical chemists all over the world.

Redding: In a pilot plant at Redding, comprehensive study is under way to measure the influence of various impurities such as sulfur, phosphorus and silica on the hot working of steels and the compensating effects of alloy metals. The entire program is to determine the amount of manganese required to offset the detrimental effects of sulfur and possibly demonstrate that important quantities of manganese can be conserved if the sulfur is more completely eliminated from steel. A prime objective is to determine the minimum manganese required for steel with known sulfur con-

tent to give the metal the desired hot working characteristics.

Los Angeles: Statistics for petroleum supply and demand on the west coast are issued from a petroleum field office at Los Angeles.

COLORADO

Denver: Accident prevention and health activities in other Southwestern and Rocky Mountain States are directed from the Denver headquarters, including coal-mine inspection, investigation of mine accidents, control and extinguishment of mine fires, and all of the advisory and instruction services. Fires have been controlled or extinguished in coal beds on public lands. Eleven fires in Colorado, Wyoming and New Mexico have been extinguished or controlled.

At the Denver station, a fluidized process of drying and carbonizing western non-coking coals at low temperatures has been developed and is now being put into commercial application to provide fuel for a power plant of the Texas Power & Light Co., which will supply electricity for the new plant of the Aluminum Company of America at Rockdale, Tex. In this development, cheaply mined and processed Texas lignite will supply fuel as well as tar and chemical products at prices estimated to be fully competitive with Texas oil and gas. Another program involving the up-grading and improving of Alaskan sub-bituminous coals is also receiving attention at Denver.

The driving of the Leadville Drainage Tunnel has been under the supervision of the Denver office. Begun during World War II at the behest of the War Production Board and with a special appropriation by Congress, the project was recessed at the end of the war prior to any effective drainage of the once productive mining area. With the advent of the Korean situation, Congress provided funds to resume the driving of the tunnel. The Leadville Tunnel has been completed and to take the results have exceeded expectations.

Rifle: In an experimental shale mine and demonstration plant at Rifle, the Bureau is demonstrating the technical and economic feasibility of utilizing oil shale resources to produce liquid fuels by actual operation of plants large enough to provide accurate and reliable information pertaining to material and manpower requirements as well as construction and operation costs. Here, shale mining studies which produced such outstanding results in the past are continuing although on a limited scale. Development of a successful rotary drill bit to replace the percussion drilling methods previously used is nearing reality. In addition to the mining studies, construction was started last year on a demonstration-scale gas-combustion retort having a capacity of about 300 tons of shale per day. This plant is expected to be in operation in the summer of 1952. The gas combustion process, which was developed at Rifle, offers a means of retorting shale at high through-put rates with very low plant investment.

ILLINOIS

Benton: Coal-mine inspection and accident-prevention educational activities

are carried on in southern Illinois, from a field office at Benton.

INDIANA

Vincennes: A large area including Indiana, Illinois, and western Kentucky is served by the Vincennes branch headquarters. The predominant activities are coal-mine inspection, first-aid and mine-rescue training, accident-prevention courses, and cooperation and assistance in local safety programs. Metal and nonmetal mines within the jurisdiction of the Vincennes office also receive assistance in improving safety practices.

IOWA

Ames: Coal-mine inspection and accident-prevention activities are carried on in the Iowa coal fields from an office at Ames.

KANSAS

Otis: The Bureau operates a helium plant at Otis and like the Exell, Tex., plant, it processes gas en route to fuel markets. The Otis plant supplies a substantial demand for helium and at the same time its operation is a conservation measure, saving helium that would otherwise be lost.

KENTUCKY

Barbourville: A substation at Barbourville facilitates service to the coal mining industry in eastern Kentucky in the vicinity of Barbourville. Coal-mine inspection, first-aid and mine-rescue training, safety courses for miners and officials, first-aid contests, and participation in the programs of local mine safety organizations comprise the regular activities.

MARYLAND

College Park: The Eastern Experiment Station on the campus of the University of Maryland at College Park is the center of a wide range of research and pilot plant activities in many phases of the Bureau's work. Included are safety problems in the minerals industries, such as roof control in mines, which is being attacked through exhaustive studies of rock pressures, roof bolting to support the roof, and related activities. Physicists, engineers, and technicians at College Park are conducting a type of investigation that seems highly theoretical but has had many surprisingly practical applications. The broad purpose is to bring the powerful tools of physical theory to bear on mine engineering as they long since have in the fields of mechanical, civil, and electrical engineering. The sciences and techniques of mechanics and electronics may seem remote from practical hard-rock mining, but a number of mining problems have been solved by their application. Electrical strain gages have traced the passage of explosive shocks through the rock surrounding blast holes, and measured their violence. The imminence of dangerous cave-ins attending pillar removal in mines has been reliably foretold by microseismic recorders. Model-size structures of mine rock have been tested for strength in a large, specially designed centrifuge.

Exploration of iron-ore deposits in the Eastern States, particularly in New York, by engineers directed from College

Park have met with considerable success. Production of magnetic iron ore has expanded several hundred percent since 1940.

Research to find methods of utilizing the manganese ores of Aroostook County, Maine, is carried on at College Park. Continued core drilling and trenching by the Bureau has proved that the Aroostook reserves, although low grade and refractory, are of such magnitude as to constitute a great natural resource if means can be found to utilize them.

At the College Park station, the Bureau is also conducting research on the recovery of metals from secondary materials. It is the aim of this program to develop methods adaptable to the requirements of the secondary metals industry whereby losses can be prevented. A degree of success has been achieved, as for example in the filtering or centrifuging of molten alloys and in the investigation of vacuum distillation processes that is attracting the favorable attention of smelting and refining companies.

To obtain more information about titanium, a new lightweight and strong metal which the Bureau of Mines has taken the lead in developing, the College Park station metallurgists are fabricating pieces of titanium for field testing by the armed services. Further knowledge of the physical and engineering properties of titanium and titanium-base alloys is the object of continuing research. Other phases of the project relate to development of a titanium electroplating process, and the discovery of a refractory material that can withstand the attack of molten titanium. Welding techniques developed by the Bureau of Mines have made it possible to use titanium in the fabrication of several items of military equipment.

College Park serves as a center for investigation and collection of information on explosions other than mine explosions, and explosion and fire hazards in the mineral industries. These hazards of explosion and fire include metallic dusts, organic dusts, gases, and vapors. Testing facilities in connection with these studies are available at the laboratories in Pittsburgh. Investigations, demonstrations, and papers on these hazards and their control are in demand by industrial groups and Government agencies throughout the United States. This service of the Bureau is carried on in close cooperation with the National Board of Fire Underwriters and other national organizations.

During the past year at College Park, surveys and tests to improve efficiency of Federal fuel-burning equipment, ranging from small domestic-type stokers to large central stations, were made for various Federal agencies; services on more than 200 special problems were given some 40 different Federal agencies. A Federal standard for Pennsylvania anthracite was developed. In serving thousands of Federal boiler plants on boiler-water conditioning, more than 9,500 samples of boiler water were analyzed and recommendations made as to chemical treatment. This work is saving the Federal Government millions of dollars.

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston: A field office recently opened at Boston will conduct a minerals resources survey for the New England States and New York.

MINNESOTA

Minneapolis: At the North Central Experiment Station at Minneapolis, the Bureau is working on the development of low-grade iron ores and taconites to augment the Nation's iron-ore supply. Methods of ore dressing and agglomeration, and other knotty problems, are being solved against the day when the deposits of high-grade, direct-shipping ore become exhausted. Minneapolis also is helping solve the manganese problem. The reserves of manganese-bearing material in the Cuyuna Range are believed to be the most significant domestic source. Results to date have shown the presence of large reserves of manganese material amenable to treatment for producing a ferromanganese product by several methods. This study is an important adjunct to the metallurgical research program in that it provides the data on the location and quantities of material available to specific processes. A pilot plant is now under construction at Minneapolis to demonstrate the feasibility of recovering a ferrograde manganese product by methods which have been successfully developed and employed on a laboratory scale.

Compilation and evaluation of all data bearing on ore reserves of the upper Mississippi Valley—in Wisconsin, Illinois, and Iowa—has been a continuing activity of the Minneapolis station for several years. Although still not quite complete, this atlas is proving its value in encouraging local mining companies to expand production.

Duluth: The station at Duluth provides the services of Bureau safety engineers and instructors to small and large metal-mining operations in the several States of the upper Mississippi Valley. Safety programs of the Lake Superior iron-mining companies and those of the copper and lead-zinc mines nearby are given full support. Bituminous-coal and lignite-mine inspection is conducted in North Dakota, Michigan, and Iowa.

MISSOURI

Louisiana: The Bureau's coal-to-oil demonstration plant operated at Louisiana is designed to determine cost and engineering data on producing synthetic liquid fuels from coal. Design based on pilot-plant data and operation of relatively large-scale experimental plants here are intended to stimulate commercial practice. In addition, these plants prove the operability of new processes. There are two plants: One produced liquid fuels by the hydrogenation of coal; the other, by a gas-synthesis plant, which includes coal gasification as well as synthesis gas conversion, are now getting under way. Design of the synthesis-gas conversion plant is based on a process developed through the pilot-plant stage in the Bureau's laboratories at the Pittsburgh station. With the second year of operation completed at the coal hydrogenation demonstration plant, over 5,000

tons of coal have been processed during a total of about 180 operating days. The 350,000 gallons of gasoline produced were shipped to the military services for testing and performance of the fuel proved to be entirely satisfactory.

Rolla: The Mississippi Valley Experiment Station at Rolla conducts a broad program of research and investigation in minerals, dealing with many strategic and critical materials. For instance, a diamond-drilling investigation, conducted in Arkansas, helped to verify the existence of several million tons of barite ore in one deposit. The direct result was the construction by private industry of greatly expanded mining and milling plants in that area, which is now the largest source of barite. Long-continued studies of the zinc-lead ore reserves of the tri-State district—Oklahoma, Kansas, and Missouri—have resulted in authoritative publications on this subject, and in the creation of a central file or catalog that is an invaluable source of geologic and engineering data to guide mining operations in the area. The development at Rolla of new zinc-base alloys containing copper and electrolytic manganese offers possible substitutes for bronzes containing scarcer and more critical materials. Because of naval applications, the Bureau of Ships became actively interested in this project, and samples of the alloys were submitted to tests by the Bureau of Standards and in other laboratories. At the present time a continued and somewhat more fundamental program of research on these materials is being supported jointly by the Bureau and the Navy Department. Magnesium-base alloys containing lithium and aluminum are known to have certain excellent mechanical properties but are subject to rapid deterioration. A project, not yet completed at Rolla suggested a solution of the difficulty, through the adoption of special melting and casting techniques. As zinc ores are a major source of the highly important metal germanium, as well as cadmium, an investigation is being made at the Rolla station on improved methods of recovering these elements from zinc concentrates prior to smelting. Progress has been made by way of a fuming or volatilization method.

MONTANA

Billings: A field office has been established at Billings for coal-mine inspection and accident-prevention educational activities in the Montana coal fields.

NEVADA

Reno: The Reno station administers the mining activities of the Bureau of Mines in California and Nevada, including the examination and development of mineral deposits to encourage production of mineral commodities, particularly those of strategic importance. Facilities at the Reno station include the hydrometallurgical and ore-dressing laboratory, in which are conducted beneficiation tests on ore samples, and developing processes for exploitation of ore deposits. A recent accomplishment is the development of an improved method of recovering gold and silver absorbed by activated carbon from cyanide solution and pulp. Numerous

mercury deposits in California and Nevada, as well as Oregon and some other States, were explored by engineers of the Reno station during and after World War II. Some of these were mined; others remain for possible future operations.

Boulder City: For many years, the Boulder City station has been a center of basic research in many minerals and metals, including manganese, chromite, titanium, and others. Some of the Bureau's most important results have come from this station. For example, a pilot plant capable of producing 150 pounds of titanium per week was designed, built and operated at Boulder City. The successful production of ductile titanium on a large scale made available for the first time samples of metal large enough to permit them to be tested for various industrial and military purposes. From 1947 to 1951, the scale of operations was progressively increased until a production of nearly 2,000 pounds per week was obtained in 1951. Since then further development of the batch process has been left to private industry. Development of a continuous reactor by the Bureau is expected to lead to a substantial decrease in the price of titanium thereby extending its uses. At its present price the use of titanium is limited to such items as jet-engine parts, aircraft structures and ordnance components in which the combination of lightness, strength, and corrosion resistance are sufficiently important to justify the high cost.

Among the manganese research programs which were developed here and are now being adopted by industry for commercial production are the electro-winning of high-purity steels and non-ferrous alloys. Similarly, high-purity manganese dioxide has been produced by this method, which has since become in high demand for the manufacture of high-quality dry-cell batteries. A process for producing metallurgical manganese ore from the large low-grade deposits in the Three Kids district of Nevada was developed at the Boulder City station. Ores from many domestic deposits have been studied and methods developed on a laboratory scale for producing usable metallurgical ores.

Processes for the utilization of low-grade domestic chromites have been studied and developed at Boulder City. Concentrates produced in Montana and Oregon have been smelted in a pilot plant scale electric furnace and relatively low-grade ferrochromium has been produced and was shipped to a steel plant; chromium-bearing steels were produced economically using this alloy. Electrolytic chromium has been produced at the Boulder City station in a process developed by the Bureau of Mines. This process has been accepted by industry and a plant is now under construction for large-scale commercial production of this metal.

Present activity at Boulder City is confined largely to construction of a 50-ton-per-day pilot plant for treating various domestic manganese-bearing materials to establish the feasibility of various laboratory processes in a plant of this size. The economics of the proc-

esses will be determined in these operations. It is anticipated that 3 months' operation in the current fiscal year will be possible but operations will continue in the coming year. Facilities will be installed for pilot plant operations on low-grade domestic chromites within the next year. Important in this program will be the agglomeration of fine chromite concentrates.

Laboratory and pilot-plant research carried on at Boulder City and elsewhere by the Bureau of Mines, with cooperative support by private interests, has led to the development of process whereby certain types of oxidized zinc ores, until now largely useless, probably can be worked profitably. Such ores occur in numerous deposits in Idaho, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and California. The process includes leaching in caustic solution and electrolytic deposition of metallic zinc.

NEW MEXICO

Shiprock: The Bureau's helium plant at Shiprock is in stand-by status now, but any sizable increase in demand for helium will necessitate the reactivation of this plant.

NEW YORK

Albany: The Bureau's accident-prevention and health activities for metal and nonmetal—other than coal—mines and quarries in New York, New Jersey, and the New England States, are carried on by mining engineers and safety instructors headquartered at Albany. The activities include safety surveys at mines and mineral-industry plants with recommendations for correcting hazardous conditions and practices, instruction in accident prevention, investigation of accidents and disasters, and participation in local safety programs. A notable accomplishment was the recent investigation and report made at the request of State and local authorities of explosions and fires from disrupted gas lines serving homes in a section of Brighton, N. Y. The conclusions and recommendations were helpful in establishing new safety regulations for such installations.

NORTH CAROLINA

Raleigh: Working from the Bureau's experiment station on the campus of North Carolina State College, Bureau engineers have participated in the verification, exploration, and development of the tungsten deposits in Vance County, N. C. Discovered in 1942 these deposits are exploited by a strong company and have become one of the principal sources of tungsten in the United States.

Under the direction of the staff at Raleigh, the largest sulfide mineral deposit—the Great Gossan Lead—in the Southeast was developed.

The emphasis of the work at this station has recently been placed upon the rare and fissionable elements. On the North Carolina State College campus, a nuclear reactor is being built for research in the atomic energy field. The program at Raleigh will be coordinated with the research activities of the college, which is being conducted in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission. The Bureau's work in the atomic-energy field will be devoted largely to research and development of analytical methods

in the rare-metal and fissionable-element field. The laboratory facilities at Raleigh are being reconditioned and converted for this purpose and a new staff of experienced personnel in this highly specialized field is being transferred to this research center.

NORTH DAKOTA

Grand Forks: Although the Bureau of Mines for many years has sought ways and means of utilizing the vast lignite reserves of the Nation, a milestone was reached in 1951 with the building and dedication of the Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory at Grand Forks, N. Dak. This laboratory, now in operation, will attempt to solve problems arising from the development of these enormous lignite reserves—estimated at 930,000,000,000 tons, of which North Dakota has an estimated 600,000,000,000 tons. The new laboratory, favorably situated near the Nation's biggest lignite belt, has all the necessary facilities to conduct an effective program.

OHIO

St. Clairsville: The St. Clairsville office was established as a headquarters for the Bureau's accident prevention and health activities in the coal mining districts of eastern Ohio and the Panhandle of northern West Virginia. Such activities include coal-mine inspections and investigations, first aid in mine-rescue training, and accident-prevention educational courses for mine workers and officials.

OKLAHOMA

Bartlesville: Engineers and scientists of the petroleum experiment station at Bartlesville study all phases of petroleum operations, and supply information that benefits not only the midcontinent region by the entire Nation. The staff here works on methods to utilize natural energy in producing oil; on methods of stimulating by fluid injection or other means to increase ultimate recovery of oil when natural energy has been depleted; on the chemistry of petroleum and principles of refining, to aid the industry in improving the refining processes and thereby obtain more and better products; and on petroleum thermodynamics—relations of heat to chemical and physical changes—to provide basic data that can be used in calculating what will happen under a given set of conditions, and thereby avoid use of critical materials and manpower in costly experimentation.

McAlester: The Bureau's station at McAlester is concerned primarily with coal-mine inspections, accident prevention educational activities, instruction in first-aid and mine-rescue and recovery methods, and investigation of accidents and disasters in Arkansas and Oklahoma.

OREGON

Albany: The Bureau's station at Albany was established in 1945 as the Northwest Electrodevelopment Laboratory. Since that time important research has been done on the following problems: production of pure metallic zirconium and study of its properties and alloys; smelting of iron ores containing nickel and chromium; electrometallurgy of zinc; production of magnesium by

thermic reduction methods; and smelting of high-phosphorus iron ores.

The outstanding achievement at the laboratory has been the development of a process for production of zirconium metal. This project was emphasized when the Atomic Energy Commission found zirconium to have particularly useful properties as a structural metal for reactors. At the request of AEC the Bureau has constructed and operated a plant, which has produced virtually all of the pure ductile zirconium that has yet been produced. Another notable accomplishment has been the demonstration that aluminum-silicon alloys, suitable for blending with secondary aluminum ingot, may be produced by electric smelting of aluminous clays. As a result of these tests, one of the producers of secondary aluminum alloy proposes to build a plant for commercial production of aluminum-silicon alloy.

PENNSYLVANIA

Pittsburgh and Bruceton: The Central Experiment Station at Pittsburgh is the principal center of Bureau of Mines research and testing work on coal and explosives. The facilities of this station included a 200-acre tract at Bruceton, near Pittsburgh, on which are situated the Bureau's experimental coal mine, its explosives testing station, and synthetic liquid fuels laboratories.

In its research and testing program on explosives and explosions, the Bureau determines the permissibility of explosives for safe use in coal mines and seeks to obtain maximum safety and efficiency through research on the fundamental scientific and technologic factors involved in the hazards of explosions of gases and dusts.

The phases of the Bureau's synthetic liquid-fuels program headquarters at Bruceton are directed toward developing new and improved processes for producing liquid fuels from coal and to derive fundamental data essential to the design and operation of large-scale coal-to-oil plants. Recent experiments have produced a variety of important contributions to the technology of making liquid fuels from coal. Synthetic liquid-fuels processes involving direct addition of hydrogen to coal, as well as those relating to synthesis of oil from gasified coal, were studied. A new gas synthesis process for converting the primary products of gasified coal, carbon monoxide, and hydrogen into liquid fuels was tested on a one-barrel-per-day pilot plant. Although this plant had a capacity 13 times greater than previous equipment used, the experiments were entirely satisfactory.

Recent research has developed data on the interchangeability of gaseous fuels to permit supplementing natural gas with manufactured gas without sacrifice of safety. Other research studies point the way toward minimizing the hazards of igniting gases in coal mines by explosives and of explosives. The Bureau's studies of the explosives limit of gaseous fuels have contributed much toward safe transportation of gas in pipelines. Study of the explosibility of starch, and other industrial dusts have aided in reducing explosion hazards. A

technical and economic study of multiple-shot blasting in coal mines is proving most useful to the industry.

The Pittsburgh station has been the center at which the Bureau's health and safety investigations and services were developed. The laboratory and testing facilities at the Pittsburgh station are employed on routine and special investigations and tests to improve the safety of mine equipment and practices. General supervision is exercised over the work of the branch stations throughout the northeastern part of the United States, including the northern Appalachian and midwestern coal fields, and engineers and instructors from Pittsburgh carry on the Bureau's health and safety services at the many large coal mines nearby. At this station, new employees are given basic training to perform the duties of coal mine inspectors, safety engineers, or safety instructors.

The hazards of electrical equipment used in underground coal mines are investigated in the electrical mechanical laboratories at the Pittsburgh station under established schedules in cooperation with the manufacturers. Tests are made of electrical equipment designed for use in coal mines and approvals are issued designating as permissible such equipment as qualify under the tests specified in the schedules. Permissible electric equipment for almost every underground use in coal mines is now available. These standards developed and maintained by the Bureau are the highest in the world but are subject to constant review, leading to revision and improvement.

The laboratories for the Bureau's investigations of hazards to health in the mineral industries are part of the Pittsburgh station. Health activities are directed toward the control of harmful or hazardous exposures and to the improvement of hygienic conditions in the mineral industries. Laboratory investigations are made dealing with the concentration and composition of dust, performance of gas-indicating instruments, toxic gases produced by burning mineral substances, explosions, and various other subjects. Permissibility tests of oxygen breathing apparatus, gas masks, and other respiratory-protective devices are made and tests of approved types are run to check the quality of those being sold to users under Bureau approval labels.

New testing schedules of the Bureau are devised as new types of equipment come into use. After careful study and investigation, the Bureau approved the first Diesel locomotive for use in coal mines of the United States. Approvals have been granted for certain dust collectors for use in drilling without water.

Other special activities centered at this station are surveys of mine ventilation, dusty mine atmospheres, and control of fires in old abandoned mine workings in and near Pittsburgh.

With the Pittsburgh station as an operating base, the Bureau is conducting investigations to determine the Nation's recoverable reserves of coking coal. This study, which is of vital importance to our iron and steel industry, covers, up to the

present time, coal fields in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Virginia, Maryland, and Tennessee. Important among the coking-coal investigations are the tests to determine the preparation characteristics of the coals, particularly with the objective of up-grading sub-standard ones to make them of metallurgical quality. The coking-coal investigations include numerous pilot-scale carbonization tests on coals from Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky to determine the expansion characteristics when coked in commercial chemical-recovery ovens, and the yields and quality of the coke and coal chemicals. These studies will continue until all of the coking coal reserves of the entire United States are investigated.

Tests of a German-made coal planer are underway in a coal mine in West Virginia and preliminary results indicate that from three to five times as much coal can be produced from thin, difficult-to-mine coal beds by using this revolutionary device as compared with conventional methods.

Preliminary work has been conducted successfully at the Pittsburgh station on the recovery of manganese from open-hearth slags using a pilot plant scale blast furnace and the final steps in this process will be possible when a basic lined converter now under construction is completed. This process was developed here and is potentially the most important manganese project now being conducted by the Bureau of Mines. Full acceptance of this process by industry could result in the recovery of one-third to one-half of the Nation's manganese requirements. The economics of this process may make possible an operation competitive with high-grade imported manganese ore, but a demonstration plant of a size sufficient to permit continuous operation may be necessary.

At the Pittsburgh station various materials used in Bureau research and service work are analyzed, including the testing of proposed rock dust materials to determine whether such materials have the proper physical and chemical properties to permit their use in mines to reduce the danger of coal-dust explosions.

During calendar year 1951, more than 21,000 analyses of samples of coal, coke, coal dusts, and other carbonaceous materials in connection with the Government's fuel inspection, Federal coal-mine inspection and other research and service work of the Bureau were made. Since this work is done at less cost to the Government than if these analyses were made in commercial laboratories, there are dual savings in this work to the Government: First, the actual cost of the analyses; and, second, in the real savings resulting from the purchase by the Government of its millions of tons of coal on a guaranteed analysis basis, with these analyses checking that contract guaranties have been met. This work is continuing, although it is not now possible to provide all of the analytical services required for the best evaluation of Government fuel purchases. The bulk of the Bureau's work on sampling coal mines to provide an analytical base for

Federal coal purchases is headquartered at this station.

Johnstown: Headquarters for accident-prevention and health activities of the Bureau in the coal fields of central Pennsylvania is in Johnstown. These activities include coal-mine inspection, accident-prevention educational courses for mine workers and officials, and instruction in first aid and mine rescue and recovery operations.

Schuylkill Haven: The Anthracite Research Laboratory at Schuylkill Haven serves as the field headquarters for the Bureau's anthracite mechanical-mining investigations, in which it has been shown that various types of mechanical-mining machinery used in mining bituminous coal can be adapted to mining anthracite, and that increased output and recovery of coal can be obtained with such machinery. In addition, Bureau-suggested methods of block caving anthracite in very thick beds have shown vastly increased production per man-day and per unit of explosives used without jeopardizing the safety of the workers. Additional field investigations are concerned with special machines adapted to anthracite conditions and new methods of removing pillars to increase recovery particularly where the major reserves of this very high-rank, high-quality fuel are in pillars left after first mining. The laboratory also serves as headquarters for field studies in the washing of fine anthracite to obtain greater recovery and to decrease stream pollution. Personnel of the laboratory cooperates with the Anthracite Institute and mine operators to determine the economic feasibility of utilizing presently wasted anthracite bone coal as a boiler fuel. The laboratory program includes design work on new and safer mining equipment and the development of expanded uses for anthracite, such as for gasification and chemical purposes.

Wilkes-Barre: The Wilkes-Barre station serves the anthracite mines of Pennsylvania, providing coal-mine inspection, training in first-aid and mine-rescue methods, and accident-prevention courses for workers and officials. Investigations are made of accidents, disasters, and unusual occurrences in the anthracite mines with recommendations for correcting the hazards or practices.

Several serious fires in abandoned or inactive coal beds endangering coal properties and communities have been controlled under the Bureau's auspices during the last 3 years. The work has resulted in saving valuable anthracite reserves and considerable property.

Wilkes-Barre is also the central office for the Bureau's study of methods to recover a large part of the great tonnage of anthracite now unminable or in the future will become unminable because of the flooding. Active mines are now burdened with infiltration of water from abandoned mines and the surface in addition to the water that normally collects during their own operations. The field studies of the problem have almost been completed, and proposals for removing the water are being prepared.

Pottsville: Field headquarters for the Bureau's study of flood prevention in the

southern and middle-western fields of the Pennsylvania anthracite region is at Pottsville.

Franklin: The petroleum field office at Franklin is directing its major efforts toward applications of secondary recovery to get a second crop of oil from the old fields of the Appalachian region. One of the important phases of the work is a study of the technology of shooting wells with high explosives to increase the flow of oil. By studying the fundamentals of oil-well shooting, using methods and data that have been developed in studies of blasting in mines, the Bureau is giving the petroleum industry guidance in tailoring shots to suit various oil-well conditions. The ultimate objectives are to increase recovery of oil, save explosives and steel, and reduce hazards to workers in the petroleum industry.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Rapid City: The Rapid City station of the Bureau is chiefly concerned with the discovery and development of pegmatite dikes that occur in the nearby Black Hills and contain deposits of beryllium, columbium, tantalum, and high-quantity sheet mica, all of which are very high on the strategic list. The station includes a laboratory in which research is conducted on beneficiation of pegmatite ores. A method of concentrating beryl from low-grade material has been developed recently; a patent has been applied for it. The laboratory personnel cooperates with a private company to improve the recovery of the lithium mineral, spodumene, which occurs in some Black Hills pegmatites.

TENNESSEE

Norris: In the electrotechnical laboratory at Norris, the Bureau of Mines conducts research on ceramics and other specialized mineral problems of the Southeast. Particularly noteworthy work is being done in the field of refractories, and in the development of synthetic mineral products and other substitute materials that will reduce our dependence on imports of strategic minerals. Mullite refractories, derived from the kyanite group of minerals, are indispensable for modern metallurgical and glass furnaces. Investigations of domestic deposits of kyanite have indicated some additional sources of supply. However, known domestic reserves of high-grade kyanite are comparatively limited and the United States has long been dependent largely on imports. Kyanite is being stockpiled and this stockpiling program is being conducted by the Munitions Board under the technical guidance of the Norris laboratory. The Norris laboratory also has engaged in extensive process investigations and product-testing programs for the development of synthetic mullite from domestic raw materials to the end of liberating the United States from dependence upon foreign supplies of kyanite.

Virtually all of our supply of strategic mica for essential electrical and electronic apparatus is imported, and the domestic output of natural sheet mica of all grades will not meet our total requirements. The Norris laboratory is engaged in research on synthetic mica and

has already made substantial progress toward ultimate national self-sufficiency in both strategic mica and block steatite talc. It has contributed to the development of integrated synthetic mica, which may serve as an adequate replacement for imported natural mica in such applications as cannot be met by integrated mica made from natural mica scrap, and it has developed hot-pressed synthetic mica, which is a new material that has many prospective applications as an electrical insulator and may be a satisfactory substitute for strategic block talc.

As the United States produces only a small percentage of its asbestos requirements and the commodity has a number of complex quality problems, research on its synthesis is being conducted at Norris.

Similarly we are entirely dependent on foreign supplies of industrial diamonds, and consequently research on hard materials that may serve as commercial substitutes for diamonds has been initiated.

Jellico: The Bureau's station at Jellico is the headquarters from which coal-mine inspection, first-aid and mine-rescue training, accident-prevention courses, and field investigations of methods for improving mine safety and health are conducted for coal mines in Tennessee and adjacent parts of eastern Kentucky.

TEXAS

Dallas: Headquarters of the Bureau's accident-prevention and health activities in the South Central States is at Dallas. The experience and skill of the Bureau's staff has won acknowledgment not only in the States they regularly serve but in similar industrial fields, notably oil and gas, throughout the country. The petroleum and gas industries and the allied chemical industries of the region overshadow the mining operations, but services desired by all industries therein are provided. The safety standards of the large industries in the region are high and are constantly being advanced with encouragement of the Bureau of Mines. Also at Dallas is a petroleum research staff that works largely on methods of increasing recovery of petroleum from the deep high-pressure fields of the southern midcontinent region. This group supplements the work of the Bartlesville, Okla., station in the midcontinent region.

Wichita Falls: The staff at the Bureau's Wichita Falls office also supplements the research work at Bartlesville, Okla., by devoting most of its attention to applications of secondary recovery by fluid injection in the older oil fields of north Texas.

Amarillo: The Bureau of Mines is the only producer of helium in the United States. The headquarters for all helium research and production is at Amarillo, which also includes operation of the Amarillo helium plant, the Government-owned Cliffside gas field of approximately 50,000 acres which supplies helium-bearing natural gas to it, and the connecting pipeline system. This plant supplies helium to the Navy, Weather Bureau, other Government

agencies, and commercial users. The research program consists of: First, investigations to locate and estimate the Nation's resources of helium-bearing natural gas; second, study of methods of separating helium from various gases for the purpose of effecting improvements and developing better extraction methods; and, third, developing applications of helium to Government and private operations. The importance of helium has increased particularly because of the demand for it in the shielded arc process of welding. Another important use of helium is as a tracer gas in charting the flow of oil and gas in underground rocks.

Exell: The Bureau of Mines' largest helium plant is at Exell, about 32 miles north of Amarillo. The Exell plant produces helium for both Government agencies and non-Federal users. The supply of helium-bearing natural gas for this plant is produced by a commercial organization in the Panhandle field, Texas, and helium is extracted from the gas while it is en route to fuel markets. Thus, the Exell plant extracts helium that would otherwise be lost and conserves the supply of this gas in the Government-controlled helium-bearing natural-gas fields.

UTAH

Salt Lake City: The Bureau's laboratory at Salt Lake City, also known as the Intermountain Experiment Station, is equipped for all types of research on the extraction of nonferrous metals from their ores, including ore dressing, pyrometallurgy, hydrometallurgy, electro-metallurgy, and the sampling and analysis of ores. A recent major achievement has been the development of processes for concentrating and leaching of manganese ores from the large low-grade manganese deposit at Artillery Peak, Ariz. These processes are being further investigated in a pilot plant constructed at the Bureau of Mines station at Boulder City, Nev. Another notable achievement of the Salt Lake City laboratory was the development of the process for production of titanium metal pure enough to be malleable. This process provided the basis for the present commercial production of titanium metal.

About half of the iron-ore reserves of Utah, which are the mainstay of the western steel industry, was indicated by work of the staff at Salt Lake City. The investigations showed the presence of some 220,000,000 tons of iron ore of plus 50 percent iron content in Utah and other Western States.

The Salt Lake City station serves the mining districts in Utah and Wyoming. Such service includes coal-mine inspection, mine-accident investigation, first-aid and mine-rescue training, and accident-prevention courses. An outstanding accomplishment has been the cooperation of State agencies, operating associations, and regional safety groups to bring about a steady improvement in mine practices in the area. A particularly notable achievement has been the methods developed in certain mines to control the formation and prevent the spread of fine coal dust during operation of modern mechanical-mining machines.

The Bureau engineers assisted in the adaptation and testing of the methods and have made the information available to the coal-mining industry.

VIRGINIA

Norton: The Norton station is headquarters for coal-mine safety work in southwestern Virginia and eastern Kentucky. The many coal mines of different size and type throughout this rugged country are all given assistance as experience has shown to be most helpful. Coal-mine inspection takes time and effort under these naturally rugged conditions. First-aid training, mine-rescue training, the safety course for mine workers, the accident-prevention course for officials, participation in safety meetings, conduct of first-aid contests, and other well-established activities have long been demanded and provided. Assistance at mine fires and explosions, and investigations of accidents or unusual hazards or conditions are made as the occasion arises.

Mount Weather: An experimental hard-rock mine for developing rock-blasting procedure, and for testing and improving rock-drilling equipment and explosives, is operated at Mount Weather, near Bluemont. An important recent phase of this work has been studies in the orientation of diamonds in drill bits for optimum performance.

The Mount Weather station also has the responsibility of storing and maintaining an up-to-date index on the vast quantity of reports and technical data of all the mineral programs of the Bureau. This material includes information on many thousands of mineral deposits in the United States and Alaska based on findings by Bureau engineers as well as on data from other sources. Summaries of the reports are made from time to time by the station staff to aid defense agencies. The station also maintains a library of rock cores resulting from diamond-drilling projects of the Bureau in Eastern States, which is of great potential geological interest.

WASHINGTON

Seattle: Coal research by means of studies on preparation, carbonization, and combustion, is carried on at the Bureau's Seattle station. Among other developments in its coal-preparation pilot plant has been the invention of a new and simple method of continuously measuring the specific gravity or density of solutions, such as the heavy-gravity fluid used in certain types of coal preparation equipment. Work at this station is continuing on improving coal preparation methods and equipment and on the development of methods for producing ultra-clean coal for making electrode carbon such as used in the extensive metallurgical industries of the Pacific Northwest.

Seattle is headquarters for the Bureau's accident-prevention and health work in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana. This work includes coal mine inspection, investigation of mine accidents, recommendations for safe practices, fire control, first aid and mine rescue training, accident-prevention courses, industrial health studies and

promotion of safety programs in the many and varied mineral industries of the region. The outstanding accomplishment is the part that the Bureau representatives have had in promoting the industrial safety programs of the region as well as their success in meeting the wide range of problems in their field.

Ceramic studies are conducted at Seattle toward the utilization of ceramic raw materials of the Pacific Northwest in the local production of structural clay products, refractories, insulating firebrick, and other clay products demanded by the rapidly expanding economy of the area.

Spokane: A minerals survey office is maintained at Seattle. An extensive investigation of widespread domestic antimony deposits carried on several years ago by Bureau of Mines engineers, with the cooperation of geologists of the Geological Survey, had as its chief result the establishment of the existence of more than 3,000,000 tons of antimony ore, most of which is low-grade material in one locality in Idaho. This locality, furthermore, was a most important source of tungsten during the war and continues to produce substantial quantities of tungsten as a by-product of its antimony operations. Several large deposits of chromite in Montana, knowledge of which is based to a considerable extent on exploration by the Bureau of Mines and Geological Survey, now constitute the only substantial domestic reserve in time of emergency. This ore is of poor quality, normally unacceptable to industry, but in any future lengthy period when imports might be sharply curtailed, could be utilized as a source of chromite. Private industry, following up the indications of work done by the Bureau of Mines, recently has inaugurated production of cobalt from the Blackbird district, in Idaho. The most outstanding result of the Bureau's program in lead and zinc is probably the encouragement it provided to industry in the metalline district of northeastern Washington. Approximately 330,000 tons of ore was produced annually during World War II in the district. Private operators have since greatly increased the tonnages of reserves, and the district promises to become one of the most important in the country. Production now is about 50,000 tons of ore monthly, yielding about 700 tons of lead and 1,200 tons of zinc.

WEST VIRGINIA

Mount Hope: The Mount Hope headquarters serves the largest bituminous-coal producing district in the United States. In this district are some of the most gassy coal mines in the world, and extraordinary measures are required to protect the miners and the mines from disaster. In some mines methane gas is present in such quantities that the ventilation must be conducted in a very special manner and the most careful watch must be kept over the percentage of gas in the atmosphere. The most experienced inspectors and safety engineers of the Bureau give attention to such mines, and cooperation with the State inspectors and company officials has been good. All of the Bureau's training and educational activities with re-

spect to safety and health are provided for the district and many special investigations and studies are made to overcome the hazards that have consistently brought death and injury to mine workers.

Logan: A field office is at Logan for the Bureau's accident prevention and health activities, primarily coal-mine inspection service for coal mines in Logan and Mingo Counties of West Virginia.

Welch: At Welch there is a field office that serves the bituminous-coal mines in the southernmost part of West Virginia with respect to coal-mine inspection and related activities.

Montgomery: The field office at Montgomery is the center of accident-prevention and health activities of the Bureau, including coal-mine inspection, in the Kanawha River Valley of West Virginia.

Fairmont: The Fairmont headquarters of the Bureau is the center of accident-prevention and health activities embracing the coal-mining districts of northern West Virginia—excepting the Panhandle—and Maryland. Such activities include coal-mine inspection, first aid and mine rescue training, instruction in accident prevention and cooperation in local safety programs.

Morgantown: The synthetic liquid fuels research program at Morgantown is directed toward the development of low-cost, highly efficient processes for gasifying coal and purifying the gaseous products. Intensive experimentation was conducted to develop a high-pressure pulverized coal gasifier using oxygen and steam. A new station has been authorized at Morgantown, and construction will start soon.

WYOMING

Laramie: The Petroleum and Oil Shale Experiment Station at Laramie works with the petroleum industry in the Rocky Mountain region to find ways of increasing recovery, both by primary and secondary-recovery methods, and on chemistry and refining of crude oil. Members of the Bureau's staff have devised new concepts of the characteristics and behavior of oil and its dissolved gas in producing formations in some of the Rocky Mountain fields. These have led to improved methods of operation and to conservation of resources. In addition, the station has provided important data on the composition and properties of crude oils produced in the Rocky Mountains—especially the so-called black oils—which have aided in utilization of oils that are difficult to refine.

The staff at the Bureau's oil shale research laboratories at Laramie centered their attention last year on the development of a process for retorting oil shale at high temperatures and at exceedingly high heating rates. The bench scale work is now virtually complete and construction of a pilot plant is underway. Oil shale research here is coordinated with the Bureau's demonstration plant and mine at Rifle, Colo.

Although experiments on the development of processes for the manufacture of sponge iron have been conducted for years, there has been little or no commercial production. However, the challenging aspects and practical possibil-

ities encouraged the Bureau to initiate a broad investigation of the production of sponge iron. A pilot plant was constructed at Laramie for the investigation of solid fuels reduction of iron ores in a rotary kiln. Tests were made on ores from Wyoming, California, and Arizona, using coals from Wyoming and Arizona and coke from Colorado. Iron pellets and nodules were produced, which were shipped to a nearby steel plant where they replaced scrap in a heat of steel. Cooperations were terminated for lack of funds, and subsequently a fire destroyed part of the plant. However reactivation of the operation is planned.

The experimental alumina plant at Laramie was built during World War II by the Defense Plant Corporation at a cost of about \$4,500,000. It was designed to produce 50 tons of alumina per day from anorthosite, an igneous rock found in great abundance in Wyoming and elsewhere in the United States. The program was terminated before the plant had been entirely completed; therefore the Bureau of Mines proposed that it be authorized to complete the experimental operation of this plant. The plant has been transferred to the custody of the Bureau of Mines and \$350,000 was appropriated to complete the plant and prepare it for operation.

ALASKA

Juneau: As a part of the Interior Department program for the development of the natural resources of Alaska, the Bureau of Mines is attempting to conduct activities in the area that will assist the development of minerals needed both for the local economy and for the general consumption requirements of the United States. In the past 3 years the principal effort has been to evaluate the quality and availability of construction materials along the Alaska railroad belt, which constitutes the most important area of the Territory from the defense standpoint. Numerous investigations of metallic mineral deposits have also been carried out over a period of years, but to date funds and personnel have been so limited that only the more accessible deposits have been investigated. Alaska contains deposits of mercury, antimony, precious metals, copper, lead, zinc, chrome, nickel, platinum, and tin that merit investigation. A small metallurgical laboratory has been set up at Juneau and will be expanded as funds become available.

The Bureau of Mines is seeking to provide an adequate supply of coal in Alaska to meet rapidly increasing demands. Movable reserves of coal in the Wishbone Hill area are being proved by core drilling and plans are being made to open a coal analysis laboratory to serve Federal coal purchasing agents in the Territory.

Anchorage: Accident-prevention and health activities of the Bureau in Alaska are carried on from the Anchorage Station. These include first-aid and mine-rescue training for many persons in mining, Government services, and allied occupations; mine inspections and safety recommendations for mining operations; and control and extinguishment of mine fires. Many other incidental services

are performed when engineers of other divisions are not available. The major accomplishments are in helping units of the mining industry to overcome the severe conditions of climate and isolation.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH].

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself briefly to the question of the trust territories. In company with my colleagues, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE], we made a visit to these trust territories. I know that they are of particular interest generally to the people of the United States. We recognize the importance that they will evidently play in world affairs. You might recall that in days gone by Spain was the first to take them over; later Germany moved in and held them until the advent of World War I when they were mandated to Japan, and Japan managed them with some degree of efficiency until 1938 when she began her march to militarism.

Today those islands are of importance to America; they are of importance to us because of changing world affairs, of particular importance, may I say, to the west coast. If we can maintain these trust territories with the friendship of their peoples and at a minimum expense to the people of the United States, they will be a protection to our west coast. Giving them up, as some might be inclined to do, will put us at the mercy of the foreign power that controls them. We must have a leadership there that respects the rights of the people and at the same time recognize that these islands have been purchased by the United States not in the sense of dollars but with the blood and lives of American soldiers on our march to Tokyo. These islands held us back because they were under Japanese domination, for a year at least, and cost us millions of dollars and tens of thousands of American lives as we marched forward and took island after island. Now, through the action of the United Nations, they are mandated to us.

I would like, first, to compliment this committee on its report particularly when it says that one of the wishes of the committee is that increased efforts be made to employ the people on those islands in the management of their affairs.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As long as the gentleman is complimenting the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations, I would like to add a compliment to the gentleman from New York. It was due to his always being courteous and to the splendid statements he made to these various groups of natives through the trust islands that we had an opportunity to address that left a lasting impression on the minds of those people in the southwest Pacific, and I cannot too highly praise the services of the

gentleman from New York in that connection.

Mr. McGRATH. The gentleman is very gracious, but I think he violates the rule of hyperbole.

Mr. Chairman, when the committee goes on and insists that we place Americans in leadership but the management to be done by the islanders themselves, they have formed a right judgment on a very important point.

Again, the committee calls attention to the fact there is no basic legislation for these trust territories. That is something which we must watch in this House very carefully. I submit that legislation should provide, among other things, that any of the natural resources of those islands will be reserved for the people of those islands subject to the jurisdiction of the armed services of the United States and that no private corporation, or foreign power, will take over the bauxite mines or any other national resource of these islands. Those are things we should watch in the organic legislation soon to be enacted—the history of our country will always be one of friendliness and kindness toward the people of the islands. We will be doing a disservice to the people of the islands and to our own country if we do not protect our mutual interests. If we adopt the other policy, I am sure that the 300,000 troops now massed 3 miles from the northern part of Japan will not find it easy to come down there, and with the difficulty now in Indochina we will not find the Philippines endangered. If we give us these islands without proper regard to the future of America I respectfully submit to you we will again have to go into those islands and repurchase them with the blood of our American youth.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to sincerely thank this subcommittee for instructing the Interior Department to keep the Indian school at Pipestone, Minn., open during fiscal 1953. The Bureau of Indian Affairs announced that they expected to close that very worth-while and necessary institution where homeless, orphan Indian children are being cared for and instructed. For the past 5 years, the Indian Bureau has planned to close this fine institution annually and I appreciate this subcommittee's instruction to them to keep it open for the benefit of these helpless youngsters.

However, Mr. Chairman, I regret that the subcommittee failed to approve my request for the transmission lines that would have made it possible for the people in my district to secure the cheap power that will soon be available from the great Missouri River Dams. Knowing these gentlemen as I do, I am sure this was not an action of the heart—but of the mind—and very likely it came about because of the lack of information in connection with this project which is so very important to the people of Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, 20 Minnesota REA cooperatives and three large private utility

companies have reached an agreement and presented a proposal which would make it possible for them to secure the hydroelectric power which, as I said, will soon be available from the Missouri River dams. The agreement between these groups, interested in securing cheaper electric energy for more than 1,000,000 people in central and western Minnesota, is in my judgment, a splendid example of cooperation and proves that it is possible for public and private power to join in common endeavor. Now these people are not asking for anything but a loan repayable at 3 percent interest, to bring a great backbone line from Garrison Dam up in North Dakota, extending into Minnesota and down through the central portion and out connecting with Fort Randall on the south. If this was an appropriation, as you well know, I would not be here urging that it be made. This is a loan to 20 REA cooperatives and three private utilities, through the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of giving the people of Minnesota an opportunity, if you please, to take advantage of this cheap hydroelectric power. I cannot agree with the contention that this good subcommittee makes every year that there shall be a policy of no starts whatsoever in the way of transmission lines. Here, we have a very worth-while project. In my judgment, the subcommittee's action is penny-wise and pound-foolish. I feel sure that their action is only the result of their not having had the proper information brought before it.

Last year the Senate debated this subject fully on the floor and suggested that these REA cooperatives and the private utilities agree on a plan for the utilization of this power and then come back this year and present it. That is exactly what they have done. They have signed an agreement whereby they will fight any further demands for transmission lines if they can get the assistance this transmission line will afford them. The line will be necessary anyway and we might as well give it to them now.

Mr. Chairman, remember this. My section of Minnesota is a high-cost fuel area. We are unfortunate. We do not have coal nearby, we do not have natural gas, we do not have oil. So the generation of our electrical energy costs just plenty of money. It costs us exactly twice what it will cost if we can secure this energy from the Missouri River. We are especially anxious to get it now, because in only 2 years' time that energy will be flowing eastward. We are not asking to take anything away from the Dakotas. Naturally, they have preferred rights, and should have. They will be fully protected. But we do ask consideration for these 1,000,000 people who today in western and central Minnesota do not have sufficient power. The development of electrical service in western Minnesota is more or less new to that area. This year in my district we will have a consumption of 75,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy. It is estimated that in 10 years from now we will exactly double that.

My friends, if you were a farmer, as I am, and had to run your milking machine at the end of one of these REA lines, and about the time of the peak load, about 5:30 in the afternoon, you would find there was often not enough energy to pull your old milking machine, and you would be disgusted, just as thousands of farmers in my area have been, and rightfully so.

Mr. Chairman, I do ask your consideration of this matter. It is strictly a loan, repayable with interest at 3 percent annually. We do not often come here and ask anything of you people, but I do want to let you know how we feel on this subject.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I do not quite understand the gentleman's position. I recall that he opposed these transmission lines last year. Is the gentleman asking for a transmission line now?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I opposed the position of the private utilities last year, if the gentleman will recall. I supported the position of the REA cooperatives. But now these two groups have gotten together; they have made an agreement, and we are bringing before this Congress the united front request to give us this line.

May I refer to this Missouri River project as similar to TVA. The other year you gentlemen from the South brought up the point that you could not operate TVA unless you had steam plants to firm up the power. What did CARL ANDERSEN do at that time? The TVA meant nothing whatsoever to his district, but he was with you on that fight. You will see in the RECORD where he was paired for that. In another instance on a division I voted for it, simply because I knew it was not good business to start a great project like TVA and not do everything possible to try to make reimbursable to the taxpayer every possible dime, even though it is necessary to put a little more money into it.

That is the same thing I am asking for this Missouri River project. The dams are being constructed. Let us use them to the utmost possible good of the people in that area who should benefit from their construction.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to compliment our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], on the fine way in which he has handled this bill and all previous bills. I think we have a very fine subcommittee. The thing I like about our subcommittee is that we have a lot of diversity. We have members with different points of view, coming from different backgrounds. I do not know of a healthier thing in legislation than diversity, because it will test the strength and weaknesses of all kinds of proposals. Our committee is fortunate in having a high caliber group of men on the subcommittee.

I, too, want to compliment our new clerk of the subcommittee, Mr. Carson Culp. He is an able legislative technician. He has done a fine job and has been of invaluable assistance to the subcommittee.

I call the attention of the Members to two important features in this bill. First of all, we have cut the budget 21 percent, the largest percentage cut made by any subcommittee thus far this year, and it probably will be the largest made by any subcommittee during the current session of Congress.

Bearing in mind that we have cut the budget 21 percent, also please take note that this particular department of the Government, the Department of the Interior, brings back to the Treasury percentage-wise more money than any other Government agency. If you will be good enough to turn to page 653 of the hearings you will see set out in a table a complete list of the sources of revenue for the Department of the Interior. The gross receipts for the fiscal year 1953 are estimated at \$231,419,149. That is an increase over the current receipts for the fiscal year 1952 of some \$15,000,000.

I mention these two items because I think we should bear in mind that the Department of the Interior is one of our most important agencies of Government, because it is in that area where we have entrusted the management of our largest share of natural resources. The Department of the Interior provides the blood and muscle for the economy of the United States. I know we are all concerned about the dollar deficit. It is a great challenge to the survival of our free enterprise system, and I must say very frankly, I think our subcommittee has done a real job of economy. At the same time every thoughtful American should stop, look and listen insofar as the deficit of resources in America is concerned. We might be able to survive a dollar deficit for a limited period of time, but we certainly cannot survive a large deficit of natural resources over the years. This department has the responsibility of seeing to it that the resources are properly managed, and properly marshaled for an expanding America. If you go through the hearings, you will see some of the vital elements of what I call the blood and muscle of American economy.

One of the big items in this bill is power, power for industry and power for the defense of America. The largest single item is reclamation to provide food for an expanding population in America. The people who are supposed to know, estimate we are going to face a serious food problem in 1975, if we do not find new sources of food for an ever-increasing American population.

You will find funds in this appropriation bill for the Fish and Wildlife Service, which manages the largest commercial fisheries resource in all the world, namely, the Alaska salmon run. There are funds for the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON, very ably pointed out the work of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines in connection with our atomic-energy

program, making available their records and assisting in providing the technical know-how to help find and exploit new uranium deposits in the United States of America. I need not remind you that the number of atomic bombs that we can make is tied in directly with our ability to find new sources of this vital raw material.

Then there is the work in connection with the management of our great public domain, which cuts across the entire economy of America, the Bureau of Land Management.

So I hope that when we look at this appropriation bill, we will look at it like any prudent businessman would look at a good and going enterprise. If you are in business, you certainly are aware of the fact that you must plow back a certain portion of your earnings into that business or else you will milk it dry, and you will not have any business at all a few years hence. So I say to you when a subcommittee comes to the floor of the House with a cut of 21 percent, and with over half of its funds, which are in the bill, being repaid to the United States Treasury, I think no one could properly criticize the job that has been done by this particular subcommittee. I believe I am speaking for the members on both sides of the aisle who serve on the subcommittee at the present time.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to express my extreme gratitude for the attitude of the committee toward the National Park Service. I notice they have increased the amounts for management and maintenance. In the national parks is one place where millions and millions of Americans get a great deal of pleasure. The national parks are a continuing natural resource which we ought to protect properly. I am glad to see that the attitude of this subcommittee is to protect and develop the national parks and to provide for the services and maintenance which the patrons of the parks require for their maximum enjoyment of these wonderful spots.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to touch for just a few moments on the problem of power in America. If you go back through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over the years, you will find that this is a subject that has been kicked around probably more than any other item that relates to American resources. We have heard charges over the years that we have plenty of power. The truth is that today we are using 69,000,000 kilowatts of power.

If you have been reading the papers recently you probably noticed the statement by Mr. James Fairman, who comes from one of the large private utilities of the United States, the Consolidated Edison Co. Mr. Fairman is the head of the Defense Electric Power Administration, and in my opinion is doing an outstanding job. He pointed out that based on present defense requirements we are going to have to increase and provide

new sources of power in the United States to the extent of some 32,000,000 kilowatts over the next 3 years, that is, by the end of 1954, nearly a 50-percent increase in 3 years. One of the big demands on our power program will stem from a request that will be made to Congress shortly for a \$6,000,000,000 increase in our atomic energy program. I regret that I cannot tell you the number of kilowatts that will be required for that program, for obvious security reasons, but it certainly should be apparent to all that there will be a very heavy demand for power in the next few years if we are going to meet our defense production schedule. We have in this bill some large items for power, but if you will look through the items listed on page 653 of the hearings you will find that one of the largest items which brings revenue to the Department of the Interior and to the Treasury Department is the Bonneville Power Administration, which is listed at \$38,500,000 for the coming fiscal year. Very frankly, I think there are some transmission lines that should have been in this bill that have not been included, such as the La Grande-Baxer line, which is highly desirable from a defense standpoint. Last year, however, the House had an opportunity to vote on roll calls, about 12 to be exact, and many of the lines that are not in the bill today were turned down by the House a year ago. I think it is a fair assumption that the House would probably be inclined to turn them down again, and I believe that is one of the main reasons why funds for some of these transmission lines were not included in the present bill.

The Bonneville Administration estimate, over-all, has been cut, not only below Interior Department estimates for fiscal year 1953 but below the level of appropriations for the current year.

The Bonneville agency, headed by Dr. Paul J. Raver, over the years has proved to be an efficient and sound operation. The objectives of a public enterprise such as Bonneville are much broader and its responsibilities are much more complex than those of any private enterprise in the Pacific Northwest region.

Bonneville, and agencies similar to it, must assume many responsibilities of a public nature and of a sort with which private enterprise is seldom burdened.

The standard of Bonneville's usefulness, or the standard of usefulness of any Government agency for that matter, is a public-interest standard. It must be based on the contribution that the agency makes to the welfare of the Nation and the welfare of that segment of the Nation which it directly serves.

The value of its appropriations should be gaged according to this standard, and this standard only.

However, if there are critics in this House who insist on judging Bonneville and the value of its appropriations purely by the standards of ordinary business, this agency also can meet those standards with complete success.

If a private enterprise makes a substantial profit for its owners—if it accounts for its expenses by standard cost accounting methods—if, by those stand-

ards it shows a profit—such a business is accounted successful.

By these same standards the Bonneville Power Administration makes a handsome profit for its "stockholders" which goes to repay, with interest, these appropriations.

Let me give you a condensed summary of Bonneville's revenues and expenses for the last full fiscal year:

Operating revenues for the fiscal year 1951 were \$36,189,028.

This compares with \$31,197,515 for the preceding year—a gain of nearly \$5,000,000 in gross revenues.

Expenses for the fiscal year 1951 total \$21,693,476, as compared with a total expense for the previous fiscal year 1950 of \$19,288,548—an increase in expenses of less than two and one-half million.

Thus we find that while revenues increased nearly \$5,000,000 over the previous year, expenses increased less than two and one-half million over the previous year. Any ordinary large private enterprise showing such a record of gain in the period of a year would receive commendation from its board of directors and its stockholders.

The figures I have just given you have been audited by Arthur Andersen and Co., a nationally known firm of certified public accountants, who, under contract, have audited the books of the Bonneville Power Administration just as they audit the books of many large private utility companies throughout the country. I mention this so that there need be no suggestion from anyone here that the figures I have read are inaccurate.

I am quite well aware of the criticism that occasionally has been made of the Bonneville annual statements which show large returns to the Federal Government. This criticism, made year after year, is to the effect that Bonneville does not pay taxes; and if it did pay taxes it could not show a profit.

The implication in such comments is that Bonneville has an unfair advantage over the private utility operations.

An answer to this is simple. Utility companies, and those who sympathize with them, tell us, time after time, that about 25 percent of their revenue dollar each year goes to Federal, State, and local taxes.

In other words, they state that roughly one-quarter of their annual revenues are taken from them by taxes.

However, the figures I have just given you on the Bonneville Power Administration show that Bonneville has had in 1951 surplus net revenues from power operations totaling \$14,495,552. This surplus is 40 percent of Bonneville's revenues for the same year.

Thus it becomes clear that even if Bonneville paid 25 percent of its revenues out in taxes it would still show 15 percent of its revenues as surplus.

As a final comment in this brief statement I want to point out that every penny that Bonneville Power Administration collects from the sale of power in the Pacific Northwest is paid into the Federal Treasury where it remains for disbursement each year by the Congress.

It is probable that most of the Members of this House have not had an op-

portunity to read the published hearings on the Bonneville power appropriation before the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

For this reason I want to call your attention to pages 120 to 127, inclusive, of part I of the published hearings.

On these pages is set forth a report by the Bonneville Administration, to members of the committee, of new management and technical developments which have been achieved by the Bonneville Power Administration in the face of rising labor and material costs and which have enabled this Administration to make annual savings of several millions of dollars as compared with the technical practices commonplace in the utility industry in the year 1941.

Among the engineering developments adopted and in practice is the design of light steel towers for Bonneville's basic transmission-grid system. This advanced design saves from 40 to 50 tons of steel and \$6,000 to \$7,000 per mile of line. Annual savings to Bonneville, as compared with 1941 practices, are in the neighborhood of \$1,700,000.

A new type of large transformer bank has been adopted by Bonneville. It is believed these are the largest transformer banks in the country today. Lower insulation levels and simplified maintenance make possible savings of about \$3,000,000 a year as compared with 1941 methods.

Reduced insulation levels for power equipment operating at 230,000 volts or higher have been pioneered by Bonneville. These new standards have been adopted by the industry and have brought estimated savings of \$250,000 annually.

Technical improvements in circuit-breaker characteristics have been pioneered by Bonneville and are saving that agency \$260,000 annually. Circuit breakers fulfill somewhat the same function as fuses on a large electric power system. Many of them are required and are expensive.

Selective use of overhead ground wires, improved techniques in the use of lightning protection, vibration dampers, and similar items are saving the Bonneville Administration more than \$2,300,000 each year as compared with the cost of older practices.

Bonneville is currently pioneering the use of autotransformers which make it possible to transmit larger quantities of power over existing facilities originally designed for lower capacities. Savings here are estimated at about \$3,000,000 a year.

Bonneville is developing rapidly a microwave communication system. First unit of this new communication method was placed in service in 1952. The improvement in communications will result in large savings in operation man-hours and in improvement of service.

Still other technical improvements are under study by the Administration and are set forth in the published report of the hearings.

While these are largely technical and do not bear repetition here, it is noteworthy that the savings in annual costs

for construction and operation of the Bonneville system have come in a period when construction costs over the nation have gone up as much as 80 percent above 1940 levels. These savings, through technical innovations, have made it possible for the Bonneville Administration to retain its low power rates while rates are climbing in all other parts of the country.

Members of the committee heard the discussion of these factors and accomplishments by the Bonneville Power Administration. They obviously were evidence to the committee that the Administration is an agency which makes aggressive efforts to pare its costs and to save the Government money.

This, I am sure, had much to do with the committee's recommendation relative to the Bonneville appropriation.

I know some members of the Congress have been bombarded with statements to the effect that Interior agencies are extravagant.

As evidence, they point to the fact that in a year when Bonneville's gross revenues from the sale of power total about \$36,000,000, its appropriations are more than twice that sum.

They cite this as evidence that Bonneville is running in the red.

To any thoughtful person who is at all familiar with the development of new enterprise, such reasoning is, to say the least, slipshod.

Nine-tenths of Bonneville's annual appropriation goes for investment in new plant; that is, into production facilities which, in future years, will bring in revenues which will more than pay off that investment, plus a net surplus.

The same thing occurs daily in private enterprise.

For example, two large aluminum companies during the next two years plan to expend nearly \$180,000,000 between them in new capital investment for additional potlines to produce aluminum. During the 3 years of this tremendous expenditure the revenues which they will obtain from sale of the metal produced by this expansion will be less than one-quarter of the amount of money which they will be expending.

These aluminum companies will borrow money for this purpose.

Private enterprise, when it raises huge sums for new plant, issues bonds or sells stock for that purpose, or borrows money from banks. The money lenders do not worry about the fact that this money which they are lending in any given year, or period of years, amounts to more than the gross revenues bought in from the sale of products.

The Bonneville Administration cannot issue bonds or sell stock to raise capital for new plant. Instead it comes to the Congress for appropriations, which, in effect, are nothing more nor less than loans, since they are repaid with interest.

The Columbia river power system, like the new aluminum plants, is a new enterprise. Its capital requirements to get started in its early years naturally exceed the revenues for those same years.

However, as the system grows and the new plant becomes productive, the revenues will increase.

This is as typical of Bonneville as it is of any new large private enterprise.

Two-thirds of Bonneville's personnel and nine-tenths of its appropriations are used to construct a huge transmission system which is being built to serve many, many years and which will take power from the new dams on the Columbia River system to market.

Each year the Congress has approved appropriations for the Army engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation to construct these large multiple-purpose dams which produce power.

Sale of the power is to pay off the annual investment of appropriations in power generators and transmission lines.

But the power cannot be sold unless it can be transported from the dam sites to the cities where it can be used. The investment will be lost unless the power is so transported. The Bonneville Power Administration is in the power transportation business. It builds a transmission system which can be likened roughly to a railroad which hauls the power to market.

Transmission lines, like railroads, cost money.

Transmission lines, like railroads, bring in revenues—in this case revenues to the Federal Government.

In this case the revenues not only pay for the construction of the transportation system but for the production of the commodity it hauls—electric power, and the operations of the system which does the hauling.

Thus it may be seen that \$66,523,400 approved by the committee is to be used not for operation of the Bonneville system, but for investment by the Federal Government in the addition to a transportation system which will bring immense returns.

More than two-thirds of all Bonneville's employees will be engaged in some phase of this plant-construction activity and will be paid out of these construction funds.

Your committee considered all these factors carefully when it reviewed the estimates for the Bonneville Administration. The cuts it has made in this appropriation have been considerable, but they have been judicious.

I have spoken at some length here on the Bonneville item because I have seen it operate at close hand. I thank other Members on both sides of the aisle from the Pacific Northwest who also have spoken in behalf of this agency and in behalf of the committee's recommendation.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to supplement and add to the discussion initiated by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] in reference to the request for a loan to the Bureau of Reclamation to build a transmission line from the Garrison Dam into Minnesota, coming in at Fergus Falls in my own district, going down through central and southwestern Minnesota and back into South Dakota. This project would provide lower power rates for the farmers of Min-

nesota, the industry, and all the people of the area.

In the record of the hearings you will find 39 pages of testimony covering this matter. I want to compliment the committee for their patience in hearing several Members of Congress from Minnesota and witnesses from REA and also the three interested power companies. Anyone can realize that in 39 pages we gave quite a number of sound arguments for the approval of this loan of somewhat less than \$3,000,000 to initiate an electric power transmission line program from the Garrison Dam into Minnesota.

It seems to me it would be wise to develop this low-cost power program for the farmers, business and manufacturing interests and the consumers and citizens generally of Minnesota at a cost of just a few millions, after having spent many hundreds of millions of dollars for great power projects such as the Garrison Dam project.

It has been pointed out that there may be a serious shortage of food in this country in the next few years. The farmers of Minnesota need cheap power and must have it in order to produce the additional food that will be needed. Incidentally the farmers of Minnesota, at Garrison Dam power rates, would have sold over a million and a half dollars last year. The need for and use of power will keep on increasing. We are asking for only a small amount to get the project started, but it is a loan and will be repaid in 50 years at 3 percent interest. At that time the Bureau of Reclamation will own the power and transmission lines and they can be turned over to private business and enterprise by sale or lease. In the area which would be benefited there are 20 REA cooperatives.

I have a feeling that the Senate might put back the amount of money in this bill. The Bureau of the Budget did approve of this item. So I think the House conferees could well and likely will accept a Senate provision to put this money back in the bill to at least get this worthwhile project started. It will be a sound investment and will return much benefit to the people in the area.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I am indebted to the gentleman from Iowa for yielding me this time to associate myself with the gentlemen from Minnesota who have addressed the Committee briefly on the importance of the so-called development of the Garrison Dam and the extension of transmission lines into Minnesota. I believe that the subject matter has been very ably covered by the gentlemen who have spoken previously on this subject. However, I want to reiterate in part what they have said.

This is the first time I know of where the private power companies and the REA were able to get together and settle the question of the distribution of this public power which would be developed

at dams along the Missouri River, particularly at Garrison, and get that power into the State of Minnesota where it is badly needed and provide for its distribution by agreement between divergent interests—certainly, the REA and the power companies.

I suppose that one of the greatest virtues that is necessary for a legislator to have is patience. I have a deep affection for the members of the subcommittee personally who have reported this appropriation bill and as a functioning group of the House, but I do think this should be called to their attention again and I am very hopeful that some decision can be arrived at in the favorable disposition of the matter which is so important to Minnesota.

I do hope that favorable consideration may be had at an early date for this important appropriation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to express my thanks to the members of this subcommittee, particularly to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], chairman of this subcommittee, for his patience and his perseverance and his help over the years in bringing to a conclusion the solutions of certain problems that exist in my district and which have been problems for a longer time than I have been the Representative of that district.

While I am making this expression here sincerely, I want to call attention to a sentence which appears at page 12 of the report in order that there may be no possibility of further misunderstanding. I do not think there will be, but I take this opportunity to make sure there will not be any misunderstanding. I refer to the following quotation:

The Yuma project should be given adequate protection against increased operation and maintenance costs that may arise—

And so forth. I point out that this particular item is one which had been discussed between the contracting parties and was eliminated from the contract and from the discussions. It refers therefore to a unilateral statement made by the Secretary of the Interior in a letter to one of the contracting parties.

Negotiations to amend the contract between the United States and Imperial Irrigation district of El Centro, Calif., were carried on for many years. Recently, after intensive work by the personnel of both the Department of the Interior and Imperial, there was executed a supplemental contract which in effect modifies the 1932 contract in order to bring the 1932 contract into line with the Mexican Water Treaty.

During the course of the negotiations, the Department of the Interior on January 29, 1952, wrote Imperial proposing a clause to be inserted in the contract as follows:

The operation and maintenance costs of the All-American Canal down to Siphon Drop which are chargeable to the Yuma project shall include neither those items of costs or expenses for sediment removal or control, lining of said canal, enlargement of appurtenant drainage facilities, or other items of costs or expenses, if any, which, in

the opinion of the Secretary are the direct result of, or are directly occasioned by, the development of power at Pilot Knob, nor costs or expenses, if any, that, in the opinion of the Secretary, may be required as a result of such power development to adjust or modify the turn-outs serving the Yuma project.

Representatives of the Imperial Irrigation district refused to accept this clause on the ground that they were willing to amend their original contract in order to reach a workable agreement which was cognizant of the problems raised by the Mexican Water Treaty, but that they would not accept any clause designed to give an advantage to other domestic interests who were merely seizing upon the Mexican Water Treaty as an excuse to accomplish a result to which they were not entitled and which could not be attained in the court of law. The Yuma project enjoys a free ride on the All-American Canal at the expense of the farmers of Imperial Valley as it is. This free ride for Yuma has cost Imperial over \$3,000,000. Imperial has, first, paid in cash the full cost of Laguna Dam, \$1,600,000, which has served Yuma since 1904 and from which Imperial has never diverted a drop of water; second, provided capacity in the All-American Canal, 2,000 cubic feet per second, for the Yuma project without a cent of capital expense to Yuma, at a cost of another \$1,500,000; third, trebled the power drop for Yuma at Siphon Drop, worth another \$200,000 per year, without cost. Yet, Yuma asks more.

The district accordingly replied on February 8, 1952, as follows:

EL CENTRO, CALIF., February 8, 1952.

Mr. G. W. LINEWEAVER,
Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. LINEWEAVER: This is in response to your letter of January 29 in which you set forth certain revisions to the draft contract designated January 4, 1952, draft, which had been suggested by Secretary Chapman. You asked for our concurrence in the revisions.

Your letter was given careful consideration by our board of directors following which I telephoned you on February 4 and gave you the board's reaction. Your letter had suggested six revisions. I told you that all of the revisions, with the exception of the first one—that of adding a new subparagraph (e) to article 16 for the further benefit of the Yuma County Water Users Association—appeared to be acceptable and I did not think there would be much difficulty in reaching an agreement with you in regard to them. I have been advised by Mr. Ely and Mr. Dowd that such proved to be the case at the meeting they had with your group on February 6.

However, as to the first revision, I told you it was totally unacceptable to our board in every respect and I discussed our reasons with you at some length. I understand that such were supplemented by Mr. Ely and Mr. Dowd at the February 6 meeting. Therefore, there would appear to be no object in repeating here all our objections since I understand that, at the meeting, you agreed to withdraw the revision from further consideration. However, it might be well to restate a few of the more important reasons for our position in this matter.

I am sure the record before the Congress, in negotiations with both your Department and the State Department, as well as in the transcript of the several hearings held by Secretary Chapman, is very clear that the

only basis which justified the request to our district for a revision of the 1932 All-American Canal contract was to bring that contract into accord with the 1944 water treaty with Mexico. Furthermore, it has been the firm position of our board, and I am sure there can be no misunderstanding about it in the Interior Department, that our district was willing to cooperate in bringing about such an accord but we would not go beyond that.

So, even if the proposed revision to article 16 had any merit or was in anywise justified, which it hasn't nor isn't, in no way has it any relation to or is it required by the water treaty and, therefore, it has no place for consideration in the proposed supplemental contract now under negotiation between us.

2. The past record indicates the most favorable consideration given the Yuma County Water Users Association in our 1932 All-American Canal contract. Our district was required, by that contract, to accept obligations and benefits on behalf of the association amounting to millions of dollars in value to that association. If our 1932 contract were to be opened up for revision other than to bring it into accord with the water treaty, which we are not asking, we would most certainly request a number of revisions to correct the unfair assumption of obligations placed on our district for the exclusive benefit of the association.

3. The All-American Canal was constructed with certain capacities and for several purposes. So long as our district operates the canal in accordance therewith, the association can have no justified complaint. The association pays none of the construction cost of Imperial Dam and All-American Canal, not even for the capacity in the canal which it utilizes, and its share of operation and maintenance costs are only for its capacity down to Siphon Drop. For the association now to seek a device by which it might escape even some of its just share of operation and maintenance costs, as it does by the proposed revision to article 16, is of itself sufficient basis for refusal by our district to give it any consideration.

May I say in conclusion, that our board and those who have represented our district have been greatly appreciative of the attitude of cooperation shown by you and your staff in the negotiations we have had. I believe all parties have shown a spirit of give and take in a serious effort to reach an agreement. I sincerely hope we have now reached that point and that a final conclusion will be had at a very early date.

Very truly yours,

EVAN T. HEWES,
President, Board of Directors.

In addition, I have noticed the following statement in House Report No. 1628, which accompanied H. R. 7176, the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1953:

The committee was gratified to learn that an agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Imperial Irrigation district has been finally executed for the operation and maintenance of the Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal. A total of \$420,000 was included in the budget for maintenance and operation by the Bureau. Since these costs will be assumed by the Imperial Irrigation district, the appropriation request for this specific item has been deleted. The committee is aware, however, that some funds will be necessary for supervision under the agreement, for preparation of a master schedule for water diversions at Imperial Dam, and for operations at the dam other than those carried on by the Imperial Irrigation district. For these purposes, \$60,000 has been allowed under the item for operation and maintenance. In view of the intense interest in the two States, California

and Arizona, in this project the committee expects the Secretary of the Interior to report fully on the operations of the All-American Canal under the recently executed agreement. In administration of the agreement, the Yuma project should be given adequate protection against increased operation and maintenance costs that may arise from siltation, excessive deterioration of the works, or additional construction required in the interest of developing and operating the Pilot Knob drop for power production as authorized by the Boulder Canyon project of 1928.

This last sentence is so much like the Secretary's letter that obviously the committee was relying on, and was misled by, the author of that letter.

I want it to be understood that the Imperial irrigation district met with the Department of the Interior at a conference table and bargained in good faith. They rejected the clause set forth above and were assured that the Secretary's representative had withdrawn this clause from the negotiations. Now, after all the conferences are over, the Secretary has taken it upon himself to state to a third party that the contract in fact gives him the power which the clause would have given him even though the clause is not inserted anywhere in the amendatory contract. The Imperial irrigation district does not accept either the interpretation of the Secretary or the language contained in the committee report with reference to claims of the Yuma project. Its position is as stated in its letter to the Secretary dated February 8, 1952. The rights of the parties are defined in the contract and not in ex parte declarations by the Secretary to third persons. The Interior Department should have made this situation clear to the committee which it manifestly has not done.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned because appropriations for Alaska public works have not been at the level contemplated when the basic act, Public Law 264, Eighty-second Congress, was approved. It was discouraging to learn the committee had reduced the President's budget request of \$20,000,000 to \$7,000,000.

I am equally concerned however, Mr. Speaker, with the import of the report of the Committee on Appropriations. The gist of the report is that municipalities in Alaska are tardy in holding elections to authorize the financing of their projects, that they are remiss in not preparing detailed plans and specifications on which a sound estimate of cost can be based, and that they make no effort to finance their share of the cost of these projects by the sale of securities which would enable them to deposit cash with the Government instead of obligating themselves to repay over a period of years.

The committee goes on to say that the committee does not intend to appropriate in a vacuum and quoting verbatim from that report "definite evidence to the effect that municipalities seeking benefits from this program have made positive efforts to assume their share of the responsibility will be required for all proj-

ects hereafter." That can only mean, Mr. Speaker, that this evidence will be required before appropriations are made. If Members of the House will consult the report of the hearings held upon the bill which resulted in Public Law 264, they will realize that all of these factors were presented to and considered by the committee before the enactment of that legislation. Many credible witnesses appeared from Alaska, including the Governor of the Territory and mayors and other officials of a number of municipalities, and testified to the inability of the Alaska communities to finance projects beyond what would be the normal demands whereas in many municipalities the needs are now aggravated by defense-swollen populations or the inability of other and smaller communities to market their securities and hence inability to raise the funds with which to meet even normal demands. Congress in its wisdom after consideration of such testimony—and I am satisfied that no Member of Congress doubts the need for public works in the Territory of Alaska—enacted a bill which would permit the public bodies of Alaska to in effect borrow an aggregate of not to exceed 50 percent of the cost of the projects authorized by the act at an interest rate of 2 percent whereas without such provisions these municipalities would either be unable to borrow at all or would be required to pay from their meager resources interest rates ranging up to 4 percent.

Moreover those who were to be charged with the responsibility for administering the act testified that the administration of the program would be facilitated by granting the administering agency authority to contract in addition to the cash appropriation in a given year. This would allow advance planning within such contracting authority and it is the only way that the public bodies of Alaska could afford to plan in advance of actual appropriations. The granting of this contracting authority has been denied, and the delay which it was testified would be overcome by its granting is the delay which the appropriations committee now complains of.

The practical effect of some of the committee's remarks if followed to conclusion would be to set up a different set of requirements for participation in this program than are contained in the basic law and hence would introduce not expedition but confusion and delay.

I am sure that the report of the committee is a blow to the hopes of the public bodies in Alaska which, in 1949, were justified in expecting, by the passage of Public Law 264, that they would be granted appropriations which they could match sufficiently to construct \$70,000,000 worth of public works for which to date there has been appropriated only \$16,000,000; and they are now met with the suggestions by the appropriations committee that requirements not in the basic legislation are to be imposed before funds for this needed works shall be available.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation measure is probably more important to my area, the State of Montana, than any other bill that comes before the Congress. For that reason I want to thank the chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee for the courtesy they showed me when I appeared before them and for the courtesy they showed the people who came from Montana to appear in behalf of things in which they were interested. They were always kind, and they helped us in presenting our facts.

Mr. Chairman, I am a member, and have been since I entered Congress, of the committee that has to do with authorizing appropriations that appear in this bill. On the whole, I think the committee has done a good job. I regret the cuts that have been made. It is regrettable to me, and I think to most Members of the Congress, that we have to curtail the development of our natural resources. The chairman spoke of that, and the ranking Republican member spoke of that matter. I think we all regret that we have to curtail these funds necessary to develop our own natural resources at a time when our population is increasing, at a time when we are not producing in calories the food we need in this country, and at a time when even the feed crops are not sufficient to feed the livestock that we wintered during the last winter. We have consumed most of our livestock feed reserves.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has to do with public domain, national parks, Indian affairs, reclamation, mining, oil, power, and soil resources. My State is largely an undeveloped State, and these things are of great concern to us. It seems almost disheartening that we have to spend thousands of millions of dollars overseas to develop mineral resources in different parts of the globe when we have those resources that could be developed in this country and in this particular area. It is disheartening to have to spend thousands of millions of dollars in Europe, in Asia, and in Africa for the development of reclamation, drainage, mineral, power development, when we need that development right here in the United States. I hope the time will come quickly when we can curtail that spending and again go forward with a program of development of our resources in this country.

The Bureau of Land Management serves a tremendously large area throughout the West, and it needs these funds, and it is to the credit of the committee that they did increase them somewhat. In the case of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, they cut the construction program, the administrative program, and the services outside of Indian reservations. They did increase the program for health and education. I wish it might have been increased more, because those are two fundamental things necessary for the development of these people. Education has to be carried forward. I hope that we can do the job that needs to be done in the education and health of Indians, above all else, and I am sure the committee joins with me on that.

In the Bureau of Reclamation the committee granted funds necessary to go ahead with the construction of the projects that are now under way. They denied funds for new projects. I regret that that was necessary. I wish that the funds could have been included in this bill for starting the Yellowtail Dam in my district, the Missouri-Souris diversion, the lower Marias, and the Fort Peck diversion. Funds were at one time included in a previous bill for the lower Marias, and I hope we can again start that project and get it under way, as well as other programs that are so necessary to supply the food and the resources that the increasing population of this country needs.

I should like to comment very briefly on the National Park Service appropriations. Two of the largest parks in the country are in my district or adjoining it. The chairman spoke of the large number of people visiting these parks as compared with those who used to visit them a few years ago. The load is tremendous, and the personnel of the Park Service has been decreased. The result is that they are having a most difficult time in policing these great national parks and monuments. We need increased personnel during the summer season when people visit the parks. I think we should, if we can, provide those funds.

Mr. Chairman, the Interior Department performs many important functions. I hope the time will again come when we can spend our appropriation for the development of our own great natural resources.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the members of this committee on the action they have taken in reducing the budget request by the 21 percent or so. It seems to me that was a service for the Members of this Congress who favor economy.

I want to compliment them also on the drastic cut in the request made by the Office of Indian Affairs. It seems to me that was one of the most meritorious things this committee did. The time has come to move perhaps more quickly than was indicated by some members of this committee, by my good friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], for instance, with many of whose remarks I thoroughly agree, toward the entire liquidation of the Indian Bureau. This does not mean that those of us who advocate the abolition of the Indian Bureau would curtail a single needed service for the Indians of this country. It does mean that we feel that these fine services which the Indians deserve, because of previous agreements or because of their present condition can now better be carried out by our States and local governments or by other existing agencies of the Federal Government.

I think it is time to follow the request of the State of California expressed by its legislature in a resolution passed in May 1951 memorializing the Presi-

dent and the Congress of the United States in these words:

It is time to dispense with any and all restrictions, whatever their nature, whereby the freedom of the American Indian is curtailed in any respect, whether as to governmental benefits, civil rights, or personal conduct.

I hope the example set by the State of California through its legislature will be followed by every State that has a substantial number of Indians in it. We are not seeking to curtail any needed service to the Indians but rather to abolish the lock and chain that has been bound around this minority race for so long through the Indian Bureau. The Indians are the only minority race in the United States of America discriminated for or against officially by our Constitution and by our laws. I say it is time to follow the recommendations of so many who have studied this question.

I have tried to find out how many Indians there are in this country. I wonder if any member of this committee or any Member representing any State with Indians in it can answer that question.

Mr. KIRWAN. About 400,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, to remain available until expended, \$959,500.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to this paragraph but seem to have misplaced it at the moment. I ask unanimous consent to return to this paragraph after the next amendment is disposed of.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power-transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, \$1,450,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, many of the citizens in the area served by the Southwestern Power Administration are interested in two phases of this appropriation bill. First, we are interested in the completion of certain facilities to connect with lines bringing power from its generation sources into southwest Missouri, and particularly the line authorized from Mansfield, Mo., to Carthage, Mo., through Springfield, Mo. This line will serve not only the city of Springfield but also other preferred customers, especially the rural-electrification projects in Missouri and neighboring areas, which have meant so much to the farmers of my district and region.

Secondly, there is interest in the completion of wheeling contracts between the Southwestern Power Administration and private utilities, such as the Empire District Electric Co., the Missouri Public Service Corp., and other utility companies, so that they shall not be put out of business but so that their facilities may be used to the fullest. I am informed that negotiations have been going on successfully between Southwestern Power and private utilities for some time, and that some wheeling contracts, at least, are now in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior for approval.

I support fully the completion of the needed Southwestern Power Administration facilities, and at the same time the coordination of Southwestern Power and the private utility companies. I consider that the agreements reached in the wheeling contracts will demonstrate that it is possible and desirable to use power generated at dams built at public expense, without injury to private companies.

I am informed by members of this subcommittee, and by representatives of Southwestern Power, that this bill provides the amounts needed to complete the dispatching and warehouse facilities at Springfield, Mo., and the connecting lines already authorized. I have checked also with Dr. Blalock, of the REA, and with officials and managers of the REA in my district, and they have informed me that they are satisfied with the items set forth in this section of the bill. I commend the subcommittee for its consideration and service in this matter.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$66,523,400, of which \$4,096,400 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COTTON: On page 4, line 23, strike out "\$66,523,400" and insert "\$56,523,400."

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I am offering for the consideration of this committee would reduce the amount provided for the construction of transmission lines in the amount of \$10,000,000. On page 4, you will note that the total amount for construction is \$66,523,400. After reductions by the committee, it is my understanding that of that amount about \$20,000,000 is for new construction. My amendment would reduce the amount proposed for new construction by one-half.

Mr. Chairman, as a representative of a New England State, I supported on this floor last week an amendment cutting the appropriation for new steam plants in the TVA. There is a definite pattern, Mr. Chairman, that is followed in these projects. We have a magnificent development in the Tennessee Valley. We have a magnificent development in

the Northwest. The hydroelectric facilities are developed and we have invested, according to my understanding, in the Northwest section of the country approximately \$2,500,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. Then it becomes necessary to firm up this power by new construction, and then it also becomes necessary and almost always in the interest of national defense to build more transmission lines and to have further development including steam plants. In this case presumably the justification is that it is for national defense, and that much of it is to be used for the Atomic Energy Commission, but it is a military secret how much of it is to be so used. If a member of the committee would assure me, and let it go into the RECORD, that every cent of this \$20,000,000 is going for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, or for defense needs purely, I would gladly and instantly withdraw this amendment. But, Mr. Chairman, as a representative of a New England State, I have gone as far as I can along the road of furnishing cheap power to attract industries to other sections of the country and away from my section as well as other sections where they do business purely under private enterprise. I am convinced that some portion of this power will take from New England and other sections of the country, private industry and they want my people in New Hampshire to help pay for their own construction. They say they come to the Congress for money and loans. It is my understanding that Congress does not have any money. All we can give them is money that we borrow—money which we ultimately get from our people in your State and my State in the form of taxes so that we can pay back the loan. If this is purely and completely and utterly for national defense, then we must submit. But mixed in with it, Mr. Chairman, is the development of that great domain of cheap public power to attract the industries upon which other sections depend. I have seen my State utterly depleted by the loss of our industries. And so in the interest of restraining the expenditures of monies—public monies—for cheap public power for private purposes, I feel that one-half of the amount of this appropriation devoted to new construction be cut off, and that the new construction be curtailed at this time to \$10,000,000. \$46,000,000 of the total \$66,000,000 is for construction now under way and this amendment leaves that untouched. That is my amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the committee will adopt it.

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

The gentleman from Washington just a few minutes ago said they were coming before the Committee on Appropriations to ask for \$6,000,000,000 for power development for atomic energy purposes. We would have provided \$200,000,000 in this bill for the construction of power projects if we knew where to get the power, but we do not know where to get the power. That is the reason they ask for only \$66,523,400, and now an amendment is offered to cut that. We would provide half a billion dollars if we knew where to get the power. We

are spending \$400,000,000 in this bill for military purposes, and the most important item of all is power, yet we are asked to seriously cut that.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. It was my understanding from the hearings that the bulk of this power would not be available until 1956. Is that correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not know when it will all come in. But the bill does contain this \$66,000,000 item and, as I say, if we knew where to get the power we would probably have an item in here for half a billion. If we cannot build these transmission lines to make use of the power we have, if we cannot find more power, then a few years hence they are going to ask: "What is the matter that we cannot get airplanes? What is the matter that we cannot get tanks?"

I would like to say to the gentleman from New Hampshire that I am for public power and I am also for private power. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is expanding to the extent of \$1,250,000,000—I again repeat, spending more money than the United States Steel, General Motors, or any corporation in the world; but this is the only place we seem to get real power, in the Northwest.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from New Hampshire that the Hungry Horse Dam, the most important dam in the United States comes in this fall and it will furnish approximately 300,000 kilowatts throughout Montana and 500,000 kilowatts downstream. This project was developed there, and we are not asking aid of New Hampshire or any other State of the Union.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. It may be a geographical accident, but the Columbia River is there with all its potential, out in the Pacific Northwest; today we are building or remodeling 12 dams under various auspices. How are we going to use the product of this increased capacity if we do not construct transmission lines for that purpose?

Mr. KIRWAN. What is the use of building the generating capacity if we do not provide for getting it out, especially at a time when we need power?

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. Is it not a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the demand for power is so great in the Pacific Northwest, especially along with the Hanford engineer works, that the schedule has projected for the future a several hundred percent increase in some areas?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I wish to point out one more thing: We are building two dams that will come into

operation this fall and next January. The pending bill provides funds for these necessary transmission lines.

If the gentleman's amendment prevails you are going to have dams without power lines running from the dams. Now, it is utterly ridiculous to come in and make such a proposal here before the House when we are trying to work out a prudent arrangement in connection with the expenditure of these funds. One phase of the item is more than \$12,000,000 to take care of the output from McNary Dam into the Walla Walla, Hanford, Pasco, Big Eddy, and Pendleton areas.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I would like to inquire, if a portion of this is for private industry, why, after we have developed at taxpayers' expense these great hydroelectric projects, why in that section of the country private enterprise cannot take some of the power or finance the transmission lines the way we do in my section of the country and the way they do in other sections of the country that I know anything about.

Mr. KIRWAN. I want to correct the gentleman from New Hampshire when he says we are spending the taxpayers' money for this purpose. The taxpayers of the United States are not spending anything on this. Every dime of the money that is put into these power projects will come back to the Treasury of the United States with interest in addition.

Mr. COTTON. We are borrowing the money and lending it; is that it?

Mr. KIRWAN. They are borrowing the money and paying it back.

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

Mr. Chairman, in reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire I would like to add just this: In the last part of the colloquy, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Jackson] indicated that part of these funds for the construction of transmission lines would be used for the purpose of getting power from some of the hydroelectric-power dams that were under construction or that might possibly be under construction in that particular area of the country.

The subcommittee on civil functions appropriations has partial jurisdiction over the construction of certain power dams in the Columbia River Valley. I happen to be a member of this subcommittee. I am not at liberty at this time to divulge exactly what our subcommittee has done or might do in reference to the budget requests for the construction of some of these projects in the Northwest; but using the example of what was done by the civil functions subcommittee last year when we considered the President's budget, I think it may be fair to say, without revealing any confidences, that some of these projects in the Northwest will be slowed down a bit from the schedule set up in the President's budget. If we are going to slow down the construction schedule of some of these hydroelectric power projects in the Northwest, it is sensible to likewise

slow down the construction of transmission lines which will transmit the power from the dams to other parts of that area.

I think you will find that we can well afford to make a reduction in the funds for the Bonneville Power Administration simply because a construction schedule for a part of these projects in that area might likewise be curtailed in part.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire does tie into the construction schedule for these hydroelectric projects in that part of the country; consequently I wholeheartedly and most emphatically recommend the adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the effect of the pending amendment will be to gut the transmission-line program of the Pacific Northwest. If this amendment is agreed to I hope there will be an opportunity for everyone to put their name on the line when the roll is called. As one Member of this House I am not going to have any part in the wrecking of a vital enterprise in this great area.

I would like to call attention to the fact that included in new construction funds is \$12,000,000 for line which will bring power from the McNary Dam into Pasco, into Richland, into Big Eddy, Portland, and Vancouver, into Kennewick and into the Walla Walla areas.

In addition, there is \$3,500,000 to bring power into the Bremerton Navy Yard area from across Puget Sound, involving a large submarine cable. Also included are two lines from Chief Joseph Dam to the Snohomish, Wash., substation in sum of \$7,685,000.

To understand the need for these new lines, please bear in mind that there are two large dams that will come into operation during this fall and in January of 1953. In October Hungry Horse will come into operation, when the first generator will go on the line. McNary Dam will put its first generator on the line in 1953.

Now, it certainly does not make sense to be building two dams that will produce about 1,500,000 kilowatts of power and then not build the transmission lines to take the power from the dams. These lines are vitally necessary to the delivery and use of this new power. Without them the power will not be sold and the investment in the dams will be wasted.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. Is it not a statement of fact, in your review of some of the transmission lines coming from McNary

Dam, that there is a specific line for which there is around \$2,500,000 allowed in this bill to handle the direct transmission of current into the Walla Walla substation, for a specific purpose, primarily the Hanford area?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct. A substantial part of that total of \$12,000,000 will be for the purpose of bringing power into the Hanford area until such time as the Ice Harbor Dam is to be constructed. Incidentally, in connection with the proposed expansion of the atomic-energy program, the facilities at Hanford will be taxed to the limit. We are about to engage in a tremendous expansion at Hanford, and all I can say is that the minimum additional investment at Hanford alone will be \$100,000,000.

The other item that I mentioned was the Bremerton Navy Yard across from Seattle. On top of all that is the fact that during this coming fiscal year, 1953, starting July 1, Bonneville will bring to the Treasury 38½ million dollars, with an over-all net, after allowance for depreciation, operation cost and interest of over \$14,000,000.

Now, my friend, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], wants to cut that revenue to the United States Treasury. If he postpones these lines he is going to cut out additional revenue that would otherwise accrue to the United States Treasury. Now, that is a fact, an undisputable fact, and if anyone wants to contradict it, I would be pleased to hear from the opposition. I would like to have the information, because if you want to cut out these transmission lines you are simply cutting off revenue. You started the job when you appropriated money for the dams. Now, you are going to have to finish it. If you fail to appropriate money for these lines, you will postpone the time when the revenue from power sales will be coming into the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will vote down the pending amendment and not permit the gutting of this vital transmission system.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but believe that the House would be making a grave mistake to adopt this amendment. I think any serious consideration of this matter would reveal that to take this amount of money, \$10,000,000, or any other amount of money, from the construction program of the Bonneville power system is not a saving at all because the system is under construction. It is quite obvious that it will be completed. As the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has just explained, two large dams will start generators on the line this coming year. That power will simply have to go out into thin air unless there are transmission lines to take it away. But, in my opinion, more important than even that fact is that this money for construction of lines is also for the development of things that are badly needed in our present defense effort. I do not propose to work the atomic energy angle in this talk

of mine. I want to mention something else.

Mr. Chairman, there is in process of planning at this moment a mine and processing plant in the southwestern part of the State of Oregon to produce nickel. Nickel is a very, very sorely needed product in the United States. This plant is to be installed by a very large industrial company. They have allocated more than a million dollars for the first operation there. They have planned to make an announcement on the 1st of April regarding their construction plans. They will produce a vast quantity of nickel, which the Government needs in its arms program. But this company has to have available to it 65,000 kilowatts of power, and there is not that amount of power available anywhere near this proposed plant. I think it is utter folly, in view of the fact that the lines will ultimately be constructed, to slow down or even stop this construction program now.

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

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted to me to the gentleman from Oregon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Let me finish the comment on this nickel project. Unless the transmission lines can be brought down there as part of this system, there is no use talking now about whether somebody else ought to build the system that is partially constructed. Let us complete the power lines so that the nickel can be mined.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. We are committed to a certain procedure out there now. To say that overnight or by action here on the floor we can change the pattern that is already started is begging the question, in my opinion.

I should like to know if there are not some rather important dams being built down on the watershed of the Willamette River, which is part of the system.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is quite true; yes.

Mr. HORAN. Are there not two or three down there?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes. There are several of these flood control dams, which will contribute to the system something over 200,000 kilowatts when completed. One of them should be completed near the end of next year.

Mr. HORAN. Is it not a matter of fact that if we are going to have the transmission system ready when the generators start turning we had better be giving mighty serious consideration to their construction at this time?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman is quite correct.

I should like to repeat the point the gentleman from Washington [Mr.

HORAN] makes, that it is entirely academic, futile, and foolish to argue that this transmission system of the Bonneville Power Administration should not be completed by the Government, when it is already about 80 percent completed and when it is now bringing and did bring into the Treasury a net revenue last year of \$14,500,000. It is rather foolish, I think, to say now that these lines ought to be built by a private industry. That argument was settled some 15 years ago. The system is nearly complete. To hold back a few million dollars in this bill contributes nothing to the economy program which all of us are engaged in at this time. It contributes nothing at all. In fact, the net result of the adoption of this amendment can be nothing in the long run other than some loss to the Treasury of the United States. There is no other way it can be reasoned out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I come from a State which has 148,000 square miles. It has less than 600,000 people. During the late war, next to North Dakota we had the greatest percentage loss of any State in the Union insofar as our population was concerned. At the present time we have building there and getting pretty well toward completion the greatest dam not only in the United States today but in the world, the Hungry Horse Dam in northwestern Montana. That dam will have its first generator installed in October of this year, the next one in January of next year, and shortly thereafter the other two. It will furnish 300,000 kilowatts of power, approximately, for the State of Montana and 500,000 kilowatts of power, approximately, for the downstream area in the Columbia River Basin.

In western Montana we have 10 percent of the hydroelectric potential in the entire Nation. I want to see my State developed so that our people can have a chance to stay home and help us make Montana what it should be. I want to see our State taken out of the economic backwardness it has been in for so many years, and I want to see the resources which we possess in such great abundance developed.

We are not in competition with the gentleman's State of New Hampshire. We are taking none of his industries, because we are using this power to develop a phosphate industry and to develop an aluminum industry. There is no competition.

Insofar as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is concerned, this is not a new project. This is a project practically on the verge of completion. We need this chance, we need this break. We are asking you to help us when this dam is completed this year to continue with these lines so that we can keep these businesses alive which have come to our State, so that we can give our people some degree of security so that we can develop the resources we possess in such great abundance.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] would strike from the bill \$10,000,000 of money that is badly needed to build additional power lines in the Pacific Northwest. I am opposed to this proposed reduction.

The Bonneville Power Administration, last year, marketed the about 2,500,000 kilowatts of electricity that was produced by the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams. For this electricity, the Bonneville Power Administration received approximately \$39,000,000 and turned this money in to the Federal Treasury.

During the past several years we have been engaged in building, at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, eight additional dams on the Columbia River. All of these dams will be in operation by January 1956 or within about 3 years from now.

These dams, by January 1956, will be producing 1,554,000 additional kilowatts of electricity which the Bonneville Power Administration must market.

To market this huge 60 percent increase in power requires that new power lines be built. If \$10,000,000 is cut from this bill as the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] proposes, this power line building program will be curtailed. As a result the Bonneville system will not have the facilities to get this additional power from the new dams to the consuming centers. We will have the dams, on which we have spent hundreds of millions, but we will not be able, if this amendment carries, because we will lack distribution facilities, to market this additional power.

The creation of such a situation is not economy. It is ludicrous, unwise, and unbusinesslike.

If a publisher were to build a large newspaper plant, equipped it with expensive linotype machines and presses and then were to provide no trucks or other facilities for distributing his papers after they were printed that would be foolish. That, however, is exactly the kind of thing that is being proposed in the amendment now proposed to the Bonneville power line appropriation section of this bill.

The gentleman's State, New Hampshire, is a small State in area. It is only a part, not more than one-sixth, of New England, while the area served by the Bonneville Power Administration is five or six times the size of all New England. Our power service problems in the West are much more difficult and complex than those of New Hampshire.

We need these additional power lines for which this bill provides. The appropriation for them should not be cut. It would not be sound business to cut it.

We have two dams now and soon will have more. We must have the necessary power lines to distribute the additional power these dams will produce. Otherwise we will be in the ludicrous position of having power producing dams but have no power line facilities to get that power to the consuming centers where it must be sold.

I hope the amendment is rejected.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion it would be a great mistake to adopt this amendment. As you know,

my district borders on the Columbia River. In fact the Bonneville project is on the Columbia River in my district and the district represented by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Transmission lines covered by this item of the bill which the amendment seeks to reduce are vitally needed to bring hydroelectric power from the plants now constructed and those under construction to the consuming market where the power may be used by consumers, many of whom are engaged in war activities. There are many metallurgical industries aiding in national defense using hydroelectric power. As you know, the aluminum industry in the Pacific Northwest is a major one and vitally essential to the war program. There is also located in this area the great Hanford atomic energy plant which is a heavy consumer of electric power.

At the present time there is a great dearth of hydro power and transmission lines providing for the area are vitally needed to make available power which is coming into production soon. Two power plants are well on the way now under construction on the Columbia River. One will be put on the production line in January 1953 and the Hungry Horse Dam will begin generation in October. McNary Dam is scheduled to put its first generator in production in 1953 also.

Chief Joseph Dam, Albeni Falls Dam, and the Dalles Dam are now under construction which will add much additional power to the grid system in the Columbia River area.

There is around \$2,500,000 in the bill for transmission of current from McNary Dam into the Walla Walla substation which is needed primarily for the Hanford plant, I am advised.

It should not be overlooked that the hydroelectric plants owned and operated by the Government are a paying investment and are bringing into the Federal Treasury substantial payments above outlay. The operating revenues from Bonneville for the fiscal year 1951 were \$36,189,028, which was a gain of \$5,000,000 in gross revenues over the preceding year. The expenses for fiscal 1951 were \$21,693,476. As a matter of fact, Bonneville is some 10 years ahead in its payments on amortization of the cost of the project.

With reference to the tax question, these excess revenues received by the Bonneville Administration, which markets the power not only from Bonneville but from the Grand Coulee Dam as well, go into the Federal Treasury. The private outlets which market the power are able to purchase this power from the Government at wholesale rates which are the lowest in the country and thereby they participate in any advantage with reference to taxes and they in turn pass on the power to the consuming public at a rate based on the low rates they receive, which results in the public securing any tax advantage there may be.

From a purely business standpoint and considering the best interests of the public treasury it would be ill advised to make a cut in this item for transmission lines and it would deprive the Federal Government of the ability to market the power which will soon be coming into

production and which is owned by the Federal Government.

It just happens that Portland and the Third Congressional District of Oregon which I have the honor to represent is the heart of the critical national defense production in Oregon. A few of the strategic and important metals produced in this district include aluminum, ferroalloys, calcium carbide, chlorine, caustics, perchlorates, chlorates, and other important chemicals. There is also a large lumber industry and manufacture of heavy equipment and machinery. Most of Oregon's defense production is dependent upon increasing amounts of hydroelectric power from the Columbia River system. Therefore, it is imperative that transmission facilities scheduled in the Bonneville Power Administration 1953 fiscal year budget requests be given a high priority.

Particularly important are the major 230,000 volt additions to the Bonneville grid scheduled to bring the new generation from McNary Dam to Portland and Vancouver load areas. The Big Eddy-Troutdale line partially in the Third District is not only important to the aluminum industry, but also to many other interconnected utilities in the Northwest pool. This also involves a new line terminal at Troutdale and other additions at the Troutdale substation to be completed when McNary Dam power becomes available in 1953.

Another important item includes additions to transmission facilities serving an important electrometallurgical industry in the Third District.

Portland, like other areas of the Pacific Northwest, has experienced a tremendous growth in the last decade, both in population and industry. Economists estimate there will be another 23 percent increase in population over the next 10 years. Domestic power loads in the area alone, are expected to double within the next 7 years. Delays in construction schedules or serious curtailment of the Bonneville Power Administration budgets would be a serious economic handicap to the Pacific Northwest, and serve to stalemate industrial growth.

Mr. Chairman, I most sincerely hope that this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to support the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire. While it is true that the State of New Hampshire may be a small State, and that Massachusetts and Rhode Island and Connecticut and the other New England States may be small States, we do not ask anybody for anything. We go and do it ourselves. You have been hearing about the Rural Electrification Administration and so forth and so on. But, in the States of New England, we are taken care of to the extent of about 90 percent by private industry and the people in private industry. We are not running here and asking you to build any Tennessee Valley Authority or Missouri Valley Authority, or any other kind of authority. It is not because of the power situation that our industry has been

moving out of New England. Industry is moving out because in New England we have had the courage to pay laboring men a salary that would keep them going from one end of the week to the other. How can we compete with the textile industry in the South when they pay 75 cents an hour and we pay \$1.16 an hour? We just cannot do it. That is one of the things we are doing, and we are going to continue to stay in business up in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and I hope that we will stop paying all the bills for the State of Oregon, and Washington, and Tennessee, and any other State in the Union. Why do you not stand up like men as we do in New England and be proud of what we have done, running our own business through private enterprise and private money? We are not asking for a harbor or a river improvement in New England to be taken care of because we are spending too much money in national defense. While we are in this national defense effort, let us not spend any money until the war scare is over.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] is recognized.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, there are two or three observations I would like to make with reference to the pending matter. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] said that if this amendment carried you would have dams built without any transmission lines to carry the power.

I suggest that we have a very good yardstick down in Georgia to this degree: In the case of the public dams or public hydroelectric projects that have been built there, the Georgia Power Company, a private enterprise, agrees to go to the bus-bar and buy that power at exactly what the Department of the Interior charges, plus the exact cost of transmission to any preferred customer in the State of Georgia. That sounds like a pretty good yardstick to me. I cannot understand, if the Georgia Power Company cannot do that and pay more taxes than this so-called revenue we have been talking about here the last few minutes, then I just do not know what has happened to other private enterprise companies in this great country of ours.

Are you willing here this afternoon to agree that the Department of the Interior through its officials can build a better power line more expeditiously and more economically than the private enterprise power companies of this country can do it? If you are willing to agree to that, then vote against the amendment. If you think that the Government through its various agencies cannot do a better job, then vote for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is very easy to understand the attitude of those who are for and those who are against the amendment.

No one can criticize our friends from the Northwest for desiring to represent their communities, get something out

of the Federal Treasury for their districts. That is a natural feeling and procedure. But it is rather amusing when you hear the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] tell us that this appropriation will be a revenue producer for the Federal Government. I hope it will be.

He mentioned \$39,000,000—a return of a little over 1 percent, because they have \$3,500,000,000 invested in those dams.

One of the other opponents of the amendment said that they had eight more dams that would soon be brought into operation. Will we then be asked for more funds for power lines? For stand-by steam plants? Well, the situation is similar to one in my own district. Many farmers wanted electricity. I have had a little disagreement with REA sometimes. Why? Because after the REA was established, what did it want? It wanted a company to cut the poles to carry the current. It wanted to creosote the poles. It desired to put them up. It wanted to manufacture electric light bulbs, copper wire, and telephones. It was not content to operate a plant and furnish electricity to farmers.

Here in Washington that agency would have gone into producing and merchandising everything that could be used electrically, had Congress not called a halt.

It is amusing to hear my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. O, I love him; I sit at his feet at least once a week to learn how to be a statesman, though I do not always follow through. He has always been for States' rights, but he does not want these States out there in the great Northwest to build their own plants, to go along with their own development. He wants the Federal Government to do it, just as he takes pride—and he is entitled to it, for I think he is the father, the mother, and the godfather too, of TVA—it was a great achievement.

When he gets Tombigbee running up through the country to Detroit—the water flowing north—then automobiles from Detroit can be floated down that canal with no, or practically no, freight charge. He tells us it will be a wonderful thing for Michigan. When I listen to him I am almost persuaded. He almost convinces me that socialized power and transportation are needed. But not quite.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I say that, while I regret taking this additional time, I did not as was the case when a similar motion was offered the other day by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] do it just to gain time. I expect to vote against this bill, the reason being that so many of us have been

talking about economy, but not giving it to the people that sometimes some of my more—well, careless thinking constituents have suggested that I vote for economy. But when I tell them I have been trying to get through legislation which would bring about economy, do you know, they seemed to question my veracity. They overestimate the power of my vote. They forget that votes, not argument, decide an issue. Yes, sir; they have speculated—some few—as to why I was not able to do more along that line.

I want on every occasion that I can to do something and to vote so that finally they will come to believe that as one Member of the House I am doing all one Member can do. I am just wondering when Members make so many pledges to their constituents and tell them time and time again that they are for economy why it is, when the votes are counted, the economy votes are not quite enough in number.

I wonder why it is, when there is a chance on a bill like this to do some cutting, there is so much opposition to it?

No one intends to deprive the people or the agencies in the great Northwest of the right ultimately to build these transmission lines. All we are saying is, Why can you not wait a little bit? Why can you not wait, not until we cut down the debt, because I do not expect anybody to wait for that—no one here will ever see it cut down as long as the party now in power continues to spend.

But when a local interest comes in asking for dollars, Members vote for spending on that particular project while condemning every other. Everyone seems to want appropriations cut except when his own district is on the receiving end.

I do not expect the Northwest to wait too long, but can you not wait until this police action—I call it war—in Korea is over? Can you not wait until the veterans, who continue in a steady stream to come home, are all here and we know what our obligations to those men will be?

Can you not wait until the poor taxpayers in Michigan, for example, become a little more able to pay their share of the tax which goes into the development of other sections of the country?

But is hope of a lessening tax burden just something to be hoped for but never realized?

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] said there were only so many people out in his State and that they had so much power already that it could not be used.

Not long ago another gentleman—I think it was the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]—was arguing and trying to get through another appropriation. I do not recall whether they got that one or not, but he was arguing for an appropriation to build steam plants to supplement the plants that they obtained originally by the use of tax money on the theory that they were flood-control and soil-erosion plants.

Oh, the truth was and is that they wanted to get cheap electric power, as they call it, at the expense of all the rest of us.

Michigan in area is a small State, probably you could put it inside of one of these big Western States, but the taxes that the people of Michigan pay compare very, very favorably with the taxes that are paid by the States in that group of States out there and which will benefit by the use of Federal funds. We are either for Government ownership or we are against it. It is no answer to say, when my district or part of it wants something, I should be for an appropriation for that and when you want something in your district, you should go along. If we continue to just logroll and trade often enough and long enough, finally practically every private industry in the United States will have been taken over by the Federal Government.

I cannot yet see where the Federal Government has operated a single industrial activity or carried on a single activity where there has been a return of a profit to the Federal Government. If someone does know of such a case I will be glad to hear about it.

Why should we not economize when it is the putting off of the day only until the need for these transmission lines arises? Please do not brag about how you got these dams and, having gotten them, tell us we must go along because we were trapped or seduced into making the first grant of public funds. I assume the next thing will be not only these transmission lines but pretty quickly you will want us to finance the factories, to use the power, pay the transportation of the workers who are to operate the plants; then you will want us to furnish housing for the men and women who are going to work in the factories. Then you will want schools to take care of their children, and before they are in operation give them Government contracts to keep the factories going so the power can be used.

Do you see where we will go finally? We will have the Government running the whole thing and at the taxpayer's expense.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I just heard a most remarkable speech by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] in which he said that in his desire to practice economy he would like to have the opportunity to vote against the measure now before us. In other words, what the gentleman has just said is that he would vote against the one bill which comes before this body which can be truly called and has been called so often the all-American bill, a bill which seeks to do something about America's resources, a bill which seeks to do something about the welfare of the Indians who are the wards of the Government, a bill which seeks to do something about our national parks, our Bureau of Mines, and other related agencies which are under the authority of the Department of the Interior.

The gentleman states that Michigan alone pays as much in the way of taxes as do the four Pacific Northwest States. I am sure that it does, because Michigan is a great State with a large population

and with huge industries. Out in our part of the country we are young, we are new. Why, it was just 77 years ago that the Custer massacre took place in eastern Montana. It was not so many years after that until the Territory of Washington was broken up into the States of Idaho, Montana and Washington.

Mr. Chairman, we are a new people, in a new part of our own country, asking you to give us the right of developing our own resources. We are not in conflict with any State of the Union, because we have resources which we can develop that can supplement the economy of the United States and not be in competition with our neighbors throughout the Union. We are not taking the textile industry from New Hampshire or Massachusetts, but we are trying to get the power to develop our chrome, our tungsten, our manganese, our phosphates, and our aluminum. Those are things which are needed for the development of the country as a whole. And when I speak of an area of 148,000 square miles, comprising my State of Montana, and pointing out to you that it contains a population of less than 600,000, I am trying to give you a picture of the fix we are in, of the help we need, and of the assistance you can give us. We are not asking for charity; we are not asking for you to give us something for nothing, but we are asking you to understand our problem, because we think we are a part of the United States, and we would like your help in seeing to it that we are treated just as well as any other part of the United States, even if we do not have the population, even if we do not have great numerical representation here.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this House has noted one thing: that all the Members from the Northwest States, Republicans and Democrats alike, are united in their opposition to this amendment, because we realize that by working together, by showing the unity we have shown, that we are doing something that will be for the benefit of the four Northwestern States, and what affects us and our welfare affects the rest of the United States as well. I hope that you will not only defeat this motion which, of course, would send back the all-American bill now before you to committee, but I hope also that you will defeat the amendment of my good friend, whom I esteem highly, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] who seeks to throttle the development of my State of Montana.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I have always had great admiration for the great Northwest, and it has been increasing the last few moments, not because it is large and my State is small. Mere physical size is not always the important thing. If it were, I would be Speaker of this House instead of one of its junior Members.

Mr. Chairman, I do not admire the great Northwest so much because of that but because of the magnificent unanimity with which its representatives go out to complete their fine empire at the expense of the taxpayers of the whole country, and I hate to stand in their way for a moment. But I admire them even more because of the mental gymnastics that they present to us today, as they have many times before. One is that by reducing the total cost of the construction of transmission lines of \$66,000,000 by only \$10,000,000, we are going to defeat the whole program when, as a matter of fact, the hearings disclose that all these kilowatts will not come in until 1956. This is a very small reduction, indeed.

Another mental gymnastic is that these appropriations do not cost anyone a penny. As a rather simple-minded New Hampshire Yankee, I just cannot follow the reasoning that we can spend money and build this great empire and it does not cost anyone anything. That is pure "bunk." We are putting up the money. If it is their point that the Government is going to get the money back and make a profit, we do not want it, because the Government of the United States is not in the banking business and it is not in the money-making business. We do not want to get rich out of our friends in the Northwest and I do not think we will. If it is such a prosperous undertaking, let them borrow the money as we do. Why, you have heard about the Yankee who prayed, "Dear Lord, I do not ask Thee to give me riches, just show me where they are." Our western friends have at their very door these great dams which we have helped them build, and they say with all that power we have given them we must give them more money for transmission lines because they just cannot even tap it for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not discussing this amendment because, after all, it is for the benefit of the West, and we in the West find out we have to work for everything. I still do not like to have some statements go by unchallenged. The statement was made, and we have heard it continuously made here on the floor—it was brought out very strongly by the chairman of this committee—that every single cent is paid back to the American taxpayer. Well, "hoey," if I know how to spell it. First of all, these projects are divided. I happen to be on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where these projects are authorized. A great portion of them are divided into what they call the flood control, recreation, navigation, and fish and wildlife phases, and they are nonreimbursable. That is all paid by the American taxpayer.

Now let us come to this item of interest. When the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] was chairman of the committee he insisted that the interest be paid into the Treasury as interest, but

today the Solicitor General of the Department of the Interior has ruled this way. They figure the interest in order to determine the power rates, it should bring back the principal plus the interest. That is a bookkeeping interest. But when the interest is paid into the Treasury, it is paid in on the principal of some of the other parts of the project, so it is not paid in as interest. I want to correct it right now. That is what the Solicitor General has ruled, and that is what the Bureau of Reclamation does every time. We have a project up right now which is not going to pass. They have it in this particular project and they have it in all others. No; that is just a lot of "hoey" that every cent of the cost of these projects is paid back to the Government. We not only do not receive any interest as interest, but we have to pay interest out of the Treasury each year for the money borrowed and advanced for these projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have no reason to feel any hostility toward the folks out in the Northwest, but this amendment only cuts their appropriation for the Bonneville construction by \$10,000,000, from \$66,000,000 to \$56,000,000. The committee has only trimmed the budget estimate from \$70,000,000 to \$66,000,000, or a smaller reduction, only about 5 percent as against an over-all reduction in the bill of 22 percent.

We have a little conflict between our friends from the Northwest. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] tells us they paid back into the Treasury \$39,000,000 last year. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] tells us they have paid back \$14,000,000. I do not know which is right.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. One was the net return and one was the gross return.

Mr. TABER. I do not know what the gross return would be, because the overall cost according to the figures someone gave here a while ago, was something like \$3,500,000,000, and \$39,000,000 would be just a hair over 1 percent on that.

It is my understanding that the Montana Power Co. would unquestionably build the power lines in Montana. That comes from people who have been out there and gone over the situation, and they have told me this today. This is the situation. The power lines are being built for additional power that will come in in 1956, and the power lines would be built in 1953. Why do we need them now?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] to close debate.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, we have scattered all over the country in regard to those transmission lines, but they are out in the Northwest. The power is needed for the saving of lives. That is what this \$66,000,000 is asked for, to try to get the kids out of Korea and get them home here. Every paper or magazine you pick up tells that we are not up to par in the national production

for defense. They are trying to get up to par. That is what this power in the Northwest is for.

Somebody came down to the well here and said we spent \$3,000,000,000. We did not spend \$2,000,000,000. I am glad it is not the New Dealers that are hollering about how you kick a billion around here as you did this afternoon. No, we have not spent \$2,000,000,000 yet, but they come down here and say we spent \$3,000,000,000 on dams. They do not think anything at all of kicking a billion around that way.

This \$66,000,000 we are asking for is to help with national defense. That is why I am down here asking you this afternoon for it. Let us vote this amendment down.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The statement has been made that the power to be furnished by these lines will not come in until 1956. The Hungry Horse Dam, the greatest dam in the country, comes in this year. Those lines are needed to transmit this power, 300,000 kilowatts in Montana and an additional 500,000 kilowatts downstream in the Columbia basin.

Mr. KIRWAN. They are putting them to the test this afternoon, whether they want to help national defense or whether they do not want to help it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the Committee that there is no transmission line included in the bill now before us which was opposed during Appropriation Committee hearings by any representative of any private power company.

Lack of private power opposition certainly can be interpreted as recognition that a cut in construction funds would jeopardize the delivery of power to the load centers. Therefore, a cut here would not be in the interest of either the Federal Government nor of the private distribution companies which buy power from the Bonneville Power Administration.

It has been said that this capital investment, which will be returned to the Treasury, can be delayed. It was pointed out that one project would not come into production until 1956. This would be the Chief Joseph Dam in Washington.

The McNary Dam, also on the Columbia River, will have 140,000 kilowatts ready for hungry industry next December. If it is left at the dam, industry will stay hungry. If industry cannot get the power, new jobs will not be created, and that means less consuming power and less demands for products of private industry, whether it be in New England or in the State of Washington.

But let us go behind power-production dates. Power is necessary for defense. But that very defense program is making it difficult to obtain transmission materials. Transformers must be ordered now to be available 36 or 40 months from today. It takes that long to plan and build lines from Chief Joseph power to Snohomish and thence to the load centers of Puget Sound.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, a reduction of this fund would be an increase in the cost of the job which must be done. In the Pacific Northwest the planning by the Bonneville Power Administration has resulted in a reduction in original estimated costs. One line has been redesigned and relocated at a saving of \$2,500,000. The redesigning represents a total saving of 90 miles of transmission line.

The technicians of the Bonneville Power Administration should be commended for work well done. Let us not delay the effective date of this efficient planning by thoughtless appropriation cuts today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (the Chair being in doubt) there were—ayes 96, noes 91.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JACKSON of Washington and Mr. CORTON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 103, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I was seeking recognition at the time of the consideration of the Southwestern Power Administration item, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] desire to offer his amendment?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement recently entered into, the gentleman is entitled to offer his amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 2, line 8, strike out lines 8 through 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "For administrative expenses in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, 16 U. S. C., 825 S., as applied to the southeastern power area to remain available until expended, \$90,000."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment involves a relatively small sum of money, but it does involve a very important principle that lies at the foundation of all these conflicts concerning the extension of public power.

This is not a case, as some of the speakers with respect to the prior amendment asserted, of whether or not there are going to be available transmission facilities for power developed at new publicly constructed dams; this is no case of derelict power lying unused at the source, Government dams; it is not a case of the blushing bride left at the church; here is a case history that demonstrates dramatically the importance of

limiting the extension of public power except where absolutely necessary and where there is no possible alternative.

This power line is a 40-mile transmission line to the town of Greenwood in South Carolina, a line which was to be constructed by agreement between the private power companies and the mutual power company owned by the community of Greenwood. Just as soon as the Southeastern Power Administration became aware of the fact that the local mutual power company was planning to build the line in conjunction with private industry, the Southeastern Power Administration moved in and unceremoniously shoved aside the private companies, put an end to the agreement that had been arranged between the local community and the private utility companies and undertook to begin building the line itself.

The sole question here is, Mr. Chairman, are we going to allow this public administration to use public money to build a power line that was in the process of being built, by agreement by private industry to the satisfaction of the people in the community. This is a clear case, the issue is clearly presented.

If the members of the committee vote down the pending amendment, it means very simply that they do not want private industry to construct lines wherever they can do so and that they prefer public authorities to construct whether or not there are any available alternatives.

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

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

Mr. EVINS. Why does not the gentleman tell the House that the private power company involved wanted the Government to give it tax-free amortization, which was refused?

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman realize that every company in the United States that is building new construction gets the tax-free amortization under the tax bill which the gentleman no doubt voted for last fall?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Government is giving the same thing to dozens of companies all over the country which are building new plants.

Mr. COUDERT. Precisely so.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, this amendment will be agreed to and that the committee will stand four square for the principle of supporting private enterprise construction where it is available. This is a case where it is clearly available and reasonably available.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, this is not a new start. Your Government and

my Government has \$319,000 invested in this line. It is the only line in the South that the Congress permitted to go in last year, and it was in front of the Congress at that time like it is today. There was the same discussion, everything was explained last year, as it has been explained today. The Congress voted last year to build this line, and it has already \$319,000 invested in that line.

What happened to bring the Government into it? The commission testifying before the committee said it was going to build a line. The commission itself, not the private company but a co-op commission down there, testified at the hearings it was going to build this line. Now the private utilities comes along 1 year after we have \$319,000 invested in this line and says that it will build the line, and wheel the power at a price. Congress agreed to build the line. Now you are coming back in here today and want to toss the line up, saying, "No fair; that does not count." I just wonder what kind of a Congress this is. Is it true what they say about us—that we are the greatest law-making body in the world? The only one ever heard to say that was an American, and I want to see it put to the acid test sometime. Just 1 year after this line was voted in, along comes a Member speaking in opposition to it. What a nice talk was made. Oh, he even talked about the bride being left at the church. That had nothing to do with this bill at all. This power line was to go down to some co-ops, a line that the private companies refused to build. After they arranged to construct it, the private interests wanted to build it themselves. Then, the Southeast Power Co. came along and said, "We will build it since you are a preferred customer." A couple of our friends were not on the floor last year, so now we are going to start all over again today.

I hope now that we will act in the American way. If it passed the Congress last year and we have \$319,000 invested in it, I think we should go all the way with the line now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN].

(Mr. GWINN and Mr. McGRATH asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted them to Mr. DONOVAN.)

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I did not have to get a letter this morning from the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers of America, American Federation of Labor, to make up my mind to support this amendment.

When this appropriation was before the House a year ago I voted for an amendment cutting the committee's appropriation for the Southeast Power Administration. But in this morning's mail I received a letter which, in my humble opinion, might well be regarded as a turning point in American politics. Enclosed in the letter was an exposition three pages long of the attitude of the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers toward the public power question in general. With your indulgence I will read a few paragraphs contained in that statement of policy.

The Brotherhood of Electrical Workers controls 75 percent of the organized electricians in the United States. Their statement of policy starts out like this:

In the interests of the common weal there is no more pressing need than provision for flood control, irrigation, navigation, and the prevention of soil erosion.

However, in the interval since the inauguration of this program there have been developed and instituted procedures engendered by a false concept of the fundamentals of Americanism.

The scope of the program now embraces the generation of electricity by power other than that procured through irrigation and flood control, steam as an instance; the distribution of electric power and the sale of electric power in direct competition with privately owned electric utility companies.

The progress of this procedure is such as to clearly indicate complete duplication of transmission facilities in competition that can only lead to extermination of private utility companies.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers does not raise its voice on the subject of public power in behalf of private companies or their management. We have met the abuses of power by these companies in the past and have achieved substantial correction. Today 90 percent of the workers in the privately owned electric light and power industry are covered by union contracts and the IBEW itself represents more than 75 percent of the organized employees in this industry.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers raises its voice on the subject of public power at this time in the interest of organized labor in the electric light and power industry. The subtle transformation of the Government program from the proper purposes of providing power as a byproduct of the initial program and of furnishing a yardstick for private utilities has reached the stage where it threatens free enterprise in this industry.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers has had drastic experience with the effect on its interests resulting from the transfer of utilities from private to public or quasi-public ownership.

Labor does not choose to have its welfare determined by the administrative orders of Government officials, no matter how well intentioned they may purport to be.

Under fascism, nazism, and communism the people work for the state. Under the policies inaugurated by the Rural Electrification Administration those employed on electrical properties work for the Government under the guise of cooperatives. It is a distinction without a difference.

Mr. Chairman, I think that statement of policy by one of the greatest unions in America may mark a step in a different direction. I am against this appropriation and I am in favor of the amendment. I hope it will be voted for by a tremendous majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, my understanding of this situation is that an arrangement was made whereby the private power companies were to build this line, and then pressure was put on the county involved to force the private power companies to back out of it. It does not look good. In other words, this Southeast Power Authority is reaching out to prevent private industry from building lines which they would be ready to build.

We should not go ahead and put up the money out of the Federal Treasury and get the Government more and more in debt when there is an opportunity to get the same service by private business and keep the control of the business of the country in private hands, so that we can get along without this tremendous approach to socialism and communism.

I hope the amendment will be adopted. The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, one reason why the opposition to this amendment is up at this time rather than last year is simply and purely because Greenwood County, my home town, in South Carolina, does not have the money to send lobbyists to Washington to call Members off this floor. Lobbying is very much in evidence here today, but they are not representing Greenwood County.

This contract was entered into by the Greenwood Power Commission with the Southeastern Power Administration last year before this matter ever came before the House, and it was approved by the Interior Department, agreeing to deliver power from the Clarks Hill Dam on the Savannah River, which will be completed this fall, to the Greenwood Power Commission, this line to pass near my home in the Third Congressional District. An appropriation of \$318,000 for this line passed this House last year without a fight. Construction is now under way. It would be poor economy indeed to abandon this line at this stage. This line is entirely within the confines of the district it is my honor to represent.

I went along with a lot of you fellows when you sought to keep lines out of your districts when you did not want them. I happen to know today that my people want this line. It is essential to continue the great work and reasonable rates furnished by the Greenwood Power Commission. Of the members of the Greenwood Power Commission, one is a farmer, one is a lawyer, one is a manager in a textile mill, one is the manager of the project, and the other is the president of one of the local banks. They are men who believe in free enterprise, men who are trying to preserve free enterprise. They are real Americans who are fighting socialism.

I stand here this afternoon and compare my record for economy and saving the taxpayers of this country money with that of any Member of this Congress on either side of the aisle. I am proud to stand here on a nonpartisan basis. I have sworn allegiance to no national party, Democrat or Republican. I am only trying to represent the people of my district.

I remember the time when the farmers of my county had no rural electricity, no electric machines to pump their water, no electricity to light their poultry houses at night, and no deep freezes. This is a fight that started many, many years ago. These companies were given every opportunity to build this line to Greenwood, and we pleaded with them 10 years ago for connecting lines. This is the only chance for the people of my district to tap the power that will be

available when the great dam on the Savannah River is completed this fall. This is a question of the good faith of the Government and this very Congress which authorized the beginning of this line last year.

I have no quarrel with the private power companies. I know their representatives personally. They are fine Americans. I wish these companies every success. They have done a great job for the American people. I wish to point out however that there is room in America for private power and where they have not or cannot do the job then Government power must help our people. This line is the opposite of socialism. This line will help the farmers, municipalities, and little industries of Greenwood, Laurens, Abbeville and Newberry counties have power at rates that will help keep them free and independent. I hope this House will be fair and economical by rejecting the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 81, noes 99.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JACKSON of Washington and Mr. COUDERT.

The Committee again divided; and tellers reported that there were—ayes 92, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read, as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, \$6,600,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to call the attention of my friend from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and the people of South Carolina and the area that would have been affected had this reduction taken place, that the amendment was defeated largely by the vote of Democratic Members, north, east, south, and west.

I am very proud of the Democratic Party, and my colleagues on the Republican side should, as they are, be proud of their party. I am a great believer in the two-party system. I am a Democrat. I belong to one party; I respect my friends who belong to the other party. I hope the people of South Carolina will recognize that we who come from other parts of the country are disciples of Thomas Jefferson the same as they are. While we may disagree on this or that bill, yet on fundamentals we are all in agreement; and when the test came today where their interests were involved we from the northern and western sections of the country joined with our Democratic colleagues from the southern section of the country in defeating this reduction amendment from \$959,500 to \$90,000, a matter of importance and concern to the people of South Carolina and particularly of the Greenwood area.

I simply call attention to the fact that there is a strong family spirit existing among some of us in the Democratic Party, and I hope that strong political family spirit will exist everywhere among Democrats in the months to come.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as always, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the very esteemed majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], who has just taken the floor to point out in connection with this particular amendment on which we have just voted, that the larger amount was carried because of votes on the Democratic side.

I want to broaden this particular matter just a little bit to talk generally about the fiscal affairs of our country; and, yes, to fit the shoe on the foot where it belongs. I say this to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]; generally speaking, as we have sought to balance the budget and cut expenditures, the votes on the Democratic side have been on the spending side; on my side, the Republican side, they have been on the saving side.

I recognize, as do many of us, the strong political attraction that is alleged to stem from the fact that you vote money for this particular project or that particular project, hoping thereby to curry the favor of the particular people who want that appropriation made, but may I point out to my friend that in the broader concept in this country there is an overwhelming demand that the expenses of the Federal Government be reduced. That demand is the direct result of a growing conviction in the country on the part of all right-thinking people that we are rapidly spending ourselves into bankruptcy and ruin.

So I am very happy to say here to you, and I hope over the radio and through the newspapers to the people of the country as a whole, that in these critical times, when the Congress should respond to the demand of the people for a reduction in Federal spending, the Republicans, by and large, are carrying the responsibility for meeting that demand. Joined by some real Democrats, most of them from the South, who are putting their country above party, may I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that we have effected some real economies and we are going to effect some more before this session is ended.

Let me say to my friend from Massachusetts and to the Members here that after the last Congress the Council of State Chambers of Commerce went to the trouble of analyzing the votes, Democratic and Republican, which had to do with the spending of the taxpayers' money. And lo and behold, when they measured it out, the first ten spenders were on the Democratic side and the first ten savers were on the Republican side. More power to my side of the aisle. The overwhelming percentage of economy votes was supplied by Members on the Republican side while the overwhelming percentage of the votes

on the spending side was supplied by the Democrats.

So I say to you, my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] when you seek to make political capital out of some individual item, the whole record should be written. Moreover, to most of you over there, on the Democrat side of the aisle, you come by the spending business rather conveniently. You like to spend. You think you have found in spending a way to continue to elect Democrat Members of Congress and to elect Democrats to the Presidency. But let me tell you something, the people of this country, who are digging deeper and deeper into their pockets for the money to pay these bills, are getting wised up and they are getting fed up. They are sick and tired of mounting taxes, and when the record is written those of us who have dared to stand for economy in Government operation need have no concern about political consequences. Let me say above and beyond that, I think we can sleep a little better at night because we have not added to the burdens of an already dangerously over-taxed Nation.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there is probably no one in this House who enjoys a political speech any better than I do, which is the reason, perhaps, I enjoyed listening to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] who just preceded me. I would like to say to you this afternoon that I am going to offer an amendment at the proper time which will give my friend from Indiana and the members of the so-called economy bloc a chance to save some very important money. I have seen a lot of amendments offered here which dealt with \$1,200 items, items that involved a refusal to pay compensation to a man who was injured, and appropriations of like nature.

I also happen to have analyzed the report of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. Many times, may I say, it is considered an honor if you are on the State chamber of commerce list as being 100 percent wrong, because I have never seen very many of these analytical agencies that have picked out any important amendments or any important bills that were in the interest of the people of the United States. Most of the votes they pick are ones that their friends voted the way the chambers approved, so that they are loaded analyses.

Last year we had a situation like this when the time came to appropriate money for the Armed Forces some \$50,000,000,000, as I remember it. That passed without a record vote and without much discussion. As a result, we have the Hébert committee, and as far as I know it has done a good job, the Hardy committee, which has been most effective, and the Bonner committee, about which I know more. It, the Bonner committee, has done a tremendous job trying to investigate waste in the procurement divisions of the Armed Forces. But if you appointed every Member of this Congress a committee of 1 and gave him a staff of 20—we could not keep up with the waste. There is only one way

to stop the extravagance and that is not give the Pentagon brass the money in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer an amendment at the proper time to cut down the Pentagon spenders by an important sum, \$5,000,000,000, and then they will not waste so much money, because they will not have it to waste. A friend of mine heard a vice president of one of the big motor companies state the other day that his company had a contract to turn out tanks. He said, "We have turned them out by the thousands; hundreds of them are sitting up in Detroit, not being used because the blueprints that were sent up by the Ordnance Department were not right and the turrets won't work. But," he said, "they keep on buying them anyway, and we keep on turning them out to be parked on vacant lots."

It is not important apparently to get these tanks to Korea. Just get them bought so the appropriation will be used.

Now, you can fool around with all of the little amendments of \$1,200 and \$1,500 and \$2,500 that you want to, but if you really want to save some real money, you had better give that Armed Forces appropriation bill some close scrutiny and do some important cutting there, and then you can balance the budget. We will not hurt the defense of the country, and then we can put in some of these items, like this power item, which are for the benefit of the people in the rural areas where they cannot get the electric power they need to produce the things that the country needs.

In closing I will say that as far as I know there is not an appropriation in any of these bills to spend one single nickel in my district. Last year there was an item of \$75,000 to build a dam on the Ohio river in my district and last year I asked the committee to take that out, and they did, because it is not necessary. To replace dams which are working now with larger more costly ones, especially not in wartime.

If it is in there again this year, at the proper time I am going to scrutinize that, and I will ask you to take it out again.

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

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will offer the amendment to reduce the military appropriation bill by \$5,000,000,000, I will go along with him.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I appreciate that. I will offer the amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And I will vote for a \$14,000,000,000 cut on the over-all budget any time it is offered.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Well, I will say to the gentleman that I am out to balance the budget. If it takes a fourteen-billion cut to do it I am for cutting that much. I voted against the tax increase last year, and I am going to be consistent and vote for a balanced budget.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The CHAIRMAN. Time is exhausted on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I will also look into the precedents on that ruling.

Mr. Chairman, the Members will never realize how much the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] grieve me, because if there is anything I dislike it is a partisan political speech from the well of the House, though I am in no way criticizing either.

I have never gone along, even when that great statesman, my former Senator, was for the misnamed bipartisan foreign policy. Perhaps I made a mistake when I did not. But I go along now—and have in the House many, many times—for what some people think is a bipartisan move. That is, those times when men from the South and men from the North, thinking alike, voted the same way. It grieves me, too, I will say to my distinguished leader from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to admit that we have those who are sometimes called spenders in our own Republican Party as well as some on the other side. In fact, the two major parties are hopelessly split right down the center on several major issues. Of course, in fairness, I must add that whether a man is a spender or not depends upon who is to get the money and sometimes whether the spending directly affects his district. None of us seem to be consistently inclined to vote against grants of public funds for projects in his own district.

I have noticed that on more than one vital issue we have had on this side of the aisle a great deal of support from Members on the other side. I recall very, very distinctly that when the Taft-Hartley bill was up, it was passed over the President's veto, and many of the votes to override came from that side of the aisle. On many another fundamental issue without any consultation the vote has been nonpartisan—as for example on UMT. It has always been my conviction that those votes were cast that way, because those who voted to override that veto honestly and sincerely believed that that was the vote they should cast. The same was true when UMT and many another issue was up. I hope it will continue that way—each thinking and voting for what he thinks is best for his country.

I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], whom I greatly admire and respect, I have had many, many more severe admonitions or recommendations from my own leadership than he administered to my personal friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]. I am sure it will not worry the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]; I am sure it will not worry him. I am satisfied that our colleague who has his own convictions and the courage to voice them, who enjoys the respect of every Member of the House, will go on his way guided by his heart and conscience until some day he will sit over in what is called—mistakenly, I think—the upper body, the Senate, as a representative of his State.

I hope that will some day be the honor his State does him and I am sure he will ably represent that State.

Now, having gotten that off my chest, I want to call your attention to a very concise article on page A1813 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an extension of remarks by the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

I will read this if I may, although I understand it may be a violation of the rules, though it is common practice.

I read from the remarks of the House leader:

The following statement—

The only statement appears to be one made by the gentleman himself—

shows that, even after paying taxes, we have more money left in our pockets than ever before, and that in return for our taxes, we are getting peace—

Getting? A long, long time getting—we are getting peace, prosperity—

With beefsteak \$1.14 a pound, I do not eat it, I look at it— and democracy.

Democracy? I will not refer personally to any of the advisers of the present administration. Let us draw the veil over that and let it go. So many are busy explaining how they got their incomes.

Read that, and judge yourselves. Peace? Prosperity? The gentleman nods his head. "And democracy." Ruled by small groups. Is that democracy? My time has run out so more on that statement some other day.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I thought we had the Interior bill under consideration here. This is more like a vaudeville show.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They certainly are not making monkeys of the people.

Mr. KIRWAN. I think we ought to proceed with the Interior bill.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Spring has come, and with it its harbingers, the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Michigan. It is always delightful at this season of the congressional year to hear their bright little chirps. I said chirps, not cheeps. In the second year of every Congress just when the trees start to bud and the foliage turns green, we have learned to expect the appearance in the well of the House of these two distinguished gentlemen. It is then that we hear the old economy song. It is then that we hear of the glories of the moth-eaten old elephant. It is then that these two gentlemen play Nostradamus and foretell the events that are to take place in the coming November. Let me warn some of the younger members on the Republican side not to take these prognostications too seriously, because during the 16 years that I have been in the House, I have never known either of them to be right in foretelling the political future.

The gentleman from Indiana says that he is able to sleep nights. I say that

he might just as well sleep days because there is nothing in his party's program that would ever keep him awake. Neither has he nor his party any program responsibility, and sometimes I think the party is totally lacking in a sense of responsibility. Evidently, I am not unique in my thoughts. The American people must feel likewise, as they have absolutely refused to entrust the Government of these United States to the gentleman's party for the past 20 years and in 20 of the last 22 years they refused to have faith in the GOP legislative ability.

The truth of the matter is that the American public realizes the impoverishment both as to ideas and men in the GOP circles. Our people are fully cognizant that the Republican Party produced Lincoln, or should I say that Lincoln produced the Republican Party? Since his death he has been succeeded by a continuity of mediocrity. The only man who approached greatness and who had the Republican label since Lincoln's death was Theodore Roosevelt, and it did not take the Republican Party long to drive him out of their councils.

The GOP has always talked economy, but it has been an economy at the expense of social legislation and human rights. Anyone who has been in this House for the last 4 years knows that every time that there has been an appropriation bill that would provide money to implement and enforce the social legislation that has become part of our law during the last 20 years, the Republican Party could always be counted upon to be in there cutting and cutting in the hope that they could so emasculate the various bureaus that the social reforms could not be brought into being. It has been a sly program, but it has not fooled the American citizen. Succeeding elections are proof that the people have not been deceived.

Most all who are sitting here today remember a year ago when the Republican Party cut to the bone the appropriation bill for flood control. Almost all of us remember the noble ideals expressed by these gentlemen in their fight for rigid economy and we can also remember 3 months later, after the disastrous Missouri River flood, how the very same gentlemen, without any shame, came running down the aisle one after the other to speak in the well of the House as proponents and friends of flood control. Surely they can never say that they were embarrassed by hypocrisy.

The gentleman from Indiana has endeavored to smear and besmirch the Democratic Party for its legislation and for its expenditures. He does this despite the fact that every time there has been a presidential campaign for the past 20 years his party has endeavored to embrace the legislation passed against the Republican will by Democratic Congresses. The American people remember these "me too" declarations and know the lack of sincerity behind the platitudes.

We on the Democratic side of the aisle are willing to take full responsibility for what we have done, and since we are taking the responsibility we also insist on taking the credit.

Let our minds go back 22 to 25 years ago. Remember the average man of that time, the clerk, the bricklayer, the carpenter, the electrician, and the policeman—the people who make up the backbone of our Nation and the mass of our citizenry. At that time when a man of that classification died, within 10 days to 2 weeks the family would go to the closet and take that man's suit, if there was another suit, and a pair of shoes and perhaps a watch and then would distribute them. That was usually the end of that man's earthly possessions. Today, when a man within that same category dies, 9 times out of 10 he leaves a small bank account, insurance policy, social-security rights for his widow, an automobile, a television set, electric refrigerator, and many other things that were completely foreign to him 25 years ago. I read just the other day that 61,000,000 of our people own their own homes, and certainly the mass of that 61,000,000 must be working people. This mass improvement occurred during the years when the Democratic Party was responsible for the legislative and administrative branches of the Government. During the same quarter of a century we saw our people receive a security that was completely foreign and unknown to them in the early part of this century. We have seen their way of life so improved that the American workingman and farmer is the envy of all of the other people of the world.

At election time you expect this great segment of our population to be fooled and bamboozled by false cries of economy and by raucous shouts of "me, too," but during these years of Democratic administration it has been possible for the American workingman and farmer with his more numerous dollars and added hours of leisure to acquire an education that prohibits political soothsayers from misinforming him as they did in days gone by. He has learned to analyze the statements made in the newspapers, magazines, books, on the radio, and on television. He has learned to think for himself and he knows those who are his friends and those whom he cannot trust. He knows your record, gentlemen, and he will not be deceived.

I have enjoyed the friendship of the two gentlemen heretofore mentioned and, while I am of the opposite political faith, I do hope that I will be given the opportunity in the years to come to listen once again to their minority prophecies.

(The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.)

The Clerk read as follows:

**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES**

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$10,750,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended on a reimbursable basis for surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management: *Provided further*, That, for the purpose of

surveying federally controlled or intermingled lands, contributions toward the cost thereof may be accepted.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 6, line 8, strike out "\$10,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,722,605."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee and the able members of the subcommittee for the fine work they have done in making a cut of 21 percent in the budget estimates, and 7 percent below the current year level as set out in page 2 of the committee report. I have offered an amendment here which relates to an item in this bill where no cut has been made whatever in the amount of the budget request, and where a considerable increase has been made over the amount which was appropriated last year for this same item.

In the case of this item the committee has recommended allowance in full of the Budget request. This means that the full cost of pay-increase legislation would be covered in the appropriation, plus an increase of \$750,000. In 1951 expenditures under this head totaled \$6,109,737—see table, top of page 149 of hearings. In 1952 the initial appropriation was increased to \$9,722,605 and in the third 1952 supplemental \$301,500 has been approved to cover increased pay costs. And now for 1953 the agency wants another very sizable increase. Personnel increased from 1,174 in 1951 to 1,299 for 1952, and request 1,420 in 1953. These figures are shown in the table at top of page 148 of the hearings.

Over this period the area of public lands under management by this Bureau has remained about the same. Volume of business and activity has admittedly grown and there may be some further increase in 1953. Mineral leases and sales of timber are expanding, and the revenue showing is very good.

On the other hand, some important economies can be effected if the Congress wishes to economize in 1953. For example, the sum of \$778,000 is included in the bill for cadastral surveys. Away back in the first annual budget of the United States one will find an item of \$700,000 for public-land surveys. Ever since that time we have been providing for this work on about the same scale, and probably for many years prior to 1923. The agency alleges—page 153—that "these surveys are closely tied to income-producing activities in that specific locations of areas upon which the resource is found must be made before action can be completed." Were we at the stage this year of initiating management of the public lands, this statement would have a good deal of merit. But Interior has been surveying, studying, and managing these lands for many, many decades and their surface resources should by now be pretty well located. One may reasonably doubt that any revenues would be sacrificed if this whole

survey operation were cut to 10 percent of its present scope for a year or two.

On the whole, it appears that appropriations have been amply increased in recent years to take care of work volume increases, and to insure effective protective measures against soil waste, weed invasions and forest and range fires. The amount which would be provided under this amendment should permit continued good progress.

Mr. Chairman, there rests upon us this year the responsibility to balance the budget, if it can be balanced. We cannot balance it by continuing to increase year after year the personnel employed in these agencies, and the amount of appropriations made to these agencies. That is exactly what has been done with reference to this particular agency.

My amendment will cut this item back to the amount appropriated last year, a reduction of \$1,027,395 from the amount carried in the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but before I take my time I wish to see if we can reach an agreement as to a limitation of debate.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is voted down. I will show you what a cut has been made in Land Management. In 1939 on the payroll of the Interior Department in the Bureau of Land Management there were 3,015 employees; as of June 30, 1951, there were 1,398; in other words, they have taken 1,617 off the payroll in that particular Bureau.

Of what does land management consist? Anybody west of the Mississippi River or maybe on the eastern bank of the Mississippi knows what halogeton is, a poisonous weed springing up on the farms and ranches. This appropriation is to control this weed. Look at the tremendous effort that is under way to locate strategic minerals. These are reasons why we are asking for this increase. Throughout most of the United States anyone who can be spared from his agency or industry is out hunting for strategic minerals to carry on the war effort. What do we find? An amendment offered to cut a million dollars off this item when in a few days you are going to be asked to vote \$54,000,000,000 for the military. You want to cripple the effort of those who are out hunting for the very minerals needed to make the weapons and material the military needs. That is done in the name of economy, but can we save this country by cutting to the backbone a part of the military effort?

As for this weed halogeton, every State west of the Mississippi is affected.

You talk of the need of lumber; you talk of the need of minerals, but we do not have a force today sufficient to issue

permits fast enough for those who are looking for and developing minerals.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. As to this halogeton weed I ask the gentleman if there is not an item of \$1,345,000 in the bill for that item.

Mr. KIRWAN. There is.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Then how can this cut affect it?

Mr. KIRWAN. Because the cut will be allocated by the Bureau of Land Management which administers the control program. I ask every Member who has an interest in the military, an interest in lumber, an interest in minerals, or in the areas west of the Mississippi to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 92, noes 83.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 92.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. 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. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. AANDAHL asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

MOUNT OLIVET CEMETERY ASSOCIATION OF SALT LAKE CITY

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3954) to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City,

Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out line 6 and insert "Utah, for use for street or highway purposes, a tract of land."

Page 2, strike out all after line 22 over to and including line 4 on page 3.

Page 3, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 2. The deed of conveyance of the tract of land described in the first section hereof shall contain a provision that such tract shall be used for street or highway purposes and that so long as the said Salt Lake City uses the tract of land for such purposes, the reversionary clause set forth in the act of January 23, 1909 (35 Stat. 589), shall not be operable with respect to that tract."

Page 3, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 3. This act shall not alter or affect Mount Olivet Cemetery Association's ownership of, or its rights and privileges with respect to, the remainder of the lands heretofore granted to it by the United States."

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentlewoman could tell us whether or not she discussed this proposition with the minority members of the committee?

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman from Indiana asked that question, because I was not expecting to bring it up at this particular moment. I thought we would be here for quite a while, and I was going to consult with the gentleman about it. When I heard we were about to adjourn I quickly came down.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it just a matter of concurring in Senate amendments?

Mrs. BOSONE. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Are they of any consequence?

Mrs. BOSONE. No.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 25, was the one hundred and thirty-first anniversary of Greek independence. The people of Greece and all those of Greek birth and descent in this country and throughout the free world

celebrated this significant anniversary of Greece's proclamation of freedom.

The people of the United States have the greatest admiration and regard for the Greek nation and the Greek people who, in their valiant fight for freedom and democratic ideals, have successfully waged a relentless struggle against Communist aggression. They have shown a fortitude and heroism seldom if ever surpassed in the history of civilization.

While I had visited Greece a number of times previously, in November last I had the distinct privilege and honor to place a wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of Greece in Athens in behalf of the officers and members of the Hellenic Memorial Post of the American Legion of Kings County. On that occasion I could not help but have a feeling of profound respect when I recalled the historic past of the Greek people, and the heroic sacrifices and magnificent resistance on the part of the Greek forces against the overwhelming Nazi forces of oppression in World War II.

In passing, I should like to note that it was my pleasure on the evening before last to be one of the guests at the Ahepa tenth national biennial banquet at the Hotel Statler here in Washington, held in commemoration of the one hundred and thirty-first anniversary of Greek independence and the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the great American Order of Ahepa. It was a delightful evening, in a friendly atmosphere with distinguished Americans from Brooklyn, N. Y., including Mr. and Mrs. Gus Nicholas and Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Mallas, and I felt proud to be a participant in the inspiring observance of the independence of the Greek nation. I was likewise proud, as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, to have had a part in 1947, and subsequently, in the implementation of the Truman doctrine, which was so vigorously praised by the speakers of the evening.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GUATEMALA

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I received a letter from a constituent of mine in California, a letter which in and of itself is like many another communication received at all seasons by Members of Congress. However, this letter, in light of recent developments in Latin America was thought-provoking to me, and posed a series of questions in my own mind relative to the conduct of our policy in the country of Guatemala.

The lady writing the letter, like so many other Americans in all walks of life, is planning a vacation for her family next year. She says in part:

My husband and I have never been to Central America or Mexico, and we have been saving for a long time to make the trip. We want to take our two children, a boy and a girl, ages 9 and 12, respectively, with us for a trip of a month or 6 weeks, in order that

they and we may see our southern neighbors and how they live. We are particularly anxious to spend some time in Guatemala, about which country we have heard so much, but we are greatly concerned with recent press notices indicating that the Communist movement in Latin America has its center in Guatemala. Knowing of your interest in, and familiarity with, this and the other southern countries, Fred said that we should ask you whether you thought we should plan to include Guatemala in our trip.

I have not answered the letter as yet, and when I do, a copy of this speech will accompany it. The problem posed in the lady's letter is not one that can either be brushed aside or answered briefly or lightly. The question of Guatemala and that nation's relationship with the Communist conspiracy is not a question of concern only to Guatemala, but one of great import and deep significance to every nation in the hemisphere. As human freedom and human dignity are important to all freemen, so is the situation presently obtaining in Guatemala of vital import to the other nations of this continent and to those peoples who have been cast by fate in a common geographical mold.

A BEAUTIFUL LAND

Guatemala is a beautiful country, a land of great mountains, deep valleys, and fertile coastal plains. Its people trace their genealogy through many centuries. Their economic lot is not a generous one, but in many instances it is no worse and in some materially better than that of many another Latin country. The artisans of Guatemala are skilled and imaginative, and in general, happy and ingenious. My first visits to the country several years ago were marked by a spirit of friendship and hospitality, and I am happy to say that among the many friendships I have made throughout the hemisphere, those in Guatemala are among the most highly prized and respected.

The opening phrase of the Communist manifesto states, "A shadow is over Europe." It can be said today that a shadow is over Guatemala. Its government has seen fit to ignore the contemporary history of human slavery which has been written in our day, and embark upon a national policy which has, as one principle, collaboration with the Communist elements within the country. Further, the government has provided sanctuary for individual Communists from a score of lands. This policy of co-operation and temporization with the disciples of Marx has led inevitably to the deterioration of relationships with Guatemala's neighbors and former friends.

PRODUCTION

Guatemala is primarily an agricultural country with an estimated 1,629,556 acres in cultivation and 508,699 acres in pasture. About 75 percent of the occupied labor force is engaged in agriculture, and domestic industries are based largely on the utilization of farm and forest products.

Principal export crops are coffee, bananas, essential oils, abacá, cicle, and hardwoods. Principal products produced for domestic consumption are corn, beans, rice, sugarcane, cotton, and

tobacco. The principal industries of the country produce, chiefly for local consumption, textiles, leather and rubber shoes, furniture, soap, candles, matches, cigarettes, beverages, flour, sugar, vegetable oils, and cement.

COMMUNISTS ACTIVE

President Jacobo Arbenz of Guatemala is considered by many, both here and abroad, to be under Communist control; or to be somewhat more charitable, under strong Communist influence in his administration of the affairs of the country of which he is chief executive. So strong a Communist influence is exercised in some departments of the Government that many have frankly called Guatemala a Soviet beachhead in the Western Hemisphere. Labor, shot through with strong Communist elements and under the almost complete domination of Marxists and fellow travelers, has been increasingly active in a well-planned and ably executed program aimed at disrupting the operation of foreign-controlled companies. This, irrespective of the fact that most of Guatemala's exports find their markets throughout the hemisphere, particularly in the United States. Any success that may be achieved in the disruption of trade between the United States and Guatemala will inevitably be reflected in terms of a steady decline in the standard of living for the Guatemalan people.

Foreign trade is an important part of Guatemala's economic life. The United States is her best customer and her principal source of imports. About 5 percent of Guatemala's exports find markets outside our hemisphere, and less than 10 percent of her imports originate in other parts of the world.

In a short-sighted effort to appease the vocal Communist minority in Guatemala the Government has endorsed and abetted coercive efforts against United States and foreign operators almost to the point of rendering successful operations impossible. In 1951, three of these investors, to wit, United Fruit, Electric Bond & Share, and International Railways of Central America paid over \$17,000,000 in payroll costs alone. This payment represents an amount of money equal to almost one-third of Guatemala's total budget for expenditures during fiscal 1951-52. The relation of foreign payrolls to Guatemala's economy is in far greater magnitude than that of any hundred corporations here in the United States, yet our southern neighbor sees fit to continue an almost unbearable campaign of harassment against the investors and operating companies.

The following economic data on Guatemala represents as accurate a picture as is presently available. Some of the figures may be subject to slight correction, but in the main the detailed figures are accurate. It is of more than passing interest to note that the total figure budgeted by the Guatemalan Government for fiscal 1951-52 is slightly less than the amount of \$62,000,000 which will be requested in the Mutual Security Act for expenditure by the United States throughout Latin America.

Certain economic data on Guatemala

I. GUATEMALAN BUDGET

(Millions United States dollars)

	Actual, 1950/51	Budgeted, 1951/52 ¹
Fiscal operation Government:		
Total revenues.....	47.4	59.7
Total expenditures.....	48.2	59.7
Revenues:		
Taxes:		
Import duties.....	15.2	17.3
Export duties.....	5.7	9.2
Alcoholic beverages and tobacco.....	9.3	11.5
Stamps and stamped paper.....	2.7	2.4
Business taxes.....	3.4	4.6
Other.....	4.6	2.3
Patrimony income.....	40.9	47.3
Public utilities.....	.6	.8
Sale of products from State properties and monopolies.....	1.5	1.4
Other.....	.2	.1
Total revenues.....	47.4	59.7
	Budgeted 1950/51 ²	Budgeted 1951/52
Expenditures (including extraordinary budget):		
Legislative.....	0.3	0.3
Executive.....	.7	.8
Judiciary.....	.9	.9
Ministry of Agriculture.....	1.2	1.3
Ministry of Communications and Public Works.....	9.5	16.7
Ministry of National Defense.....	5.3	7.2
Ministry of Economy and Labor.....	2.5	3.1
Ministry of Education.....	6.8	7.8
Ministry of Government.....	4.1	4.5
Ministry of Finance.....	3.2	5.6
Ministry of Public Affairs (Attorney General).....	(³)	(³)
Ministry of Foreign Affairs.....	1.3	1.5
Ministry of Public Health.....	5.4	4.8
Accounting Office.....	.4	.5
Public debt.....	2.1	3.0
Pensions.....	1.3	1.7
Total expenditures.....	45.0	59.7

¹ This is the original budget as passed by Congress. The budget has subsequently been increased to \$61.2 million.

² Breakdown of actual expenditures not available. Data given refer to budgeted expenditures.

³ Less than \$50,000.

II. TRADE

	1950	Per cent	1951	Per cent
Total exports.....	67.6	76.0
Total imports.....	71.2	80.8
Principal exports:				
Coffee.....	52.8	78	58.5	77
Bananas.....	7.6	12	6.0	8
Chicle.....	1.3	2	2.0	3
Lumber.....	.2	.3	.6	.8
Essential oils.....	1.5	2	2.2	3
Abacá.....	1.5	2	2.0	3
Others.....	2.7	4	4.7	6
	67.6	100	76.0	100
Principal export markets:				
United States.....	60.2	89	66.7	88
Canada.....	1.2	2	1.9	2
Other Western Hemisphere.....	.5	1	.9	1
All other countries.....	5.7	8	6.5	9
	67.6	100	76.0	100
Principal import sources:				
United States.....	48.8	69	54.3	67
Canada.....	2.3	3	2.7	3
Other Western Hemisphere.....	10.2	14	9.0	11
All other countries.....	9.9	14	14.8	19
	71.2	100	80.8	100

⁴ This is the official valuation. At current prices banana exports would be approximately twice this amount.

IV. NATIONAL INCOME—ESTIMATE OF GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT, 1947-48

Source	Amount	Percent of total
	Millions U. S. dollars	
Agriculture (including fishing and forestry production).....	\$189.8	56.7
Corn.....	45.0	13.5
Coffee.....	26.1	7.8
Bananas.....	18.2	5.4
Beans.....	12.4	3.7
Livestock.....	35.1	10.5
Fishing.....	.8	.2
Other agriculture.....	52.2	15.6
Manufacturing and mining.....	46.3	13.8
Food and beverages.....	16.0	4.8
Textiles.....	8.7	2.6
Lumber.....	4.2	1.2
Indian handicrafts.....	10.7	3.2
Other manufacturing and mining.....	6.7	2.0
Private construction.....	4.2	1.3
Private services.....	61.1	18.2
Wholesale and retail trade.....	23.5	7.0
Transportation.....	11.0	3.3
Housing.....	17.5	5.2
Other, including professional and domestic services.....	9.1	2.7
Government.....	33.6	10.0
National.....	30.4	9.1
Municipal and autonomous entities.....	3.2	.9
Total gross national product	335.0	100.0

V. FOREIGN FIRMS' EXPENDITURES IN GUATEMALA

Foreign capital in Guatemala is represented largely by direct investments of three United States-owned corporations: United Fruit Co., the International Railways of Central America, and Electric Bond & Share. The expenditures of these companies in Guatemala are as follows:

[In millions of United States dollars]

Company	Year	Payments to Government	Payroll and other expenditures to individuals	Total
United Fruit and its subsidiary Compañía Agrícola	1950	1.1	13.5	14.6
Electric Bond & Share	1951	.2	.8	1.0
I. R. C. A.	1951	6.7	6.7
Total		1.3	21.0	22.3

¹ \$9.7 million of this represents payroll expenditures.

The above data do not include payments for imports by these companies from balances held in the United States or locally. The data for Electric Bond and Share and IRCA refer only to payroll expenditures.

VI. UNITED STATES PRIVATE DIRECT INVESTMENTS

The value of United States-owned direct investments in Guatemala as of May 31, 1943, was reported as \$87,300,000. During the 6-year period 1945-50 a net additional inflow of \$36,000,000 from the United States was recorded. The \$87,300,000 was divided as follows:

	Millions of dollars
Manufacturing.....	0.4
Mining and smelting.....	.4
Petroleum.....	1.1
Public utilities and transportation.....	62.8
Agriculture.....	19.3
Trade.....	1.4
Finance.....	.1
Miscellaneous.....	1.4
Nonprofit organizations.....	.4
Total	87.3

XCVIII—138

VII. BALANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS, 1950

[Millions of United States dollars]

1. Current operations:	
Merchandise:	
Imports (FOB) adjusted.....	-64.1
Exports (FOB) adjusted.....	78.9
Total	14.8
Services:	
Diplomatic and consular.....	.7
Institutional contributions.....	1.2
Films and theaters.....	-4
Freight.....	-10.4
Consular collections.....	.1
Government services, miscellaneous.....	-.3
Insurance.....	-1.4
Tourism.....	.7
Other services.....	-.4
Total	-10.2
Remittances: Relatives and students.....	-.4
Interest and dividends:	
External debt.....	-.01
Private enterprises.....	-4.0
Total	-4.0
Total current2
2. Capital operations: Short and long term	4.6
Total current and capital operations	4.8
3. Change in gold and foreign exchange reserves	-1.3
4. Residual	-3.5

Within the framework of agreements reached at various conferences held throughout the hemisphere during the course of the past few years this Nation has voluntarily and willingly become a party to cooperative effort. The role of the United States in relation to its neighbors has undergone a remarkable change. No longer does this country seek by force to impose its will upon its neighbors, but looks to the Organization of American States to resolve differences at the conference table. It is an equal partner in a common cause.

Today, the United States seeks the rule of reason as a substitute for the rule of force.

We are today engaged in a mortal conflict-at-arms in the Far East, a conflict to determine whether the new and global aggression of the Soviet Union is to replace in the councils of men the power of reason and logic, and whether force is again to become the international yardstick of political success. We are determined that we shall not yield ground to the aggressor, and in our conduct we are but exemplifying anew the determination so adequately expressed by our southern neighbors not so many years ago when they considered themselves the objects of military and economic aggression.

We do not covet one foot of the earth's surface held by another sovereign nation, but we are determined that no third party will wrest by force the liberties that have been won by the blood of men determined not to become slaves. Guatemala should be in the forefront of that fight for human rights, and not, as is presently indicated, an agent of those to whom God and the rights of man are but catch phrases to be used or discarded as the exigencies of the moment demand.

It is not interference in the internal affairs of any nation to deplore the descent of that nation into slavery, and it is not inconsistent with the obligations of the United States under the terms of

the treaties to which it is a signatory, to bring to the attention of a neighbor the likely effects which may follow on a willingness to become enslaved.

Communists will use Guatemala as they have used every nation against which their aggression has been directed. Under the cloak of a paternal regard for the welfare of its people, communism will lead Guatemala down the dead-end road of totalitarianism. Such a prospect is of the gravest concern to those who are the neighbors and friends of that country. We have no desire to see Guatemala City become the Prague of the Western Hemisphere, but he who directs the draught of air to the fire of the Communist conspiracy against human liberty invites the further and unwanted attention of those who would rule the world.

To confuse the mechanism of democracy with the diabolical machinery of the Communist state is to lay the groundwork for eventual destruction. It is no more possible to do business with Stalin than it was to do business with his immediate predecessor in world aggression, Adolph Hitler.

A police sentry dog on duty in a forced labor camp of the Soviet Union receives more food per day than a worker (Slave labor in the Soviet World—AFL free labor committee, 1951). Let those Communist leaders in Guatemala who profess such a deep regard for those who follow their leadership tell some of the facts of labor under the Communist regime. Let those workers in Guatemala who prefer freedom to absolute slavery make appropriate inquiry to determine the facts for themselves.

The Organization of American States has an obligation in the instance of Communist infiltration in Guatemala. This concern is not reserved alone to the people and the Government of the United States. Manacles fit as easily upon the wrists of the apathetic as upon those of the alert, and with much less trouble. An obligation rests upon each member republic of the OAS to take collective action against aggression wherever it may occur throughout the hemisphere, and the aggression of the Soviet Union in Guatemala is no less malignant and no whit less dangerous because it is not borne on the tips of Soviet bayonets. Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Albania, China, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Rumania, are tragic milestones along the trail of national inertia and apathy.

The Communist in Guatemala, like his counterparts in every other nation on earth, owes no allegiance to Guatemala, to its constitution, or to its traditions and ideals. The course of action to be followed by the Guatemala Communist was dictated in Moscow and not in Guatemala City. If the cooperation of the Government of Guatemala threatened only the welfare of the people of that country, the other member nations of OAS might be justified in dismissing the matter as one of no import to their own welfare. But, as a divided Germany, a partitioned Austria, a severed Trieste constitute cancers upon the body of Europe, so would a successful political coup in the Western Hemisphere serve to transfer overnight to

our hemisphere the fears and the tensions which now serve to make Western Europe an armed camp.

The satellite nations have not fallen prey to the Communist masters as the result of the use of armed force. The slave states have achieved their roles as puppets through a total disregard of the danger and nature of political infiltration. More effective than howitzers and bombs, the political agents of the Kremlin have succeeded in destroying both the will to resist on the part of the subject peoples, and the effective unity within a nation which is necessary to the maintenance of constitutional forms.

Aggression has a foothold in the Western Hemisphere, and through the efforts of a small minority in Guatemala this aggression will continue to thrive and expand unless the moral strength of the Organization of American States is mobilized and brought to bear upon the problem. To this time, OAS, as an organization created and maintained to insure collective security within the hemisphere and to band together in the face of aggression, has chosen to look elsewhere when the question of Soviet activity in Guatemala has been under discussion. It is not enough to say that OAS is concerned only with armed aggression from abroad, or that the question of national sovereignty is too delicate a matter in the present instance. To permit the rise of Soviet power in the Western Hemisphere is to negate the substantial work which has been accomplished over the past two decades in putting down the threat of foreign aggression from any source.

Writing in the Washington News of February 27, 1952, Ludwell Denny had some observations to make with respect to the Guatemalan situation. Commenting on the extent of infiltration, Mr. Denny said:

LATIN AMERICAN REDS
(By Ludwell Denny)

Communist penetration of the strategic Caribbean area is testing the Organization of American States (OAS), which is supposed to provide mutual defense for the hemisphere.

In Guatemala a Red minority has considerable control, through an alliance with the national-socialist government and a united front against the United States. The Communist conspiracy is also active in Mexico, Cuba, Costa Rica, and Panama, as well as in South America.

The Organization of American States is doing little or nothing about it. Several excuses are offered for this indifference:

One is that the primary purpose of the OAS is defense against external attack. Another is the traditional sensitivity to alleged interference with internal affairs of member states. Still another is that several Latin American governments of a national-socialist complexion are themselves potential Guatemalans. Finally, the new Red technique of indirect, piecemeal confiscation is hard to handle.

The worst aspect of OAS inaction is that the United States is being restricted by membership in such a pact. In relying on collective security through the United Nations, and the regional North Atlantic and hemisphere organizations, this country did not intend to curtail its basic right of self-defense. But that may be the net result of the OAS.

What is the United States to do in a case like Guatemala? How long must it permit

a fellow-traveler regime to subject American companies—such as United Fruit, International Railways of Central America, Electric Bond and Share, and Pan-American Airways—to arbitrary, discriminatory, and confiscatory regulations without legal redress?

As part of the good-neighbor policy, the United States long ago abandoned military intervention to protect its citizens and their rights. Also, it has refrained from using financial retaliation and economic sanctions.

The theory was that there would be collective restraints, that the good-neighbor policy would work both ways. Not only was this country supposed to help others—they were expected to come to its aid. They are not doing so in the case of Guatemala.

Congress and the American public and press are asking why. In an unusual House debate Monday, Democratic Leader JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and Republican Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, joined to warn that Guatemala has become a Stalinist "beachhead" in this defense area. OAS members may take a long look at Representative MARTIN's closing statement:

"It should be of the deepest concern to every American republic which believes in and hopes for the continuance of the inter-American system that this Guatemalan Communism threat to the inter-American system be eliminated."

The time is coming when our Latin American allies will have to stand up and be counted on this. Stalin has shown his hand in similar "nationalist" situations in Iran and Egypt. The United States cannot allow him to repeat that security threat in the Guatemala-Panama heart of our own defense area.

If the OAS fails to face up to this emergency, it will lose the respect and support of the United States.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, my advice to my constituents is to detour around Guatemala next summer, and every summer thereafter, until the government of that country decides to cast its lot with freedom and against aggression; with its friends and neighbors and against the foes of world peace and human dignity; and with democratic principles of government as against the rule of the total state.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CRIPPLING DECISIONS FAVOR
COMMUNISTS

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, recent disclosures of communism and corruption in the highest echelons of Government service, shocking as they have been, have occasioned no great surprise to thoughtful Americans, aware that they are the natural and inevitable twin byproducts of political alliance with radical pressure elements coupled with waste and extravagance in Federal expenditures. The sown seeds of disloyalty and dishonesty have taken root and it can well be assumed that public exposure to date are but the forerunner of the crop of culprits yet to be harvested.

Even our Federal courts, long the object of respect approaching reverence in the eyes of the American people, are no longer above suspicion. The country has witnessed with understandable dismay the spectacle of Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed violating the rigid

ethics of the highest tribunal in the land by appearing in a lower court to lend the dignity of their robes to the defense of the archtraitor, Alger Hiss, notwithstanding the preponderant evidence of his guilt. Powerful aid was not lacking from other official sources, as evidenced by the support rendered by Circuit Judge Charles Fahey and Ambassador at Large Philip Jessup, supplemented by the action of the Governor of the great State of Illinois in bringing the weight of his office to bear as a character witness to influence the decision of the jury. The first trial, under such imposing pressure, supplemented by the obvious bias of Federal Judge Kaufman, resulted in a hung jury. The second trial, Federal Judge Henry W. Goddard presiding, lacking the character testimony of these legal and political luminaries and judged solely on the merits of the case, resulted in a verdict of guilty.

The country has also noted, with deep concern, the broad interpretation of Federal courts upholding the right of noncooperative witnesses, under the fifth amendment, to refuse to answer the simplest questions, even those relating to age, place of residence and whether they appeared by virtue of subpoena, propounded by congressional committees, on the grounds that answer would tend to incriminate and degrade. The constitutional provision, designed to safeguard lawful rights, enacted before the day of communism and nationally organized racketeering, has become a major weapon to defeat justice. The law should provide latitude where the national security is involved.

Over a score of the enemies of our country have already escaped richly merited punishment by virtue of that crippling decision which, combined with the instruction issued by the President banning access to departmental files to congressional investigating committees, has rendered them practically impotent, has provided security to subversive activities and has bared the breast of America to those who seek her destruction.

Today I shall present for your consideration the facts in another case which in my opinion reeks with judicial bias and represents a shocking travesty upon American principles of justice and fair play.

As a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities which held hearings in the case of the so-called Hollywood Ten and therefore familiar with the nature of their subversive operations, I was amazed and profoundly disturbed by successive verdicts in Los Angeles Federal courts awarding heavy damages and restoration to their film occupations to the members of that aggregation of proven Communists, who after serving prison sentences for contempt of Congress, sued motion picture producers for breach of contract and conspiracy.

In approaching the subject let me briefly recall the circumstances that led to the hearing, the facts developed thereby and the action taken by the committee as well as the action later taken by the Department of Justice and the Federal District Court of Washington, D. C.

Exhaustive preliminary investigation by the committee resulted in its decision to subpoena certain screenwriters and directors, whom evidence had disclosed had utilized the opportunity provided by their highly compensated occupation to carry the Communist line into film presentation, subtly inserted, constituting a most insidious and effective type of Soviet propaganda, designed to arouse resentment against the American social system and create racial and religious antagonism. Woven skillfully into the fabric of a motion picture, it was not readily detectable and was accepted by the public as a bona fide content of the original work of the author of the film story.

The witnesses who appeared in response to subpoena on October 27, 1947, were John Howard Lawson, Lester Cole, Edward Dymtryk, Herbert Siebermann, Adrian Scott, Alvah Bessie, Albert Maltz, Ring Lardner, Jr., Samuel Ornitz, and Bertold Brecht.

Lawson, the first of the 10 called to testify, persisted in evading direct answers to questioning, the routine tenor of his responses being reflected by the following exchange:

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lawson, are you now, or have you ever been, a member of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. LAWSON. In framing my answer to that question I must emphasize the points that I have raised before. The question of communism is in no way related to this inquiry, which is an attempt to get control of the screen and to invade the basic rights of American citizens in all fields.

Mr. McDOWELL. Now, I must object.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman—

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. LAWSON. The question here relates not only to the question of my membership in any political organization, but this committee is attempting to establish the right—

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. LAWSON (continuing). Which has been historically denied to any committee of this sort, to invade the rights and privileges and immunity of American citizens, whether they be Protestant, Methodist, Jewish, or Catholic, whether they be Republicans or Democrats or anything else.

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Mr. Lawson, just quiet down again. Mr. Lawson, the most pertinent question that we can ask is whether or not you have ever been a member of the Communist Party. Now, do you care to answer that question?

Mr. LAWSON. You are using the old technique which was used in Hitler Germany in order to create a scare here—

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Oh—
Mr. LAWSON. In order that you can then smear the motion-picture industry, and you can proceed to the press, to any form of communication in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. You have learned—
Mr. LAWSON. The Bill of Rights was established precisely to prevent the operation of any committee which could invade the basic rights of Americans. Now, if you want to know—

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the witness is not answering the question.

Mr. LAWSON. If you want to know—
(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. LAWSON. About the perjury that has been committed here and the perjury that is planned.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lawson—
Mr. LAWSON. You permit me and my attorneys to bring in here the witnesses that testified last week and you permit us to cross-

examine these witnesses, and we will show up the whole tissue of lie—

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). We are going to get the answer to that question if we have to stay here for a week. Are you a member of the Communist Party, or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LAWSON. It is unfortunate and tragic that I have to teach this committee the basic principles of American—

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). That is not the question. That is not the question. The question is: Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LAWSON. I am framing my answer in the only way in which any American citizen can frame his answer to a question which absolutely invades his rights.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you refuse to answer that question; is that correct?

Mr. LAWSON. I have told you that I will offer my beliefs, affiliations, and anything else to the American public, and they will know where I stand.

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Excuse the witness—

Mr. LAWSON. As they do from what I have written.

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Stand away from the stand—

Mr. LAWSON. I have written Americanism for many years, and I shall continue to fight for the Bill of Rights, which you are trying to destroy.

The CHAIRMAN. Officers, take this man away from the stand.

The Chair then called Louis J. Russell, committee investigator, to the stand, who established the long record of Communist activity of Lawson, and presented to the committee a photostatic copy of his Communist Party card.

Thereupon the chairman announced the decision of the subcommittee to cite Lawson for contempt of Congress.

There followed on the witness stand the remaining nine writers whose respective attitudes toward the committee, whose irrelevant oratorical outbursts and whose photostatic copies of Communist Party cards paralleled that of Lawson. In each instance the committee took the same action as was taken in the case of Lawson, recommending that each individual be cited for contempt of Congress and that appropriate resolutions be presented to the House of Representatives.

The House by vote of 347 to 17 sustained all citations. The Department of Justice thereupon proceeded to prosecution and on December 5, 1947, the entire 10 were indicted by the Federal Grand Jury. John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo were convicted on April 19, 1948, and May 5, 1948, respectively, and both were sentenced to 1 year imprisonment and \$1,000 fine. Both appealed the verdicts. The remaining eight in the meantime had proposed a stipulation, which was agreed upon, that the cases of Lawson and Trumbo would be considered test cases and their cases were continued for disposition pursuant to this stipulation.

The United States Court of Appeals upheld the convictions of Lawson and Trumbo and on April 10, 1950, the Supreme Court refused to review the decisions. Lawson and Trumbo immediately petitioned the Supreme Court to reconsider its refusal to review their contempt of Congress convictions. On May 29, 1950, the Supreme Court refused to

reconsider its decision. Lawson and Trumbo began serving their 1-year sentences on June 9, 1950. In the week June 21-28, 1950, the remaining eight witnesses, having waived jury trials, went on trial in district courts before judges Pine, Curran, and Ketch in three groups. On June 29, 1950, decisions in all three trials were rendered and all eight were convicted and sentenced.

On November 25, 1947, the film producers conferred concerning the action to be taken in the light of committee revelations, congressional citations, and the obvious public reaction and decided to discharge the guilty writers for violations of the good-conduct clause in their contracts. Clearly, separation of the group from their vital posts in the film industry was not only richly merited by their disloyalty to their employers and to their country but demanded from the standpoint of national security. The producers had no alternative to suspension as a patriotic obligation and further they recognized that retention of the Communist writers would place them in the false light of condoning their acts.

This, then, was the situation after the Hollywood Ten, a thoroughly discredited band who had earned the contempt and loathing of their countrymen, were cited by the Congress of the United States on November 24, 1947.

The country was mildly amused on February 25, 1948, when Lester Cole, then under indictment, instituted suit in the Federal District Court of Los Angeles for reinstatement and payment of compensation at the contract rate of \$1,350 per week, said contract having been suspended on December 2, 1947, by Loew-MGM pending clearance of congressional charges. Clearly, the opportunity provided for meditation after his citation had not tempered the arrogance and contempt of law and lawmakers displayed during the congressional hearings, but the Nation sat back to await the anticipated decision by the court which the honest American layman assumed would take the form of a finding for the producers based upon justification for contract cancellation including forfeiture of unearned compensation, since the Cole-Loew contract contained the following provision:

The employee agrees to conduct himself with due regard to public conventions and morals, and agrees that he will not do or commit any act or thing that will tend to degrade him in society or bring him into public hatred, contempt, scorn, or ridicule, or that will tend to shock, insult, or offend the community or ridicule public morals or decency, or prejudice the producer or the motion picture, theatrical, or radio industry in general.

Such was the decision the public had a right to expect—but what did they get? A jury verdict for the plaintiff, Cole, and a decision by Judge Leon Rene Yankwich of the Los Angeles Federal District Court on December 20, 1948, awarding judgment to Lester Cole in the amount of \$150,000 plus interest at 7 percent from the original termination date and ordering him restored to his screen-writing job.

The verdict and decision mocked justice. They made a screaming farce of the deliberations of our Federal courts. They provided bone and sinew to the Communist cause in America. They established the guilty as the beneficiary of our legal process. And who paid the judgment cost? Loew's, Inc.? Partially, yes, but the American taxpayer footed the heavy share which normally would have found its way to the United States Treasury as income tax. Moscow must have rocked with glee at the news.

The case shrieks to the heavens for congressional examination.

Let us first review the record of Lester Cole, plaintiff in the first suit, who, when called before the committee, refused to make intelligent answers to questions directed to him but pursued a course of irrelevant vaporings that clearly indicated his intent to obstruct the committee inquiry. Failing to obtain direct and relevant testimony, the Chair excused the witness.

Mr. Louis Russell, committee investigator, was then called to the stand and produced a photostatic copy of the Communist Party card of Lester Cole bearing the number 47226.

The Peoples World of October 22, 1942, and October 31, 1942, revealed that Lester Cole supported LaRue McCormack, the Communist Party candidate for State senator in California from the thirty-eighth senatorial district, Los Angeles County. Lester Cole revealed his sympathies with the Soviet Union as witnessed by his signature to the statement made by American Progressives in Defense of the Moscow Trials. The Moscow trials aroused world-wide condemnation. They were characterized by forced confessions and were staged as political demonstrations rather than trials in our sense of the term. The Hollywood Reporter charged Lester Cole with holding Communist Party membership book No. 46805 in the propaganda section of the Communist Party. This charge was never denied or rebutted by Mr. Cole. The Communist press was active in the support of a petition for the pardon of Festus Coleman, of which Lester Cole was a signer according to the Peoples World of November 24, 1942. The League of American Writers, an affiliate of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers, with headquarters in Moscow, has been pledged to defend the Soviet Union and "the use of art as an instrument in the class struggle." On three occasions it was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as well as by Attorney General Francis Biddle, who said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7445:

The overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control.

The Peoples World of February 11, 1943, page 5, lists Lester Cole as a speaker at the League of American Writers School. Also, New Masses of April 22, 1941, and the Daily Worker of April 5, 1941, carry the name of Lester Cole as a signer of the Call to the Fourth Congress of the League of American Writers, June 6 to 8, 1941, New York City. This con-

ference, which was held a few days prior to Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, denounced the war as imperialistic, attacked President Roosevelt and endorsed the American Peace Mobilization which was then picketing the White House and denouncing President Roosevelt as a warmonger. According to the Peoples World of October 22, 1942, and October 31, 1942, Lester Cole was active in the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, the successor of the Hollywood branch of the League of American Writers. One of the organizations participating in the Hollywood Writers Mobilization was the Screen Writers Guild, of which Lester Cole is a member of the executive board, according to the Daily Worker of August 10, 1947, and the Screen Writer of July 1947. John Howard Lawson, who was identified by the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, issue of August 23, 1947, as a Communist Party member, is a leading figure in the Screen Writers Guild, cited as Communist-dominated.

Now let us review the record of Leon Yankwich, the Federal district judge who tried the case of Lester Cole against Loew's, Inc., and who rendered judgment in favor of Cole.

Leon Rene Yankwich was born in Jasse, Rumania, on September 25, 1888, and received preparatory schooling in that country. He migrated to the United States in 1907 at the age of 19 and 2 years later, in 1909, was admitted to the bar in Oregon and California and thereupon engaged in the practice of law, although he was not naturalized as an American citizen until 1912. He was a guest lecturer in the 1945 season before the Peoples Educational Center, Hollywood, Calif. This organization was cited by Attorney General Clark on June 1, 1948, and on September 21, 1948, as Communist and subversive. It was also cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947. Their report reads:

An expanded Communist Party institution for the purpose of disseminating Communist propaganda.

Out of the mouth of the Communist director of the Los Angeles Workers School is a positive statement to the effect that the Communist Workers School helped organize the Peoples Educational Center as the organization which would carry on its activities. The Peoples Educational Center was presented with the Communist Library of the Workers School. It is highly significant that associated with Judge Yankwich as lecturers before the Peoples Educational Center were John Howard Lawson, Herbert Biebermann, and Edward Dymytryk, three individuals included in the membership of the Hollywood Ten. Among the lecture subjects treated before the Peoples Educational Center were American Isolationism, The Soviet Union in Quarantine, What the Soviet Union Really Wants, False Solutions for Real Problems and True Solutions for Real Problems, Union Organization, Problems of the Minorities, and Youth Organizations. It is interesting to note further that another lecturer before the Peoples Educational Center was Ben Margolis, identified as a mem-

ber of the Communist Party, on the subject Legal Profession Procedures. Margolis is a member of the National Lawyers Guild, a Communist front organization, and has been cocounsel for the Hollywood Ten. It provides added interest to note that he was one of the three attorneys representing Lester Cole in the case presided over by Judge Yankwich.

I am reliably informed that Jack Weatherwax—known Communist—declared at an open forum in Los Angeles on January 7, 1945, that he had recently attended a meeting in the home of Judge Yankwich and delivered a speech on the dangers of fascism in this country.

In April 1945 the Peoples Educational Center, Los Angeles, cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General, presented Los Angeles community leaders with a brochure entitled "New Perspectives for Los Angeles Peoples Educational Center." The brochure included a photo of Judge and Mrs. Yankwich, and the contents revealed plans to establish another similar educational center in the industrial section of the city.

Judge and Mrs. Yankwich gave a reception for Dr. Frank Davis, director of the Peoples Educational Center, Los Angeles, in April 1945.

In 1947 and 1948 Judge Yankwich was a speaker at meetings of the American Civil Liberties Union in Los Angeles. The California Committee on Un-American Activities in their 1943 report quotes:

The American Civil Liberties Union may be definitely classed as a Communist front or "transmission belt" organization. At least 90 percent of its efforts are expended on behalf of Communists who come into conflict with the law. While it professes to stand for free speech, a free press and free assembly, it is quite obvious that its main function is to protect Communists in their activities of force and violence in their program to overthrow the Government.

The Senate Fact Finding Committee on Un-American Activities of the California Legislature opened public hearings in Los Angeles on Monday, February 16, 1948. Federal Judge Leon R. Yankwich voluntarily appeared on Thursday, February 19, 1948, and after being recognized endeavored to make a speech to the audience. It was only after he was admonished by the chairman that he finally consented to address the committee. He stated that he was appearing before the committee because he had learned that his name had been included in previous committee reports in connection with the Communist school, the Los Angeles Peoples Educational Center. After Yankwich was impressed with the idea that his remarks should be addressed to the committee and not to the audience, he said, "It was stated that I delivered a lecture before some educational group and the newspaper which reported it had a statement which intimated that I had been 'taken in' by a group, so all I want to do is this—I want to say this—I do not care whether they are Communists or anything else." It was the finding of the committee that—

Judge Yankwich's conduct and attitude was a disgraceful reflection upon the Federal bench. For anyone to fraternize with the enemies of the people of the United States,

its Constitution and Government is had enough in itself, but when a judge of the Federal bench lends his position and name to dignify traitorous organizations, such as the Communist Peoples Educational Center, then no condemnation is strong enough to characterize such action. In these critical times when the Federal bench will be called upon to deal with cases involving the traitorous activities of Communist Soviet agents, a man such as Yankwich is not qualified because of his obvious bias and sympathy for pro-Communist, pro-Soviet causes to sit on the Federal bench.

Mr. Coombs, chief counsel for the committee, introduced a copy of the open forum, published every Saturday at 1022 California Building, Second and Broadway, Los Angeles, by the Southern California Branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, a Communist front organization. This issue carried an article signed by Judge Leon Yankwich attacking the criminal syndicalism law, held constitutional by the high courts of California and the United States. The law is aimed at those who advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

Such is the record and reputation of Judge Leon Yankwich, the Rumanian immigrant who as a youth sought the freedom, security, and opportunity afforded under our American system, and after attaining under that system the eminence inherent in a seat on the Federal bench has lent his influence and his exalted position to the aid of its enemies.

According to affidavit submitted by Loew attorneys several weeks prior to the Cole-Loew trial, Judge Yankwich confided to a friend at a party that he hoped the case would not come before him because he would have no alternative but to rule in favor of the plaintiff Cole.

The case was subsequently assigned to Yankwich.

The opening move by Cole's attorney was a motion for a summary judgment directing the studio to reinstate Cole. In taking the motion under advisement, Judge Yankwich said:

As a matter of fact, I don't think Cole declined to answer. There is no power on God's earth that says a committee can ask a man a question and insist on an answer of "Yes" or "No."

Attorneys for MGM filed an affidavit of prejudice asking Judge Yankwich to disqualify himself because of described pretrial opinion expressed by the judge at the previously mentioned private party. Judge Yankwich thereupon ruled upon both matters. He denied the request for summary judgment, thereby assuring that the case would go to trial, and he filed affidavits of his own to combat the Metro affidavit, refusing requested change of venue.

Attorney Herman Selvin, representing MGM, stated that Cole "offended and shocked the community" by refusing to answer questions by a congressional committee as to his membership in the Communist Party and that such refusal violated the contract because it injured the film industry.

"As a matter of fact" interjected Judge Yankwich, "they did not decline to answer the question. Where is the law that

a witness must answer 'yes' or 'no'?" He continued, "I read what happened. The men said a few words and then were taken from the stand." The judge commented earlier that "it was pretty obvious that the studios got cold feet. They got frightened by the Thomas committee." The Thomas committee is not sacrosanct, he added. Attorney Selvin objected to the cold-feet reference as not being pertinent to the case before the court. "Did not that man Eric Johnston first say he was going to stand by the writers?" Judge Yankwich rejoined. "And then later on did not they fire them all?" "I do not know about that," replied Selvin. "Then you have not been reading the papers," said the judge. At another point Yankwich said, "The record before the court gives Cole's entire testimony and at no time did he say 'I will not answer that question.'" Certainly, such comments from the bench would have a prejudicial effect upon the listening jury. In the light of the Yankwich opinion as to whether or not Cole refused to answer, let me present here an extract from the record indicating the manner in which Cole answered questions propounded by the chairman and by the chief investigator for the Committee on Un-American Activities during the House hearings:

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Cole, are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to make a statement [handing statement to the chairman].

Mr. McDOWELL [perusing statement]. I think it is insulting, myself.

The CHAIRMAN. This statement is clearly another case of vilification and not pertinent at all to the inquiry. Therefore, you will not read the statement.

Mr. COLE. Well, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, ask the first question.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, may I just ask if I do not read my statement—

The CHAIRMAN. You will not ask anything.

Mr. COLE. Is the New York Times editorial pertinent—the editorial in the Herald Tribune pertinent?

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead and ask the question.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Cole, are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. COLE. I would like to answer that question and would be very happy to. I believe the reason the question is asked is to help enlighten—

The CHAIRMAN. No, no, no, no, no.

Mr. COLE. I hear you, Mr. Chairman; I hear you. I am sorry, but—

The CHAIRMAN. You will hear some more.

Mr. COLE. I am trying to make these statements pertinent.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question, "Yes" or "No."

Mr. COLE. I am sorry, sir, but I have to answer the question in my own way.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a very simple question.

Mr. COLE. What I have to say is a very simple answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but answer it "Yes" or "No."

Mr. COLE. It isn't necessarily that simple.

The CHAIRMAN. If you answer it "Yes" or "No," then you can make some explanation.

Mr. COLE. Well, Mr. Chairman, I really must answer it in my own way.

The CHAIRMAN. You decline to answer the question?

Mr. COLE. Not at all, not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ask the witness if he was here under subpoena?

Mr. COLE. What is it, Mr. Chairman? I beg your pardon?

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Cole, you are here under subpoena served upon you on September 19, are you not?

Mr. COLE. Yes; I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. And the question before you is: Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. COLE. I understand the question, and I think I know how I can answer it to the satisfaction of the committee. I wish I would be permitted to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Can't you answer the question?

Mr. COLE. You wouldn't permit me to read my statement and the question is answered in my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you able to answer the question "Yes" or "No," or are you unable to answer it "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. COLE. I am not able to answer "Yes" or "No." I am able, and I would like to answer it in my own way. Haven't I the right accorded me as it was to Mr. McGuinness and other people who came here?

The CHAIRMAN. First, we want you to answer "Yes" or "No," then you can make some explanation of your answer.

Mr. COLE. I understand what you want, sir. I wish you would understand that I feel I must make an answer in my own way, because what I have to say—

The CHAIRMAN. Then you decline to answer the question?

Mr. COLE. No; I do not decline to answer the question. On the contrary, I would like very much to answer it; just give me a chance.

The CHAIRMAN. Supposing we gave you a chance to make an explanation, how long would it take you to make that explanation?

Mr. COLE. Oh, I would say anywhere from a minute to 20, I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty?

Mr. COLE. Sure, I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. And would it all have to do with the question?

Mr. COLE. It certainly would.

The CHAIRMAN. Then would you finally answer it "yes" or "no"?

Mr. COLE. Well, I really don't think that is the question before us now is it?

The CHAIRMAN. Then go on to the next question.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Cole, are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLE. I would like to answer that question as well; I would be very happy to. I believe the reason the question is being asked is that because at the present time there is an election in the Screen Writers Guild in Hollywood that for 15 years Mr. McGuinness and others—

The CHAIRMAN. I didn't even know there was an election out there. Go ahead and answer the question. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLE. If you don't know there is an election there you didn't hear Mr. Lavery's testimony yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. There were some parts I didn't hear.

Mr. COLE. I am sorry, but I would like to put it into the record that there is an election there.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, there is an election there. Now, answer the question. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLE. Can I answer that in my own way, please? May I, please? Can I have that right? Mr. McGuinness was allowed to answer it in his own way.

The CHAIRMAN. You are an American, aren't you?

Mr. COLE. Yes; I certainly am, and it states so in my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you ought to be very proud to answer the question.

Mr. COLE. I am very proud to answer the question, and I will at times when I feel it is proper.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be very simple to answer.

Mr. COLE. It is very simple to answer the question—

The CHAIRMAN. You bet.

Mr. COLE (continuing). And at times when I feel it is proper I will, but I wish to stand on my rights of association—

The CHAIRMAN. We will determine whether it is proper.

Mr. COLE. No, sir. I feel I must determine it as well.

The CHAIRMAN. We will determine whether it is proper. You are excused.

Such was the nature of the replies of Lester Cole to pointed questions, closely paralleling that of John Howard Lawson, previously detailed, and the fact that the entire group of screen writers followed the identical routine clearly established that they had agreed on a uniform procedure to avoid direct answer, probably on advice of counsel. Yet Judge Yankwich refused to construe it as refusal to answer—a hardly reasonable conclusion.

The decision of Judge Yankwich in the Cole case was reversed by the United States Court of Appeals, ninth district of California, and was sent back to the lower court for retrial. The appellate court found no fault with the ruling of Judge Yankwich but stated that he allowed testimony to be presented that confused the issue.

On retrial the monetary award was reduced to \$74,250 but reinstatement of Cole to his \$1,350-a-week job was again ordered by the court and Cole at this moment is reengaged in adaptation with its dangerous potential for propaganda in the wrong hands and no question exists that Cole falls into that category.

Subsequently, suit was filed by Adrian Scott against RKO and Ring Lardner, Jr., against Twentieth Century Fox, which resulted in a jury finding for the plaintiffs. Judgment was awarded by Federal Judge Ben Harrison on February 19, 1952, based on the Yankwich precedent, to Scott for \$84,300 and to Lardner for \$20,000, plus 7-percent interest. This decision has been appealed and is still pending.

Lester Cole and Dalton Trumbo filed suits for \$400,000 against MGM, which according to the Los Angeles Daily Mirror were settled out of court for a total exceeding \$100,000.

To cap the climax, still another suit has been instituted by the entire Hollywood Ten against all the major studios for conspiring to prevent plaintiffs from working in the motion-picture industry for a total in excess of \$48,000,000. This suit has not yet come to trial.

In these days of the mounting threat of world-wide communism, it is mystifying to our American citizenry that our courts choose to disregard fact and intent and interpret the law and the evidence in diametric opposition to the national interest. To decide that the plaintiff, Cole, a proven member of the Communist Party and an alleged member of the propaganda section of that party, after having been convicted and sentenced for contempt of Congress, had

not brought himself into public hatred, contempt, scorn or ridicule and had not by his statements and conduct before the House Committee on Un-American Activities "tended to shock, insult or offend the community" within the meaning of the Cole-Loew contract is an unreasonable and unwarranted conclusion. Cole and the entire Hollywood ten did bring themselves into public hatred, contempt and scorn and they did shock and offend the country since but one construction could be placed upon their actions, and for jury and court to draw any other conclusion is beyond comprehension. To require the studios to restore them to their screenwriting disservice, to resume their activities in the interest of a foreign enemy provides a most amazing climax to a weird chapter in American history. Let it not be forgotten that these same plaintiffs had previously faced a Federal grand jury in Washington, D. C., in an action brought by the Department of Justice and on the identical evidence were indicted and later were sentenced to imprisonment plus \$1,000 fine in each instance.

Inherent in that finding and sentence was shock and offense to the community and public hatred, scorn, and contempt within the meaning of the good-conduct clause, a fact that Judge Yankwich chose to ignore.

I am more than confident that I voice the opinion of the great American public when I vigorously protest the decisions rendered in the Los Angeles courts and the occupancy of a seat on our Federal bench of any individual whose conduct evidences sympathy to an un-American cause.

The Congress, in citing the writers for contempt, and directing prosecution by the Department of Justice, created the situation that has placed the picture producers in their predicament and has already resulted in heavy losses to the studios and to the taxpayers and in the light of a pending suit for \$48,000,000 further and greater losses may follow.

After the citations were voted by the House what alternative to the discharge action taken was left the studios? If the studios had failed to act, an aroused and indignant public would have demanded dismissal through boycott and picketing. As it was, according to the testimony of Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Producers' Association, at the Scott-Lardner trial on February 7, 1952:

Conduct of the witnesses brought the industry into disrepute. The public seemed convinced that the industry was infiltrated with Communists and refrained from attending film theaters for a time.

The Congress has an interest in this case that cannot be overlooked or evaded. Therefore, to fulfill the obligation of the Congress to insure to the people the highest principles of honor, integrity, patriotism, and justice in our Federal courts I ask for a congressional investigation to determine the fitness of Judge Leon Yankwich to retain a seat on the Federal bench.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I think it may be said, with some safety, that the voters in both primaries, in New Hampshire a few weeks ago, did their own thinking and did not obey the dictates of any machine or organization. That State, as a whole, kicked over the traces.

Now this is being explained in various ways, to suit various purposes.

Manchester, the largest city, and a textile manufacturing center, expressed its resentment in no uncertain terms. I think that this shows the undercurrent of dissatisfaction that exists in New England as a result of the remote indifference to their problems on the part of Washington.

There is some scattered unemployment throughout the Nation, but we have cities in New England where those without work, number 20 percent and more of the labor force.

Now this is a fact which we cannot pick up and put down or come back to at our leisure. We are not dealing here with a bale of wool or of cotton, but with human beings whose predicament worsens with each pressing day.

We in New England are worried and restless.

We know that certain long-range adjustments are necessary to solve the problems of our woolen-worsted industry. This is a responsibility that must be shared by management, labor, communities, and States.

But short-range help is urgently needed.

This alone will aid the unemployed to pay this week's rent and today's food bill.

On April 4, 1950, almost 2 years ago, I asked the Congress to route United States purchasing to jobless areas, but the warning fell on ears that were not interested in New England.

Early this year we introduced legislation to increase and extend unemployment benefits, but again we are meeting with a complete lack of understanding.

Washington gets far more from Massachusetts, for instance, than it ever pays back. We have paid billions in taxes within recent years, much of it to help in the development of other States. Some of this is taken from us through sheer duplicity. Let me recount one example. The United States Chamber of Commerce has uncovered the fact that since 1938 Massachusetts employers have turned in \$94,843,000 in unemployment administration taxes to the Federal Government, and have received back for the same purpose, only \$56,234,000. Almost \$39,000,000 was diverted to other States, like North Dakota, which netted 158 percent of its employer contributions. The rest was lost in the general kitty. Massachusetts could use some of the \$39,000,000 right now.

As a third alternative, we have called upon the Secretary of Labor to redeter-

mine the minimum wage so as to meet the prevailing wage requirements of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act and make them conform with the industry average as of 1952. Inasmuch as 58 percent of woolen-worsted manufacturing is located in New England, it would seem that the rates paid in the Northeast States must be the determining factor. We are not asking anything unusual here, but simply that the law be enforced. There are many precedents for this. Rates have recently been upgraded to conform to prevailing standards on drugs, paints, and varnishes. Can anyone maintain, therefore, that it should not be done for woolen-worsted?

We have offered three alternatives on which we received no support. Only when Comptroller General Warren, in effect, authorized defense procurement agencies to grant contracts to firms in labor surplus areas, even though the Government might be able to obtain lower prices elsewhere, did active opposition come to life.

Notwithstanding the testimony by Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Assistant to the Director of Defense Mobilization, and in charge of manpower, that "Ninety-odd percent of defense contracts are now negotiated contracts."

Furthermore, the national manpower mobilization policy promulgated by the President on January 17, 1951, states, in effect, that the primary aim of manpower mobilization is to safeguard our national security through proper use of our human resources. I repeat—"human resources."

Think that one over, gentlemen.

The textile industry is New England's largest.

When so many of its workers are unemployed, as they are and have been for some time, constituting the largest percentage of jobless in the Nation, American human resources are being wasted. Something must be done immediately to provide them with work, and the responsibility for this is squarely in the lap of the Federal Government because no other agency can cope with it soon enough.

See for yourselves.

Send a committee up to New England to get first-hand evidence of our situation so that you may comprehend what it means for tens of thousands to be without life-sustaining employment, and then judge whether technicalities will satisfy us.

When we propose emergency unemployment compensation for distressed areas, those from other regions unaffected by this problem protest, saying, "No; you can't expect even temporary help from the Federal Government because yours is a State problem."

But when we ask to have defense orders funneled to communities where unemployment is serious, they change their tack and say, "No; we refuse to consider special aid for a locality or a State. The problem must be approached on an industry-wide basis."

All right.

Let us reduce the price differential by raising the minimum wage to meet prevailing rates, according to the law

known as the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, and make it apply to the whole industry.

Again the opponents to aid for New England change their tactics. Now they insist on local responsibility.

The road blocks that have been put in the way of every proposal to provide temporary assistance for the displaced workers of New England, are prima facie evidence of a conspiracy to undermine the economy of our region.

This we will not tolerate.

Why, I ask you, is each and every measure to provide first aid for our people killed in committee, or smothered by pressures that force Government agencies to evade their responsibilities under existing laws? Not just one solution has been sidetracked, but all that have been proposed so far.

Comptroller General Warren, on January 14, 1952, ruled that the diversion of defense contracts into unemployment areas without regard to the lowest bid is legal. Awards of defense contracts through negotiation, rather than competitive bidding, was a common procedure during the emergency of World War II.

On February 15, 1952, the plan to give a greater proportion of contracts to distressed areas was announced officially.

It was then that the back-seat drivers interfered.

The ODM, then tried the unusual maneuver of advancing and retreating at one and the same time. This jamming of the gears was described as a reexamination.

It was decided that textile centers, with the highest ratios of unemployed in the Nation, would not be considered as distressed areas at this time.

Tell that to the unemployed in Manchester, N. H., and in a half dozen other New England mill cities.

Even at this late stage, I do not hear any voluntary offers of support from other points of the national compass in behalf of legislation to alleviate our crisis by increasing and extending unemployment compensation benefits through Federal grants and for a limited period.

It might not be inconsistent at this time to recall the solicitude of the United States Government for surplus agricultural commodities. It would appear by comparison that surplus labor is entitled to at least the same benevolent consideration.

Thousands of New Englanders are beginning to question the sincerity, the understanding, and the capabilities of their National Government.

I reiterate, they expect, and have a right to expect, that short-term help will be forthcoming from the Congress and the executive department.

The textile industry of New England has more facilities and skills available than any other equivalent section of the industry in this Nation. Silent plants and idle workers are waiting for your answer.

I suggest that we inquire as to that portion of the Armed Forces budget for textile procurement which remains unspent.

Furthermore, I believe that we should establish a formula of priorities for distressed areas in the negotiation of defense contracts.

Finally, in the budget for the fiscal year 1953, we should provide for the stockpiling of woolen-worsted goods, authorize purchases beyond anticipated needs, and earmark increased appropriations for such purposes.

These alternatives, plus those I have previously mentioned, together with others which you may bring forward, offer us a choice of emergency aids. There is, therefore, no excuse for doing nothing.

New England's army of jobless textile workers cannot fight their problem with words from Washington.

Positive action is required.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am familiar with the distress of the textile industry in the area the gentleman from Massachusetts represents. I, too, have distress in this industry in my particular area.

Is it not the history of the United States that whenever there has been flood, fire, or disaster in any section of our country, the people in all other sections have rallied to help out those in distress?

Mr. LANE. That is right.

Mr. CANFIELD. After all, are not we who represent the textile areas asking that there be a sharing of these contracts so that people who are now walking the street, who are unemployed, will be able to find jobs, and in that way the unemployment compensation rolls will be relieved? Is not that, after all, the objective of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. LANE. May I say to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, I know he is very familiar with the distress in the textile area, because he has many textiles in his own district, that all we are asking in the textile distressed and depressed areas of this country, especially in the Northeast, is that we get a fair, just, and reasonable share of these Government contracts in order to alleviate this unemployment situation, which is now prevalent in our cities and towns where the textile industry is concentrated.

Mr. CANFIELD. That will not mean that industry in any other part of the country will be liquidated or hurt to any great extent, does it?

Mr. LANE. We do not desire to create unemployment in any other section of the country in order to relieve our unemployment. All we want is a just and

fair part of these textile contracts so that we will be helped.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I join in this cause with the gentleman from Massachusetts in fighting for American citizens who seek employment in a very important industry.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his very helpful and constructive speech in reference to this matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ARENDS and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. ARMSTRONG and to include a brief article from the Washington Post.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. PERKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in two instances, notwithstanding it is estimated by the Public Printer that the extension will cost \$224 in one case and \$224 in the other.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. PHILLIPS to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain correspondence.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington and also to include certain extraneous matter in connection with remarks made in Committee of the Whole on the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. D'EWART.

Mr. MCGUIRE in two instances and to include two articles.

Mr. YORTY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous remarks.

Mr. DURHAM in two instances.

Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of New York and to include an editorial.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania and to include an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal and a speech.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. VAN PELT).

Mr. KEATING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of New York and to include a resolution.

Mr. POULSON in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland.

Mr. SPRINGER and to include an address delivered by Lindsay C. Warren.

Mr. SHAFER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FISHER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK in two instances, to include in one a letter from Anthony D. Tieso, Disabled American Veterans, Department of Massachusetts, and other data.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RICHARDS and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include a speech on the defense-minerals program.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 148. An act for the relief of Gerdina Josephina Van Delft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 171. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Pielecki Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 365. An act for the relief of Jean Krueger and Edith Krueger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 420. An act for the relief of Gloria Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 569. An act for the relief of May Hosken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 603. An act for the relief of Wanda Charwat, and her daughter, Wanda Aino Charwat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 645. An act to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Seattle, Wash., the Hiram R. Gale Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 762. An act for the relief of Alexander Urszu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 779. An act for the relief of Ziemowit Z. Karpinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 794. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shu-Ting Liu Hsia and her daughter, Lucia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 869. An act for the relief of Marie Cafcalaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 992. An act for the relief of Daniel Wolkonsky and his wife, Xenia Wolkonski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1037. An act for the relief of Wai Hsueh Tan, Mrs. May Jane Tan, Robert Tingsing Tan, and Ellen Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1050. An act for the relief of Hisako Hanabata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1154. An act for the relief of Edi Bertoli, Gino Guglielmi, and Sarafnio Ballerini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1162. An act for the relief of Pietro Meduri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1189. An act for the relief of Anthony Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1420. An act for the relief of Pinfang Hsia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1422. An act for the relief of Jerry J. Lencioni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1494. An act for the relief of George Georgacopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1527. An act for the relief of Sisters Dolores Illa Martori, Maria Josefa Dalmau Vallve, and Ramona Cabarrocas Canals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1536. An act to stabilize the economy of dependent residents of New Mexico using certain lands of the United States known as

the North Lobato and El Pueblo tracts, originally purchased from relief program funds, and now administered under agreement by the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests, to effect permanent transfer of these lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1555. An act for the relief of Rosarina Garofalo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1565. An act for the relief of Andy Duzsik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1630. An act to amend the provisions of the act of March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1235, 1253) authorizing the granting of easements for rights-of-way for electrical transmission, telephone, and telegraph lines and poles; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1679. An act for the relief of Stephen Gorove; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1765. An act for the relief of Harumi Kamiaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1766. An act for the relief of Frederic James Mercado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1812. An act for the relief of Janice Justina King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1828. An act to confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1843. An act for the relief of John Kintzig and Tatiana A. Kintzig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1855. An act for the relief of Joachim Volk, also known as Steven Craig Delano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1863. An act to effect the entry into the United States of Yukio Niimura, a minor Japanese national; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1891. An act for the relief of Lubo Paskalovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1999. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of any statute of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of such employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 2033. An act for the relief of Gluseppa S. Boyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2034. An act for the relief of Charlotte Elizabeth Carson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2051. An act for the relief of Naomi Salto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2066. An act for the relief of Heidi Geraldine Connelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2102. An act for the relief of Alcide Orazio Marselli and Angelo Bardelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2210. An act for the relief of Richard A. Seidenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2220. An act for the relief of Theresa Hatcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2294. An act for the relief of Carl Hilmura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2307. An act for the relief of Holger Kubischke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2380. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2390. An act to amend section 302 (4) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act

of 1940, as amended, relating to penalties; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 2462. An act for the relief of Teruo Uechi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2485. An act to provide for the issuance of a distinctive service ribbon bar in recognition of the services of merchant seamen; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2530. An act to provide certain decorations for outstanding and heroic conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2544. An act to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for judicial relief; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2552. An act to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2554. An act for the relief of Eugene Richard Sushko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2569. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2571. An act for the relief of Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2593. An act for the relief of Jean Hamamoto, also known as Sharon Lea Brooks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2611. An act to amend section 3 (a) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2635. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2643. An act for the relief of Kathleen Cowley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2672. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Mueller (also known as Elizabeth Philbrick); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2721. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2770. An act for the relief of Matheos Alafouzou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 27, 1952, 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:

1283. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmit-

ting a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 2,000 tons of low-grade quartz crystals and quartz crystal chips now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 60 Stat. 596, 50 U. S. C. 98b (e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1284. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to exempt from taxation the amounts paid for admission to theaters and other activities operated by or under control of the military departments"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 586. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5767, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum resale prices and which are extended by State law to nonsigners; without amendment (Rept. No. 1646). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 587. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3719, a bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for unpaid compulsory labor and inhumane treatment of prisoners of war and for other enemy violations of the Geneva Convention respecting prisoners of war; without amendment (Rept. No. 1647). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 588. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6839, a bill to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post office purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1648). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2447. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 5120. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act so as to require the insurance of deposits payable at branches of insured banks in Puerto Rico; with amendment (Rept. No. 1650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6909. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AANDAHL:

H. R. 7245. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 7246. A bill to extend retirement benefits to certain former Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7247. A bill to provide for the gradual elimination of salmon traps in the waters of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 7248. A bill to provide for the naturalization of certain Mexican citizens who serve in the Armed Forces during the period of the Korean hostilities beginning June 27, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 7249. A bill to provide that all data, records, findings, and reports relating to civilian personnel in the executive branch of the Government shall be made available to committees of the Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 7250. 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; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 7251. A bill relating to the amount of gross income which a dependent of a taxpayer may have without loss by the taxpayer of an income-tax exemption for such dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 7252. A bill to provide for the naturalization of certain Mexican citizens who serve in the Armed Forces during the period of the Korean hostilities beginning June 27, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (by request):

H. R. 7253. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum of certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 7254. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to exempt postmasters from compulsory retirement for age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7255. A bill to amend section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to employee stock purchase plans); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 7256. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 7257. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 7258. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7259. A bill to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1952)

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

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

O God, the might of them that put their trust in Thee, amid all the mortal ills that prevail and the subtle dangers that beset us, save us from the fatal folly of attempting to rely upon our own wisdom and our own strength. In a world so uncertain about many things, we are sure of no light but Thine, no refuge but Thee. The din of confusing words assails our ears from an agitated world. Grant us a deep inner calm, undisturbed by any outer commotion. Give us courage to seek the truth honestly and with reverent determination to follow humbly the Kindly Light that leads us on.

Thou hast created us so that even our mortal bodies are to be Thy temples. Grant that the holy places of our inner lives may harbor nothing unworthy of our highest and best—

"The ruins of our soul repair,
And make our heart a house of prayer."

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 26, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3954) to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2077. An act to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Yuriko Tsutsumi;

H. R. 899. An act for the relief of Malka Dwojra and Tauba Kron;

H. R. 3668. An act for the relief of David Yeh; and

H. R. 3954. An act to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

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

NATO ANNIVERSARY CEREMONY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an announcement which I should like to have the clerk read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the announcement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

NATO ANNIVERSARY CEREMONY

Plans for a ceremony in observance of the third anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty have been made by the Department of State. The ceremony will take place on April 4, as the defensive alliance enters its fourth year, from 10:30 a. m. to 12 noon, in Constitution Hall in Washington, D. C. Among the participants will be the President of the United States, Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder, Director for Mutual Security W. Averell Harriman, and Deputy Secretary of Defense William C. Foster.

All Members of the Senate are cordially invited and formal invitations will be sent to them by the Secretary of State in a few days.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the Record, and to transact other routine business, without debate.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF EXECUTIVE MANSION (S. Doc. No. 111)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, in the amount of \$20,000, fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reason for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7260. A bill to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 7261. A bill to provide for the conservation of fish and wildlife on the Klamath Reservation, in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 410. Joint resolution to authorize the appointment of a special investigator and a maximum of three deputies with powers to investigate improper and illegal conduct in the transaction of the business of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to authorize completion and termination of the issuance of immigration visas authorized under the act of June 25, 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relating to their senate joint resolution No. 1, relative to the furnishing of Federal assistance, including arms, ammunition, clothing, and equipment to the California Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 7262. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. R. 7263. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Giammarco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 7264. A bill for the relief of Carmela Scavone DiBiasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7265. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Goldstein and wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7266. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Markovits, daughter of Mrs. Rose Markovits and Eugene Markovits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 7267. A bill for the relief of Curtis W. Strong; 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:

655. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Edward C. Davis, and others, of Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

656. Also, petition of A. F. Horton, and others, of Oviedo, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.