By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 7712. A bill for the relief of Dan Hong Mar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7713. A bill for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy; 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:

704. By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Petition of Mrs. Nora B. Powell, and 95 other citizens, of New Castle County, Del., urging enactment of legislation prohibiting alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

705. By Mr. ELLSWORTH: Petition of citizens of Albany, Oreg., urging Congress to restrict or prohibit the advertising by radio or television of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

706. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of residents of Colora and Rising Sun, Md., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in our magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

707. Also, petition of residents of Cecil County, Md., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in our magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

708. By Mr. VAN PELT: Petition of Mrs. Leonard J. Giebink, of Waupun, Wis., and 43 other residents of this community in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2188, to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television, and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

709. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Northeast Washington Citizens Association, Washington, D. C., protesting the reduction of the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia for 1953; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 5, 1952

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 1, 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:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the new week and for the new day bathed in the glory of this flowering month of May; for the dawn orchestra of birds' songs, for the fragrance and tint of the tiniest flower, for the mystic beauty of lights and shadows weaving patterns of splendor across the verdant fields and templed hills. Through it all and in the laughter and tears of our fellow pilgrims, and in our own souls, tune our hearts to hear Thy voice, that we may know we are not alone.

Grant us vistas of the strength that waits to be added to our weakness, for the great enterprise of world brotherhood committed to our hands. So gird the lives of Thy servants here in the ministry of public affairs that they may make decisions greatly, walk on the high levels of noble purpose and, with kindling sympathies as wide as human need, in all things quit themselves like men. In the Redeemer's blessed name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 1, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States 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. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5652) authorizing the Oregon State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into north slough, Coos County, Oreg.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CHAVEZ was excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate until May 15.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORSE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing through May 17.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact 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 communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS (S. Doc. No. 124)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953, in the amount of $3,500,000, for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. Doc. No. 125)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953, in the amount of $84,000, for the Department of Justice, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Louie How or How Louie from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on August 1, 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO HEADQUARTERS OF AIR POLICE IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, on the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TEMPORARY SUPPLEMENTAL AID FOR SCHOOLS IN CRITICAL DEFENSE AREAS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve and extend the duration of Public Law No. 874 of the Eighty-first Congress, to provide temporary supplementary aid for schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NECESSARY OFFICE EXPENSES FOR CERTAIN UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that United States commissioners who are required to devote full time to the duties of the office may be allowed their necessary office expenses (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a dependent exemption even though the gross income of the dependent is $600 or more, if the dependent is in full attendance at an approved school, college, or university, and further to provide an additional exemption or a deduction for a taxpayer who is in full attendance at an approved school, college, or university

"Whereas thousands of young men and women seek higher education in the schools, colleges, and universities of this country each year; and

"Whereas the costs of tuition, books, materials, and sustenance have advanced rapidly in the past few years, thereby making it more difficult for families of limited means to provide their children with the advantages of higher education; and

"Whereas in many cases students are required to extend their earning power to the maximum to assist their parents in providing the funds to meet the costs of higher education; and

"Whereas under existing inflationary conditions a student is often capable of earning by part-time employment sums in excess of $600 annually, resulting, under present law, in the loss of his status as a dependent; and

"Whereas the loss of this dependent exemption results in a tax increase of at least $133.20 annually, coming at a time when the family is hard pressed for every dollar to continue the child's education; and

"Whereas thousands of self-supporting students, in earning necessary funds to meet the costs of higher education, earn sums in excess of $600 annually, resulting in a substantial tax on the excess; and

"Whereas higher education is one of the pillars of our democracy, and it is therefore desirable that all seeking to obtain the benefits thereof should be encouraged and assisted in every way possible to attain that end: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to amend the Internal Revenue Code by providing:

"(a) That a taxpayer shall not lose his right to claim an exemption for a dependent even though the gross income of the dependent is $600 or more, provided the dependent is in full attendance upon a regular full-time program leading to a degree or diploma at an approved school, college, or university which meets the educational requirements of the State in which it is located; and

"(b) That a taxpayer who is a student enrolled on a full-time basis in an approved school, college, or university shall be entitled to an additional $600 exemption or entitled to claim a deduction from gross income of the amount actually expended by him from his earnings for tuition, books, and materials, not exceeding, however, the sum of $600.

"2. That the secretary of state is hereby directed forthwith to transmit a copy of this joint resolution, properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, to the respective Presiding Officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and to all of the Senators and Representatives from New Jersey in the Congress.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

A resolution adopted by the Northeast Washington Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, favoring restoration of Federal payment to the District government to $12,000,000 in the District of Columbia appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring restoration of necessary appropriations to the Department of Labor, relating to the consumers' price index; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A cablegram in the nature of a petition from the medical and dental officers of Rheinmain Air Base, Frankfurt, Germany, signed by W. E. Whelan, relating to the length of their service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the director, civil defense, State of Florida, Jacksonville, Fla., notifying the Senate that the State of Florida submits a duly authenticated copy of an interstate civil defense compact ratified by that State (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Resolutions adopted by the Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party of New York State, New York, N. Y., relating to the Defense Production Act, and so forth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A cablegram in the nature of a petition from the Puerto Rico Railroad Brotherhood, San Juan, P. R., signed by Primitivo Melendez, president, and Mariano Ducrett, secretary, praying for the prompt approval of the constitution of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5048. A bill relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal-revenue laws; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1507).

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

S. 2690. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make unlawful certain practices of ticket agents engaged in selling air transportation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1508).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 3101. A bill for the relief of Inger Larson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 3102. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to John Takes Gun sole heir of the estate of Marie Takes Enemy;

S. 3103. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Wallace W. Pease;

S. 3104. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to the heirs of the estate of Ray Bluebud, allotment 1671; and

S. 3105. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to the heirs of the estate of Lee Bluebud, Allotment 1669; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CAIN, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. WELKER, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SEATON, and Mr. DUFF):

S. 3106. A bill for the relief of the owners of certain steel plants, possession of which has been taken by the Government under Executive Order 10340; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3107. A bill for the relief of Owen Lowrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3108. A bill to extend national service life insurance benefits to certain members of the Armed Forces who died in combat with the Japanese forces prior to April 20, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 3109. A bill to authorize the issuance of 300,000 special nonquota immigration visas to certain refugees, persons of German ethnic origin, and natives of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3110. A bill for the relief of Nikolas Walleri; and

S. 3111. A bill for the relief of Eusebio Asla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3112. A bill for the relief of Kuniko Vicent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3113. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of the use as a wildlife refuge of the area included in the Lower Souris Migratory Waterfowl Refuge in North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3114. A bill for the relief of Hezron Moxey and Leeton Ambrister; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3115. A bill to modify the comprehensive plans for flood control in the Missouri River Basin to provide for the inclusion in such plans of adequate elementary and high school facilities at Newton, N. D., to replace the facilities located in Sanish and Van Hook, N. D., which are to be abandoned as a result of the construction of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3116. A bill for the relief of L. R. Swarthout and the legal guardian of Harold Swarthout;

S. 3117. A bill for the relief of Lew Shee; and

S. 3118. A bill for the relief of Kiyoko Oda Hitesman and Maria Hitesman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND (by request):

S. 3119. A bill for the relief of Albert H. Gilpin; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3120. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal financial participation for old-age assistance, and to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children;

S. 3121. A bill to increase the amount which old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries may earn in covered employment without loss of benefits; and

S. 3122. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize the extension of Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance to employees of institutions of higher education who are covered by State or local government retirement systems; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

RELIEF OF OWNERS OF CERTAIN STEEL PLANTS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of the owners of certain steel plants, possession of which has been taken by the Government under Executive Order 10340.

I am very hopeful that early and favorable consideration may be given to the proposed legislation, and that the steel dispute may be settled within the framework of the Labor-Management Relations Act. It is my belief that the bill sets forth an expedient method of overcoming the arbitrary seizure of the steel industry.

The bill (S. 3106) for the relief of the owners of certain steel plants, possession of which has been taken by the Government under Executive Order 10340, introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture 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.

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. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address delivered by him at the Hungarian Freedom Day celebration, at Trenton, N. J., on April 27, 1952.

By Mr. GREEN:

Address delivered by him on acceptance of bust of John Paul Jones, in the Capitol.

By Mr. CAIN:

A sketch of Senator CAIN, published in Congressional Quarterly News Features of March 7, 1952.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorials commenting on address delivered by him before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 19, and address delivered by him before the Engineers Club of Lehigh Valley, Pa., on April 16, 1952.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Statement prepared by him, together with quotation from a recent book review by John Higgins Williams, published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of March 9, 1952, on the book, Eisenhower, the Man and the Symbol, written by John Gunther.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Address by Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane, United States Navy (retired), Chairman Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administrator, United States Department of Commerce, before Baltimore Association of Commerce, at Baltimore, Md., on April 9, 1952.

Article entitled "Church Honors Negro Mother: State-Born Mrs. Thomas is Catholic Mother of Year," published in the Baltimore Sun of May 5, 1952.

Letter from Baltimore Association of Commerce to him relating to proposed Federal Bureau of Accident Prevention.

By Mr. BENTON:

Address entitled "Why We Are Doing So Badly in the Ideological War," delivered at Georgetown University by Dr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion.

Letter addressed to him by Mr. Marion B. Folsom, chairman of the board of trustees, Committee for Economic Development.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Editorial entitled "Immigration Omnibus," published in the Washington Post of April 30, 1952.

Editorial entitled "The New Immigration Bill," published in the New York Times of May 1, 1952.

By Mr. GEORGE:

Editorial entitled "Rule by Law at Stake," published in the New York Times of May 5, 1952.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article entitled "The Next 6 Months Will Decide," published in Christopher News Notes for May 1952.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Article entitled "Fees at French Ports Cost United States $2 to $6 To Land Each Soldier," published in the Washington Evening Star of May 4, 1952.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Editorial entitled, "Facts, Not Words, on the Steel Seizure," written by C. P. Ives and published in the Baltimore Sun of April 28, 1952; also an editorial entitled "The Steel Case in the Supreme Court," written by C. P. Ives and published in the Baltimore Sun of May 5, 1952.

By Mr. TOBEY:

Statement regarding the national debt, written by Mr. Chandler Hovey, banker, of Boston, Mass.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Address entitled "The Role of Sea Power in Modern War," delivered by Hon. Dan A. Kimball, Secretary of the Navy, at Detroit, Mich., April 25, 1952.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Letter entitled "POW's Must Be Protected," dated April 21, 1952, addressed to the editor of the Washington Post, and signed by nine citizens, including Representatives JUDD, of Minnesota and Senator DOUGLAS.

Winning oration entitled "The Privileges and Responsibilities of the Individual Under the Constitution," delivered by Gerald Goldman, of Chicago, Ill., in the American Legion Department of Illinois oratorical contest.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "To Stop Wasting Our Ex-Presidents," published in the New York Times magazine section of April 27, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Office for Former Presidents," published in the Houston Chronicle of April 6, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Our Former Presidents Should Not Become Ghosts," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of April 2, 1952.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF ADOPTION OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement that will not take more than a minute and a half.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 3, all those who believe in freedom had the welcome opportunity to observe the one hundred and sixty-first anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. This opportunity was taken advantage of in many communities throughout the free world, and especially by our many fine citizens of Polish origin and descent in Massachusetts. I want very much to take this moment or two today, since the Senate was not in session on May 3, to pay tribute briefly and modestly to the magnificent courage and devotion to freedom's cause which have characterized the history and the people of Poland since the tenth century.

In these terribly troubled times, when freedom everywhere is threatened as it has never been in all the world's history, we are grateful indeed for the example of fortitude and continuous aspiration toward freedom which has characterized Poland and her people for nearly a thousand years.

In those 10 turbulent centuries the Polish people have known grief and tragedy in many forms. They have seen their beautiful land partitioned four times, with many of their citizens ruthlessly killed and many thousands of others sent into permanent exile. However, throughout all their tribulations the Polish people have continued to pray and to speak and to work for that freedom without which life is not worth living. Their constitution of 1791 expresses wonderfully their firm determination in this vital regard.

We are grateful, as we observe the one hundred and sixty-first anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, for this opportunity to pay tribute to the Polish people in Massachusetts, in all our 48 States, and throughout the world, but even more importantly to take heart ourselves from the example which they have so magnificently set for all of us, in freedom's name and in freedom's holy cause.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Saturday was Polish Constitution Day, of which some note was taken by the Senate last Thursday. Since the Senate was not in session on Saturday, I ask unanimous consent to speak briefly on this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in times of misfortune, people's thoughts invariably turn back to happier and more inspiring days of the past. This is particularly true of the Polish people who, after all the sufferings they have endured and the sacrifices they have made for freedom, find themselves once again enslaved in their homeland by Soviet imperialism. Last Saturday, May 3, the anniversary of their first democratic constitution, the Polish people, in and out of Poland, joined in commemoration of this great national event. The adoption of the constitution in 1791 constitutes one of the brightest and most significant landmarks in Poland's entire history. The event came at a time when nearly all of the nation was parceled out among the three greedy monarchs of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Yet a small band of patriotic, farsighted, and dauntless Poles dared to draft and to present to the country this document of freedom.

That constitution made Poland a constitutional monarchy with a responsible, cabinet form of government. Ancient class distinctions and privileges were wiped out, and the government was strengthened by bringing the peasantry under the protection of the law. What is, perhaps, even more significant for those days and for that part of the world, was the fact that this constitution guaranteed absolute religious freedom. In this and in other ways, the Polish Constitution was in the vanguard of democracy's advance into central and eastern Europe.

In commemorating the one hundred and sixty-first anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, we are paying our respects to the memory of its creators—some of the most valiant figures in the heritage of western democracy.

Those figures are part of the American heritage today. The deeds and sacrifices, and the views and ideals, of men like Pulaski, Kosciusco, and Chopin are, indeed, an integral part of our traditions. These men, and many others I could name, developed from the same ideological ferment that produced George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson in our own land.

The Polish Constitution of 1791, the French Constitution of 1792, and the American Constitution of 1787, are among the great landmarks in the growth and development of constitutional law the world over.

Throughout the years there have come to our land millions of men, women, and children of Polish birth. They have brought to this country the rich heritage of their own culture along with the passionate love of freedom and order under law which was their birthright. These traditions and qualities have been amalgamated into the tradition that we call American. America has been enriched and western civilization has been enriched by this process.

In these dark days of challange to the values of individual dignity and of government under law it is good for all people to recall the widespread origins and the deep-rooted foundations of these ideals and values.

Americans of Polish descent, in observing constitution day, knows that behind the iron curtain in Poland, millions of freedom-loving Poles are making mental note of this day. I know that the love of freedom still lives in that unhappy land. Such a love cannot be extinguished, not even by all the slave labor camps and repressive means of Soviet tyranny. Freedom will come again to Poland, and a new constitution, and a new government under law, deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed, will one day be reestablished in the land of the Vistula. All Americans and all freedom-loving people everywhere join in hope and prayer for the speedy coming of that day.

Mr. O'CONOR subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today certain statements were made by several Senators in regard to Polish Constitution Day. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at that point a statement which I have prepared.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

POLAND

The Constitution of the United States means much to every loyal American, not only as a safeguard for his prized freedoms but because it is a symbol to all the world of the meaning of American citizenship. We can understand, therefore, the feelings of loyal citizens of Poland, and of their friends and relatives in this country, many of them of Polish birth, in connection with the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, May 3.

It has been my privilege on many happier occasions in the past to participate with that great group of Maryland citizens whose forefathers came from Poland and who naturally, therefore, take great pride in the contribution made by the people of that great land to world civilization in past years.

Today Poland suffers untold anguish at the hands of a godless world movement which knows not the meaning of justice or decency and which makes the practice of either a felony punishable by death. On the occasion of this 1952 celebration it is entirely appropriate to express, on behalf of our own State of Maryland, and, I am sure, on behalf of every patriotic resident of this country, our heartfelt sympathy at the unfortunate fate that has befallen them, and our sincere wishes for a brighter future free from the slavery which now oppresses them.

Though they are held captive now by the might of brute force, their thoughts and hopes, their culture and traditions are all linked inseparably with the ideologies and the principles which have been the basis of American hopes and progress from the very beginnings of this country.

Our people realize that the great masses of Polish people today are as firmly imbued with their age-old convictions, and are as deeply determined to regain their freedom at the first opportunity as their forebears ever were in all the turbulent history of bygone years.

Let us extend to them, therefore, assurances of our sympathetic interest in their welfare and our desire and decision to do anything within our power to assist them when the time comes when such assistance may be effective. They are living in a dark hour, but the Polish people have survived dark years in the past and have emerged stronger and with a deeper love for their freedoms and a firmer desire to realize to the fullest upon the wealth of culture and progress which has been handed down to them through the years.

May this be the last Constitutional Day anniversary that will find their territory occupied by a foreign conqueror. May they and all the suffering people of eastern Europe now ranged unwillingly with the U. S. S. R. awake some day soon to a happier day when they can be free from the sorrow that now overwhelms them.

Mr. MOODY subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with Polish Constitution Day, to which reference has been made by other Senators, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a brief statement prepared by me.

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

The Polish people and the people of the United States are linked together in friendship by many bonds. None of these is of greater significance than the fact that we share a common belief in freedom and national independence. Even through the years of suffering under foreign oppression, the Poles have clung to these great ideas.

It was to give tangible form to them that they evolved and enacted the constitution of 1791, one of the great documents of the archives of world democracy. Had the Poles been permitted to develop their nation in peace under this constitution, their government might have led all Central and Eastern Europe into the camp of democracy. The constitution of 1791 was ideally suited to the conditions that then prevailed in that part of the world. It provided for government of ministerial responsibility. A host of ancient privileges and prerogatives, formerly enjoyed by a few, were abolished, and a rough equalitarianism was established along broadly democratic lines. Class distinctions were eliminated and the full protection of the government was extended to the peasants. Absolute religious freedom became the law of the land. Small wonder that this document won the admiration of the great English liberal, Edmund Burke, and brought upon the heads of its founding fathers the full fury of the autocratic powers that had partitioned Poland.

It is natural for Americans who share with Poles the ideals of freedom so ably expressed by their eighteenth century leaders to join with them in commemorating this anniversary.

MOTION PICTURE "MY SON, JOHN"

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one day last week, in the company of the Vice President, and others, it was my privilege to witness a private showing of a great motion picture which has just been released by Paramount Pictures Corp. The title of the picture is "My Son, John." Among other things, it marks the return to the screen, after 17 years of absence, of America's outstanding actress, Helen Hayes. This unusually important and impressive motion picture opens in Washington on May 7.

"My Son, John" was directed and produced by Leo McCarey, who ranks as one of our country's outstanding directors. In addition to Helen Hayes, it features such outstanding personalities of the American screen as Robert Walker, Van Heflin, Dean Jagger, and a number of other stars. I ask unanimous consent that the names of those associated with the production of the picture be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

MY SON, JOHN

Producer and director.	Leo McCarey.
Adaptation by	John Lee Mahin.
Screen play by	Myles Conolly and Leo McCarey.
Story by	Leo McCarey.
Director of photography.	Harry Stradling, A. S. C.
Art direction	Hal Pereira and William Flannery.
Edited by	Marvin Coil, A. C. E.
Orchestrations by	Robert Russell Bennett.
Costumes	Edith Head.
Special photographic effects.	Gordon Jennings, A. S. C.
Process photography	Parciot Edouart, A. S. C.
Set decoration	Sam Comer and Emile Kuri.
Make-up supervision	Wally Westmore.
Sound recording by	Gene Merritt and Gene Garvin.
Music score by	Robert Emmett Dolan.

CAST

Lucille Jefferson	Helen Hayes.
John Jefferson	Robert Walker.
Mr. Stedman	Van Heflin.
Dan Jefferson	Dean Jagger.
Dr. Carver	Minor Watson.
Father O'Dowd	Frank McHugh.
Ruth Carlin	Irene Winston.
Ben Jefferson	James Young.
Chuck Jefferson	Richard Jaeckel.
Bedford	Tod Karns.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to add that this is a picture which I believe should be seen by the people of every American home. Not since the great screen picture Birth of a Nation, which was filmed during World War I, has there been a picture which has so stirred America patriotically as this production by Leo McCarey entitled "My Son, John." It has as its locale a typical American community, which happens to be Manassas, Va., but which could be any American city. It deals with the great global conflict between communism and godlessness on the one hand and the patriotic purposes and principles of our cherished American concepts on the other. We find woven into the plot of this exciting picture the background of the Alger Hiss espionage case, the background of the Judith Coplon spy case, and the background of the W. K. Remington disloyalty case.

Americans who have read about Hiss, Coplon, Remington, and others will recognize their prototype in My Son, John. The evil poisons of godless communism and the tragedies they cause are faithfully and feelingly depicted in this picture, which is undoubtedly the greatest, most stirring pro-American motion picture of the past decade.

It appeals to me that this is a picture which patriotic organizations throughout the country, parent-teachers' associations, churches, fraternal groups, and educational groups should join in bringing to the attention of their communities. It is magnificent entertainment, and a dramatic production of high patriotic motive. It should be seen by every American who has eagerly been waiting for Hollywood to produce a stirring and memorable drama portraying with patriotic overtones and motives the idealogical clash which has become the major problem of our times.

May I also state, Mr. President, that Columbia's magnificent new picture, Walk East on Beacon, is another gripping and compelling picture on the same theme and demonstrating dramatically how America's great FBI is operating to penetrate and punish the conspiratorial Communist-spy apparatus in America. Hollywood is to be congratulated on these two new and intensely patriotic pictures. It is devoutly to be desired that they will be followed by many more of similar nature.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair reminds Senators that the Senate is now engaged in the transaction of routine business. The Chair will not recognize any Senator for a speech at this time, and will not do so until he has laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, to be read.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Chair also include a motion to rerefer?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Such a motion is in order under the rules at any time when a bill is before the Senate, but it is not now in order, while the Senate is engaged in the transaction of routine business.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 458)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for national flood insurance, and for other purposes, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 3086.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This bill was made the unfinished business on Thursday, but the bill itself was not reported to the Senate until Wednesday of last week, during the recess of the Senate, under a unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Monday, April 28. Therefore the Chair, without objection, will regard the first and the second readings of the bill, which are required under the rules of the Senate, as having been held.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the first two readings are considered as having been held, will a motion to refer the bill be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A motion to refer is in order at any time while the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to do so, provided I do not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, the Senator from California may yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Benton	Hennings	Moody
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Mundt
Byrd	Humphrey	Murray
Cain	Hunt	Neely
Carlson	Ives	Nixon
Case	Jenner	O'Conor
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Seaton
Duff	Langer	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Long	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Magnuson	Stennis
Ellender	Malone	Taft
Ferguson	Maybank	Thye
Flanders	McCarran	Tobey
Frear	McCarthy	Watkins
Fulbright	McClellan	Welker
George	McFarland	Wiley
Gillette	McKellar	Williams
Green	McMahon	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose, without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in the light of the fact that we are now about to consider Senate bill 3086, which is a bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, it

would be well for every Member of the Senate to ponder the thought-provoking article, entitled "United States Tries Too Hard To Teach Needy Countries Its Ways," which appeared in yesterday's issue of the New York Times. Mr. President, I now send this article to the desk and ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

UNITED STATES TRIES TOO HARD TO TEACH NEEDY COUNTRIES ITS WAYS—AMERICAN TECHNIQUES ARE NOT ALWAYS BEST UNDER OTHER CONDITIONS, U. N. EXPERTS FIND

GENEVA, May 3.—Experience gained over a period of several years in the field of technical assistance to underdeveloped Communist-threatened countries has convinced many western officials that the United States is getting too little done by trying to do too much.

These officials do not mean too much money is being put into the programs. There is no visible limit to the amount of help the underdeveloped areas of the world could use. What is meant is that the United States is trying to do too much of the helping by itself.

The United Nations Technical Assistance Board concluded one of its frequent meetings here today. It is the top body that guides and tries to coordinate the United Nations agencies in various kinds of technical-aid programs. Most of the problems reports to this group and discussions that of this kind of operation are reflected in arise within it.

UNITED STATES SPENDS FAR THE MOST

The United States is the largest financial contributor to the United Nations programs of technical assistance. It also has programs of its own administered by United State Government departments under the State Department's general supervision. At present more than 10 times as much is being spent by the United States on its unilateral programs as on those conducted through United Nations agencies.

Both United States and European officials in close touch with this work have been convinced for a long time that a United Nations agency can get more results for a dollar's expenditure in most underdeveloped areas than the United States can get operating alone. This is because a very large part of the problem is always to get the local governments to accept conditions that will make assistance effective. The United Nations body can afford to be much tougher about insisting on the right conditions than can the United States, which to an increasing extent is finding local governments unwilling to face the criticism that they are taking American dictation.

But the fundamental weakness of the present American approach as these officials see it is the result of a much more subtle factor than the choice of the machinery whereby technical assistance is proffered to underdeveloped countries.

The American tendency is to regard American techniques as the best for all parts of the world without much reflection or inquiry into what other countries with advanced industrial and scientific knowledge have to offer. When people are taken out of their countries and trained as agricultural economists, public administration officers or engineers the American tendency is to bring them to the United States for training. Similarly American technicians are automatically sent abroad under United States programs and the United States Government usually puts forward American experts to work under the United Nations as well.

SUPREMACY ISN'T ENOUGH

No European or Asian officials would deny that United States industrial supremacy has many features that can be exported or that the United States is the best place for a technician to go for study in many lines of activity. But not in all.

If Korea ceases to be a battlefield and becomes a reconstruction area this problem will become very acute, technical-assistance officials believe. Will it be the wisest to try to teach Koreans American administrative methods, American farming methods, and American health-service procedures?

Trained Korean central bank officials who can understand and carry out monetary controls to stem inflation are desperately needed. Several are being trained now. But they are being trained in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, whose size, complexity, and policies give it hardly any resemblance to the kind of central banking operation the Koreans will need to know how to conduct.

Would it not be wiser, officials are asking, to train Korean central bankers in India or Siam, both of which have excellent central-bank staffs and where they would see how to deal with matters that resemble their own Korean problems?

Many western officials are convinced that the United States would be politically and financially stronger if it deliberately adopted a policy of giving American aid through the medium of other democratic countries, technicians and institutions. The United Nations machinery is the most obvious but not the only way this policy could be applied.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is my intention to move to re-refer Senate bill 3086 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report to the Senate on or before May 15. I make this motion as one who has supported the North Atlantic Pact and the prior arms implementation bills. I expect to support an authorization bill this year, but I strongly believe there are valid and compelling reasons for the pending legislation to be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Of the $6,900,000,000 involved in this bill, as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, approximately $4,700,000,000 deal with military phases in a direct sense. In other words, 70 percent of the funds authorized relate to a field in which the Armed Services Committee has a direct and vital interest. I might also say, Mr. President, that when the arms implementation bill was before the Senate a year ago, it was considered by both the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, sitting jointly. There was resistance to doing that this year by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Until Saturday, May 3, neither the committee report nor the hearings were available to the Members of the Senate or to the public. To claim that a part of a week end is sufficient to give study to this complex legislation is absurd.

A week or 10 days of hearings before the Armed Services Committee will permit Members of the Senate to study the report of the Foreign Relations Committee and the hearings that are now available. The Armed Services Committee would undoubtedly concentrate on the military, rather than the economic phase of the bill.

Even with the $1,000,000,000 reduction recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee, this bill still provides for $6,900,000,000. This amount, while it may seem small to some who are used to dealing with astronomical figures, is nevertheless equivalent to the total Federal budget for the fiscal year 1938. It is larger by a billion seven hundred million dollars than our total budget receipts for the fiscal year 1940.

It is my judgment that if this bill passes in its present form any hope for a balanced budget for the coming fiscal year is impossible of realization. I call attention to page 79 of the hearings. On that page there appear some figures relative to the public debt of Belgium-Luxemburg, France, Italy, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, in contrast to our own debt now amounting to $260,000,000,000.

Several of these nations are operating on balanced budgets and are to be commended for so doing. Based on the figures presented to us by the President of the United States, we will be operating with a $14,000,000,000 deficiency. All of the $6,900,000,000 authorized by this bill, if subsequently appropriated for by the Congress, will be from borrowed money and the result of deficit financing. I do not underestimate the serious financial problem facing our Nation, but that is not the only reason for my motion.

On my responsibility as a Senator and as a member of the Armed Services Committee, of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Armed Services, and of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy I believe that we are taking a calculated risk with our national defenses, air, sea, and land, which, as the elected representatives of the American people, we should not take without further examination by the committee which is primarily responsible for our armed services.

The Constitution of the United States provides, in article I, section 8, that—

> The Congress shall have power to * * * provide for the common defense * * * to raise and support armies * * * to provide and maintain a Navy—

And while, of course, the Constitution did not mention the Air Force the same responsibility rests with the Congress with respect to that branch of the Armed Forces. Partly because the President of the United States froze the funds provided by Congress in 1949 we have lost invaluable and never to be recaptured time in having an adequate Air Force in being.

Since June of 1950, we have been engaged in an undeclared war in Korea. Our ground forces there today are outnumbered more than 2 to 1. Our fighting planes are often outnumbered from 2 to 4 to 1.

Approximately one-half of our planes are obsolete or at least obsolescent.

It is my belief that men have unnecessarily died in obsolescent planes in Korea because this great Nation of ours, pioneer in the field of aviation, has not

the present capacity or available funds to give our Air Force planes which are second to none.

While our present limited aviation capacity and funds have been channeled to equip NATO countries with modern jet planes, we have, partly as a result of this concentration, temporarily lost superiority in jet commercial transportation to Great Britain as a recent flight from London to Johannesburg has indicated.

How much of the morale factor in the Air Force stems from our flyers being asked to fight the Korean war and if necessary world war III to a large extent in left-over planes from the last war? It may well be vital to the security of this Nation and to the ultimate defense of the free world to have from one to three modern carriers capable of striking and moving attacks along the periphery of the potential aggressor nations rather than to have all of our eggs in fixed bases which may or may not be available to us when the chips are down.

How much in port charges, mentioned by the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and taxes to foreign governments are we paying out of our mutual defense funds to our allies that should be going into planes, guns and ships?

In the committee hearings, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] properly raised the question as to the relative cost of equipping and maintaining a European Army compared to the cost of equipping and maintaining an American Army. The figures are most interesting. A chart is set forth on page 23 of the committee report. However, there is a significant omission. It does not show what it would cost to equip and maintain Asiatic forces who also believe in resisting communism. Such forces could be of tremendous help in holding the Pacific flank of the free world.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, is the Senator from California willing to yield at this time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should prefer to finish my statement, after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is one question I should like to ask in relation to the pending appropriation bill. I would be glad to have it placed at the end of the Senator's remarks. I may be unable to remain. I desire to remain, if possible, but the nomination of the Attorney General is to be considered by the Judiciary Committee, and that may require me to leave.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the circumstances, I am very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish today to call attention to the fact that the original act, namely, the National Security Act, authorizing the appropriation, was referred to the Armed Services Committee. Section 307, authorizing the appropriation, provides:

> There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act—

Indicating that the Armed Services Committee has authority over appropriations for the military. As I understand, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is a common defense instrumentality, so that it is really a part of our own Military Establishment. If that be true, should not this authorization go to the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In my opinion, the Senator is quite correct. I think every argument I have heard made before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services, on which the very able Senator from Michigan serves with me, indicates that our own Joint Chiefs of Staff have supported this program because it is a part of the common defense. While I quite agree that there are certain phases of the bill dealing with the economic factors involved which might properly go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I think the precedent which was established last year should have been followed by both committees, because under our system the responsibility, committeewise, rests with the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Returning to the question of the relative costs of manpower mentioned in the committee report, that part of it which apparently is overlooked, some study should be made of what the cost and potentialities are of Asiatic forces from the Republic of Korea, the Republic of China, Japan, Thailand, the Philippines, and Pakistan, and any other Asiatic country that was willing to carry its fair share of the load in resisting Communist aggressions in that area of the world. Some very significant testimony was taken not long ago by the Senate Armed Services Committee relative to the progress made by the United States Military Mission on Formosa of the relative cost of equipping and maintaining the Nationalist forces there compared with other areas of the world.

Yet, on page 604 of the hearings, it is shown that when Formosa was being discussed only two members of the Foreign Relations Committee were present.

The arms aid bill needs to be integrated with our own defense requirements. I would like to get the frank opinions of our Joint Chiefs of Staff as to how they would divide the total defense figures of some $60,000,000,000, including our own defense as well as military aid abroad, if that total sum was to be reduced and instructions given that no further jets were to be sent to other nations until the United States Air Force was completely equipped with modern planes.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I do not believe I would be discharging my obligation to the Senate if these facts were not now called to the attention of the Senate.

In Korea a hot war is now going on. We are supplying 90 percent of the Armed Forces and our 107,000 casualties are 93 percent of casualties suffered by United Nations members.

How many of the nations that are getting aid under this bill have abided by the letter and the spirit of section 511, A and B, and how many of them have been spoon-fed American dollars while they fail to comply with the clear congressional intent?

We have heard the argument that we could not get better than a stalemate in Korea because we did not have the power to win the undeclared war there. A partial answer to that suggestion may be that we have in part an outnumbered and outmoded air force and we have not provided the modern planes and carriers for our naval air program. I am not in favor of Americans being asked to risk their lives in a second-best air force or with inferior land or sea equipment.

The Nation would be shocked if it knew the calculated risks we were taking with the security of this heart land of human freedom and with the lives of young men who may have to meet a Soviet air force outnumbering them materially. We are the elected representatives of this Nation. It is long past time for us to cease abdicating our responsibilities to the executive branch.

Mr. President, I move that Senate bill 3086 be rereferred to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report to the Senate on or before May 15.

Mr. CAIN and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Because of the obvious common sense and logic in the remarks of the Senator from California I should like to express my admiration for what my friend from California has said so clearly and to state that I am anxious to vote for the motion which has just been made by him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall vote with the Senator from California, but I should like to ask for his comments on two points I did not hear him mention in his speech.

He has referred to the mutual security bill which is the bill now before the Senate, which authorizes $6,900,000,000. We have been hearing witnesses on the defense appropriation bill, and the issue is whether to cut down expenditures from $52,000,000,000 to $40,000,000,000 as was done in the House. I should like to ask the Senator from California if I am not correct in stating that last week the President sent to the Congress a message authorizing additional public works appropriations, of which $2,600,000,000 would go to the armed services. I point out to the Senator that the House subcommittee dealing with defense appropriations cut out half of the appropriation required for public works in the fiscal year 1953. The whole question will come before the Armed Services Committee.

Another item is with reference to atomic energy. In the testimony it was stated very frankly that there would be another supplemental request for something over $4,000,000,000 for additional atomic energy plants made necessary by the national defense.

All these items are concerned with the national defense and the building up of mutual aid abroad, together with the building up of our fighting forces in Korea.

I agree with the Senator from California that the bill should go to the Armed Services Committee for review, but am I not correct in stating that the other two items are an integral part of the whole question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I quite agree with the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe they are closely integrated with the problem in the over-all defense picture. Under our rules, the Armed Services Committee has a very peculiar responsibility in the field of defense; and I might say, as one who serves not only on the Committee on Armed Services but on the Subcommittee on Appropriations and also on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, that the problems are closely interrelated, because we obviously cannot deliver atomic weapons by jeep or by horseback. We must have modernized air equipment in order to make delivery. So the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts fits into the whole picture. If we are to reach a condition even of a reasonable balancing of the budget it is essential to review the whole defense picture in one big package. I think no Senator will disagree with the statement that it is highly unlikely that this Congress will pass additional tax legislation. We are already levying more taxes than we did at the height of World War II. There will have to be some reductions or some redistributions among the funds left. I do not believe that can intelligently be done unless it is tied in with the whole defense picture.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not the Senator's intention, if the bill is referred, not necessarily to go into the details which the Foreign Relations Committee has covered so thoroughly in its report, but to try to get an over-all look at the entire picture?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. I have supported the North Atlantic Pact because I do not believe it is in our national interest to permit communism to overrun what is left of the free world. Where I have differed with some aspects of our foreign policy is that we were closing the door to communism in Europe and leaving the door open in Asia.

I wish to say to the able Senator from Iowa so as to indicate that there will be no chance of great delay in getting the bill out of committee, that my motion itself provides that the Committee on Armed Services shall report back to the Senate on or before the 15th of May.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator from California, as he has analyzed the report, realize that the Committee on Foreign Relations, in its wisdom, has put into the report and the bill new elements of flexibility, and that the transitions made between economic and military aid are tied into the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I am familiar with what the committee did.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for two questions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. My first question is, Does the Senator from California believe that the Committee on Foreign Relations was in any way lax or derelict in its duty to investigate thoroughly?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, I will say to the able Senator from Iowa. I think he knows me well enough to understand that I have a very high regard for him and for the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think it has its field of jurisdiction, and I am not suggesting for a moment that it was not entirely proper for the Committee on Foreign Relations to give this subject a thorough hearing and to make its report to the Senate from the point of view of the Committee on Foreign Relations. But I am suggesting, most respectfully, in view of the precedent of last year, that both committees should sit jointly, and in view of the very direct responsibility the Committee on Armed Services has with the national defense, it is also just as proper and just as necessary, in my judgment, for the Committee on Armed Services to have an opportunity to consider the facts and develop some questions which perhaps the Committee on Foreign Relations did not have either the background or the knowledge to develop.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator, and shall now propound my other question. I hope the Senator from California will not deduce from my questions any imputation of improper action, but I wish to ask him if in making the motion he has now submitted he is acting under his undoubted right and responsibility as an individual Senator, or whether he is acting by direction of the Committee on Armed Services or its chairman.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am acting on my own responsibility as a United States Senator and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I am not acting under instructions of the Committee on Armed Services.

While I was recently in California, on a very brief visit, I understand some discussion of the subject took place in the Armed Services Committee. Prior to the time I had left for California, and at the time the bill was originally referred, it had been the unanimous judgment of the Armed Services Committee that they should either sit in with the Committee on Foreign Relations or have the bill re-referred to the Armed Services Committee. I understand there has been some change of mind on the part of some members of the committee since that time, but today I am acting on my own responsibility as a Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to ask the Senator from California if he could give us an estimate of the time it might require for the Committee on Armed Services to go into this matter thoroughly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Perhaps the Senator from Michigan was not in the Chamber when I began my remarks, but my motion itself provides that the Committee on Armed Services shall report back to the Senate on or before May 15. That represents a period of 10 days. As I judge the situation, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, it would not be our purpose to duplicate all the testimony which has been taken by the Committee on Foreign Relations, or to send for many of the same witnesses, some of whom may now be in Europe, or to deal particularly with the economic phases of the bill.

However, with the knowledge we have, I feel that there are certain aspects, tying in with our own defense and affecting American aviators who are flying obsolete and obsolescent planes in Korea, which at least need to be integrated and gone into by the Committee on Armed Services.

Of course, I fully appreciate that the Senate in its wisdom may determine that it does not desire to rerefer the bill, but, as I have pointed out in my remarks, I feel I would be derelict in my responsibility if I did not suggest some of the very real problems which exist in our national defense, and say where I believe we are taking certain calculated risks which are not in the interest of the security of our own Nation or, indeed, the security of the free world.

If the Senate, with those facts in mind, wishes to deprive the Committee on Armed Services, which has the responsibility in this field, of this opportunity, then the responsibility rests upon the Senate.

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

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the Senator from California whether he remembers that at the time the mutual security bill was before the Senate, many of us, including possibly the Senator from California—though my memory is not clear about that—felt that military features should be referred to the Army, and that point 4 features should go to the State Department. Without asking the Senator from California how he felt about it, I will say that I felt very strongly that way.

I feel that the time has arrived when our unwisdom in putting these two disparate projects under one heading is beginning to show itself. Point 4 should have come through the State Department, or some other agency equipped to speak on that subject, to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Armament matters relating to NATO in Europe normally belong in the Committee on Armed Services. It seems to me that we are simply reaping the results of our own unwisdom. I can see no other way of handling the situation than along the lines suggested in the motion made by the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Vermont. I may say to him, since he raised the question, that my own feeling consistently has been that the arms and armament features which are

very definitely related to our own defense should be considered by the Committee on Armed Services. As I understand the Senator from Vermont, I do not believe I can join him in suggesting that there should be two bills. However, time has shown that there may have been a good deal of wisdom in the suggestion the Senator has made, which would have avoided a situation of the kind in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator will recall that this year, as also last year, I was one of those who favored a joint meeting of the two committees because of the danger of the interrelation of different jurisdictions. Therefore I should like to ask the Senator if his motion contemplates that the Committee on Armed Services shall take a new look at the situation and probably suggest recommendations different from those made by the Committee on Foreign Relations, or amend the recommendations which have been made? Where are we going to be after the Committee on Armed Services acts, if it does act?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator from New Jersey that his question covers one of the very reasons why some of us suggested originally that we should follow the precedent of last year, and get the viewpoint of both committees.

As I stated earlier, it is not my intention to delay the bill unnecessarily. I am as interested in carrying out our NATO obligations as is any other Senator, but I also feel that when Americans flying in Korea are being out-numbered 3 or 4 to 1, when American aviators are flying obsolescent and obsolete planes which are being shot down in flames, we do have the responsibility of reviewing our own actions whenever we have doubt.

I may say to the Senator that so far as the defense features are concerned, if the bill is referred to the Committee on Armed Services under the instructions I have included in my motion, that committee will have to report back to the Senate on or before the 15th of May. I would assume they could make such recommendations as to the bill as a legislative committee might properly make. However, though I have no control over what the committee may do, it would be my idea that they should not go into the economic phases of the bill, but rather that they would concentrate on the military phases, and the effects of the military phases upon our national defense.

For the further information of the Senator, I understand that today, for instance, the fly-away cost of a Saberjet plane approximately $250,000. With all the spare parts, and so forth, the cost mounts up to perhaps $550,000.

I believe that we must very carefully examine certain phases of this question in connection with aid to other countries which have not indicated that they are willing to stand up and be counted in this effort. I also believe that there is an obligation upon the Congress and upon the American people not to let some of those countries violate the letter and spirit of section 511 (a) and (b), wherein the Congress clearly indicated that they should stand up and be counted. In this connection I think there has been considerable winking at that legislative requirement, and an attitude of tongue-in-cheek.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is not arguing, is he, that the Armed Services Committee should take jurisdiction away from the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not arguing that; but I am not agreeing that the Foreign Relations Committee should take jurisdiction away from the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is the reason why the Senator from New Jersey favored joint meetings.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think we would have avoided this difficulty if there had been joint meetings, as the able Senator so clearly indicated.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think we could have avoided the difficulty, but the situation we face now is that that decision was not made at the time. The subject was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. The Foreign Relations Committee has held hearings and has submitted a report, and we are prepared to present the bill to the Senate.

I ask the distinguished Senator from California whether he intends to take a new look at the subject and bring in a different recommendation as to the form of the bill, the amounts, and so forth. If so, what will the parliamentary procedure be? I am seeking light.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from New Jersey in all good humor that I do not intend that this procedure shall be an empty gesture. I do not intend that the Armed Services Committee shall be required to sign a blank check for something which has already been done by the Foreign Relations Committee. If the bill is as good as the Foreign Relations Committee apparently believes it to be, and if that committee has considered all aspects of the situation, there may be very few changes to be made in the bill by the Armed Services Committee. If there are certain aspects relating to our own critical defense needs with respect to which the Foreign Relations Committee lacked the background information, and if there are certain aspects into which the Foreign Relations Committee did not go, I should consider it incumbent upon the Armed Services Committee to make such recommendations to the Senate as it believes should be made. Then the question can be amply discussed in the Senate.

Let me add one additional word. On Friday I tried to obtain a copy of the report, as well as a copy of the hearings. At that time the hearings were in proof form and were not available to me. I was told that it was expected that they would be ready on Saturday. On Saturday my office again inquired. The report was not ready, but it was expected soon. Finally, on Saturday afternoon, I obtained a copy of the report of the Foreign Relations Committee and a copy of the thick bound volume of hearings. I worked rather diligently Saturday evening and Sunday trying to digest as much of the material as possible. It is now Monday. I believe that if the Armed Services Committee should be accorded the limited time which we are requesting to study this proposed legislation, in the meantime the Senate would have an opportunity to study the report and the bill as reported from the committee of which the able Senator from New Jersey is a member.

Mr. President, we are not dealing with peanuts. As I pointed out, even with a reduction of $1,000,000,000 by the Committee on Foreign Relations, the bill still provides for expenditures of $6,900,000,000. That is more money than the entire Federal Government was costing the American people as late as 1938. It is more money than all the taxes taken into the Federal Treasury as late as 1940. I think it is not unreasonable that the 96 Members of this body should have a little more time than one weekend to consider a question of this magnitude. I say again that $6,900,000,000 is not peanuts, although there may be some who think that we are dealing with such astronomical figures that this amount can be handled in one afternoon.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator from California, and I am in sympathy with much of what he has said. I myself had not seen the report until last night. That was because I had been out of the city.

I am still confused as to the parliamentary situation. If the Senator will yield for a parliamentary inquiry, I should like to ask the Chair to advise me as to the parliamentary situation presented by the pending motion. In the event the Armed Services Committee should submit a report which differed from the report of the Foreign Relations Committee, would the Foreign Relations Committee report and recommendation which is now before the Senate be subject to amendment by the Armed Services Committee, or would there be a conflict of jurisdiction? In other words, does the motion of the Senator from California contemplate that jurisdiction would be transferred from the Foreign Relations Committee to the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before the Chair rules, if I may make an observation, I will say that the Senator from California is not proposing, in effect, that the work which the Foreign Relations Committee has done be eliminated and written off the record. The Foreign Relations Committee has held hearings and has submitted a report. The report is before the Senate. The bill is before the Senate. We are now merely asking that the bill be re-referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the bill has already been reported by the Foreign Relations Committee. However, if the Senate Armed Services Committee considers the bill, it will have authority to report it back with amendments so far as the military features are concerned.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Then the original bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee and the amendments recommended by the Armed Services Committee would both be before the Senate for debate when the time came to present the matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They would then be properly before the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to say a word on the parliamentary situation. The Chair has indicated that if the bill were referred to the Armed Services Committee such reference would be only with respect to military items. If the bill is referred to the Committee on Armed Services, the whole bill will be before that committee, and everything in it will be before the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is quite correct. However, the Parliamentarian advises the Chair that by the terms of the motion of the Senator from California the Armed Services Committee would report back only on the military aspects of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the question of amending the Mutual Security Act of 1951 was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That committee commenced hearings on March 13. The hearings continued uninterruptedly from March 13 to April 4. Thereafter the committee went into executive session, and has been considering the bill since that time.

This is only an authorization bill. It does not appropriate any money. It merely authorizes the appropriation of not to exceed a certain amount of money for the various purposes set forth in the Mutual Security Act.

The House committee has not yet acted on the bill. Therefore the entire subject is still before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. When the House acts, if there is a difference between the House and Senate versions of the bill, of course it must go to conference and the differences must be ironed out.

The Appropriations Committee will then consider the question of appropriations. The Foreign Relations Committee has carefully inserted in each item of this authorization the language "not to exceed" a certain amount of money. I know that the practice has developed for the Appropriations Committee to feel more or less bound to appropriate the sum authorized, especially in connection with matters pertaining to our foreign relations. That ought not to be the attitude adopted by the Appropriations Committee.

We have before us a motion to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee. Perhaps such reference would be limited. At any rate, the motion is to refer it to the Armed Services Committee. Had the Armed Services Committee been authorized to sit jointly with the Foreign Relations Committee, as was done last year, much of the difficulty would have been avoided. That was not done. The subject was before the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Foreign Relations Committee proceeded to discharge its duty as best it could. The committee has reported the bill with an over-all reduction of $1,000,000,000. Perhaps the view may be taken in this body that it should be reduced by more than a billion dollars. That is within the competency of the Senate. The bill is now before the Senate. The Senate may reduce it by another billion dollars, by $2,000,000,000, by $3,000,000,000; or the bill may be defeated entirely, if the Senate wishes to do so.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The reason I rise is that I observe that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a copy of the testimony on his desk. I do not find it on my desk. I wondered when it was made available. If there has not been sufficient time given to Senators to consider the matter——

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, Mr. President, that is an entirely different matter. If Senators have not had time properly to consider the measure, action on it should be postponed until they have had such opportunity. I thought that perhaps the measure would be before the Senate for the greater part of the week.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have just now received a copy of the testimony.

Mr. GEORGE. The point I make is that there is no occasion to refer the bill to the Committee on Armed Services at this time, because the subject has been before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and every member of the Armed Services Committee could have attended the hearings for almost 2 months, or at least for a full month of open hearings. Any member of the Committee on Armed Services could have been heard if he had desired to be heard. Any member could have been present at the hearings.

The House committee has not yet reported an authorization bill to the House. When that committee does report it to the House, it may report an authorization bill which is a billion dollars below the Senate bill, or it may report it in the amount contained in the Senate bill. However, whatever is reported to the House, and whatever is passed by the House, the bill must go to conference, and the conference bill will then come before both Houses. It is then that the Committee on Appropriations will consider the matter.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I unhesitatingly say that I believe the Committee on Appropriations should exercise its full jurisdiction. If it believes that it should not recommend an appropriation in the amount contained in this authorization bill, it should reduce the amount to the figure it feels should be appropriated.

However, the point is that if the bill is referred to the Committee on Armed Services, what will we then have? The Committee on Armed Services may come forward with a recommendation that not exceeding so many dollars be appropriated for military purposes. Nearly all the amount contained in the bill is for military purposes. The Committee on Foreign Relations, it is true, is the committee which has jurisdiction over the authorization of expenditure of money even for military purposes in this field. Nearly all of it is for military purposes. Suppose that the Committee on Armed Services should make a different recommendation. In that case the Senate would be confused. On the other hand, the Senate, if it wishes to reduce the respective amounts, or if it wishes to raise them, has full power to do so.

Mr. President, we should debate the question on the floor of the Senate until it is disposed of. It would be confusing, I may say to my distinguished friend from California, for whose judgment I have great respect, if the bill were sent to the Committee on Armed Services.

I may say further to the Senator from California that there is not any way to separate any one item in this bill or in any other authorization bill from the general subject of national defense.

Reference has been made to the financial side of it. Undoubtedly the financial side of it is important. However, the bill has not been referred to the Committee on Finance. That committee has not had an opportunity to consider it. It is true that some of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are also members of the Committee on Finance, just as some members of the Foreign Relations Committee are members of the Armed Services Committee, and just as many Members of the Senate are members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Certainly there cannot be any national defense for this Government or for the free world which rests upon the unstable and shaky foundation of economic chaos. Everyone knows, or should know, that that is so. The Committee on Foreign Relations has proceeded as best it could to say that the full amount should be reduced by a total of $1,000,000,000. Then it has provided that not exceeding the amounts provided for the several items covered in the bill may be appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia will yield to me so that I may ask for the yeas and nays on this question. If the yeas and nays were ordered, Senators could have the assurance now that there would be a record vote on the question. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall conclude in a minute.

I see no reason why this bill should be referred to the Committee on Armed Services. My distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I have great confidence in his judgment, as I have great confidence in the judgment of every other member of the Committee on Armed Services. I do not see that this bill has anything directly to do with our national defense, except that under the national defense bill, when that is before the Senate, it

will be found that perhaps the branches of our armed services may transfer some of the end items to the NATO countries if an emergency should arise which would authorize such a transfer.

Mr. President, I supported the North Atlantic Treaty. I did note vote for, but voted against, the first appropriation to support this very program. Before the ink was dry upon the North Atlantic Treaty, we were faced with a request for appropriations of more than $2,000,000,000. Most of it was for the reconditioning of so-called excess arms and munitions and for excess surplus arms and munitions. One billion dollars of it was in money or contract authorizations. I voted against it. I knew it was foolish to throw away $500,000,000, or perhaps a billion dollars, under that bill. It was foolish. It has produced no good to the NATO countries or to ourselves. But we had to do it. It had to be done in a hurry. The administration wanted to show the world that we were going to arm the Western European nations overnight. We did it before there was even a program drawn. What was the result? There is no man living, Mr. President, who can trace any benefit from the $500,000,000 in contract authorizations and $500,000,000 in cash money we gave away under that first bill.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe that the Senator from Georgia has as clearly indicated as it could possibly be indicated the very direct relationship between the arms implementation program and our military security, because in the particular area to which the Senator is now referring, namely, that of so-called excess equipment, actually that excess equipment had formerly been in the war reserve of this country.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It was declared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and our military authorities that it was not needed for our war reserves and that it could become excess equipment.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Now we are being asked to purchase for our own Military Establishment certain categories of equipment which a short time ago we declared to be excess equipment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, even when the first bill was before the Senate, the Armed Services Committee sat with the Foreign Relations Committee, and the bill actually reported was the joint product of the two committees. In the consideration of the second bill, the two committees sat together.

They did not serve together in regard to the bill, which now is before the Senate. At this time, to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee will lead to nothing but confusion, Mr. President.

I am trying to emphasize the point that the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee are very much bound, in respect to a measure of this sort, by the representations made to us by the spokesmen for the Government. We try to hedge against that by providing that not to exceed the amounts stated in the bill shall be authorized for appropriation, and we leave the final determination to the Appropriations Committees.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is a member of the Appropriations Committee; the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is also a member of the Appropriations Committee. That committee is a very large one. So it seems to me there is no occasion to refer this bill to the Armed Services Committee.

I beg the Senate to remember that this bill is only an authorization measure, and the House of Representatives has not yet acted upon it. The House may vote to reduce further the amount of the authorization provided by the bill, or the House may vote to increase the amount of the authorization. When both Houses have acted on the authorization bill, and when it is enacted into law, a corresponding appropriations bill must be referred to and considered by the Appropriations Committees.

So, Mr. President, there is no occasion for the Armed Services Committee to have the bill referred to it. My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and he will be there, together with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and other distinguished Members of this body. Of course at that time they can pass upon this subject, in the light of what that committee is doing for our national defense together with what we are also doing for other countries.

Mr. President, if I were sure that it would not lead to confusion, I would say that it would be all right for the Armed Services Committee to consider this bill. However, if that committee differed at all in regard to any item, a state of confusion would ensure. So, Mr. President, if I wished to have the bill killed outright, I would vote to have it referred to the Armed Services Committee; and then, thereafter, I would vote to have the bill referred to the Finance Committee.

I do not believe the distinguished Senator from California has any purpose to kill the bill; I think that, generally speaking, he has favored the enactment of legislation of this sort. However, I am saying that if the bill were referred to the Armed Services Committee, the result might be to kill the bill, because following action by the Senate, the House must act on the bill, and thereafter both Appropriations Committees must consider the corresponding appropriation bill. So, in view of its present status, I can see no reason on earth for sending the bill to the Armed Services Committee.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall be compelled to vote against the motion of the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my motion, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on what question is the request for the yeas and nays made?

Mr. KNOWLAND. On the motion to recommit.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second to the request for the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think we are entitled to have the yeas and nays on this motion, and therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from California had a chance to request the yeas and nays, and the Senate would not agree to order the yeas and nays on his motion.

I do not object to having a quorum call at this time, but I think we are engaging in a great deal of ballyhoo that is not helping the work of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Texas may think it is ballyhoo. He has his responsibility, and I have mine. I believe we are entitled to have the yeas and nays ordered on this question. In view of the small number of Senators now on the floor, I think it is proper parliamentary procedure to suggest the absence of a quorum, in order to have a quorum on the floor, and then to see whether the Senate itself wishes to have the yeas and nays ordered on this question.

So, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California withhold momentarily his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think we shall expedite matters if we either have the yeas and nays ordered or if there is a quorum call at this time. A number of Senators who have commitments to attend committee meetings will be able to attend those meetings if they know there will be a yea-and-nay vote on this question.

I shall be glad to withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum if we can have the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I was on my feet, addressing the Chair, and was awaiting recognition, when the Senator from California rose to his feet and suggested the absence of a quorum. My parliamentary question is this: Can a Senator, without being recognized, but merely by suggesting the absence of a quorum, interfere with a Senator who is on his feet, seeking recognition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair must say to the Senator from Iowa that the Senator from California was recognized, and the Senator from Iowa was not recognized.

Therefore, the suggestion of the absence of a quorum is in order, and the clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Benton	Hennings	Moody
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Mundt
Byrd	Humphrey	Murray
Cain	Hunt	Neely
Carlson	Ives	Nixon
Case	Jenner	O'Conor
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Seaton
Duff	Langer	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Long	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Magnuson	Stennis
Ellender	Malone	Taft
Ferguson	Maybank	Thye
Flanders	McCarran	Tobey
Frear	McCarthy	Watkins
Fulbright	McClellan	Welker
George	McFarland	Wiley
Gillette	McKellar	Williams
Green	McMahon	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is obviously a sufficient number seconding the request, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the motion of the Senator from California will not prevail. Senators have been questioning me as to when the Senate may conclude its business for the session. I realize that there is hardly a bill which comes before the Senate that does not overlap, so far as jurisdiction is concerned. It might even be said that it may be important for a tax bill to be referred to the Armed Services Committee because taxes must be levied in order to raise money for the maintenance of the armed services. The Committee on Foreign Relations is a competent committee and it has given the pending bill careful consideration. Long hearings have been held. If the Armed Services Committee had felt that it should have jurisdiction, it had the right to appeal in the first place from the decision of the Chair referring the President's message to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to recall to the mind of the majority leader that the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], at the time the message was referred, gave notice that he would make a motion, when the bill came from the Foreign Relations Committee——

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know what other information the Armed Services Committee could gather in addition to what has already been gathered. It may be that the members of that committee are more competent than are the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I think the Foreign Relations Committee is competent to pass upon the questions involved.

I did not want the bill to become involved in a jurisdictional dispute. If the Armed Services Committee intended to take action it should have taken it before this time. It should have moved to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations after the hearings were concluded.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not think any member of the Armed Services Committee has taken the position that the Foreign Relations Committee had not a proper interest in the bill, but I also feel that there are many members of the Foreign Relations Committee who likewise understood that the Armed Services Committee had a proper interest in the bill. When the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in his judgment and wisdom, determined that the Senate would not follow the same procedure it followed a year ago, it was clearly indicated on the floor that such a motion as I have made would be the only alternative. We are not trying to deprive the Foreign Relations Committee of its proper interest, but we also feel that there is a very real interest in the bill on the part of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not question the fact that the members of the Armed Services Committee have an interest in the bill, but they do not have any greater interest than has the junior Senator from Arizona or any other Member of the Senate. Because a Senator happens to be a member of a certain committee it does not follow that other Members of the Senate do not have an interest in the questions which may be involved in a given measure. The rules of the Senate provide that only one committee shall consider proposed legislation. I should have liked to see the question determined without such a motion being made, but that was not done.

Personally, I think the Foreign Relations Committee has done well with this bill. If the Senate is ever going to get away from Washington it must take the recommendations of its committees and consider proposed legislation on the floor. I do not think a showing has been made that the Armed Services Committee has any superior knowledge of the facts with reference to the questions involved in the bill than have members of the Foreign Relations Committee. So I hope, Mr. President, that the motion will be rejected.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I sought recognition in order to correct an erroneous impression which I feel is somewhat prevalent.

The eminent Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has made a motion to rerefer the bill. There is no question of rereference before the Senate. The bill has never been referred to a committe of this body. The President sent a message on the sixth day of last March in which he asked that consideration be given to an extension of the Mutual Security Act. The message was referred by this body to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Committee on Foreign Relations, as every Senator knows, conducted protracted and extensive investigations and public hearings and reported a bill under leave of the Senate.

I invite attention, Mr. President, to the fact that on the 28th day of April the eminent majority leader [Mr. McFARLAND] stated as follows:

> Mr. President, I understand the Committee on Foreign Relations has ordered reported an extension of the mutual security program, and I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized during any recess of the Senate this week to report an original bill extending the Mutual Security Act.

Under order of the Senate, which was made on April 28, the Committee on Foreign Relations, on the 30th day of April, while the Senate was in recess, reported an original bill which was given a number and ordered placed on the calendar. Through inadvertence it is not on the calendar on page 12, where it should be, following calendar No. 1417. But an original bill was reported to the Senate under leave of the Senate.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The technical point which the Senator has raised may be correct, but the bill which is now reported to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee was certainly before that committee. In view of what the Senator from Iowa has said, perhaps the language of my motion should have been that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, rather than rereferred. But, certainly, the subject matter was before the Foreign Relations Committee. The President's message was before the Foreign Relations Committee. The bill itself has been formulated by the Foreign Relations Committee. For that reason I thought the technical question of rereference would not be material.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from California is correct in his statement that under the order of the Senate the President's message was before the Foreign Relations Committee. The committee conducted protracted investigations into the subject matter. The bill was reported under leave of the Senate. The bill and the subject matter involved are within the jurisdiction and control of the Senate. It is true as a parliamentary matter that the Senate can take the bill from the calendar and refer it to some other committee if it sees fit to do so.

I hope the Senate will not take such action. It would mean delay, which considering the subject matter and its importance, would, in my judgment, be wholly unjustified.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. Is it not correct to say that perhaps the major share of the appropriation proposed to be authorized is for direct military purposes?

Mr. GILLETTE. I think perhaps the greater percentage is, yes.

Mr. CASE. Is it not also correct that General Gruenther, in testifying before the Committee on Foreign Relations, stated that he was unable to speak in dollar amounts, but that he was speaking of the military equipment that would be necessary, in his judgment and in the judgment of General Eisenhower, for purposes of the mutual security pact?

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not know that I understand the question of the eminent Senator. Is he questioning the testimony of some witness before the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. CASE. If I may make a brief statement, I will then ask a question which I think perhaps will clarify what I have in mind.

My understanding is that when General Gruenther was before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and was asked whether he felt the amount of dollar appropriations provided for was needed, he stated he was not in a position to price items of military equipment, but that he could state what was needed in terms of so many planes or so much military matériel.

If that be so, the point then is, would not the Committee on Armed Services be in a good position to give the Senate valuable judgment in translating military equipment into dollars, and hence their recommendations would be important?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, I repeat what I said a moment ago, that in all probability the greater portion of the sum of $6,900,000,000 will be devoted to military purposes. It is the contention of those who are supporting the appropriation that even the portion of the expenditure that is to go to ECA assistance will be of military value indirectly.

What some persons overlook, and what I believe the eminent Senator overlooks, is that the whole purpose of military aid and economic aid contained in the bill is to assist our allies abroad. The whole question is one of international cooperation and international action, and, as such, is, of course, within the purview of the authority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which, acting under that authority, formulated the bill and reported it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a little further?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. I certainly do not question in any degree the fact that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations appropriately considered the bill and made its recommendations with respect thereto. However, in view of the fact that by far the larger portion of money is for military aid, in view of the fact that General Gruenther said he was not equipped to translate such aid into dollars, and in view of the further fact that the Senate in considering this bill obviously cannot go into categories of individual pieces of military equipment and price them in dollars, it seemed to me that it would be appropriate to have the Committee on Armed Services give consideration to military equipment items, so that they could be translated into dollars and the Senate might thereby be enabled to legislate intelligently.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. Whatever logic there is in the statement just made, and the statement along similar lines made earlier by the eminent Senator from California, the same type of argument can apply to other phases of the aid provided for. It could be urged with just as much logic that because the bill provides ECA assistance and technical assistance under point 4, dealing with the question of raising food, it should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and let that committee consider it, because much more than a billion dollars, indeed, as I recall, about $2,000,000,000, goes into the field of production and distribution of food. By the same argument and the same logic, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce could say that the bill comes within their jurisdiction. Likewise, the Committee on Banking and Currency, which deals with the question of exchange and currency among the nations, could claim, because of that fact, the right to handle the bill.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Let me complete my statement, please. The fact of the matter is that there is not one sentence in the bill which refers to any other matter than the question of international cooperation. There is not one such sentence at any point in the bill.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have the highest regard and respect for my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Iowa, but the fact of the matter is that of the $6,900,000,000 authorized in the bill as reported 70 percent deals with military aid. Furthermore, in the total amount, as the Senator has said, provision is made for food and economic aid. However, ECA legislation as such has historically been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I merely wish to say that there is a vast difference between the question whether, because provision is made for food, the bill should properly go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and what we are suggesting, namely, that when we are dealing with military equipment, first, we must realize, that much of it is coming from our own war reserve and war stocks, or at least is competing with military equipment we want for our own forces. Secondly, when we enter the field of military equipment, we get into a highly classified area, with which the Committee on Armed Services has to live day after day. So I think there is a vast difference between the point raised by the able Senator from Iowa and a bill which contains an amount 70 percent of which deals directly with the Armed Forces.

Mr. GILLETTE. We are dealing with principles; we are not dealing with percentages. However, even on the basis of the Senator's own argument, the assumption is that 30 percent deals with funds to be made available for international cooperation outside the military sphere.

In that connection, I wish to quote from the testimony of Secretary Lovett, when he appeared before the committee, in answer to a question propounded by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. The Senator from New Jersey asked:

> Will you give us a picture of how that was done? It must be a very complicated job.
>
> Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir; it is a very complicated job. Senator SMITH the first step, of course, is the development of what is called a military plan. That planning is done by the chiefs of staff of the various member countries separately, and then in unison in what is called the military committee of NATO. That is the over-all military committee, one adjunct of which is the so-called standing group, which consists of Britain, France, and the United States, and is in constant session. After the basic plan is developed, the so-called military-assistance advisory groups, the MAAG's in the various countries, work with the country itself to find out what portions of their total contribution in men and matériel are unavailable to that country for reasons perhaps beyond their control. They measure the size of the orders, the equipment, the locally procured equipment by the country itself, and then there is left a gap.

Mr. President, I shall try to get to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts as soon as possible.

The point is that the entire basis of the bill, including the direct military assistance, which is supposed to have its effect on our military alliance with our friends and our allies in the NATO organization, and every other feature of the program, deals with international cooperation. I repeat that it would be just as logical to ask that the bill be referred to the other committees which I have mentioned, because of their jurisdictional authority over certain features. The Senate could have referred the bill to those committees. However, I submit that there is no agency or subagency of the United States Senate, in the entire list of committees, other than the Foreign Relations Committee, which has complete charge of every phase of this subject.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know that the committee of which the Senator is a member gave this subject careful consideration. I should like to point out to him two or three considerations.

First, I point out that according to the committee report, on page 25, the military-assistance feature of the bill amounts to $5,350,000,000 out of a total of $6,900,000,000. Since the bill was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee there has been considered by the House, and is now before the Senate Appropriations Committee, a Defense Department budget with respect to which there is great resistance by the Defense Department to reducing the budget from $52,000,000,000 to $46,000,000,000, a reduction of $6,000,000,000.

Since that bill has come to the Senate from the House the President has sent to Congress a message asking for

an authorization of $2,800,000,000 more in public works for the Armed Forces. Since this bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations the Atomic Energy Commission has suggested that it is coming before us with proposals for more than $4,000,000,000 worth of new construction.

All those items concern the military. It seems to me that it is perfectly proper for the Armed Services Committee to take an over-all look at the picture, balancing all the factors, to determine what it believes should be recommended for the military. If arms are going to Europe, some of those arms cannot go to our Armed Forces at home. Therefore, I say to the distinguished Senator from Iowa it seems to me that conditions have changed and many new conditions are arising which make it proper to refer this subject briefly to the Armed Services Committee. That is all the Senator from California is asking. He is requesting only a brief over-all consideration by the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the distinguished Senator. He made only one statement to which I take exception, and which he repeated.

The Senator stated that a bill had been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. I repeat that there is no bill before the Senate except the original bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Massachusetts accepts the correction.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Massachusetts was undoubtedly referring to the President's message, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I do not care to take more of the time of the Senate. There are two things to which I wish to invite attention. One is that there is nothing before the Senate except the bill which was formulated and reported, under leave of the Senate, by the Foreign Relations Committee. That bill is now on the calendar. The Senate, in its discretion, can send the bill anywhere it wishes to send it. It can proceed to consider it, or it can refer it to any committee to which it chooses to refer it, because the Senate has control of its own actions in that respect.

I repeat what I stated earlier, that there is no subagency of this body which has complete jurisdiction of the subject matter of this particular bill, which was reported as an original bill from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia feels that we should proceed to act upon this authorization measure now. I am not unmindful of the questions raised by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. He has stated that since the bill was acted upon in the Foreign Relations Committee the Department of Defense has objected to the reduction of $6,000,000,000 made by the House in the appropriations for that department; also that the President has submitted a new public-works program for the military, and that the Atomic Energy Commission intends to propose a new construction program.

When the Senate acts on this bill it will go to the House. The House can refer the bill to any committee to which it wishes to refer it, or to any number of committees. We may rest assured that the House will go into the subject very fully. Then the differences between the House and the Senate will have to be reconciled.

Later the subject will come before the Appropriations Committee. As a member of that committee I very definitely feel that if, before reporting an appropriation bill, we receive information to the effect that the amount ultimately authorized is beyond our ability to finance, the Appropriations Committee will be under neither a legal nor a moral obligation to recommend the appropriation of the entire amount which may be agreed upon in the authorization. Nor will any Member of the Senate be bound by the vote we may take this week on the pending bill to make the authorization agreed upon the final figure, regardless of any information which the Committee on Appropriations may receive, or any developments which may subsequently arise.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his contribution.

Mr. President, I see no purpose whatever which could be served by the adoption of the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] other than that of delay; and under the circumstances, delay is unthinkable.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. FULBRIGHT addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield first to the Senator from California, who was first on his feet.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to ask the able Senator from Iowa whether he is familiar with the discussion which took place in the Senate on March 13, when the President's message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The question has been raised as to why a different procedure was not followed. I read from page 2274 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, 1952:

> Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I repeat what I stated in my opening remarks. I said I wished to serve notice on the Senate that, in my opinion, the Senate Committee on Armed Services should be directed to examine the bill before it is voted on by the Senate. It bears a very vital relationship to matters which pertain to the equipment of the armed services of the United States and to the defense of the United States.
>
> Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?
>
> Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield.
>
> The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the Senator yields, the Chair will state to the Senator from Georgia that if and when the bill is reported to the Senate from the Committee on Foreign Relations, after it is up for consideration and not until then a motion will be in order to refer it to the Committee on Armed Services.

I wondered whether the Senator from Iowa was familiar with the exchange which took place between the Vice President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in reply to the question of the Senator from California, let me say that the Senator from Iowa now recalls the discussion, since it has been called to his attention by the eminent Senator from California.

I think I am justified in making the statement that I have just been informed that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] has telephoned from Florida, where he is rather actively engaged at the present time, to the effect that at that time he was in favor of the course which he then recommended, but that it is now too late, in his opinion, to refer the bill to the Committee on Armed Services. I asked my informant if I would be justified in making that statement, and I was told that the statement had been made to the whip on the majority side, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa some questions with respect to one or two points.

Suppose the bill should be referred to the Armed Services Committee, and that committee should change certain provisions of the bill—for example, the provisions dealing with the point 4 program—and report the bill back to the Senate. Then I suppose it would be in order to refer it again to the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine the effect of the recommendations of the Armed Services Committee. There is no end to that kind of procedure if we are to adopt the narrow point of view of the Senator from California. If his point of view were adopted, would not the procedure which I have described be justified under such circumstances?

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Arkansas has placed his finger upon the impossible situation which we might face. We might have two entirely different bills before us. Then the subject might be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and we would have another bill. This bill is in control of the Senate. The bill is on the calendar. It is now before the Senate for consideration. Any amendments which any Senator may have in mind can be offered. Indeed, the present speaker expects to offer some important amendments.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is one other point I should like to raise. It is with respect to the amount authorized for direct military aid. Approximately $1,000,000,000 of that amount, as mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts, is to be used to make what are referred to as offshore procurements, namely, to purchase within European countries whatever armaments they can make. That has a very important eco-

nomic effect, and that effect is one of the motives for authorizing the appropriation. I cannot understand how the Armed Services Committee would be able to exercise as good judgment in that respect as would the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Therefore, when we get down to analyzing the objectives of the bill, it is seen that the bill is not entirely a bill for military purposes, as the Senator from California seems to have indicated. Certainly some aspect of it, such as the point 4 program, should not be subjected to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GILLETTE. I again thank the Senator from Arkansas for his contribution. I repeat what I said a moment ago, namely, that in no sense is this bill to be construed as purely a military measure. It involves the question of international relationships, of which subject the Committee on Foreign Relations has complete jurisdiction. It has augmented jurisdiction by having been authorized by the Senate to act for it when the President's message was referred to the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield further?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is one further illustration I should like to make. Every treaty which comes before this body touches some aspect of our life, such as manufacturing, agriculture, arms, or some other aspect. If we were to accept the theory advanced today, every treaty would have to be referred to two committees, or perhaps even more committees. The Committee on Foreign Relations strikes me as being a committee that is different from what we call a substantive law committee.

Mr. GILLETTE. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Every matter dealing with foreign relations deals also with some aspect of our national life, involving some substantive legislation which is now within the jurisdiction of another committee. There is no question that this bill is in essence a foreign relations bill if there ever was one.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Arkansas is correct. I take exception to one statement he has made, from which an improper conclusion might be drawn. I refer to his comparison of the judgment of the Committee on Foreign Relations with the judgment of the Committee on Armed Services. I concede to the members of the Armed Services Committee as sound judgment as I concede to any other Senators in this body. I do not concede to them superior judgment in a matter that is within their jurisdiction.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not mean to leave such an implication.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am certain the Senator did not intend to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was trying to draw a distinction between matters essentially in political and economic fields on the one hand, and the military field on the other, not as a matter of judgment. Perhaps I should have said information.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senate is presented with a motion on behalf, not of the Committee on Armed Services, but by one of its members, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to refer the bill to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations, so long as I have been connected with it as a humble servant of the Senate, has endeavored to do what the Senate has ordered it to do. We have undertaken to bring whatever ability, intelligence, and industry we possess to the solution of the questions which have been properly referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

That being the case, the Senate has never yet within my recollection ever turned down the Committee on Foreign Relations on any important measure, and it has never turned it down on any minor matter, like the motion of the Senator from California to refer the bill to the Committee on Armed Services.

The motion itself presupposes on the part of the Committee on Armed Services superior knowledge and superiority over the Committee on Foreign Relations.

What did we do? In the first place, last year we had the members of the Committee on Armed Services sit with us. I made no objection to it. Did we get any better bill than we would have gotten otherwise? I do not think so. This time we invited the members of the Armed Services Committee to the preliminary hearings. We had the Secretary of State before us when the members of the Armed Services Committee were present. We had the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Lovett, before us when the members of the Armed Services Committee was present. We had Mr. Harriman, the Administrator of this program, before the committee when the members of the Armed Services Committee were present. Everything that was presented to the committee was known to the members of the Armed Services Committee. Did the Committee on Armed Services or any of its members ever come back before the Committee on Foreign Relations to discuss any particular item in the bill? If any member did, I have no knowledge of it. Did any of them, either individually or on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services, come before the Committee on Foreign Relations to discuss any item of the bill at all? If anyone had come, he would have been courteously received, and his testimony would have been accepted. We would have given every consideration to any member of that committee.

That did not happen, Mr. President. Now, after the Committee on Foreign Relations has toiled, expended great effort, and devoted much work to this bill, a motion is made to refer it to the Committee on Armed Services.

The Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on this bill from March 13 to April 4, and thereafter considered it to April 30. The motion is now made that the Committee on Armed Services be given 10 days to supervise and overrule and modify and amend and debate a measure the consideration of which took the Committee on Foreign Relations from March 13 to April 30.

We held executive sessions, Mr. President. We did not hold executive sessions because we wanted to exclude any information from our sessions to the outside. We held executive sessions in the interest of speed, and in the interest of legislation. Those executive sessions were held on April 7, 16, 17, 18, 21, and 30.

Mr. President, there is some evidence today that some Senators at least are approaching this question from a political and partisan standpoint. We have Republican members on the Committee on Foreign Relations. Only one Senator withheld his vote by voting present. Every other Republican Senator on the committee voted to report the bill.

I ask Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle, "Do you want to repudiate their votes? Do you on the floor of the Senate want to cast a vote which will be construed in your State and in the country generally as a repudiation of the Republican members of the Committee on Foreign Relations?"

The bill was reported by a vote of 12 to 0. One Senator did not vote. Do Senators wish to inform the country that on this important aid bill, the Mutual Security bill, which affects not alone the building up of Western Europe, but also the safety and security of the United States, the Senate has rejected the action of the Foreign Relations Committee and repudiated the votes of the Republican members of that committee, in order to gratify the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. President, let us consider for a moment the question of jurisdiction. I hold in my hand rule XXV of the Senate rules. That rule comes from the Legislative Reorganization Act, and relates to standing committees.

Paragraph 1 (c) of that rule reads in part as follows:

> The Committee on Armed Services, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
>
> 1. Common defense generally.

Is anything said there about foreign relations or about the activities of our Government in foreign lands? Not a word.

Next, the rule provides:

> 2. The War Department and the Military Establishment generally.
>
> 3. The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally.
>
> 4. Soldiers' and sailors' homes—

And so forth. Mr. President, not a dollar proposed to be authorized by the pending bill would be authorized in connection with matters which rule XXV says shall be within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. Not a dollar proposed to be authorized by the bill would be authorized for our domestic Armed Forces or for the Navy. The bill relates purely to foreign relations, whereas the jurisdiction of the Armed

Services Committee is in relation to matters pertaining to our own defense, military and naval.

Mr. President, are two committees to have jurisdiction of the same subject? If such a policy is to be adopted, then in the case of practically every bill called up on this floor, some Senator could find a point on which to base a motion that the bill be referred to some other committee. What good would that do, except to cause delay, confusion, uncertainty, and misinformation?

The members of the Armed Services Committee and every other Member of the Senate will have full opportunity on the floor—not in some closed room, but on the open floor of the Senate—to propose any amendment or any modification or any increase or decrease in the authorizations provided by the pending bill. Anything provided in the bill will be open to review by Senators on the floor, not because they are members of this committee, that committee, or the other committee, but because they are Members of the Senate of the United States and because they will then be dealing with a subject which was referred by the Senate of the United States to a particular committee.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Texas. I would call his attention to the fact that the first subject listed in paragraph 1 (c) of rule XXV as coming within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services is common defense generally.

Furthermore, section 101 of title I of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 refers to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and the United States is paying a great portion of the burden in connection with that Organization.

I would not say that the Armed Services Committee was attempting to exercise any superiority of judgment or anything of the sort; but I believe it is simply endeavoring to put together, for consideration in one place, all matters pertaining to the common defense.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not agree with some Senators who take the position that this entire problem is one of dollars and cents and mathematics and statistics. Great principles are involved. The mutual security pact is not based on dollars, but it is based on the great questions of liberty, freedom, and the individual rights of the governments that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Heart beats, noble thoughts, and high conceptions cannot be considered in or reduced to terms of dollers. Something more than the ring of a dollar is involved in these matters.

They should not and cannot be considered alone from the point of view of dollars. The Senate is taking legislative action in regard to great questions which affect the people of the world.

Some committee that is jealous or that believes it should have superiority of wisdom, seeks to intrude itself upon the jurisdiction of another committee, although the Senate itself has voted to have this matter referred to the latter committee.

Mr. President, we who serve on the Foreign Relations Committee are not saying that we should settle this question. The question has already been settled by the Senate itself. At the time when the President's message was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, if the Armed Services Committee had challenged that reference, that committee could then have submitted a motion to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee, instead of to the Foreign Relations Committee. However, the members of the Armed Services Committee waited and delayed, just as the action now proposed would result in delaying action on this important measure.

Mr. President, according to the view of some persons, all appropriation bills should be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee because every appropriation bill deals with money, with financial outlays, with expenditures. Therefore, according to the view of some, all appropriation bills should be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, not to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, the pending bill does not deal at all with our military and naval programs. Some Senators have spoken about an item of the pending bill which authorizes an expenditure of $4,000,000,000 for military arms. Mr. President, Congress has authorized appropriations of more than $50,000,000,000 for our military defenses here at home. Yet some Senators would have the Senate believe that the rather small military arms authorization item carried in this bill for mutual security should outweigh all other considerations and should result in the reference of the bill to the Armed Services Committee.

It seems to me that if the Armed Services Committee is so anxious and willing to toil and study with the defense bill of over $50,000,000,000 and with the organization of the Army, the organization of the Navy, and all other matters relating to those services, it should have enough to do without spreading its wings, not only all over the United States but also over foreign countries and taking over the jurisdiction of foreign relations which rightly rests with the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, if I am not in error, the Senator from California complained about what was happening in Korea and how our planes in Korea were inferior and were outnumbered; and he made other complaints about happenings in Korea. Those matters are certainly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. Therefore, why does not the Armed Services Committee correct the situations complained of, inasmuch as they relate to the arms of the United States, not to the foreign relations of our country. Their only relationship to foreign affairs arises because of the fact that in Korea we are fighting some foreigners. However, if we do not have a sufficient number of planes in Korea, if we do not have adequate supplies for our planes in Korea, if we do not have proper support for those planes, let the Committee on Armed Services provide for those things. If that committee has been as derelict in performing its duty in respect to Korea as it has been in its effort to take over the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee, that is its responsibility.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Texas familiar with the fact that when question is raised by members of the Armed Services Committee or by members of the Appropriations Committee, in asking our responsible military authorities why our Air Force is flying obsolete or obsolescent planes in Korea, against the Communists, one answer which constantly is made is that with our productive capacity we cannot take care of the requirements for Europe and at the same time take care of the requirements for the Americans who are fighting in Korea? That is one of the reasons why I have made the motion to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee, so that we can obtain some integration of our defense activities.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the bill pertaining to our defense activities already is before the Armed Services Committee, so the argument now made is only a pretext. I do not know what the Joint Chiefs of Staff told the members of the Armed Services Committee, but evidently what they told them did not influence the committee sufficiently to make it provide more planes or better planes. I am in favor of more planes and better planes. I want the United States to send to Korea a superb and superior Air Force which will bring us victory and will result in bringing our boys home. However, that will not be done by quarreling within the Armed Services Committee. There is the weak spot, if there is any. That is where the fault lies, if there be fault.

Mr. President, after all, what is wrong with this bill? What fault has been found with it by members of the Armed Services Committee who are presently supporting the pending motion? Do they think the amount it authorizes is too large? Do they want to cut down the support program for Western Europe, where we are undertaking to build a rampart which cannot be infiltrated by vicious and hostile and evil influences from Communist countries? Do they want to abstain from giving money for the purpose of building a protective wall in Western Europe, through which no arm, no sword, and no spear in a Communist infiltration or a Communist attack could pass to destroy the liberty and democracy of Western Europe? Do they want that effort to fail, and then to have laid open to attack the democracy and security of the Western World? No, Mr. President; I do not think so. If there be anything wrong with the bill, it can be corrected through amendments on the floor of the Senate. Members of the Armed Services Committee will be here, or they ought to be here; and, when the bill is taken up section by section, let them offer amend-

ments. Let such amendments stand the test of debate upon this floor; let them stand the test of current and accurate information and discussion. I have no objection to that. If Senators want to attack the entire bill, they could do that upon the floor of the Senate. In fact, they could do it much better on the floor of the Senate than in a private committee room. Let them proceed if they want to deny all help in behalf of mutual security; but what they would accomplish, Mr. President, if this motion were adopted, would be delay and still more delay. I do not want more delay. We must pass imperative legislation; we must enact pressing measures in order that Congress may be able to adjourn so that Senators may attend the national conventions which will be held in July.

Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations has given this measure every possible consideration. We not only considered the bill in its over-all respects and heard leading citizens of the United States, including the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of Mutual Security testify concerning it, but we then considered it in detail. Amendments were offered, discussions were had. We voted on all controversial questions. We cut the authorization $1,000,000,000. There had been a loud cry that the amount authorized should be reduced. We reduced it to the extent of $1,000,000,000. The bill, so reduced, has been approved, even by such conservative members of the committee as the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and other Senators. It is not an extravagant measure. It has been carefully considered. One provision has been dovetailed with another.

Mr. President, I should regard it as a great misfortune if the Senate, reflecting upon its own authority, reflecting upon what it has already done, and reflecting upon the Committee on Foreign Relations, with all the toil, labor, and anguish it has undergone in the consideration of this measure should now refer it to another committee.

Mr. President, what are some of the matters within the normal jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations with which the Committee has undertaken to deal? Among other matters included within the bill—and I hope the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] will pay heed—is technical cooperation, known as Point 4. That subject has always been before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Is it desired now to remove it from consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations and send it to the Armed Services Committee?

The former European Recovery Program, the ECA, was before the Foreign Relations Committee. That program is no longer in operation, though there are certain kindred activities which must receive attention. Matters affecting the Institute of American Affairs, and dealing principally with Central and South American countries, have always been handled by the Committee on Foreign Relations. That subject is included in the pending bill. Do Senators desire to send that to the Armed Services Committee?

Matters connected with the International Refugee Organization and the Palestine Refugee legislation have always been considered to be within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder what the attitude of the Senator from Texas would be, assuming that the Armed Services Committee, for purposes of illustration, were to eliminate, or practically eliminate the Point 4 program. Would not the Senator, as Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, be compelled then to ask that the matter be referred again to his committee for reconsideration?

Mr. CONNALLY. I see the point of the Senator from Arkansas. This would be my view of the situation: We have this bill now before the Senate, reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations. If the bill were referred to the Armed Services Committee, that committee would be expected to report another bill. In that event, instead of having one bill, we should have two. I assume that the Chair would then have to determine which bill would be considered first. Amendments would be in order, of course, during the consideration of either of the bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not hear the first part of the speech of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. Is it contemplated that the pending bill would remain on the calendar, and that another bill would be reported, resulting in our having two bills on the same subject before the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I may say my understanding is that the Senator from California—if he is listening—wants to refer this entire bill, including every part of it, to the Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. But I did express my personal opinion that, in my judgment, the Armed Services Committee would direct its attention to the military aspects of the bill, those aspects which have a very direct bearing upon the American Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is there anything in this bill for the American Army, Navy, or Air Force?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; but approximately $4,700,000,000 of the amount authorized, or 70 percent of it, could very well come at the expense of the American Air Force, Army, and Navy, and have a deterrent effect upon them.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is up to the two Houses of the Congress.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. In a moment. I am glad the Senator from California admits and acknowledges that, of all the money authorized by this bill, there is not $1 for the United States Army, there is not $1 for the Navy, there is not $1 for the Air Force yet the Senator claims that the bill should be referred to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Texas will yield further to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Surely the Senator does not want to misrepresent my position. I made it very clear, I believe, that approximately 70 percent of the amount authorized by the bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee relates to military aspects. I have pointed out that the amount of money involved has a direct relationship to our own Army, Navy, and Air Force in a very close and coordinated manner. Therefore, Mr. President, I do not believe we should talk about the common defense, which is what we have been talking about, in connection with the arms implementation legislation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator pointed out that $4,000,000,000 is to go to foreign nations. Is that ours? Does it go to our armed services, to our Navy, to our Air Force? No; it goes to Europe. Is not Europe foreign? I have always regarded it as being foreign. Therefore, the entire subject comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I invite the attention of the Senator from Texas to section 8 on page 11 of the bill. He says it does not affect the United States Armed Forces. I suggest to him that that section gives the opportunity of buying from the Armed Forces of the United States excess equipment amounting to $1,200,000,000; so that it does directly affect our armed services.

Mr. CONNALLY. Anything that affects the United States in its dealings with foreign governments with reference to any kind of aid, if it is only a dollar, means that we shall not have as many dollars at home to spend for other purposes. If wheat is involved, it means that we shall not have as much wheat at home after we send some of it to India or China. The Senator from California admits that there is not a dollar in the bill for the United States Army, Navy, or Air Force, but he wants to have the Armed Services Committee take over and control the bill.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas if the bill was ever introduced?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; it was reported as an original committee bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. All the committee had before it was a message from the President, was it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; but there was a draft bill attached to the message.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Armed Services Committee had wanted to expedite the work of the Senate, it could have held hearings on the part of the message

over which it felt it had jurisdiction, or it could itself have introduced a bill. But, no; it waited, although we were anxious to proceed rapidly with the business of the session, until after the Foreign Relations Committee had completed its work and reported a bill to make a motion to refer, a motion which, if agreed to, involves going back over the whole subject again.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Arizona is correct.

I was mentioning a while ago, Mr. President, the different subjects over which the Committee on Foreign Relations has had jurisdiction. They include the Palestine refugee situation; the children's fund; exchange of persons, known as the Fulbright program; the Korean Aid Act; aid to Greece and Turkey. All these questions which relate to foreign relations have been within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations and have been acted on by that committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is involved an authorization to purchase arms with the money provided under the bill; is there not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; that is true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me the impression which may have been created that the bill provides for the direct supplying of funds by the Armed Forces of this country is not accurate. It merely gives permission and authority to purchase excess armament, if it is available, under a certain formula, and it will be paid for under the authorization provided by the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should say that the Senator from Arkansas is entirely correct. I was trying to point out to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that though he says the bill does not affect our armed services at all, it does make it possible to send equipment now in the possession of our armed services to the armed services of other nations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator that practically every bill that comes before us impinges upon the jurisdiction of one or more committees. We can find overlapping jurisdiction in almost all bills. Questions dealing with the Defense Production Act go to the Banking and Currency Committee. It is certainly important, in some of its aspects, to the Committee on Armed Services. The central question is, What is the overriding signification of the bill? Is it more a foreign policy matter or is it a matter affecting our Army, Navy, and Air Force? It is a foreign relations measure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not for one moment state to my colleague from Arkansas that it is an armed services matter alone. Last year a similar question was heard by both committees. What concerns me is the fact that last Friday morning I listened to testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. This morning I listened to testimony before the Committee on Armed Services. The difficulty today is in getting sufficient equipment for our armed services. The pending bill permits the production of more equipment, which will not go to our Armed Forces but to our friends abroad. That may be the best way to handle the situation, but at the same time it is helpful to look over the whole field without going into details.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Committee on Foreign Relations looked into the whole field. We spent from March 18 to April 4, in addition to approximately 12 days of executive hearings. What does the Senator from Massachusetts think we were looking at? We were looking at the over-all picture. We were not simply twiddling our thumbs. We were considering the whole subject. Anything we do by way of giving aid to Europe has an effect on us. If we appropriate only 50 cents for Europe it has a reaction here; infinitesimal, I admit, but it illustrates my point. Anything we do in regard to foreign relations has a reaction within the United States. It cannot be avoided. I do not want to avoid it. I want to meet my duties as I see them.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall vote to recommit this bill to the Committee on Armed Services. I have some doubt that if the chairman of the Armed Services Committee were present he would vote against recommitting the bill to the Committee on Armed Services. It is my impression that if the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee were here he would desire to look at the bill, and I believe it is very likely that he would support the motion, inasmuch as members of his committee would like to study the matter.

I have always thought we should reduce the enormous expenditures for foreign aid. It is my information that this particular bill, for example, involves more money than we have spent for flood control, for the improvement of rivers and harbors, and for the production of power in this country since the beginning of the Nation. Here is an item of $6,900,000,000 to be expended at a time when our funds are limited. The taxpayers today are paying to the very limit of their ability, and we must now judge, in defending this country, how much of various things we can afford. The Armed Services Committee is at this time investigating the question of aircraft procurement for this Nation. We find that we are sadly lacking in the planes we need for a strategic air force, both to attack an enemy in the event we are attacked, and to defend the Nation with aircraft to intercept hostile planes.

The testimony before the committee, which I was privileged to hear in part, pretty well convinced me that until we have a strategic air arm able to strike enemy targets effectively, which can be called upon to retaliate in the event we are attacked, until we have an air arm effectively able to defend this Nation, the expenditures we make for other services, and the expenditures we make for foreign aid, should be token expenditures. The ability of this Nation to defend itself from atomic attack, and to repel any such attack made upon us, should be of first importance in all our expenditures for defense.

The point has been made that foreign aid is involved, but I believe every Member of the Senate will agree that the only reason why we would be willing vote for $6,900,000,00 in 1 year for aid to foreign nations would be that it would directly contribute to our ability to defend ourselves as a Nation.

The point has been made that perhaps the Armed Services Committee believes it has superior knowledge of what should be done, in so far as foreign aid is concerned. I do not claim that to be the case at all. However, I believe it would be fair to say that the Committee on Armed Services might have superior knowledge of how the best results could be accomplished for the money spent in defending our Nation. It seems to me that we should take a look to see how much money this Nation can afford to spend to acquire new aircraft, such as jet bombers and jet fighter planes, in which we are sadly deficient, and make it possible to utilize atomic warfare, before we make the proposed enormous expenditures for foreign aid.

I realize that at a later time there will be appropriation bills for such items before the Senate, but in trying to decide how much should be spent for various items and programs, it seems to me the Committee on Armed Services should have some idea of what is being done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the Senator's contention that we are short of airplanes because of a lack of appropriations voted by Congress?

Mr. LONG. I know that Congress refused to go along with an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from California 2 years ago. He received very little support at that time. As I understand, most of his support came from members of the Committee on Armed Services. Perhaps we would be better equipped with airplanes today if the appropriations he sought had been voted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then, is it the Senator's contention that the reason why we do not have as many airplanes as he says we need is that there has not been a sufficient appropriation of money?

Mr. LONG. If we had been striving in the last 4 or 5 years to produce more aircraft, we would have more today. That goes without any further argument. We have not had the production in the last 3 years to enable us to have today the effective air program which we should have.

At the same time, let me say that Congress was beating down efforts to reduce economic aid to Europe. If Congress had not been beating off proposals to give us a 70-group or larger air force, our air force would have been better able to defend the Nation today, in my opinion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator believes that the solution to the problems

that confront us today is military, does he?

Mr. LONG. Not entirely, no.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, primarily?

Mr. LONG. The ability to defend this Nation is primarily a military matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the solution, in the Senator's opinion, is to be sought through military means?

Mr. LONG. I cannot answer that question categorically in one word.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then the Senator can take two words.

Mr. LONG. I will take a few more than that in my own time, and the Senator from Arkansas can address himself to the question in his time.

I would say that primarily what we are trying to accomplish with foreign aid, as I understand, is to develop the ability of this Nation to defend itself. The whole defense program is intended to provide for the common defense of the Nation. Many of us have voted for appropriations and expenditures for foreign aid based upon just such an assumption, namely, that we were going to be able to make it more possible to protect ourselves.

Let us look at the program. An appropriation of $6,900,000,000 is proposed. Everyone who knows anything about it, including the committee which studied it, knows that if the Soviet Army should move tomorrow, all this money would be lost, because it would not prevent the Soviet army from overrunning Europe. We believe that by building up our resources over a period of time, we will be able to provide sufficient strength in Europe to enable the countries there to defend themselves.

What is the major factor that prevents the Soviet Union from moving at this time? It is the fact that the United States of America is substantially superior in atomic weapons, and has an Air Force that will enable us to break through with atomic weapons. What will keep the Soviet Union from moving for the next 2 or 3 years? Primarily American atomic warfare and an American Air Force. These should have first priority.

In arriving at correct judgments in these matters the Committee on Armed Services has made a study of the situation, and has had an opportunity to study it thoroughly, and would be well qualified and should be given an opportunity to pass on proposed legislation.

There is one other item. Some people prefer that the Armed Services Committee not look at this bill. I am not thinking of Members of the Senate: I am thinking about people interested in obtaining large appropriations for Europe. Those people have had a chance to discuss this matter with and to convince members of the Committee on Foreign Relations that this matter was justified. It has been my impression that they have not had as much success with the Armed Services Committee.

It is unfortunate that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], is not presently here, being engaged at this time in a contest in the State of Florida with another member of the Armed Services Committee, who has had almost 3 months' leave in proposing his candidacy to the Nation.

Nevertheless we have as the ranking majority member of that committee the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. The Senator from Virginia would be a most appropriate Senator to preside as temporary chairman of the committee, because, in my opinion, there is no Member of the Senate who has made a more thorough study in his effort to find where proper economies can be effected than has the senior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, there is involved here a question of how much we can strip our defenses for the defense of Europe. I understand this bill provides that excess arms would be sold to foreign countries. That immediately raises the question as to how the Army and the State Department will manage to work out a program so that Europe can have modern equipment taken from the American arsenal. It can be done only by declaring it excess. I suppose that means they might go so far as to declare jet aircraft excess, and then, even though useful here, they could be shipped to Europe. Various other equipment of that sort is involved.

It might be well for the Armed Services Committee to see just what kind of defense equipment is going to be declared excess, because I am of the opinion that, insofar as the Air Force is concerned, if anything that is taken from this Nation to be sent to Europe would be useful there, it would be useful here.

Therefore, I support the Senator from California in feeling that before this matter is acted upon by the Senate, the Senate Armed Services Committee should have an opportunity to look into it. I did not attend the meetings of the Committee on Foreign Relations the day General Gruenther appeared. I would have been interested in attending. However, a member of the committee senior to me advised me that the same testimony was going to be presented before the Armed Services Committee, and that therefore it might be wise to wait until General Gruenther appeared before the Armed Services Committee. General Gruenther did so appear. The junior Senator from Louisiana was under the impression that the other witnesses were going to appear before the Armed Services Committee. Therefore, desiring the opportunity to examine some of the witnesses and to become better acquainted with this legislation, in order, perhaps, to offer proper amendments to it, the junior Senator from Louisiana will support the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I want the Senate, in voting on this question, to realize what it is acting upon. Senators who favor the motion will vote to reject the recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and to affront, and almost to insult, that committee, to which this subject was referred by the Senate. At the time the President's message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations no motion was made to refer it to any other committee.

Senators who vote for the pending motion will be voting against acting upon the bill which was reported from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by a vote of 12 to none. Why should Senators wish to do that? Is it because they wish to make speeches? They have had ample opportunity to make speeches, and they will have further opportunity to make speeches when the bill is taken up formally in the Senate. There is no bridle on debate in the Senate. Senators can discuss the bill as long as they desire. If there is anything wrong with it, let us bring it out into the open, where we can see it. Let us not rely on generalities, and statements to the effect that the Armed Services Committee ought to look into the subject. According to its own statement, the Armed Services Committee has not been looking into the question of aircraft, as pointed out by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and as was pointed out earlier by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

If the Senate votes to adopt the motion of the Senator from California, it will be setting a precedent whereby, with respect to any bill which comes before the Senate, any Senator who can find some little pretext, some little loophole, can make a motion to refer the bill to some other committee.

Does such procedure contribute to the orderly operations of the Senate? Does it contribute to the prompt disposition of the business of the Senate? On the other hand, it contributes to delay, to speculation, and to quarrels and quibbles, even within the Armed Services Committee itself. No one expects the bill to be reported back from the Armed Services Committee untouched. It will be daubed up in some way if it is referred to that committee. If that were not the intention, the proponents of the motion to refer the bill to that committee would not be so strenuous in their efforts.

Mr. President, I regret to see delay in connection with this measure. It is of the highest importance. What we do here today will be reflected in every chancellery in every great country in Europe. It will be said, "The United States is not going to carry out its NATO obligation. The United States is not going to follow up and aid Western Germany to become a part of Western Europe. The United States is not going to follow up in aiding Western Europe to build up a rampart against the wild waves of communism which will break against it. The United States is not going to aid in building up a great fortress which no totalitarian army can pierce, and no totalitarian armed force can seriously endanger."

Do we want that to happen? It is going to happen if we vote to refer this bill to the Armed Services Committee. Mr. President, I hope and pray that the Senate will not commit such a tragic and grievous error.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have no interest in the jurisdictional questions which arise as between the two committees. Both committees are manned by men as able, patriotic, and conscientious as any I have ever known. But while I am not interested in the

jurisdictional question, I am vitally interested in the entire issue of mutual-security legislation. As Senators know, I have long been an ardent supporter of mutual-security assistance. I think it would be a world tragedy and a tragedy for our own country if we should fail to take action promptly.

The motion of the distinguished Senator from California, if adopted, would inevitably lead to much delay. There could be no report from the committee in less than 2 or 3 weeks. Two weeks, I believe, is the time mentioned in the motion. Thereafter, of course, any changes made by the Armed Services Committee—and inevitably there would be changes—would have to be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee for further consideration.

The Armed Services Committee claims jurisdiction because of the large percentage of the proposed appropriation to be devoted to military purposes. The Foreign Relations Committee and other committees of the Senate may claim similar jurisdiction with regard to certain items and certain titles involved in the proposed legislation. In the meantime, I believe the world would be in a turmoil. Our allies would lose confidence in the good faith and good will of the United States to help them and, incidentally, help ourselves. I believe that the effect would be tragic in its implications. I believe that the effect would be one which we could not possibly overcome.

When the bill is debated on the floor of the Senate, amendments can be offered. As the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] pointed out, such amendments might cut half a billion dollars or a billion dollars, or more, from the bill which has been reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

On the other hand, the Senate might increase the amount. Today I submitted an amendment restoring the full amount which has been requested for foreign assistance. I hope that that restoration amendment will be carefully considered and favorably acted upon by the Senate. I believe that the money which has been asked for is vitally necessary, and means much to the success of our efforts to bring peace and security to our country and to the entire world. I believe that adoption of the motion made by the distinguished Senator from California to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee would inevitably confuse the thinking of the Senate. It would inevitably confuse the thinking of the entire American people, and would bring discouragement, loss of hope, and loss of confidence to the entire world.

For these reasons I shall vote against the motion of the Senator from California, and I very much hope that it will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to refer the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions to report it to the Senate on or before May 15, 1952. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hennings	Mundt
Benton	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Nixon
Cain	Ives	O'Conor
Case	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Knowland	Seaton
Douglas	Langer	Smith, Maine
Duff	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Long	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Magnuson	Stennis
Ecton	Malone	Taft
Ellender	Maybank	Thye
Ferguson	McCarran	Tobey
Flanders	McCarthy	Watkins
Frear	McClellan	Welker
Fulbright	McFarland	Wiley
George	McMahon	Williams
Gillette	Millikin	Young
Green	Monroney	
Hayden	Moody	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understand that on this motion a vote "yea" will be a vote simply to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee, with instructions to report the bill not later than the 15th of May, with any suggestions which it may have to make in the form of proposed amendments; and the bill which will then be before the Senate will be the bill which has been reported by the Foreign Relations Committee. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bennett	Ives	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Seaton
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Cain	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Case	Knowland	Stennis
Cordon	Langer	Taft
Dirksen	Long	Thye
Duff	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	McCarthy	Welker
Ecton	Millikin	Williams
Ferguson	Morse	Young
Flanders	Mundt	
Hendrickson	Nixon	

NAYS—33

Benton	Hayden	McMahon
Clements	Hennings	Monroney
Connally	Hoey	Moody
Douglas	Humphrey	Murray
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Ellender	Lehman	O'Conor
Frear	Magnuson	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Maybank	Robertson
George	McCarran	Smith, N. C.
Gillette	McClellan	Tobey
Green	McFarland	Wiley

NOT VOTING—23

Anderson	Hill	Martin
Brewster	Holland	McKellar
Bricker	Hunt	Pastore
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Kefauver	Smathers
Capehart	Kerr	Sparkman
Carlson	Kilgore	Underwood
Chavez	Lodge	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to refer the bill (S. 3086) to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions, was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1310, which is Calendar No. 1155.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will a motion to lay on the table a motion to reconsider be in order following action upon the motion of the majority leader?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have no desire to preclude a motion to lay on the table, if the Senator desires

to make such a motion. So far as I am concerned, we are proceeding to other legislation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let us first have an opportunity to make the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, with the understanding that I may have the floor immediately following the disposition of that matter, I withdraw my motion temporarily.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which my motion to refer Senate bill 3086 to the Committee on Armed Services was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from California to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is very unusual for me to be unwilling to abide by the decision of a majority of the Senate, and so, of course, in this instance I am quite willing to do so. That is why I yielded for the motions to reconsider and to lay it on the table. However, I desire to call the attention of Senators to the fact that, by this vote to refer Senate bill 3086 to another committee than that which reported it they have probably delayed adjournment of the Senate by at least 3 weeks—not less than 3 weeks. That is satisfactory to the Senator from Arizona; he can remain here as long as any other Senator. But the responsibility for the delay must be upon those who voted to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee, not upon me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona renew his motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1310?

WELFARE OF COAL MINERS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1310, which is Calendar No. 1155.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1310) amending Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the Senator's understanding that, if the Senate proceeds to the consideration of Senate bill 1310, it will continue its consideration when the mutual security bill is reported from the Armed Services Committee and is placed on the calendar, or will the mutual security bill be placed ahead of this bill and any other bill which may be on the calendar at that time?

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall have to meet that situation when it arises. We do not know what will be on the calendar at that time. I do not know what the Senate may do. The Senate might want to refer the mutual security bill to the Judiciary Committee or to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when it comes back from the Armed Services Committee. A number of committees may desire to consider that measure. I do not intend to commit myself.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I certainly want no misunderstanding. I have had numerous requests to report the control bill and the housing bill. The control bill, particularly, is for the good of all the people of America, since it is designed to stop inflation. I certainly want no understanding that if it should be pending when the mutual security bill is again reported, the control bill would be laid aside for the purpose of considering the mutual security bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1310, which has been read by its title.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the act of May 7, 1941 (55 Stat. 177; 30 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 4f–4o), is hereby amended as follows:

At the end of section 5 add the following:

"Any owner, lessee, agent, manager, superintendent, or other person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish complete and correct information pursuant to this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment not exceeding 60 days, or both."

Following section 6 (f) thereof, add sections 6 (g), 6 (h), 6 (i), and 6 (j) as follows:

"(g) The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and from time to time revise such regulations in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act as he may deem necessary to establish safety standards and requirements to be observed in the operation of coal mines, the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce. Such regulations shall be designed to eliminate or ameliorate, so far as practicable, unsafe or unhealthful conditions or practices in such mines which result in explosions, cave-ins, inundations, suffocation of miners, accidents, and occupational and other diseases.

"Such regulations shall prescribe—

"(1) minimum standards governing timbering, support, and prevention of collapse or squeeze in coal mines as may be required in the interest of safety;

"(2) minimum standards governing the construction and use of machinery and equipment and the composition and use of explosives in coal mines as may be required in the interest of safety;

"(3) minimum standards governing operations, equipment, methods of mining, ventilation, prevention of gas or dust explosion, and transportation in coal mines as may be required in the interest of health and safety;

"(4) minimum standards, in the interest of health and safety, governing inspections of and repairs to coal mines, coal-mining equipment and machinery and inspections of coal-mining methods and procedures; and

"(5) other standards to effectuate the provisions of this act.

"(h) Any operator or his representative who after having been duly notified of a violation of any regulation promulgated under the provisions of this act continues to willfully violate such regulation shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months or both.

"(i) Whenever the Secretary of the Interior, authorized coal-mine inspector, or any other authorized representative of the Secretary, finds that any violations of any regulation under this act result in a condition that constitutes an imminent danger to the life or safety of employees in the mine, he shall by oral or written order setting forth the dangerous condition found to exist and the unsafe area covered thereby, require the operator or his representative to withdraw all employees, other than those necessary to correct such unsafe condition, from the unsafe area until such danger has been eliminated and a certificate of correction has been issued, as hereinafter provided. Any operator or operator's representative who has notice of such an order of withdrawal, whether oral or written, shall immediately comply with it. The posting of a copy of the order at or near the mine entrance and the delivery of a copy thereof to the operator or his representative while the mine is in operation shall be evidence that the operator or his representative at the mine has notice of the order as of the time of such posting and delivery. Whenever the Secretary of the Interior, an authorized coal-mine inspector, or any other authorized representative of the Secretary shall determine that the condition has been corrected, so that it no longer constitutes a violation of the regulations, he shall issue a certificate of correction, upon issuance of which the operator may reopen the area affected by the order of withdrawal.

"In accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior, the operator of the mine to whom the order of withdrawal is directed may appeal to the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, or any authorized representative of the Secretary. Thereupon, a different coal-mine inspector or inspectors shall reexamine and inspect the mine and file a report within a reasonable time. A copy of the report shall promptly be delivered to the operator of the mine. Upon such reexamination, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, or any other authorized representative of the Secretary, as may be provided in such regulations, may affirm, revise, or set aside the order of withdrawal. Upon petition filed by any person aggrieved by the order of the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, or any authorized representative of the Secretary affirming, revising, or setting aside the order of withdrawal, he shall hold a hearing and, upon the record made at such hearing, enter a final order in the matter. All proceedings under this paragraph and appeals from final orders thereunder shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. Pending final disposition of any proceeding under this paragraph, the order of withdrawal shall be complied with.

"(j) Any operator or his representative who willfully fails to comply with the order of

withdrawal issued under the provisions of section 6 (i) of this act shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $10,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 2 years, or both."

After section 11, add a new section 11A, as follows:

"SEC. 11A. State laws or contracts pertaining to mine safety shall not be deemed to be superseded, save only to the extent to which they are in conflict with the provisions of this act or the regulations or orders issued pursuant to it."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that following the consideration of this bill, unless there is an appropriation bill ready, we shall probably take up Calendar 1072, Senate bill 2550, a bill to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes. Inasmuch as no notice has been given of the consideration of that bill, and because considerable interest has been manifested in it, it is my purpose to move that when the Senate concludes its business today, it recess until Wednesday, in order that Senators may have an opportunity to study the proposed legislation.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the majority leader has now given notice that he intends at a very early date to call up Senate bill 2550, the so-called McCarran immigration bill. I want to protest with all the vigor at my command against the consideration of that bill. There is a bill which was introduced nearly 2 months ago which is a substitute for Senate bill 2550.

This is neither the time nor the place to enter into a discussion of the relative merits of the two bills, but the fact remains that Senate bill 2842, introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and myself, together with 11 or 12 other Senators, has received and is receiving the support of many religious, civic, and patriotic organizations, and of a great number of private individuals.

We have requested a hearing on the bill at which the sponsors as well as those representing important organizations could appear. We have not yet received a hearing. Certainly, the Senate should not take up Senate bill 2550 without at least having a hearing with regard to the bill which has been introduced as a substitute, a bill which has engaged the interest and support of many hundreds of thousands if not millions of persons. I ask, Mr. President, that before Senate bill 2550 be taken up, a hearing be given to the so-called Humphrey-Lehman bill, Senate bill 2842. I make the request on the grounds of fair play and justice and as being in the interest of the great American people, many of whom are deeply interested in the complex, difficult, and highly important question of immigration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is Senate bill 1310. The question of taking up the other bill is not before the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. It was my understanding that Senate bill 1310 was made the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate voted to consider it and it is now before the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Arizona has been outlining future legislation. I should like to ask him when he is going to make good on the promise he gave us to bring up the St. Lawrence waterway bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall do the best we can with that bill. The vote today jeopardized consideration of the St. Lawrence waterway bill. It will delay the Senate. But I shall do my very best. The bill has been reported, but the vote today has jeopardized its consideration, without question.

Mr. TOBEY. I voted "nay."

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

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

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

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am amazed to hear the Senator from Arizona say that the vote taken by the Senate this afternoon has jeopardized the consideration of the St. Lawrence waterway bill. The bill to which he refers on which the vote was taken has to do with cooperation with foreign nations. Is there any nation more neighborly and more cooperative with the United States, more necessary to the security of the United States, than is the Dominion of Canada?

The Dominion of Canada for months has been asking whether the United States is going to cooperate with her in the construction and development of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project. We have not even given her the courtesy of an answer. Whether we vote yes or no, our nearest and best neighbor is asking whether we are going to cooperate. Canada wants to let contracts for the work during the coming summer, and she will undoubtedly go ahead. Do we not owe it to Canada, even if we do not owe it to the people of the United States, to consider the measure? Are we going to adapt the economy of this country to suit the desires of a few bankers and utility and railroad men, or are we going to take into consideration the welfare of Canada and the United States? Are we going to let the Santa Fe Railroad and the Union Pacific Railroad——

Mr. TOBEY. Do not forget the New England railroads.

Mr. AIKEN. Are we going to let them tell us what the Congress is going to do and when we are going to do it, or are we going to do what we should do?

Mr. TOBEY. We should show some guts here. That is what we need.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we are trying to proceed with the business of the Senate in an orderly manner. I meant by my statement that the vote jeopardized the consideration not solely of the St. Lawrence seaway bill, but of other bills. Any vote which delays consideration of a bill and wastes the time of the Senate jeopardizes the consideration of other proposed legislation.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the delay has not been more than 4 hours because of the procedure of referring the mutual security bill to the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; that is not true. The Mutual Security bill is one which has to be considered, and the Senate is being delayed in the consideration of that bill and other "must" legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that cooperation between Canada and the United States is of high importance?

Mr. McFARLAND. Oh, yes. I concede all that. But it is also true that when we get down to the last days of the session and Members on the Senator's side of the aisle are asking whether Congress can adjourn in time for the conventions, there will not be a corporal's guard of Senators present to consider the business of the Senate when the conventions start.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the Senator, most respectfully, as one Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle, that I hope and trust that the reference of the mutual security bill has not delayed the Senate in any way. So far as I am concerned, my vote was not a partisan one at all. I have been hearing about the enormous amounts of money required for atomic energy and for public works, and I have listened to statements of the leaders of the armed services that they cannot stand a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in expenditures. The action just taken, I believe, assures proper and thoughtful consideration of a very important measure, and, personally, I do not believe it will delay the Senate 1 minute.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. In a moment. The Senator from Massachusetts may not have thought that his vote was partisan, but it certainly was a partisan vote. There can be no "ifs" and "ands" about that. We know why the bill was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. It is all right. The minority have a right to delay. That is their privilege.

I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question, with the permission of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Texas may proceed.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the case of the mutual security bill, I heard objections raised about the amount of this appropriation, the amount of that appropriation, and the amount of the other appropriation. Did the Senator raise those objections because he wanted to cut the amounts appropriated for foreign aid?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Not necessarily.

Mr. CONNALLY. Either necessarily or unnecessarily.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Not necessarily at all. I feel that the problem is an over-all one dealing with the security of the United States, and its solution is based on the armed strength of the United States. Is it better for an American boy to have a gun or for a European boy to have a gun? Is it better for an American boy to have a tank or for a European boy to have a tank, or for American boys in Korea to have tanks? Is it better for us to have a jet fighter here or that there be one in Europe? These are all important questions.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has very skillfully evaded answering the question I asked him. I asked him whether he favored major cuts in the program. He has not answered that question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not going to answer it——

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Until I see what is presented as the over-all picture. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that I always have the greatest respect for him, and if I was able to evade a question of his, I am brighter than I thought I was.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator said, "I am not going to answer." If that is not evading, I do not know what it is. Will the Senator tell us what the mutual security bill ought to contain?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will tell the Senator when the Armed Services Committee gets a chance to look at the over-all picture, in connection with the $56,000,000,000 requested to be appropriated for the defense of our country; the $4,000,000,000, which presumably will be asked for atomic-energy development; and the $2,800,000,000 for public works. All those matters must be considered together.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator still skillfully evades. The Committee on Foreign Relations has nothing to do with the $56,000,000,000 recommended appropriation, but the Senator from Massachusetts does have, and he puts that up as a bugaboo while he is saying that he will not tell how much he favors for mutual security.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. In reference to the question whether it is better for an American boy to have a gun or for a boy in Europe to have a gun, I merely wish to say that if it means that the man in Europe will help do Europe's part of the fighting, I am willing that Europe should have some guns. I think the American people should be willing to let Europeans have some guns to help in the fight against communism. We do not want to see the fighting done by Americans. We do not want to see American boys killed in an effort to protect the whole world.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of the action taken by the Senate in referring S. 3086 to the Armed Services Committee, and the announcement of the majority leader as to pending business, and also the business which will be forthcoming later, I wish to make some observations.

First, when the mutual security bill is reported by the Armed Services Committee, it is my intention to offer an amendment which will include the entire St. Lawrence seaway proposal, because I consider the seaway to be a part of mutual security. If anything is mutual, it is the relation between the United States and Canada. That is one matter about which we can be sure today in this mad world. It is my intention to give every Senator a chance to go on record and do his part in the creation of the St. Lawrence seaway as a matter of mutual security. That is the first thing I shall propose.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is it the desire of the Senator from Minnesota that the Senate not take up the St. Lawrence seaway measure until the mutual security bill comes from the Armed Services Committee? It may be quite a while before it is reported again.

Mr. TOBEY. We could take up the St. Lawrence seaway bill tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Arizona that I have a second alternative. I am not trying to be in any way unkind to the majority leader, and I voted with him on the question of referring the mutual security bill to the Armed Services Committee. I voted against referring it. I think the Senator's position is right, and I agree with him in his statement. I think we can at least amend the mutual security bill to provide some mutual security in this hemisphere, and that includes development of the St. Lawrence seaway.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Minnesota take that view before the Committee on Armed Services, where the bill is now pending?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be more than happy to take it before the Armed Services Committee. I do not know whether I will get their view, but they will at least get what little benefit may come from my views.

I have a second proposal to make, to which I invite the attention of the majority leader. If and when the McCarran bill comes before the Senate—and it is to be the second item of business after the mine-safety bill—it is my intention to move that the McCarran bill be replaced by the St. Lawrence seaway measure.

Along with the Senator from New York, I wish to voice a protest. We worked almost a year on an immigration bill which would be a substitute for the McCarran bill. The McCarran proposal is a recodification of all immigration laws, and includes in it any number of legislative booby traps and other things that are being resisted by many religious, fraternal, and civic groups and national societies throughout the country.

The press of America has become alive to some of the difficulties involved in the McCarran bill. Editorial after editorial has appeared in Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish papers, and representatives of religious groups are coming before the Members of Congress saying that we ought to go slow and support the Humphrey-Lehman or Lehman-Humphrey proposal, which is a proposal in which they are interested.

I have told the majority leader what my position is. I am not being critical of him. The McCarran bill has been before the Senate a long time. I say the Committee on the Judiciary owes us a hearing on a substitute proposal advanced by 12 or 13 Members of the Senate. We have not had any hearing. Therefore, I wish to tell the majority leader that if the McCarran bill comes before the Senate as the second item of business, I shall move, first, to substitute the St. Lawrence seaway measure. If that is unsuccessful, I may say there is going to be a long pitched battle here, because there are surely a great number of people in this country who are concerned about an equitable immigration law and we think that the substitute measure would provide an equitable immigration law.

I know the majority leader and others are concerned about Japanese and other oriental immigration. That can be taken care of separately. We do not want to buy the whole package that has come from the Committee on the Judiciary, known as the McCarran bill.

I wanted the majority leader to know my position. I stated it to him privately; now I am stating it publicly.

Mr. McFARLAND. In all fairness, I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I do not desire to commit myself this far ahead, but I shall probably oppose any proposal to substitute the St. Lawrence seaway bill for the immigration bill. There is no connection whatever between them. I have been interested in helping the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway, and have wanted to push that measure along as rapidly as possible. But I should like to see it come forward in such a manner that it will have a fair opportunity to be passed by the Senate. So I probably shall be one of those who will vote against the Senator's proposal. I want it understood now that if we proceed with measures in their proper order, in an orderly manner, I shall support it. But if it is proposed to do anything like what is suggested by the Senator from Minnesota, I shall probably oppose it as vigorously as I can.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the information of Senators, the Chair thinks it his duty to state that while a motion

is pending to take up one bill it is not in order to move to substitute another bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that. I was merely discussing what I feel are some of the alternatives to be presented in the days to come.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course, if a bill is taken up it is then in order to move to displace it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I understand that the unfinished business is the Neely mine-safety bill, and we must surely act on that measure.

I am merely saying to the majority leader, who has been with us in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway bill, that I am not differing with him, and I do not say he has not cooperated. I am merely saying that the McCarran bill, which recodifies all immigration laws since the beginning of the Republic, is a bill which is not thoroughly understood. It is a bill which has been lying on the table a long time. For 2 months there has been a substitute bill before the committee, and there have been no hearings on it.

I desire that the RECORD be perfectly clear that I have no delusions as to what is going to happen in the days to come. I know that we do not have time to go through hundreds of pages of legislative amendments and that undoubtedly, if the McCarran bill is passed, we are going to have ourselves saddled with a very unfortunate piece of legislation.

I ask the majority leader at least to give credence to the validity of the argument that after many people representing some of the greatest religious, civic, and fraternal bodies in America, have worked for a year to perfect a substitute measure, at least they are deserving of a hearing before a committee of the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me say to my good friend for Minnesota that fortunately or unfortunately—I think fortunately for me—I do not have control of the committees, and I cannot tell them what they should do or what they should not do. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that when he offers his substitute I shall certainly give what he has to say my careful consideration before I cast my vote. I realize that the immigration bill is a large bill, and involves a codification of all the immigration laws. It should receive careful consideration. However, there are certain provisions in that bill which I feel must be given consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They are worthy of consideration.

Mr. McFARLAND. One of them is the provision that the Japanese shall have the same privileges as others in the East. I feel that we must take up the bill and consider it. I am sorry if the Senator from Minnesota has not had the hearings to which he feels he is entitled. That fact may result in more time being consumed on the floor of the Senate. However, I assure the Senator that I will give careful consideration to whatever he may have to say on the subject.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to address a question to the majority leader. First, let me say that our bill takes care of the oriental situation to exactly the same degree, and quite as fully as does the McCarran bill.

I am very much interested in the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

I have fought for that project for upwards of 30 years—I believe longer than has any other Member of the Senate. I shall certainly make every effort to see that it is considered and brought to a vote.

However, I am also deeply concerned about the immigration bill. I am concerned because we are estopped from having a real hearing, in which the American people, including many civic, religious, and national groups and others may have an opportunity to express their opinion and point out the weaknesses of the McCarran bill and the merits—if there are any—of the substitute bill which my associates and I have introduced.

I feel that it is proper to bring this matter vigorously to the attention of the Senate and of the American people, because when we vote on the bill which is to be taken up after the mine safety bill is disposed of, I think the Senate should be in possession of all the facts, and should decide not to take up the McCarran bill at that time, but to take up the St. Lawrence seaway measure. I think it should be made perfectly clear that in the opinion of the Senate a hearing should be afforded on the substitute immigration bill. I think that is a reasonable request. I believe that the protest and demand which have been made are fair.

I bring this subject to the attention of this body and to the attention of the American people, because I think we are not receiving a square deal. I do not believe that the American people are receiving a square deal if legislation so complex and bulky as that represented by the two bills to which reference has been made is to be passed without the closest scrutiny by the committee, in the first place, and by the Senate, in the second place. The committee has not scrutinized the substitute bill. It has not opened the bill. It has not the slightest idea what is in the bill. I feel that I am justified in making this demand, and in making as vigorous a protest as lies in my power. I hope that I shall be supported.

In conclusion, I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. I have laid my cards on the table. My colleague from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has done likewise. We shall endeavor to have the McCarran bill laid aside temporarily, and take up the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

I should like to have notice as to the time when the distinguished majority leader intends to seek to have brought up the next bill after the mine-safety bill. I ask the majority leader to agree to give notice to the Senator from Minnesota and myself when he intends to bring forth a proposal to take up whatever bill he may decide to try to bring up. In that way we can oppose, if we wish to do so, taking up such a bill, or we can offer a substitute for it in the form of other legislation. I think I am making a fair and reasonable request.

I voted against the Knowland motion, because I thought it bad for the country, and bad for the peace and security of the world. However, I do not wish to be trampled upon. I do not wish to have the rights of our people trampled upon. I do not wish to see a far reaching piece of legislation such as is represented by the immigration bill passed without the most minute and careful scrutiny. We intend to offer Senate bill 2842 as a substitute and to offer many scores, if not hundreds, of amendments if we are not successful in securing the passage of our substitute bill.

Mr. President, I think the request which I am making of the majority leader is reasonable.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I certainly agree that the request which the Senator from New York has made is reasonable. It is reasonable for any Senator to ask that he be given notice ahead of time as to when a motion is to be made to bring up certain legislation. That is my reason for giving such notice at this time. Certainly before I make the motion I will see to it that the distinguished Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota are notified and given an opportunity to be present in the Chamber.

My good friends have been very patient with me and considerate of what I have tried to do. For a period of approximately 2 months the bill referred to has been on the calendar but has not been considered. I see no evidence that there are to be hearings in the Judiciary Committee. I have not heard of any vote to allow hearings. Under those circumstances, I feel that the only way to bring the subject before the Senate for consideration is to move to proceed to consider the bill which has been reported. Then if the distinguished Senator from New York and other Senators who join with him desire to do so, of course it will be their privilege to move to take up the substitute. The subject can then be fully debated.

That is about all I can say in that connection.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to associate myself with the statements of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] regarding the immigration bill. I believe that their bill, of which I am a cosponsor, is a far superior bill. However, I do not want the St. Lawrence seaway project to be brought up under circumstances in which it would be handicapped. I am very glad

to hear the majority leader say that he is ready to support that measure.

I hope that the majority leader will see fit to substitute the St. Lawrence bill for the immigration bill so the Lehman-Humphrey measure may be considered by the committee. I hope the distinguished Senator from Arizona will see his way clear to do this.

But in any event, I should like to ask the majority leader whether we can have his assurance that if the immigration bill is considered first, the St. Lawrence seaway measure will be brought before the Senate for a vote and next on the agenda.

The St. Lawrence seaway project has been under discussion for more than a quarter of a century. It has been backed not only by every President for the past quarter century, but by every nominee for the presidency of both parties. The measure has been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations by a vote of 9 to 4. I realize that we are trying to adjourn at an early date. I am afraid that the measure might be caught in the late adjournment rush, and in that way not come to a vote before the Senate. Therefore I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether we could have his assurance that either before or after the immigration bill is disposed of, the St. Lawrence seaway project measure will be brought up for a vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Policy Committee of the Senate has not considered the question of when the St. Lawrence seaway bill should be brought up for consideration by the Senate. I do not like to take all the responsibility in that regard, and I should not be expected to take all the responsibility. All I can say to my good friend from Michigan is that I am in favor of having it considered by the Senate. As Senators well know, I should like to have it considered at an early date. I hope that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] will give very careful consideration to what the effect might be of substituting the St. Lawrence seaway bill for other legislation, unless it is done as a last resort.

Mr. President, I cannot tell in advance what the Policy Committee will decide to do. I can tell the Senator from Michigan that I am in favor of taking up the St. Lawrence seaway bill and having it considered at this session of Congress. But I realize that we get into legislative snarls. For example, the vote today on the mutual security bill has delayed and jeopardized consideration not only of the St. Lawrence seaway bill but of other bills as well. So far as I am concerned I shall not hold it against some of my friends on the other side of the aisle for voting against us, even though I know that they could have helped us if they had voted with us.

I shall do my very best to have all important legislation considered by the Senate at this session. There are other important bills which will have to be considered. Perhaps it will mean that we shall have to work longer hours and a few more days than we thought would be necessary. I hope the committees will give early consideration to all important legislation, particularly the appropriation bills, which must be acted upon. The faster we can pass these bills the more it will help all of us.

The mutual security authorization bill which we were considering today, until it was referred to another committee, must be passed in both the Senate and in the House before the Appropriations Committees of both Houses can consider the subject. There can be no question that the work of the Senate has been delayed by the vote today to refer the mutual security bill to the Armed Services Committee. Let those who did it take the responsibility.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I realize that the distinguished Senator from Arizona is not the entire Policy Committee. I also realize the high respect in which his colleagues hold him and the great influence which he has in the committee. I hope he will use that influence in this case. I would appreciate his giving us assurance that his purpose would be to see to it that the St. Lawrence seaway measure will come up for consideration either before or directly after action is taken on the immigration bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know what important legislation may come up for consideration even tomorrow.

Mr. MOODY. There is no more important legislation than the seaway legislation.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know about that. Some very important legislation may be proposed in the Senate. I have gotten myself into a few awkward positions by making promises and then trying to live up to them. I will say that I will do what I can—and I know that the Senator from Michigan believes me when I tell him that——

Mr. MOODY. I know that I can take the word of the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I appreciate his statement.

Mr. McFARLAND. However, I do not want to commit myself to do something that I may not be able to do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Oregon without losing the floor.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of the Humphrey-Lehman immigration bill, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made this afternoon, and to express the view that those of us who are sponsors of the bill—and we are a considerable number in the Senate—are entitled to the parliamentary courtesy of having a hearing held on our bill before another bill, for which our bill is intended as a substitute, is brought before the Senate for debate and action. I think that is a just, fair, and reasonable request.

I am at a loss to understand why a bill on this subject should be scheduled for a vote on the floor of the Senate when a large number of us have not had an opportunity of having a hearing held on our bill. Such a course violates my sense of fairness. Hearings on the Humphrey-Lehman bill should be proceeded with at once so that we may have the record put on the desk of every Senator. In that way each Senator can take his choice between the two records, and decide whether the McCarran bill or the Humphrey-Lehman bill should be adopted. In my judgment that is the way legislation should be considered in the Senate, not by literally setting aside a large group of our colleagues in the Senate and saying to them, "You have a bill, but we will not give it hearings; we will leave it up to you to amend on the floor of the Senate the bill on which hearings have been held."

I am sure that after further reflection on the subject the point of fairness that I now make will receive favorable consideration from the Senators who are in charge of scheduling the business of the Senate, and that the McCarran bill will be set aside until hearings have been held on the Humphrey-Lehman bill.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Connecticut, without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The so-called McCarran bill is 300 pages long. I venture to suggest that very few Members of the Senate are likely to read it. In my judgment it is full of inconsistencies and potential injustices, not only to fellow American citizens but to those who seek to become American citizens after entry into this country.

It would be a tragic mistake, in my opinion, Mr. President, if we did not follow the leadership of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who have given so much thought and time to this bill, by seeing to it that hearings are granted upon the bill, so that the complex issues in the two bills might be drawn up side by side for the Senate to see and understand more clearly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] may make a brief statement at this time without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, a few moments ago I spoke on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project. I should like to make it clear that I feel that the great work which has been done by many organizations on the so-called Humphrey-Lehman bill should have very serious consideration by the Senate. I am sure that it will be brought up in one way or another. Therefore it seems to me that the proper course of action for the Senate to follow would be to have the Committee on the Judiciary hold the hearings on the bill that have been requested this afternoon.

I hope the committee is willing to give consideration to the proposals made by the distinguished Senators who have spoken here, and is willing to give consideration to the views of a great many persons who are intensely interested in this matter because it means their very lives. They object strenuously to some of the provisions of this 300-page bill. If Senators choose to ignore those proposals and those views, of course, they can do so. However, I hope they will not.

In my judgment, it would be wise for the Senate to defer considering the McCarran bill until the Humphrey-Lehman bill has been gone into thoroughly by the Judiciary Committee. I would regret to see these two great issues, the St. Lawrence and Lehman bills, both of which are so important, caught in a vise on a question of substituting one for the other, because the result might be to bring about the defeat of both of them.

So I hope the majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who is sponsoring a bill of his own, will give consideration to the bill introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I am at a loss to understand why that bill, which was introduced many weeks ago, has not been given serious consideration and why hearings have not been held on it long before now.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT RELATING TO BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably the bill (S. 1973) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with reference to the building and construction industry, and for other purposes, with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 1509) thereon.

At this time I should like to submit a brief analysis of the bill:

First, it permits the execution of collective-bargaining agreements prior to the hiring of employees in the building trades industry.

Second, it permits labor agreements which require membership in the contracting union on or after the seventh day following employment.

Third, it permits such agreements despite any other provision of the act or of any other Federal, State, or Territorial law.

Fourth, it requires that a labor organization executing such a contract be in compliance with the financial statement and non-Communist-affidavit-filing provisions of the present act.

Fifth, and finally, it provides for an expedited election in which employees covered by a contract permitted under the bill could choose another bargaining representative.

Mr. President, these amendments are intended to remedy the hardships and disruption of labor relations which have resulted from the proved impracticability of accommodating the normal doctrines and election procedures of the National Labor Relations Act to the building and construction industry. I may say that we held extensive hearings on the bill; and with the bill, which is reported favorably from the committee, a report is being filed.

It is my hope that we shall soon reach the bill, for consideration in the Senate, because of the dire need in the building and construction industry for the enactment of this remedial legislation. I may say that it has bipartisan support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE BENEFITS—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am about to ask unanimous consent to introduce and send to the desk 3 bills to amend the social security laws. These bills are a part of a series designed to liberalize the social security benefits for the American people. I trust that the Congress will see fit to act on these bills during the current session.

The social security system at this time is a dual one. In addition to the contributory phase of the program, our laws also provide for old-age assistance. The inflated cost of living in recent months has placed a severe burden upon all Americans, but a particularly onerous burden on our older citizens who are forced to live on a fixed income. Members of the Senate are already aware of the bill I introduced a few days ago, providing for an average increase of 12½ percent in old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Mr. President, I would say again that the statistical information I received from the Social Security Board indicated that such a 12½-percent increase could be forthcoming without any additional taxes or without in any way sacrificing the solvency of the social security fund. I presented my documentation from the board to uphold my position.

In addition to this increase in insurance benefits, it is important that we increase the benefits going to the recipients of old-age assistance.

Therefore, I send to the desk a bill to increase by $5 the financial contribution of the Federal Government toward the payment for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children.

There is a second and most urgent problem in connection with our social security laws. A number of editorials recently have been written urging the reform in those laws insofar as they affect the ceiling income which a recipient of old-age and survivors insurance benefits may earn without loss of those benefits. I ask unanimous consent that two of those editorials in my possession—one from the Washington Post of April 20, 1952, and the other from the Saturday Evening Post of April 5, 1952—be incorporated in the body of the RECORD following this statement.

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

(See exhibits A and B.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so as to complete my statement about the bill, let me say that in this period of growing manpower shortage, it is wrong to discourage persons over 65 years of age from working even at part-time jobs. However, our present law does just that. Our laws do not discriminate against a recipient of old-age benefits if he receives additional funds through investments, annuities, or employment in a job not covered by the Social Security Act.

Mr. President, I wish to make clear, for the RECORD, that if a man is a recipient of old-age insurance and if he receives additional income from stocks or dividends or from some employment not covered by the old-age insurance legislation, he still can obtain his old-age insurance benefits check. However, if he is over 65 years of age and if he has more than $50 a month income from any employment that is covered by the social-security legislation, he will receive no old-age and survivors insurance benefits check. Such a situation seems to me to be downright discrimination.

That act discriminates against a person who attempts to earn additional funds by part-time or full-time employment in a job covered by the Social Security Act. Regardless of whatever merit there may have been at one time for such a provision, in my judgment, it does not exist today. It works to the disadvantage of persons in the lower-income brackets, who—after all—are those most in need of social-security benefits.

It would be preferable, in my judgment, to eliminate all ceilings from the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the law. It is my judgment, however, that the Congress would not be prepared to go that far at this time. However, a healthy society is one which makes the maximum use of available manpower, and a healthy individual is one who can feel that by his employment he is making a contribution to his society, regardless of his age.

Mr. President, by increasing the amount of income which a recipient of benefits under the old-age insurance system may earn and may still retain his insurance benefits, we shall release millions of man-hours of skilled labor for our production program. We need additional manpower, and we need the experience and the trained manpower of our senior citizens.

I wish to emphasize the point that many of these persons at the age of 65 are still in the vigor of life; and their old-age insurance benefits come to them by right, not by charity, for those funds have been contributed to by themselves and by their employers. So those beneficiaries receive those funds by right. Yet the social security system law, because it was written in the days of the depression, when we wished to decrease the number of employables, prevents a man from receiving any old-age insur-

ance benefits if he has additional income amounting to $50 a month or more. I think that provision of the law should be changed. My proposal is that such a person should be allowed to earn at least $100 a month, for today a man cannot live on $49.99 a month, plus what little insurance benefits he is able to obtain. After all, Mr. President, under the present law the recipients of these insurance benefits are being discriminated against by being denied a chance to obtain gainful employment.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not true that any person who has an annuity policy with a private insurance company will receive those annuity payments regardless of whether he continues to work?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Obviously that is true.

Mr. MOODY. Does the Senator from Minnesota know that in the city of Detroit not long ago a man over 65 years of age earned in 1 month, at odd jobs, $50.67, and as a result of the fact that he earned 67 cents more in 1 month than this foolish law allows a recipient of benefits under the old-age-insurance system to receive, he was disqualified from receiving from the Government the annuity for which he had paid?

I should like to add that I am delighted that the Senator from Minnesota is introducing a bill on this subject, for I have a similar bill at the desk, and I would be happy to join the Senator from Minnesota in urging early action.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I understand that many of the newspapers throughout the country—and one which I can recall at the moment is the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which recently published an editorial on the subject—have referred to that same provision of the present law.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who now is serving as Presiding Officer of the Senate, knows more than any of the rest of us do about financial matters and the system of insurance benefits, and I hope he will lead in the effort to increase the ceiling in this insurance structure and at the same time make it possible for employment to be had by thousands and thousands of our senior citizens who would engage in additional and valuable employment if they were permitted to do so under the old-age-insurance system.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to introduce and send to the desk the bill which will increase to $100 the amount which old-age and survivors' insurance beneficiaries may earn in covered employment without loss of insurance payments.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill which makes it possible for employees of institutions of higher education to be covered under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, under the terms of Federal-State agreements, regardless of the fact that these employees may be covered by an existing retirement system.

In a poll of public educational institutions conducted by the American Council on Education in March 1950, 80 percent of the institutions expressing an opinion favored giving college-university teachers who are members of public-retirement systems an opportunity to go under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program. Over 83 percent favored making coverage available to nonteaching personnel covered by a public plan.

I hold in my hand a letter which I have received from the president of my university, Dr. James L. Morrill, president of the University of Minnesota. In writing as a spokesman, he informed me that at the annual meeting of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, held at Houston, Tex., last November, the presidents of the member institutions, meeting with the member institutions of the National Association of State Universities, concluded by an overwhelming majority that those institutions should be accorded the opportunity of coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system.

This principle has been accepted by a great many Members of the Senate. In fact, I am cosponsor of a bill, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Senator LEHMAN, Senate bill 2705, in which this recommendation is incorporated. In the interest of clarifying this simple and straightforward objective, I have been asked to introduce the bill which I am now sending to the desk. This bill would separate this provision from other amendments of the Social Security Act which might be more controversial. It is a pleasure for me to introduce this bill.

It is my hope that the Senate Finance Committee will soon schedule hearings on this bill. A companion bill, H. R. 5604, has been introduced in the House of Representatives.

The Members of the Senate are aware that I, as a cosponsor of Senate bill 3079, am in favor of a more extended revision of the Social Security Act than is provided for in these bills. The three bills which I am introducing today do not call for lengthy consideration or extended debate. They are meritorious on their face, and should be acted upon without further delay.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Post of April 20, 1952]

DISCOUNT ON WORK

Reform is urgently needed in many sections of the Nation's social-security laws. but the first call for attention should be the provision denying a person his old-age benefit if he earns more than $50 a month in a job covered by social security. The Social Security Act discourages persons over 65 from working even at part-time jobs. A person who can find a job not covered by social security, however, may earn as much as possible and continue to receive his old-age benefit. Or, if he happens to have investments or annuities, he may receive any amount of money from them and yet continue to draw his old-age benefit under social security. Here is a discrimination against earnings as opposed to incomes.

That discriminatory rule was written when the New Deal was fighting mass unemployment and using every possible device to get people out of the labor market. Now there is a manpower shortage and a great need to encourage people to work. The chief person hurt is the one in the lower-income brackets who needs the benefit most of all, but, in present circumstances, society itself is the loser. Society is losing the labor of many persons who would like to work part time but refuse to do so because they would have to forego a pension they believe they have earned. All this is without consideration of the immensely important fact that nearly everyone is better off doing some kind of work.

In its annual report just issued, the Social Security Administration recognizes the inequity of the old-age provision and recommends a partial reform. The reform, unfortunately, does not go far enough. It would merely raise by an unspecified amount the total which beneficiaries may earn and still receive benefits. Most of the objections would still prevail even if the amount were $100 or $150 rather than $50. The report says that the earnings ceiling "should not be so large that beneficiaries could continue to work at regular full-time jobs and still get benefits." But the Nation needs their work.

Persons over 75 receive old-age benefits whether they earn $50 a month or $500. It would be costly to make the same provision for all over 65 at once, but we should move as fast as possible in that direction. Persons over 65 should not be discriminated against for being worth-while members of society. That is what the present law does.

EXHIBIT B

[From the Saturday Evening Post of April 5, 1952]

WHY PUT A LIMIT ON EARNINGS OF RETIRED PEOPLE?

Under the unique theory embodied in the social-security law, a single man or widower who has retired and is receiving a maximum of $80 per month may not earn more than an additional $50 per month. If he is paid more than that, he forfeits his $80 stipend. In fact, it is only slightly more than a year ago that Congress amended the law to permit beneficiaries to augment their social-security income to the extent of $50. Before January 1, 1951, the limit was $15 a month.

Just how elderly people on small annuities are supposed to pay their bills in these inflationary times, the Social Security Act does not state. Neither does it explain the justice of restricting the amount which a retired man may earn by his own labor when no restriction is placed on what a more fortunate oldster may receive from investments, private pensions, and annuities, or rich and grateful relatives. Another mystery is the provision in the law by which beneficiaries of social security who reach the age of 75 are permitted to earn as much as they like.

However, until he is too old to tear into an 8-hour day like a game cock, the retired man does well to play it safe. If he decides that it is ridiculous to try to live on $130 a month—his $80 social security stipend plus the $50 he is permitted to earn—and goes out and gets a job, the first $100 a month he earns, less income tax, makes it a stand-off between working and sitting quietly on the porch. The $80 social-security check which he forfeited, was tax-free but the $100 or more which he earns is taxable at the new high rates. Any normal annuitant would ask himself, "Why work for the price of loafing?"

On page 18 of the 1951 booklet, Your New Social Security, is found a heading: "Who pays for it?" The answer: "Federal old-age and survivors insurance is paid for by a contribution (or tax) on the employee's wage and the self-employed person's earnings from his trade or business." Well, if the retired worker has "paid for" his benefit, along with an equal contribution by his employer, what

business is it of the Government what other income he has or how he earns it? A man on a private retirement plan gets his pension without any strings attached as to the amount he may earn. The same is true of annuities from insurance companies. Social security is described by the Federal wind machines as insurance for which the worker has paid with his own money along with a contribution by the boss. But if the worker at age 65 has bought no more than an obligation not to add to his small allowance by taking a job on the side, he has a right to ask, "Is this insurance or a dole?"

This restriction on the earnings of social-security beneficiaries was tacked onto the law in 1934 because it was considered a good idea to discourage elderly people from entering the labor market. Unemployment was high when the law was passed. But, aside from economic hardships, the restriction discourages able and active men from utilizing their abilities at a time of life when they need all the help they can get. Retirement is tough going for most healthy men, and to force idleness on them is a cruel injustice. Social workers and business leaders who expected retirement plans to solve the problem now hold conferences on how to reconcile people to retirement.

There is also the national angle. If the Nation's defense industries demand more and more men, it is obvious that the abilities and skills of thousands of men who have reached their sixty-fifth birthdays can be used. It is a strange policy indeed which would suppress this available labor supply by bribing men not to take jobs that pay them more than $12 a week. When this antisocial practice is carried on in the name of social insurance, to which all employed people are compelled to contribute out of their earnings, insult is added to injury. Representative W. STERLING COLE, of New York, has proposed an amendment to the Social Security Act, permitting people over 65 to earn $100 a month without losing their annuities. But why should there be any limit at all?

There being no objection, the bills introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY were severally received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 3120. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal financial participation for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children;

S. 3121. A bill to increase the amount which old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries may earn in covered employment without loss of benefits; and

S. 3122. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize the extension of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to employees of institutions of higher education who are covered by State or local government retirement systems.

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, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1650. An act to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Savannah, Chatham County, Ga.;

S. 1798. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico relating to the waters of the Canadian Rivers;

S. 2160. An act to authorize the Attorney General to admit persons committed by State courts to Federal penal and correctional institutions when facilities are available;

S. 2223. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy the Government-owned magnesium foundry at Teterboro, N. J.; and

S. 2639. An act to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

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. 586. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land on the Chena River to the Tanana Valley Sportsmen's Association, of Fairbanks, Alaska; and

H. R. 4199. An act to authorize the transfer of lands from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 755. An act for the relief of Dr. Eleftheria Paidoussi;

H. R. 836. An act for the relief of Harumi China Cairns;

H. R. 1968. An act for the relief of Senta Ziegler;

H. R. 1969. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic;

H. R. 2355. An act for the relief of Nobuko Hiramoto;

H. R. 2608. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act;

H. R. 2676. An act for the relief of Andrijana Bradicic;

H. R. 3136. An act for the relief of May Quan Wong (also known as Quan Shee Wong);

H. R. 3271. An act for the relief of Toshiaki Shimada;

H. R. 3524. An act for the relief of Jan Yee Young;

H. R. 3598. An act for the relief of Lydia Daisy Jessie Greene;

H. R. 3830. An act to authorize the construction and equipment of geomagnetic station for the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 4220. An act for the relief of Hazel Fong Hee;

H. R. 4337. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions;

H. R. 4397. An act for the relief of Mingian Hammerlind;

H. R. 4535. An act for the relief of Nigel C. S. Salter-Mathieson;

H. R. 4764. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the participation of certain Provinces of the Dominion of Canada in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4772. An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Harris;

H. R. 4788. An act for the relief of Yoko Takeuchi;

H. R. 4911. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Maria Kuebler;

H. R. 5187. An act for the relief of Rodney Drew Lawrence;

H. R. 5437. An act for the relief of Motoko Sakurada;

H. R. 5590. An act for the relief of Marc Stefen Alexenko;

H. R. 5922. An act for the relief of Karin Riccardo;

H. R. 5931. An act for the relief of Holly Prindle Goodman;

H. R. 5609. An act to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of poisons in the mails to persons or concerns having scientific use therefor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5936. An act for the relief of Kunto Itoh;

H. R. 6012. An act for the relief of Gylda Raydel Wagner;

H. R. 6055. An act for the relief of Anne de Baillet-Latour;

H. R. 6088. An act for the relief of Hisako Suzuki;

H. R. 6101. An act to extend the provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, to the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 6172. An act for the relief Manami Tago;

H. R. 6480. An act for the relief of Elaine Irving Hedley;

H. R. 6561. An act for the relief of Monika Waltraud Fecht; and

H. R. 6805. An act to increase the salary of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia.

REGULATION OF USE OF CERTAIN MEDICINES IN TREATMENT OF EPILEPSY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am sure that, like myself, many other Members of the Senate have received letters from constituents objecting to a proposed food and drug regulation which would, it seems, cut them off from a source of medical aid which has meant a great deal to them. These people, Mr. President, are unfortunate victims of epilepsy—a disease for which there is as yet no cure. They carry a grievous burden through no fault of their own. It is obviously the duty of decent people in and out of Government to do everything possible to help them and to shun anything which would unnecessarily add to their troubles. Yet their obviously honest, sincere, and troubled letters indicate that if the proposed regulation is allowed to take effect, it will, in their opinion, cause still further anguish and suffering.

Mr. President, I do not pretend to be an authority on epilepsy, on how it should be treated, or on the type of governmental regulations which may be needed to protect the public interest in these matters. Seeking information on this problem, I turned to one of our colleagues who for years has made it his business to study all phases of health legislation, a man who most certainly has a thorough knowledge of the human as well as the legalistic aspects involved in these problems. I refer to our esteemed colleague the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who for more than a decade has carried the responsibility of investigating for the Senate legislative proposals in the field of health. As regards this particular problem. I regard his opinion as most authoritative, since he was and is chairman of the Senate committee which considered the legislation under which the regulation in question is purportedly based—a committee, I must say, which struck from that legislation language which would have done by law that which it is now proposed to do by regulation. I find, Mr. President, that the Senator from Montana feels strongly that this regulation should not be permitted to take effect. I find that he has already vigorously protested the issuance of the regulation to which my constituents take exception. I find that his belief is based upon a thorough knowledge of the problem and is buttressed by sound and considered reason-

ing. I find those reasons most persuasive, and I think they should be brought to the attention of all those in the Congress who share my deep concern over the new problem confronting those poor people who have been unfortunate enough to be stricken by epilepsy.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the conclusion of these remarks, a letter from the Senator from Montana to Mr. Oscar R. Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, in which the Senator urges that the proposed regulation be withheld, and an accompanying statement setting forth his well-considered reasons for taking that position. I commend them to the attention of the Congress.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
PUBLIC WELFARE,
March 13, 1952.

Hon. OSCAR R. EWING,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EWING: I am enclosing a series of letters sent me by good citizens of Montana in protest against a proposed regulation which apparently would make it impossible for these sufferers from epilepsy to continue to receive the medicines they believe helpful as they have in the past. I believe that if you read these letters, Mr. Ewing, you will conclude as I have that the writers are honest, sincere, and sorely troubled people unfortunate enough to have been stricken by epilepsy or to have someone in the family who has been so stricken. Since as yet we have no cure for epilepsy, theirs is already a grievous burden at best. They deserve our sympathy and every help we can give them. Yet, as their letters show so clearly, they are convinced that if this regulation goes into effect, the Government will be adding to their present burdens another and most serious one; that we shall be depriving them of a tested and effective source of aid without giving them any other place to which to turn for help.

Now I know that the Food and Drug Administration exists solely to help and not to hurt our people. I am convinced that Commissioner Crawford and his aides are sincere in their belief that it is very dangerous for anyone to take habit-forming drugs such as phenobarbital unless a physician actually sees the patient regularly and increases or decreases the dose in accordance with the patient's condition and considering the presence or absence of other diseases which the patient may not have been aware of. I know that the proposed regulation is intended to aid rather than to harm epileptic patients. Nonetheless, after reading these letters, I am convinced that the proposed regulation if issued at this time, under these circumstances, and before every effort has been made to solve the problem in other ways and so as to provide these sufferers with a practical and acceptable alternative, would be neither fair nor proper. Therefore, I strongly urge that the proposed regulation be withdrawn and not allowed to go into effect. I ask too that you personally review the many problems involved and that, in transmitting my strong feelings on this matter to the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, you add your own. I do this because of my knowledge of your long and sincere interest in our people's health problems, your professional experience in this field, and your often-proved ability to properly equate long-range and desirable objectives with the immediate realities which confront our people.

For your further information, I am attaching hereto a brief statement of some of the reasons which have led me to urge, as I now do again, that the proposed regulation be withdrawn. In closing, permit me to say that my concern over this matter reflects an interest only in the problems confronting the sufferers from epilepsy and the members of their families who have written me. I have no interest in or personal knowledge of the particular firm which apparently would be adversely affected if this regulation went into effect.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

SOME CONSIDERATIONS LEADING TO THE CONCLUSION THAT THE PROPOSED REGULATION AFFECTING PATIENTS OF THE WESTERN MEDICAL CORP. SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

1. The proposed regulation is based on the idea that if a physician prescribes phenobarbital for a patient he has not himself examined that action may be inimical to the health of the patient.

It is my understanding that if a physician regularly engages in actions actually inimical to the health of his patients, he would be violating both a cardinal principle of the code of medical ethics and the laws governing medical licensure in most of our States.

If this is true and if the physicians working for the Western Medical Corp. are in fact endangering the health of their patients by prescribing phenobarbital on the basis of mailed questionnaires, then I must ask why is this regulation needed? Why have not those Western Medical Corp. physicians, who are members of the Illinois Medical Society, been charged with violating medical ethics and, if they are in fact endangering their patients by their practices, expelled from the society? Surely their fellow doctors know better than we in Washington what practices are bad for patients and most certainly they have obligated themselves to take action against unethical practitioners. Furthermore, why haven't the licenses of all the physicians involved been revoked by the Illinois Board of Medical Examiners if, in fact, these physicians are engaging in practices harmful to their patients? Since neither of these actions has been taken, I can only conclude that the practices followed by the physicians of the Western Medical Corp. are not considered harmful by their fellow practitioners in Illinois. If they are not, then there is no reason for the proposed regulation.

2. I have reviewed the instances presented by the Food and Drug Administration to the Senate's Subcommittee on Health as justifying the contention that phenobarbital should not be dispensed in the manner followed by the physicians of the Western Medical Corp. I find on inquiry that when one thinks in terms of the way medicine is actually practiced in this country, those instances could just as well have occurred to the patients of local practitioners; that similar unfortunate instances have and do occur to the patients of local practitioners; that the proposed regulation might prevent the occurrence of such incidents among the patients of those few doctors affiliated with the Western Medical Corp. but not at all amongst the patients of the some 200,000 other doctors in the country and that, consequently, insofar as the regulation is aimed at ending or minimizing the occurrence of such unfortunate incidents as were recounted to the subcommittee, it is a most ineffectual approach and, insofar as its only effect along these lines would be highly discriminatory, an unfair one.

3. In effect this regulation says to the people who have written me, "Even though you are satisfied with the treatment you have been getting; even though you believe it has been of great help; even though it might well be exactly what your own local doctor might prescribe, we believe it unsafe and we insist that you go to a local physician if you want to continue to receive the medication you have been getting." The Food and Drug Administration has advanced several very persuasive reasons why an epileptic patient should be under the regular and immediate supervision of a doctor of medicine. Were I unfortunate enough to be stricken by epilepsy, I should find those reasons compelling.

It seems to me, however, that such reasoning is of little importance when considered in terms of the facts set forth in the letters sent me. The Government in effect is telling the individuals concerned that they must go to local physicians for the type of treatment they desire and find effective. The facts seem to be that most, if not all, of the patients involved did go to local physicians—often to several and often, on referral to such fine men as those at the Mayo clinic—before they sought help by mail from the doctors of medicine associated with the Western Medical Corp. Only after feeling that their own doctors were not giving them satisfactory care did they turn to Chicago. For reasons compelling to themselves these people decided that as regards epilepsy they could no longer turn for aid to the doctors of medicine in their home communities. Now you would tell them that they cannot seek relief from duly licensed doctors of medicine in Illinois. What alternatives will they have? I think the alternatives are obvious, and I question whether it is either good public policy or good medical policy to leave these poor people with only such alternatives.

Before leaving this point and since it is connected, I noticed with interest that representatives of the Western Medical Corp. stated that they were willing to enter into a stipulation that they would accept no patients for treatment who had not been diagnosed as epileptic by a physician who had actually seen the patient and was willing to so state. It seems to me that the Food and Drug Administration might well have accepted this offer and studied its results before deciding to promulgate the regulation in question.

4. A fourth and most important consideration leading to my conclusion is the following. Even if there were no question but that the objective sought by the proposed regulation was sound and in the public interest, I would still question the advisability of putting it into effect before a real effort had been made to provide a really effective and medically desirable alternative for the patients who will be affected and for their families. These people are carrying a grievous burden. We must make every effort to lighten it rather than to increase it. Yet we would deprive them of their present source of aid and tell them to seek help from sources and through systems already found wanting. Would it not be well to seek the aid of State medical societies, of the AMA, of voluntary health-insurance plans, and of other agencies and attempt to work out plans whereby these people could be assured that they would receive competent treatment for epilepsy, from sources accessible to them, without any stigma of any sort, and at prices they can afford to pay before invoking anything as drastic in its effect as the proposed legislation? Not only do I think it would be well to thoroughly explore all such possibilities first, but I believe that competent, humane administration demands that such an effort be made before any action capable of causing such grave concern to so many already afflicted people is taken.

STATE TITLES TO THEIR TIDELANDS

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on May 3, 1952, the junior Senator from Washington found reason to address a letter to the editor of the New York Times. For the reason that the subject discussed is, I think, of interest to all Senators, I wish to read the letter for the information of the Senate:

MY DEAR MR. EDITOR: Under date of Friday, April 25, I read with interest but concern your editorial which carried the heading, Veto Called For. In this editorial, through which you called for a Presidential veto of legislation confirming State titles to their tidelands, you failed, in my opinion, to recognize certain facts and you made some misleading statements. I trust that your good paper will admit the omissions of fact and will correct those statements which seem to be in error.

Mr. President, I think it would be appropriate at this point to read the editorial to which I have made reference. It reads as follows:

VETO CALLED FOR

A national outcry would doubtless be raised if Congress should pass a bill simply handing over to the States of California, Texas, and Louisiana a multi-billion-dollar asset that now belongs to the people of all the United States. Yet that is, in effect, just what both Houses of Congress have already done in approving two different versions of a quitclaim bill resigning to the States all Federal rights to vast offshore oil deposits. The only choice now facing the conference committee is therefore a choice between two evils; and when the new quitclaim measure comes before him, we urge the President to repeat the veto action he took on a similar bill in 1946.

Last year the House passed by better than 2 to 1 vote the Walter bill giving away to the States full title to the land under the sea from the low-water mark along their coasts out to the traditional 3-mile limit or, in some cases, even beyond. This was essentially the same gift that the Senate approved 3 weeks ago, and we regret to note that Senator IVES, of New York, was one of those who voted for it. But the House went even further. It also gave the States three-eighths of the oil revenue from lands extending all the way out to the edge of the Continental Shelf, which reaches 150 miles into the Gulf of Mexico. Both measures were passed in the face of Supreme Court decisions confirming the paramount rights of the Federal Government to the lands under dispute.

The issue really comes down to whether the Federal Government or the States will control the private exploitation of one of the Nation's most important strategic and economic resources, which the highest Court has clearly indicated lies within the domain not of the States but of the Federal Government. Until the issue is settled, the development of the offshore fields will be hamstrung; and it is regrettable that Congress has refused to accept the compromise O'Mahoney bill that at least would have encouraged work to proceed. This measure would have confirmed Federal title to the area, but would have given the States some revenue. However, any quitclaim bill, in whatever form presented, deserves the Presidential veto it is almost certain to get.

Mr. President, my objections to the attitude shown by the New York Times are contained in the remainder of my letter to the editor, which I wrote under date of May 3, 1952:

Mr. Editor, you have stated that the pending quitclaim legislation would simply be handing over natural resources to California, Texas, and Louisiana—the implication being that these are the only three States involved in the issue. I take it to be so that your editorial writers must know that the legislation in question applies to the submerged lands and resources beneath navigable waters within the statutory boundaries of all the States in the Union.

Your editorial writers ought to know and probably do know that the State of Washington has already been unceremoniously hauled directly into the tidelands question by the Secretary of the Interior who by Executive fiat has attempted to strip Washington State citizens of their coastal submerged lands. I am attaching a copy of the Secretary's letter on the matter to the Governor of the State of Washington for your consideration and information. The Secretary of the Interior has publicly claimed power over the submerged lands of all coastal States.

Permit me to ask several other questions:

Can it be that the Times has charged Mayor Impellitteri, of New York City, with malfeasance in office because he wrote a letter to the junior Senator from New York, Mr. LEHMAN, asking for Senate passage of the quitclaim legislation?

Since the Times editorially supported the candidacy of Dwight Eisenhower, I wonder if you are criticizing the general's policy? Certainly the Times must know that General Eisenhower has endorsed the policy of State ownership of natural resources within their statutory boundaries.

Can the Times be charging as evildoers the attorney general of New York, the Governor of New York and the Port of New York Authority, who have all supported and approved the quitclaim legislation?

Your editorial gives me reason to inquire how really informed is the Times about the facts concerning tidelands, about who has owned these tidelands historically and about the legal status of these tidelands today? There is nothing in your editorial which indicates that the Times has done any competent research on the tidelands question.

Your editorial speaks as though its writer were an acknowledged authority on the tidelands problem. Is the Times aware that it has differed fundamentally from the legal interpretations offered by former Dean Roscoe Pound, of the Harvard University Law School, and other recognized legal authorities such as Prof. Manley O. Hudson, of Harvard, and Prof. John Hanna, of Columbia University Law School? Is the Times actually determined as your editorial implies, to impute moral turpitude to the National Association of Attorneys General, the American Bar Association, the Council of Governors, and the Council of State Governments who have, without more than several dissenting votes, supported and endorsed the quitclaim legislation while constructively criticizing and taking issue with Supreme Court decisions which made the quitclaim legislation necessary?

The Congress has studied and debated the tidelands question and problem for some years. A substantial majority in both Houses of the Congress have voted to pass quitclaim legislation. The Times seeks to dispose of a great public question in an editorial which leaves too much unsaid. I do encourage your writers to give the tidelands question the considered and documented consideration to which it is entitled.

In all sincerity, I beg to remain,
Yours very truly.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Reports of committees are in order. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of 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.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand that there is objection to the nomination of Mr. Adams. I have not been notified that it has been withdrawn. I favor the confirmation of his nomination, but I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of Clarence H. Adams is passed over.

POSTMASTER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James F. Hughes to be postmaster at Boise, Idaho.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand there is objection to the nomination of James F. Hughes, and I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of James F. Hughes to be postmaster at Boise, Idaho, will be passed over.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Karl Robin Bendetsen, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CAIN subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the Department of the Army and the Nation itself on the appointment of Karl Robin Bendetsen, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Army. Some years ago Mr. Bendetsen was a distinguished and promising young citizen of the State of Washington. Those of us who live there have admired his progress, and continued to respect his integrity and his ability, and to wish him well. We feel that his appointment will assure even greater security and protection of our Nation's welfare.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Jack Garrett Scott, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William J. Kennedy, of Ohio, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the nomination of William J. Kennedy be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT AT SAN FRANCISCO

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John P. McEnery, of San Jose, Calif., to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Vice Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowance of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Vice Adm. Matthias B. Gardner, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Wednesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, May 7, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 5 (legislative day of May 1), 1952:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Joseph C. Green, of Ohio, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Edmund J. Dorsz, of the District of Columbia.
Charles W. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Sverre M. Backe, of California.
John W. Campbell, of Alabama.
Vincent Canzoneri, of Maryland.
Ernest B. Gutierrez, of New Mexico.
Lee M. Hunsaker, of Utah.
Leopold J. LeClair, of Massachusetts.
William P. Shockley, Jr., of California.
Francis M. Withey, of Michigan.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

John Crawford Brooks, of California.
Joseph W. Thoman, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Marcus J. Gordon, of Minnesota.
Robert G. Hooker, Jr., of California.
John W. Jago, of California.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Rosel H. Hyde, of Idaho, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1952. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

Marguerite C. Casey, [redacted]
Jean C. Cynkar, [redacted]
Dorothy M. Kuehn, [redacted]
Mary F. McLean, [redacted]

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 5 (legislative day of May 1), 1952:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Karl Robin Bendetsen, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Jack Garrett Scott, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

MINT OF THE UNITED STATES

John P. McEnery, of San Jose, Calif., to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert H. Scarborough
Sydney M. Shuman
John F. O'Connell

To be ensigns

William K. Vogeler
Salvatore J. Bardaro, Jr.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade indicated, subject to qualification provided by law:

To be captains

Isidor E. Rittenburg, effective May 1, 1952.
Kenneth G. Crosby, in accordance with law.
Glendon E. Boothe, in accordance with law.

To be commanders

William F. Deane, effective March 4, 1952.
Edgar F. Hicks, Jr., effective March 4, 1952.
John C. Bull, effective March 4, 1952.
Arthur L. Wardwell, effective March 4, 1952.
Emmett H. Sheridan, in accordance with law.
Raymond H. Tryon, Jr., in accordance with law.
Chester J. Beyma, in accordance with law.

To be lieutenant commanders

V. Ralph Sobieralski, in accordance with law.
Lorne G. Taylor, in accordance with law.
John O. Boyer, in accordance with law.

To be lieutenants

Norman E. Taylor, effective March 1, 1952.
John R. Plaggmier, in accordance with law.
Leonard S. Baker, in accordance with law.
Eugene W. Richards, in accordance with law.
Samuel D. Parkinson, in accordance with law.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Arthur E. Greaves, Jr., in accordance with law.
Omar H. Quade, Jr., in accordance with law.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Matthias B. Gardner, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be major generals

Christian F. Schilt
Thomas J. Cushman

To be brigadier generals

Gregon A. Williams
Frank H. Lamson-Scribner

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be brigadier generals

Arthur H. Butler
Thomas A. Wornham

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 5, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Most merciful and gracious God, whose thoughts toward us are those of love and peace, give us now that confidence which, in the midst of difficulties and dangers, casts itself undismayed and unperplexed upon the Lord.

Grant that we may never allow infidelity and disbelief to invade and infiltrate the sanctuary of our souls and cause us to live negatively and hopelessly.

Inspire us to live affirmatively and faithfully, assured that where Thou dost lead and guide, Thou wilt also provide.

May we help men everywhere to be loyal to the loftiest ideals and principles, releasing and lifting their troubled spirits out of fear into faith, out of bondage into freedom, and out of defeat into victory.

Hear us in the name of the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 1, 1952, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On May 2, 1952:

H. R. 4645. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite A. Brumell.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 755. An act for the relief of Dr. Eleftheria Paidoussi;

H. R. 836. An act for the relief of Harumi China Cairns;

H. R. 1968. An act for the relief of Senta Ziegler;

H. R. 1969. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic;

H. R. 2355. An act for the relief of Nobuko Hiramoto;

H. R. 2608. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act;

H. R. 2676. An act for the relief of Andrijana Bradicic;

H. R. 3136. An act for the relief of May Quan Wong (also known as Quan Shee Wong);

H. R. 3271. An act for the relief of Toshiaki Shimada;

H. R. 3524. An act for the relief of Jan Yee Young;

H. R. 3598. An act for the relief of Lydia Daisy Jessie Greene;

H. R. 3830. An act to authorize the construction and equipment of a geomagnetic station for the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 4220. An act for the relief of Hazel Sau Fong Hee;

H. R. 4337. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions;

H. R. 4397. An act for the relief of Minglan Hammerlind;

H. R. 4535. An act for the relief of Nigel C. S. Salter-Mathieson;

H. R. 4764. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the participation of certain Provinces of the Dominion of Canada in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4772. An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Harris;

H. R. 4788. An act for the relief of Yoko Takeuchi;

H. R. 4911. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Maria Kuebler;

H. R. 5187. An act for the relief of Rodney Drew Lawrence;

H. R. 5437. An act for the relief of Motoko Sakurada;

H. R. 5590. An act for the relief of Marc Stefen Alexenko;

H. R. 5609. An act to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of poisons in the mails to persons or concerns having scientific use therefor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5922. An act for the relief of Karin Riccardo;

H. R. 5931. An act for the relief of Holly Prindle Goodman;

H. R. 5936. An act for the relief of Kunio Itoh;

H. R. 6012. An act for the relief of Gylda Raydel Wagner;

H. R. 6055. An act for the relief of Anne de Baillet-Latour;

H. R. 6088. An act for the relief of Hisako Suzuki;

H. R. 6101. An act to extend the provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, to the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 6172. An act for the relief of Manami Tago;

H. R. 6480. An act for the relief of Elaine Irving Hedley;

H. R. 6561. An act for the relief of Monika Waltraud Fecht; and

H. R. 6805. An act to increase the salary of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 586. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land on the Chena River to the Tanana Valley Sportsmen's Association, of Fairbanks, Alaska;

H. R. 4199. An act to authorize the transfer of lands from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture;

H. R. 4262. An act relating to the height of the building known as 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.;

H. R. 5185. An act for the relief of Epifania Giacone;

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1953; and

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1258. An act to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Louie H. Emfinger;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of Dr. Nicola M. Melucci;

S. 1360. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of John J. Snoke;

S. 1363. An act for the relief of Ceasar J. (Raaum) Syqyia;

S. 1537. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II";

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Sister Stanislaus;

S. 1903. An act for the relief of Toshiko Minowa;

S. 2043. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior;

S. 2256. An act for the relief of Col. Julia O. Flikke and Col. Florence A. Blanchfield;

S. 2324. An act to amend the law relating to the disposition of wages and effects of deceased seamen in order to require that such wages and effects must be delivered to a legal personal representative of the deceased only when they exceed $1,000 in value;

S. 2334. An act for the relief of Miguel Narciso Ossorio;

S. 2379. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907;

S. 2498. An act for the relief of Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi);

S. 2546. An act to provide for attorneys' liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States;

S. 2561. An act for the relief of Susan Patricia Manchester;

S. 2573. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Anson Pease;

S. 2605. An act to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia;

S. 2696. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States;

S. 2706. An act for the relief of Sister Julie Schuler;

S. 2729. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer, without reimbursement, to the Department of the Army the Birmingham General Hospital, Van Nuys, Calif.;

S. 2731. An act to authorize the transfer of hospitals and related facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes;

S. 2735. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended;

S. 2736. An act to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property, and for other purposes;

S. 2805. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Kerr;

S. 2871. An act relating to the manner of appointment of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, the deputy re-

corders, and the employees of the Office of Recorder, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent Resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52–19.

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A DAM ON THE COOS RIVER, OREG.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5652) authorizing the Oregon State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into north slough, Coos County, Oreg., with Senate amendment, 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 authority is hereby granted to the State of Oregon, acting through its highway department, to construct, maintain, and operate, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, a dam and dike for preventing the flow of tidal waters into north slough in Coos County, in township 24 south, range 13 west, Willamette meridian.

"SEC. 2. Work shall not be commenced on such dam and dike until the plans therefor, including plans for all accessory works, are submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, who may impose such conditions and stipulations as they deem necessary for the protection of the United States.

"SEC. 3. The authority granted by this act shall terminate if the actual construction of the dam and dike hereby authorized is not commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years from the date of the passage of this act. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize the construction of a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into north slough, Coos County, Oreg."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us if this Senate amendment has the approval of his committee?

Mr. LARCADE. Yes. The committee approves the amendment as made by the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is simply giving Oregon the right to construct a dam?

Mr. LARCADE. On the Coos River in Oregon. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this a navigable stream?

Mr. LARCADE. Yes, it is.

Mr. RANKIN. But it is the State of Oregon and is not a private corporation?

Mr. LARCADE. Yes. It has the approval of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read by the Clerk:

MAY 1, 1952.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Desiring to be away from my office for a few days, I hereby designate Mr. John A. B. McElveney, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III of the House.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. 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. 66]

Abbitt	Dempsey	James
Adair	Denton	Jarman
Addonizio	Dingell	Jenkins
Andrews	Dollinger	Jensen
Anfuso	Donohue	Johnson
Armstrong	Donovan	Jonas
Ayres	Dorn	Jones, Mo.
Bailey	Elliott	Jones, Hamilton C.
Baring	Elston	
Barrett	Engle	Jones, Woodrow W.
Battle	Fallon	
Beall	Feighan	Judd
Beckworth	Fernandez	Kee
Bender	Fine	Kelley, Pa.
Bolling	Flood	Kennedy
Bolton	Gamble	Kerr
Boykin	Garmatz	Kersten, Wis.
Bray	Gary	King, Pa.
Brownson	Gore	Klein
Bryson	Graham	Lane
Buckley	Granahan	Lantaff
Buffett	Grant	Latham
Bush	Green	Lesinski
Canfield	Greenwood	Lind
Carlyle	Gwinn	McConnell
Carrigg	Hall, Leonard W.	McCulloch
Case		McGrath
Celler	Halleck	McGregor
Chudoff	Harden	McKinnon
Church	Hart	Machrowicz
Clemente	Harvey	Madden
Combs	Hays, Ark.	Miller Calif.
Cooley	Hays, Ohio	Miller, Md.
Corbett	Hedrick	Miller, N. Y.
Coudert	Heffernan	Morano
Crumpacker	Heller	Morgan
Davis, Ga.	Herlong	Morris
Dawson	Hess	Morrison
DeGraffenreid	Hunter	Morton
Delaney	Irving	Multer
Mumma	Robeson	Tackett
Murdock	Roosevelt	Taylor
Murphy	Sabath	Vail
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sadlak	Van Pelt
O'Konski	St. George	Velde
O'Neill	Sasscer	Watts
Osmers	Saylor	Weichel
O'Toole	Scott, Hardie	Welch
Passman	Sheehan	Werdel
Patterson	Shelley	Wharton
Philbin	Sheppard	Wheeler
Polk	Short	Wickersham
Potter	Sieminski	Williams, Miss.
Powell	Sikes	Williams, N. Y.
Prouty	Smith, Wis.	Wilson, Ind.
Rabaut	Stanley	Wood, Ga.
Redden	Steed	Woodruff
Ribicoff	Stigler	Yates
Roberts	Sutton	Yorty

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 253 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the grounds upon which he bases the question of privilege.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have in my possession a number of newspaper articles which appeared in the press of Binghamton, which inflict damage upon my character, upon my reputation, upon my good name as a Member of this House, and upon the standing I have with my constituents. I submit these articles for your inspection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sees a great many articles here that seem to be what the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has said. The Chair does not find in any of these articles, which he has examined hurriedly, anything that would reflect on the character or contribute to moral turpitude on the part of the gentleman from New York. It seems the articles, generally speaking, are what he has said in reply to something said about him.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit that these newspaper articles deal with and describe a situation on the floor of this House on last Thursday afternoon at which time I was attacked and had no opportunity to defend myself because I was not here.

The SPEAKER. Well, that is not the fault of the House. The Chair wants to be entirely fair with the gentleman from New York, but this question of personal privilege is one that must be really laid out, where it reflects upon the gentleman's character, where it contributes to moral turpitude, or something like that, and affects him in his representative capacity.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I hope the Speaker will give me an opportunity to air my views as a result of the charges that have been made against me.

The SPEAKER. Of course, if the gentleman could refer to a case where he has been affected in his representative capacity, or where he has been accused of moral turpitude——

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. There have been accusations made. They were made on the floor Thursday afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will allow the gentleman to take these newspaper articles, and if he can find such accusations for the Chair, the Chair would appreciate it. What the Chair has read have been statements which the gentleman from New York has made in reply to happenings on the floor of the House.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. On page 1 of the Binghamton Press there is a charge that I made certain statements in connection with the current primary campaign in New York State against my opponent and also against other Members of the House. I am here to say that I never made the charges as they were pointed out, and that is the reason I rise today to ask permission from the Speaker and to ask recognition to have an opportunity to express myself on the floor of the House, because I have been unfairly attacked.

For instance, on page 1 of the Binghamton Press as of Friday evening, May 2, there is the headline: "Did HALL say it? Well, 'yes' and 'no,'" leaving the inference to the people of my district that I made a statement or did not make a statement and the result was that the whole issue was left in doubt. I feel that I should have an opportunity to express myself here because I feel, frankly, that I have been wronged as a result of the proceedings on the House floor Thursday afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is attributed in the paper with saying—and it is in quotes—that he reflected on Members as drinking too much liquor on some of their trips and also saying that in all probability they were giving away atomic secrets to the enemy. That is in quotes from the papers, and many of the Members saw it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am sure the Speaker will give me an opportunity to clear that up with the membership.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have a resolution of the privilege of the House, and under that I would be entitled as I understand——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has got to dispose first of the question presented by the gentleman from New York, if the gentleman from Michigan please.

Does the gentleman from New York deny the statement attributed to him in these newspapers? Does he deny the statement attributed to him that he said other Members were in all probability giving away atomic secrets to the enemy under the influence of whisky?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I absolutely deny it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to recognize the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 months it has become evident that there was an undue interest in the primary fight raging in the southern tier of New York by certain Members of the House. I would be the last in the world to say that interest was not justified. They have every right to observe and to take an interest in that primary fight. As you know, it involves two Members of the Congress, and there has been considerable talk about it.

There is no reason in the world why there should not be general interest on the part of the membership of the House; on the other hand, however, I think the fair-minded Members of this House will agree that there should be a hands-off policy in the southern tier insofar as the membership of this House goes in this primary fight. I am not seeking out any personalities or any individuals, because I feel for every last Member of this House a very firm friendship. We are all in this thing together; we all have a common duty to be interested in each other. But I have evidence, Mr. Speaker, that individual Members, probably 15 or 20 are deliberately taking part against me in this primary up in the southern tier of New York, and particularly in Broome County. I am sure the Speaker will agree with me when I say that the average Member of Congress, and I have been a Member of this House for 13 years and speak with some experience, has just about all he can do to take care of affairs in his own district and not borrow trouble in somebody else's district.

I have a copy here of the Binghamton Press which specifically states that a certain Member of Congress attacked me to a reporter of that paper, attacked me disgracefully, and yet insisted to the reporter that his name be withheld. If you were attacked by another Member of Congress or an individual outside, would you be content to feel that the Member or the individual was justified in attacking you if he insisted on having his name withheld?

I know that each and every one of you, with the red blood that is in you, would resent, and resent most strenuously, as I do, to have an attack leveled against you for the consumption of the people of your district, having permanently displayed that attack in the headlines of the largest newspaper of your district. I know you would resent just as I do attacks by Members of Congress when they withhold their names and tell the newspapermen specifically they will not let their names be published.

You know what you would call a thing like that. It is as cowardly and as dastardly as anything that could possibly be imagined. I am here, Mr. Speaker, to protest those proceedings, to protest interference of this kind. I submit to you that the election in each congressional district is entirely up to the people of that district and should not be interfered with, either by the Congress as a whole or by individual Members of Congress.

As I say, I am not here to attack anybody. I am here to defend my good name. I am on trial politically in my district and these attacks leveled at me have hurt, they have hurt me terribly because I have been unable to defend myself and unable to fight back. I am grateful to the Speaker of the House for affording me this opportunity.

I spoke of one or two Members who have withheld their names. There are other Members who have deliberately attacked me long distance, and I say "long distance" because there is a pipeline into my district about as big as any pipeline you have ever imagined kept open by the Gannett News Service. I can tell you that any word spoken about me, either off the floor or on the floor of the House, is mentioned directly, if it is of a derogatory nature, by the Gannett Service. It goes all over my district and all over the southern tier of New York.

So those words and attacks by individual Members of Congress, I am sure you will agree with me, are unfair when they are made to that news-service man deliberately and wantonly to destroy my good name and character in this particular election that is coming up.

I have another evidence of interference in my district and I am not going to mention him unless somebody asks me, then I will be glad to mention him if I am queried at this time. There is one Member of Congress who has gone out of his way to use his congressional frank to send hundreds of speeches into my congressional district, building up my opponent, with derogatory words in reference to me. You will remember the case of Hamilton Fish back in 1944 when he was accused by the newspapers of the country of letting his congressional frank get out of his hands and being used by other individuals to be sent into other congressional districts throughout the land. Here is a situation like his.

Mr. Speaker, the use of the congressional frank by another Member of Congress—I repeat, I will be glad to disclose his name if you want me to—is absolutely unfair. It is unfair to me; it is unfair to the people of my district; and it is unfair to the Congress as a whole because I know that the average Member of Congress would not allow his congressional frank to be used in a congressional primary contest. So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the use of that congressional frank by this other Member of Congress against me and in the interests of and in favor of my primary opponent is absolutely unfair. It is also unethical.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. Would the gentleman give us the name of the Member whose frank has been misused?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes. It is Congressman LEROY JOHNSON, of California. I have always considered Congressman JOHNSON one of the best friends I had in the House here, and I think it is an act of unfriendliness for him to frank an editorial derogatory to me into my congressional district, deliberately to stir the people of my district against me. I think it is an unfriendly act, and it is something that should not be countenanced in the future.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I will say in regard to the statement placed in the RECORD by Congressman JOHNSON that I did not see anything in it derogatory to the gentleman.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman, apparently, did not read the

editorial in the Binghamton Press. There never appeared anything in the Gannett newspapers that was not derogatory to me.

Mr. SHAFER. That has nothing to do with what Congressman JOHNSON placed in the RECORD.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. The editorial was incorporated in his remarks. I will not yield any further. I beg the gentleman's pardon. That editorial was derogatory to me, and it was meant to be derogatory. It was sent into my congressional district in favor of my opponent. Anything friendly to my opponent is unfriendly to me.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Once more.

Mr. SHAFER. Just to be fair with me, I read all of what Congressman JOHNSON said, and it was merely plauditory of the gentleman's opponent, that is all.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am sorry, but it was not entirely plauditory—it was plauditory to my opponent, but it was derogatory to me in that there was a deliberate position taken in this particular contest, which I think is unfair. Now, that brings it all up into one point I am going to make here. Shall this Congress become a select society, blackball our Members we do not like, protect our Members we do like? Or shall we place the power of election in the hands of the people of the congressional districts, where it belongs, and keep our hands off? We should let the people elect the Congressmen. And I believe that we have every right to see that our own congressional districts are kept inviolate so that the people of the country can have an opportunity to do the electing instead of the Members of Congress who may be in favor of one candidate in a particular district or the other.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman that it is the business and the duty of the people of his district to select their own candidate. Now, the gentleman will recall that I said many times what I thought were complimentary things about the gentleman who is now talking on the floor of the House. Has not the gentleman used those statements of mine in his own district?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Well, if the gentleman refers to that attack that he leveled on me about 4 years ago, at which time he branded everything I have ever proposed as being crazy, I assure him that I did not use those words. I want to point out——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, the gentleman has not answered my question. At no time did I brand everything you proposed as "crazy."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I just answered it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; the gentleman did not. I asked him if I had not said many complimentary things about him on the floor of the House and that he used them in his district. Did I or did I not? Has he or has he not used complimentary statements I have made?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I would use them if I could find them; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure; and you can find them.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Is the gentleman accusing the gentleman from California, who is not here present, with a criminal misuse of his frank?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I certainly am not. I certainly am not, and I am not even accusing him of anything, except that I think he ought to keep his hands off my congressional district and let the people decide for themselves who they want for their Congressman. Has it come to the point where the House of Representatives is going to supersede the power of the people in the congressional districts? I say if such a situation has come about, it is time that we put a stop to such a trend. It is certainly evident in our section.

I find all I can do is to attend to my own business in my own congressional district, and I cannot be looking around to mess into the affairs of any other congressional district or to try to pick on any other Member of Congress. I think you gentlemen will agree with me that each and every one of us, burdened down as we are with the tremendous number of problems that we have, certainly does not have any time to get into other congressional elections, whether we may feel friendly to some person or another. I am not vying in any popularity contest here in the House. What I am trying to do is to get reelected.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Across the length and breadth of this country, referring to what the Speaker said in recognizing the gentleman, there have been statements made with respect to Members of the House which are having a very derogatory effect on many other Members. I should like to have the gentleman comment further as to whether or not those statements were in whole or in part false, and if so, to what extent.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Absolutely false; absolutely false. If I may proceed, I want to develop another thought. I am sorry, I cannot yield further.

Mr. JACKSON of California. We are all very much interested.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I know you are.

Mr. JACKSON of California. And I think the people are all very much interested.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is why I am taking the floor today.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot yield further.

Mr. SHAFER. Along this same line.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman please let me develop the point I am trying to develop? The gentleman is a fine gentleman, none better.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot yield. I just told you I cannot yield, and I am not going to. I will a little later.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman has not been talking on the question of personal privilege on which he was recognized, which is with reference to atomic secrets being divulged by tipsy Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order, and the Chair requests him to speak to the question he raised.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I respect the Chair's desires, and I will do that. I have to develop it just a little bit.

If you recall, Mr. Speaker, the State legislature in 1951, meeting in joint session, passed the reapportionment bill in New York State, which mixed up and gerrymandered a lot of congressional districts, reducing the number of congressional districts from 45 to 43.

At that time I very strenuously pointed out to the people of the State of New York that I felt that such was a terrible wrong to them, because it deprived them of congressional representation. I felt that it was unfair to allow anything like that to proceed. I fought the plan all last fall by speaking all over up-State.

Then the Binghamton Press, which certainly cannot be accused of being friendly to me, came out with an editorial and said that under no circumstances should Broome County, which is my home, be placed in the district of another Member of Congress in the southern tier of the State of New York. The Binghamton Press stated further:

> We realize that the Reapportionment Act of 1951 is an attempt on the part of politicians in Albany to eliminate Congressman HALL from the Congress once and for all.

I am not saying that myself. What I am saying is that the Binghamton Press editorialized it on several occasions. So that it is not Congressman HALL making those statements, it is the Binghamton Press. As they are supposed to be the gospel truth, nothing in the world could make anybody doubt that statement. So that was the first step in the phase of this whole program to get rid of Congressman HALL.

After the reapportionment bill was passed I had nothing more to say. Neither did any of the New York State delegation. Why should they? They were all sitting pretty. I resolved myself to be reconciled.

I said, of course, there is nothing that one can do so far as interfering with the law is concerned. The law has been passed by the legislature. There is not any reason in the world why any of us, as Members of the Congress, should protest, because it was too late. So I reconciled myself in good faith, and since then I have been very happy to get into Chemung, Tioga, and Steuben Counties

to get a chance to meet the people in those counties. It has given me an opportunity to become a better Representative in talking with the people of those counties, and the people of my own home county, face to face. By talking with patriotic Americans in that way, it has made me a better Representative just as I know talking with your constituents makes you better Representatives.

The unfortunate part of it is that there are others now taking sides. An unfair attempt is being made on the part of certain Members of the House of Representatives, and I hope there are only a few of them, to project themselves into this contest and to come up into the southern tier of the State of New York and to smear me, and to say that I am not fit to be a Member of the Congress from Broome County, and from the southern tier district. Such action is in direct violation of the Constitution which guarantees the privilege of each congressional district to do its own electing, without any interference from either the Members of the Congress or anybody else. When one is given an accolade and testimonial on the floor of the House, as was my opponent last Thursday, it certainly looks to the people in my section that I am getting the worst of it. It looks as though Members unfriendly to me are trying to superimpose themselves on the people of my congressional district, and trying to deprive them of deciding for themselves who they want for their Congressman. Naturally I resent this strongly.

I know each and every one of you would absolutely object to the same thing being done in your district. Frankly, and honestly, I am going to continue to resist those efforts. I am going to resist them with every weapon that I have. I do not have many because my opponent has all the newspapers and he has all the organizations and all the organized groups with him, so that I do not have many weapons. I am fighting my own battle, fighting alone—fighting against great odds so it is certainly not necessary for the House of Representatives to take a stand in this congressional election. I know that I would not take a stand in any other district between two colleagues, for one colleague and against another. I certainly am only asking the fair and decent American thing, for other Members of the Congress to watch on the sidelines and not deliberately come, as I mentioned the gentleman has, with the frank, and harpoon me, and build up my opponent. It just is not fair.

It just is not fair for outsiders tc interfere in an election. The only persons who should be involved in the election of a Congressman are the people in that congressional district. Unfortunately, in my own part of the State of New York, they have had that right challenged. In my home section, the people are pretty red hot over it because I have talked with at least 15,000 in my congressional district since the first of January. I have driven home the point that they are the only ones who should decide the election, and not some Member of the Congress down here, and not somebody else in the Government, and not somebody else from outside. I have told them that my principle has been, and my campaign slogan has been, to outsiders, "Keep your hands off my district." Let the people decide who they want for their Congressman. Do not tread on me. Give me an opportunity to do as well as I can to be reelected.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just simply to get to the key of the situation, and not to inject myself into this, according to the Binghamton Press under the date of April 22, an item which appears on page 4709 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 1, the gentleman from New York is reported to have said or asked whether atomic secrets are leaking—the word "leaking" was quoted—from the Joint Senate and House Committee on Atomic Energy. Did the gentleman say that—intimate that secrets were leaking from the Joint Senate and House Committee?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The Binghamton Press says that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am just asking.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I asked the question of the audience, and I was attempting to answer, because they had asked me previously to the time I made the speech, but I in no way inferred that any Member of the House was leaking atomic secrets, because that certainly would not be in line with patriotism on the part of Members of this body.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am simply trying to assist the House in asking these questions. The gentleman is also reported to have said:

> Well, it will probably be another elbow-tipping party. That's what a lot of these congressional junkets are. It's time the people of this district stopped them and it's time they got a look at their candidate.

Did the gentleman refer to elbow-tipping parties?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I deny that.

Mr. McCORMACK. And continuing:

> A lot of atomic secrets are leaking out. Where are they leaking from? Are they leaking from the parties these high-hat Congressman on the Atomic Energy Committee attend?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I deny that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Continuing:

> Are there stooges of the Communists present at these parties and when they get these Congressmen a little tipsy, are they spilling out secrets that are going into Russian hands?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I asked the question, sir, as a result of some of the questions that had been asked me.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman did not make that statement?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I did not.

Mr. McCORMACK. As an expression of his own opinion?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is right, sir. I assure you I have made no statement which would in any way reflect on the over-all membership of this House. But I would also say this: that I expect to make future campaign speeches in my district, and I am not going to be gagged in any way, either by my opponent, in making these campaign speeches, or by anybody else. I have the right to make campaign speeches in my district and I expect to make a lot of them between now and primary day.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman referred to certain discussions and statements made on the floor of the House recently, and in the statement of his own in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under May 1, I notice it began by saying:

> Mr. Speaker, upon my arrival in Washington late today I learned that I had been submitted to one of the most cowardly attacks on the floor in history.

Then you go along and discuss other items, and here you make this statement:

> Perhaps the question I raised hit some guilty consciences and they yelled to high heaven.

Now, what are the questions raised that you think hit the consciences that caused them to yell to high heaven?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot answer the gentleman that, because I do not know.

Mr. BARDEN. That is in the gentleman's own statement.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Well, listen, I cannot yield any longer. I am just going to try to develop this thought if I can.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The population decrease in New York brought about a reduction of two Members in congressional representation.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is right.

Mr. MASON. In view of that fact the Legislature of New York had to make provision to reduce the representation of the congressional group from New York by two, did it not?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is right.

Mr. MASON. Then in making this adjustment some districts had to be put together, did they not?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is right.

Mr. MASON. In the judgment of the Legislature of New York, they put a part of your district with a part of another district, and that meant you would have to run against a sitting Congressman in that district.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes, sir; and I want to run against just that one Congressman. I do not want to run against the whole House of Representatives, because I could not win if I were compelled to do so.

Mr. MASON. The point I am trying to arrive at is this: If you have any complaint to make as a result of the Reapportionment Act of the State of New York, then your complaint should be

registered with the Legislature of New York and not with this Congress that had nothing to do with that reapportionment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is all right, Mr. MASON, but there has been a great deal of talk and interest to the point that there has already developed right in this House as I have mentioned before an attempt to mention and cripple me, deliberate attempts on the part of individual Members of this House, to come into the congressional district and attempt to defeat me; and I think that such a thing is unfair, and I know that you will agree with me that you would resent it strongly in your congressional districts. I resent it strongly in my particular situation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am trying to be fair to the gentleman and I am trying to catch up with the denials and counter denials that have been made.

The gentleman from Massachusetts read to you a certain statement that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD quoting an article which appeared in the Binghamton Press. You denied having made the statement.

I have here another article written by Robert McManus, Binghamton Press staff writer, referring to you. It says:

The Binghamton Republican who returned to his office yesterday after Wednesday night's speech before a Townsend Club at 21 Main Street was questioned by telephone by a reporter.

He did not retreat from the remarks he made in the presence of the Binghamton newspapermen Wednesday night and in another speech here on April 21.

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] denied to the gentleman from Massachusetts that he made the statement——

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I did not retreat in any of the remarks I made about my opponent in that particular speech I made, and I am not retreating now.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Then we would like to know the difference between "retreat" and "denial."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. There is no retreat; I will tell you that, because between now and August 19 there is just one motto that I have and that is "Go ahead."

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Quoting from the same newspaper article:

Asked if he denied saying that he resented Members of Congress who got publicly plastered at cocktail parties. HALL said: "I do not deny that, but I did not single anyone out."

The gentleman made that statement, did he?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Would you resent anybody who got publicly plastered at cocktail parties?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am not resenting; I am asking the gentleman about this statement.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Sure the gentleman would resent anybody who got publicly plastered at cocktail parties, especially when he came over to you and made himself obnoxious; certainly he would resent it. I think it is about time they got rid of some of these cocktail parties here in Washington; I think it is about time that we had a moratorium on them. Of course I do not get invited to them—very many of them.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Of course the gentleman would decline.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. But I will tell you right now that if you condone attending these cocktail parties you are crazy; and I am not picking out any one single individual. The people back home think of sobriety, and they think sobermindedness is absolutely necessary to make sure of our country. If we are going to resist the powers behind the iron curtain there is no other way we can do it, and I say that in resisting them we are fighting with our backs to the wall. The Russians have their representatives at these cocktail parties.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. Is it not true that you are going to frank this speech out to all of the voters in your district?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. None whatsoever. I have franked out thus far in the campaign just about one-half what some other people have that are accusing me and introducing bills abolishing the franking privilege. I will go along with them if they want to abolish the franking privilege entirely; but the gentleman should not pick me out and accuse me of abusing the franking privilege when they are franking thousands of letters into my Congressional district building up the other fellow and running me down.

Mr. POULSON. Would the gentleman be willing to report to the House the amount of mail which you have franked out in comparison to anyone else?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. How do I know how much anybody else has franked out?

Mr. POULSON. If you put the information in you could ask them to do likewise.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will tell you; I have franked about 50,000 to 90,000 pieces of mail since the first of January, but others opposing me have franked out more than double that amount. So if you want to get into the franking privilege question I assure you that I am not hypocritical about using it, and I will use it just as long as I can and just as long as it is legal.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. .Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. On April 30 at 6:30 p. m. over a program broadcast from Station WENE, did you make this statement?—

"He—

Meaning Representative COLE—

was also promised the support of several of his buddies on the Atomic Energy Committee who happened to be junior members under him.

"If you will get into the act up home and help me get elected," Congressman COLE said to them, "I will see you get a few political plums and a big advancement when I get to be chairman of that committee. But you've got to help me beat HALL first."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is a campaign speech.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman make that speech?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is a campaign speech. I made it over WENE.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did you mean to charge your opponent had promised members on the Atomic Energy Commission that if they would go up there and help him they would secure some sort of a job from him?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Does the gentleman want proof of what has already happened there?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I asked you whether you made that statement.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. At least two members of the Atomic Energy Committee have come into my district by pipeline through the Gannett News Service and have made speeches against me. They got a Fair Deal Senator to also smear me in the pages of the Binghamton Press. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has attacked me right in my own papers and I will tell him face to face that I resent it strongly.

Mr. DURHAM. I would like the gentleman to quote that and to show it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will show him the article in the Endicott Bulletin. He made a strong statement against me, and injected himself into my congressional district.

Mr. DURHAM. Where at?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. By pipeline, by long distance he made a statement against me.

Mr. DURHAM. I would like the gentleman to show that. I think he is all wrong.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will show you it in the Endicott Bulletin.

Mr. DURHAM. I would like to see it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will say it is one of the most questionable tricks that was ever pulled to come in and take sides against a colleague.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the words be taken down.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will be glad to show it to you, Mr. DURHAM, if he will come over there.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. May I withdraw those?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can by unanimous consent.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want to withdraw the statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. You withdraw the word "smear" too?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York, when he is complaining about others reflecting on him, should not reflect on others.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must proceed in order if he proceeds at all.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has no doubt read the article from the Binghamton Press of April 22 which quotes him as asking certain questions with reference to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Did the gentleman ask questions purporting to be the same things that are carried in this paper?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. What does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. HINSHAW. I mean exactly what I say. The gentleman understands perfectly well what was carried in the Binghamton Press as of April 22, in which he asked a number of questions, or is purported to have asked a number of questions.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not know what the gentleman is driving at.

Mr. HINSHAW. Let me read them.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will try to answer you. I want to say that if this is designed in any way, this questioning on the part of my good friends is designed in any way, to put the damper on my right to free speech in my district, it has absolutely failed, because I am going to continue to make campaign speeches. I have a lot lined up and I am not going to cancel any of them.

Mr. HINSHAW. Similar to this?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am not going to attack anybody in this House unless I am brought to it and forced into it. I have never attacked a man yet, I never attacked a man yet until he attacked me.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. This quotes the gentleman as asking the question:

> A lot of atomic secrets are leaking out. Where are they leaking from? Are they leaking from the parties these high-hat Congressmen on the Atomic Energy Committee attend?

Did the gentleman ask a question purporting that same sort of thing?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Let me say this, that you know as well as I do that atomic secrets are leaking out. You know that as well as I do.

Mr. HINSHAW. Did the gentleman ask that question?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I asked a lot of questions, and I assume you have.

Mr. HINSHAW. I asked the gentleman if he asked them?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I know that I have never asked any question which threw any reflection on any Member of this House.

Mr. HINSHAW. Did the gentleman ask that question?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I asked a lot of questions.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, did the gentleman ask that question?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the newspaper quoted it, I suppose I asked it in a speech. But I can tell you this, that having the utmost respect for every Member of the House of Representatives, I would be the last in the world to impugn the motives or cast any reflection upon any Member of this House, because I think it is one of the finest groups of men that I know of; there is no more distinguished group in the entire country, but I am going to say this to them, do not tread on me; keep out of my district; let me fight this battle with my opponent and let him fight me. Just stay away from my district and do not get into my district, because I am not going to tolerate it if I can possibly help it. Keep the Fair Deal Senators out of my district, too, and keep the franking privileges out of my district. Let my opponent use the franking privileges as much as he wants to. He has to account for them as much as I do, and he has to admit he is using them. I have no objection to his use of the frank.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is quoted in this paper as saying, "Are there stooges of the Communists present at these parties, and when they get these Congressmen a little tipsy are they," meaning the Congressmen, "spilling out secrets that are going into Russian hands?" Did the gentleman ask that question?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have asked a lot of questions. I have asked a lot of questions, because the people of my district expect me to ask questions. They have asked me questions and they have asked you questions, and I repeat, as far as impugning the motives and casting any reproach or smear on any Member of Congress, I have never done it and never expect to do it. And, I can tell you this, that I am going to have at least in my district a real campaign, and I do not want to have to fight every Member of the House of Representatives, because all together they can lick me. They are much stronger than I am.

Mr. SHAFER. We are getting in awfully deep, and when I say we are, I say you are.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. No; I am not.

Mr. SHAFER. Now wait, please. I just merely have a suggestion. The gentleman has asked certain questions and he made certain denials and the House bears with him. If the gentleman has made statements in the heat of the campaign, why not admit it and say, "I am sorry for it?"

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. No, no. You will hear a lot more speeches, Mr. SHAFER, before I get through up there, because I have the right to make them as a free American citizen.

Mr. SHAFER. Certainly you have.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have a right to make them as a free American citizen and as a Member of this House. I have a right to make campaign speeches without somebody coming into my district and attempting to malign me or to attempt to make trouble for me.

Mr. SHAFER. I am sorry; I just tried to be helpful.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I just want you to know that I reserve the right to make campaign speeches in my district.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire any more time to answer the charges made against him?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I appreciate this opportunity to come before the House and point out the situation, Mr. Speaker, and I deeply appreciate the attentive listening of the House. I thank you.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I rise to a question of privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his grounds.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House, under rule IX, which in part reads:

> Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.

I send to the Clerk's desk a resolution.

That resolution recites certain statements alleged to have been made by a Member of the House in public speeches, some of them over the radio, and to have been later published in the Press.

Those statements, if made, affect the safety, the dignity and the integrity of individual Members of the House, of the membership of the House as a whole, of a joint committee of the House and the Senate, and of the House.

The Member of the House who is alleged to have made those statements has, according to the press, requested that he be given opportunity to comment on at least some of the statements which he is alleged to have made.

The resolution on the Clerk's desk recites some of the statements which it is alleged were made. I ask that the resolution be read and that, upon the conclusion of the reading, I be given time under the rule to discuss it.

Precedents justifying the resolution date from April 26, 1876, to March 10, 1948.[1]

---

[1] No attempt has been made to cite all of the precedents.

Hind's Precedents of the House of Representatives, volume 3:

"2628. A newspaper charge that an officer of the House had conspired to influence legislation was considered as a question of privilege. On April 26, 1876, Mr. John D. White, of Kentucky, submitted as a question of privilege a preamble and resolution reciting an allegation from a newspaper charging that the Clerk of the House and some of his subordinates had conspired to prevent retrenchment of expenditures, and directing the Committee on Rules to investigate the charges and make report thereon.

"Mr. William M. Springer, of Illinois, made the point of order that the resolution did not involve a question of privilege.

"The Speaker overruled the point of order on the ground that the resolution, though going to the verge to which any matter of privilege of a Member of the House should go, involved enough of substance in its connection with the House and legislation to bring it within the rule and definition of a question of privilege.

"2641. The publication by the Public Printer of an article alleged to be for the

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must submit a resolution on that matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I sent it to the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 631), as follows:

(1) Whereas the Washington Times-Herald of May 1, 1952, published in Washington, D. C., carried the statement, that, at Binghamton, N. Y., EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, a Member of Congress, declared that he resents "Congressmen who get genuinely soused at cocktail parties"; and

(2) Whereas the said Congressman is alleged to have said "I feel a Congressman has better things to do than to go around and get publicly intoxicated"; and

(3) Whereas said statements referred to in the foregoing paragraphs numbered 1 and 2, if made, are a charge, not that one or a small number of Congressmen, but that a comparatively large number of Congressmen, are in the habit of drinking to excess at cocktail parties, and are a reflection upon the

---

purpose of exciting unlawful violence among Members has been considered a matter of privilege.

"The Speaker may pass on a question presented as of privilege instead of submitting it directly to the House.

"On June 8, 1854, Mr. Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio, submitted, as a question of privilege, the following preamble and resolution:

" 'Whereas A. O. P. Nicholson, Esq., printer to this body, editor, and proprietor of the Washington Union, in his paper of this morning has published an article most evidently designed to excite unlawful violence upon Members of this body: Therefore,

" '*Resolved*, That said A. O. P. Nicholson, and all other persons connected with the Washington Union, be expelled from this House.'

"Upon the presentation of these resolutions a suggestion was at first made that questions of privilege had heretofore been referred to the judgment of the House.

"The Speaker at first acquiesced in this view, but afterwards determined that there was involved in the resolution a question of privilege, and that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Giddings, had a right to move to expel from the Hall any officer of the House. * * * The editor or editors of the Union had the privilege of the Hall, but they had not the privilege of the floor. That paper had a number of reporters here, and they were here by law of the House and under the direction of the Speaker. The gentleman proposed to expel them all, editors and reporters. The Chair was of the opinion that the question was a privileged one, and so decided. * * * Mr. A. O. P. Nicholson was entitled, under an express law of the House, to the privilege of the Hall as an ex-Senator of the United States. He was named in the resolution.

"The resolution proposed by Mr. Giddings was not agreed to by the House.

"SEC. 2652. A charge that a Member had been holding intercourse with the foes of the Government was investigated as a question of privilege. On July 15, 1861, Mr. John F. Potter, of Wisconsin, offered the following resolution:

" '*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary be directed to inquire whether the Honorable Henry May, a Representative in Congress from the Fourth District of the State of Maryland, has not been found holding criminal intercourse and correspondence with persons in armed rebellion against the Government of the United States, and to make report to the House as to what action should be taken in the premises, and that said committee have power to send for persons and papers and to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation, and that said Hon. Henry May be notified of the passage of this resolution (if practicable) before action thereon by said committee.' "

"Mr. Henry C. Burnett, of Kentucky, made the point of order that the resolution was not in order as a question of privilege.

"The Speaker submitted the question to the House, and the House decided that the resolution was in order as involving a question of privilege.

"By a vote of 56 yeas to 82 nays the House refused to lay the resolution on the table. It was then agreed to.

"SEC. 2653. A resolution directing an inquiry into alleged treasonable conduct on the part of a Member was admitted as a question of privilege. On December 19, 1865, Mr. John F. Farnsworth, of Illinois, as a question of privilege, submitted the following:

" 'Whereas it is alleged that Benjamin G. Harris, a Representative in this House from the Fifth District of the State of Maryland, was, in the month of May last, before a very respectable and intelligent court martial tried, and by said court convicted, upon charge and specifications, to wit: "Violative of the sixth article of war," by giving aid and comfort to the public enemy and inciting them to continue to make war against the United States, declaring his sympathy with the enemy and his opposition to the Government of the United States in its efforts to suppress the rebellion; and

" 'Whereas it was proved at such trial (as is alleged) that the said Harris expressed his regret that the assassination of President Lincoln came too late to be of any use to the rebels, and at the same time declared that Jeff. Davis was a great and good man, all of which acts on the part of said Harris are inconsistent with the oath which he has taken as a Member of this House; and

" 'Whereas the said court martial sentenced the said Harris (among other things) to be forever disqualified to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States, which sentence was approved by the President: Therefore

" '*Resolved*, That the Committee of Elections be directed to inquire into the facts of the case and that they report the same to the House, together with such action as said committee shall recommend; and in making their investigations said committee to have power to send for persons and papers.'

"Mr. Charles A. Eldridge, of Wisconsin, raised the question of order that no question of privilege was involved.

"The Speaker held that the question raised was a question of privilege, and of the very highest kind, since it involved the right of a Member to his seat.

"The resolution was then agreed to—yeas 138, nays 21.

"2637. The publication by a Member of alleged false and scandalous charges against the House and its Members, which he also reiterated in debate, was held to involve a question of privilege.

"The House took action as to a Member who reiterated on the floor certain published charges against the House, although other business had intervened.

"Instance wherein testimony taken before a committee and relating to the conduct of a Member was not reported to the House at once.

"On July 29, 1892, Mr. Charles J. Boatner, of Louisiana, as a matter of privilege, submitted the following resolution, and demanded immediate consideration thereof, to wit:

" 'Whereas on page 216 of a book purporting to have been written by Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, a Member of the House of Representatives, the following charge appears:

" ' "Drunken Members have reeled about the aisles, a disgrace to the Republic. Drunken speakers have debated grave issues on the floor, and in the midst of maudlin ramblings have been heard to ask: 'Mr. Speaker, where was I at?' " and

" 'Whereas the publication of such charges, if untrue, is a grave wrong to this body, and if true the responsibility should be placed where it belongs; and

" 'Whereas the said Watson has reiterated the same on the floor of the House: Therefore, be it

" '*Resolved by the House*, That a committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker to investigate and report to the House whether such charges are true, and, if untrue, whether the said Watson has violated the privileges of the House and their recommendations relative to the same. That said committee have leave to sit during the sessions of the House, to send for persons and papers, to swear witnesses, and to compel their attendance.'

"Mr. Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, submitted the question of order, whether, the House having failed to take action respecting the remarks of Mr. Watson at the time he reiterated the charges on the floor of the House, and having passed to other business, it was not now too late to hold him to account therefor.

"Mr. Louis E. Atkinson, of Pennsylvania, made the further point of order that the pending business before the House was a conference report, which was itself a matter of the highest privilege.

"The Speaker held that the resolution submitted by Mr. Boatner presented a question of privilege, and that whenever the Speaker is of opinion that a question of privilege is involved in a proposition, he must entertain it in preference to any other business.

"The Speaker also held that the pending business was the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 752, and that no conference report was pending. Both points of order were therefore overruled.

"On August 8, 1892, Mr. Boatner submitted the report of the select committee authorized by the adoption of the resolution, and of which he had been made chairman.

"This report stated that the committee summoned Mr. Watson and such witnesses as he indicated, and very soon the fact was developed that the charge as to drunken speakers referred to Mr. J. E. Cobb, of Alabama. The committee thereupon went on and examined testimony as to Mr. Cobb, no point of order being made that the testimony implicating a Member should first be reported to the House.

"The committee concluded that the charge was a libel upon the membership, and recommended the adoption of the following resolution:

" '*Resolved*, That the charges made by Thomas E. Watson in his book against the House of Representatives, viz, "that drunken Members have reeled about the aisles, a disgrace to the Republic," and "drunken Members have debated grave issues on the floor," etc., are not true, and constitute an unwarranted assault upon the honor and dignity of the House, and that such publication has the unqualified disapproval of the House.'

"This report was made in the last hours of the session and does not appear to have been acted on.

"SEC. 2649. A proposition to censure a Member presents a question of privilege.

"Early instances wherein the Speaker passed on questions presented as of privilege instead of submitting them directly to the House.

"On January 24, 1842, Mr. Thomas Gilmer, of Virginia, presented the following resolution:

" '*Resolved*, That in presenting for the consideration of the House a petition for the

legislative integrity and moral conduct, not only of individual Members of Congress, but of Congress as a whole; and

(4) Whereas it is alleged that said Congressman, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, further "demanded to know whether congressional observers tippled at recent Nevada atomic bomb tests"; and

(5) Whereas it was further charged that the said Congressman, Representative EDWIN ARTHUR HALL had "challenged the Atomic Energy Committee to call him to explain similar remarks which he made the previous week"; and

(6) Whereas the Binghamton Press, under date of April 22, 1952, carried a news story stating that Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, addressing a Townsend Club in the city of Binghamton, N. Y., made the statement that Representative W. STERLING COLE of Bath, N. Y., a Member of Congress and a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, was planning to go to Nevada to witness an atomic bomb experiment; and

(7) Whereas the news story further alleges that the Representative from New York, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, further said, referring to the gentleman from New York, W. STERLING COLE, "I see that my opponent is going to Nevada, ostensibly to witness an atomic bomb explosion"; and

(8) Whereas the said EDWIN ARTHUR HALL is further alleged to have said, "Well, it will probably be another elbow-tipping party. That's what a lot of these congressional junkets are. It's time the people of this district stop them, and it's time they get a look at their candidate"; and

(9) Whereas the foregoing statements, set forth in paragraphs Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, if made, carried by implication and directly a charge that, while performing their official duties, individual Congressmen and members of a congressional committee indulged in an excessive consumption of intoxicating liquor which interfered with their legislative duties and the legislative duty of the committee, and are a reflection upon, not only the legislative integrity of the Congressmen to whom reference was made, but upon the legislative integrity of a congressional committee and of the Congress as a whole, and tend to discredit not only Members of Congress, but a congressional committee and the Congress as a whole; and

(10) Whereas the said EDWIN ARTHUR HALL is further quoted as saying at said meeting, "A lot of atomic secrets are leaking out. Where are they leaking from? Are they leaking from the parties these high-hat Congressmen on the Atomic Energy Committee attend?

"Are there stooges of the Communists present at these parties and, when they get these Congressmen a little tipsy, are they spilling our secrets that are going into Russian hands?"; and

(11) Whereas the statements alleged to have been made, as set forth in paragraph No. 10, if made, carry the implication that individual Members of Congress and a committee of Congress, composed of both Members of the House and Senate, while on their official duties, consume intoxicating liquor to such an extent that agents of the Soviet Government are able to obtain secret information of value to a potential enemy; and

(12) Whereas the said EDWIN ARTHUR HALL further is charged with saying at said meeting, "We are on the outside looking in. My opponent supposedly is on the inside, looking out. We can hope that after next August 19, he will be on the outside, looking in"; and

(13) Whereas the gentleman from New York, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, is reliably reported to have said, over Radio Station WENE, Endicott, N. Y., on April 30, 1952: "The latest trick is to order me called before the Atomic Energy Committee because I said I had seen (accused) my opponent of tipping the elbow. The truth is I hope they give me the chance to come before their committee. I'd like the chance to shake the warning finger at them all"; and

(14) Whereas, said statements, if made, not only reflect upon the gentleman from New York, W. STERLING COLE, in his Representative capacity, but upon a committee in its official capacity and upon the House as a whole and upon the Members of the House; and

(15) Whereas, the making of said statements, if made, as above referred to, and the publication thereof in the press as is indicated by exhibits A and B, which are attached hereto and made a part hereof, call in question the legislative integrity, in their representative capacity, of individual Members of the House and the legislative integrity of a congressional committee made up of members of the House and the Senate, and of the House itself, and tend to minimize and destroy the confidence of the people in their elected Representatives in the Congress, and are a grave wrong to this body and to the individual Members of the Senate who are members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, and, if true, the responsibility therefor should be placed where it belongs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the gentleman from New York, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, be given an opportunity to and be directed by the Speaker of the House to appear at the bar of the House, at a time to be fixed by the Speaker but not more than 1 week from this date, and there to make to the House a statement as to whether he made the utterances, or any of the utterances, attributed to him, and, if he insists that said statements were made, that he be called upon by the Speaker to forthwith submit evidence, if such exists, of the accuracy of such statements; and be it further

Resolved, That, if, upon said hearing, it appears that said statements were made and are untrue, that the Speaker then proceed in accordance with the rules and established procedure of the House.

Or, in the alternative, that a committee of five Members of the House be appointed by the Speaker to, within 10 days, investigate and report to the House whether the gentleman from New York, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, made the statements, or any of the statements, attributed to him, or similar statements of like intent, and, if said statements were made, whether they were true; and, if untrue, whether the said EDWIN ARTHUR HALL has violated the privileges of the House. That the committee make such recommendations as to them may seem appropriate; be it further

Resolved, That said committee have leave to sit during the sessions of the House, have power and authority to send for persons and papers, to swear witnesses, to compel their attendance and that, upon the conclusion of such hearings, if held, the Speaker take such action as shall under the circumstances appear to him to be appropriate and in accord with the rules and procedure of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief, taking no more than 20 minutes of the time of the House, although under the rule, I assume, the time allowed would be 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, first permit a preliminary statement as to the manner in which this issue first came before the House.

As you all recall, we lost a very dear friend and colleague, Reid Murray, of Wisconsin. It was my purpose to make some remarks on the bill which was then pending before the House.

Several of our colleagues desired to attend the funeral of our former colleague.

It was suggested by the minority member in charge of the debate, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], that inasmuch as I intended to talk generally on the bill, I make my remarks at the time that other Members of the House would be away attending Mr. Murray's funeral rather than when an amendment in which absent Members were interested was pending. It occurred to me at that time that if we were to pass upon a bill making appropriations calling for millions of dollars, and my attention having been called to statements which it was said had been made by our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], which, it was said, charged, among other things, that Congressmen get genuinely soused at cocktail parties and that Congressmen had something better to do than to go around and get publicly intoxicated, it would be appropriate at that time to call the attention of the House to those charges, because certainly, if those charges were true, that is if a substantial number of the Members of the House were in the habit of becoming intoxicated while attempting to perform their official duties, we should not vote for the expenditure of millions of dollars unless we knew just what we were doing. That is how the whole matter came up, and somewhat to my surprise, Members from New York and other Members of the House took occasion to use that opportunity under the rules to make some remarks with reference to the press stories. As I recall, none of the remarks, except perhaps those made by two Members of the majority, reflected in any way upon the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]. They were made in praise of their colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], who, they apparently thought, had been unjustly assailed.

---

dissolution of the Union the Member from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) has justly incurred the censure of this House.'

"Mr. Joseph R. Underwood, of Kentucky, objected to the reception of the resolution at this time, as not within the established order of business, and consequently not now in order.

"The Speaker said that he considered this a matter of privilege, and referred to a precedent that occurred in 1836, in which the gentleman from Massachusetts offered a petition from certain slaves near Fredericksburg, Va., and on which occasion a resolution was offered by a gentleman from Virginia that the gentleman be brought to the bar and censured. Under this precedent the Chair did not feel at liberty to arrest the proceeding."

On March 10, 1948, Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 2, p. 2476) rose to a question of the privilege of the House and offered a motion to strike from the RECORD remarks reflecting upon the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which had been inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

A quorum was counted. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2476.)

The motion was adopted—ayes 144, noes 35. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2479.)

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman commences the main body of his statement, I wonder if he would yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Very briefly, because I assured the Speaker I would not use any more time than was necessary.

Mr. COX. Such a demonstration of active ignorance that we have witnessed this morning might make one wonder if the services of a physician are not necessary; and remembering that, the gentleman might remember it in measuring the severity of his denunciation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is not my purpose to denounce anyone. My sole purpose is to afford an opportunity to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] an opportunity to tell the House just what statements attributed to him, if any he made, he did make, and what inferences he intended to convey by what he said, if he said anything.

This resolution is here because in the past a certain section of the press has used the opportunity time and time again to question not only the loyalty but sometimes the intelligence of the Congress as a whole. In years gone by perhaps no man in the House has taken more vilification, more abuse, with the exception of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the former Member, Mr. Dies, than have I from left-wing commentators and columnists.

So, naturally, these statements in the press were called to my attention, I became a little resentful, because if there is anything in which the people must have confidence it is in the Congress of the United States of America. If we as a group without question permit the House to be assailed by Members of the House, then certainly we will lose the confidence of the people.

Memory carries me back to July 12, 1942, when Walter Winchell, while an officer of the United States Navy, asked a radio audience, "How about the voters going after those other saboteurs who landed in Congress?"

Again, a few days later, referring to the eight German saboteurs, all but one of whom were hung, Mr. Winchell inserted in his column published in the press the following statement:

> Another reason some Congressmen are demanding the eight saboteurs be shot is that they might talk too much.

Again, on July 26, 1942, the same gentleman over the radio made the statement that—

> Nearly everyone who printed seditious articles has been indicted except those who put the same things in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD * * * But "honeychile"—all of them will be confronted by the same charges after November 5. (For quotations given, see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 89, pt. 1, p. 532.)

Then, on Sunday, January 31, 1943, after many who had incurred Walter's displeasure had been elected by substantial majorities, over the radio, Winchell anounced that there were some 14,000,000 "damned fools" in America who voted for Members of Congress.

What was my personal reaction? At that time I tried to induce the House to call Mr. Winchell before the House and put him under oath to give us evidence which would indicate that there was even one saboteur in Congress. I was as sure as man could be that there was no truth whatsoever in his statement. He should have been made to publicly admit his malice, his untruthfulness.

Mr. Speaker, the House took that vile charge lying down. Is it any wonder that lesser commentators, editors, and radio announcers, feel free to vilify Members of Congress, congressional committees, and the Congress itself.

If the charges set forth in the resolution which has been introduced were made and if they are untrue and if the House fails to take action, will not our inaction be interpreted as a license to make false charges against congressional committees, against the Congress, which impair—yes, may well destroy—its usefulness, its authority?

On one occasion, one of the local papers carried an editorial, the caption and the first paragraph reading as follows:

> DISLOYAL CONGRESSMEN
>
> Very few people will share the reported indignation of certain Members of the House at the discovery that the names of disloyal Congressmen may have been filed away by the Civil Service Commission.

Appearing before a committee of the House, the writer of the editorial was questioned and answered as follows:

> The CHAIRMAN. Now, the caption, in the opinion of some, leads to the conclusion that there are in Congress disloyal Congresssmen. Was that your intention, to say that there are Members of Congress who are disloyal?
>
> Mr. ———. No, sir. I think that the text of the editorial makes is very clear that I did not intend to say that and in fact it does not say it.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Then the editorial continues:
>
> "Very few people share the reported indignation of certain Members of the House at the discovery that the names of disloyal Congressmen may have been filed away by the Civil Service Commission."
>
> What do you mean by the expression, "disloyal Congressman"? Identify them, if you will.
>
> Mr. ———. As I said, I do not know of any disloyal Congressmen.

The inference left by that editorial might well have been that Congressmen disloyal to their country were sitting in the Congress, voting and acting as the people's representatives.

By the failure of the House in the past to act when Members of Congress, congressional committees, or the House itself have been accused of disloyalty, we encourage the efforts of those who would destroy the confidence of the people not only in their representatives—in the Congress—but in the Government itself.

I do not mean that a free press or free speech should in any way be limited. What I propose is that, when charges which reflect upon the official integrity of congressional committees or upon the integrity and loyalty of the Congress as a body are publicly made, then those who assert those charges to be true should be given an opportunity to offer proof.

If the charges are true, then the Congress forthwith should purge those who are disloyal. If the charges are untrue, then that fact should be made public, and that by the admission of those who made them, testifying under oath.

I cannot go along with any policy which permits Members of the House to make false statements, questioning the loyalty or integrity of the House or its committees.

Now, what were the statements that are alleged to have been made by our colleague from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

Before I go into that, just one reference to what was said earlier in the day: I asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] a question. It was whether or not I had not said many complimentary things about him on the floor. He knows and the Members of the House know that I have. I am sure that he has used some of those statements in his district. That is all right with me. I expected he would.

But he came back and he said something about my making reference to a crazy bill he introduced. I do not know whether I referred to it as crazy. If I did so, it was accurate to a certain extent. What was the proposed legislation? Much as we all want the men in the service to have every opportunity to get home and visit their parents, there is little that we can do as long as we are at war.

Maybe again I was a little resentful because the gentleman by the proposed legislation which he offered had made our office force a great deal of unnecessary work. The proposal which he made was that the men be granted at Christmas time a 30-day furlough, or that they be given railroad or other transportation so that they could go home over the holidays. How in the world can you fight and carry on a war and give the men 30 days to go home to visit their parents?

When I wrote to my constituents who wanted me to support the Hall bill and I said, "It is impossible, it cannot be done," back came the answer, "Congressman HALL says it can be." Naturally, they wanted the boys home and they agreed with Congressman HALL instead of their own Representative because he advocated something they desired.

That is the only thing I have been a little resentful of, because it was so absurd that I thought I should say something about it, and I hope the gentleman if he feels grieved will forgive me for that criticism.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Speaking to the gentleman's resolution, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], who had the floor a few moments ago, said that he had the right to ask questions of his opponent or anyone else. I believe those are close to the words, at least, that he used. No one will deny any Member of the Congress the right to ask a question of his opponent in an election.

The gentleman's resolution calls upon the gentleman from New York, if the resolution is approved, to make answer as to whether or not he made these wider references not only to his opponent but to all of the members of the Committee on Atomic Energy, and perhaps by other language to all of the other Members of the House of Representatives.

He also, as I understood him, made reference to the fact that he and he alone was fighting another man and another man alone. But he draws into his picture all of the other Members of the House when he makes general reference to the rest of the House or to a committee of the House.

I hope that the gentleman's resolution will be agreed to so that the gentleman from New York may have an opportunity to explain just what he had in his mind.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, I assume that this being a campaign year, and most of us having opponents in our districts we are primarily concerned and our business is with the people of our district.

So far as I know, no man here, certainly not your humble servant, is concerned with the election in the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]. He is capable, as he said, of fighting his own battle. I doubt very much whether any Member of this House other than his opponent has taken very much interest in his campaign; I know that I have not had any interest whatever in it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would say that if the newspaper report of the questions asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] are correct, that he has damaged in all probability every other Member of the House in his campaign, and certainly the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; yet he says he wants it singled down to between himself and his own opponent and everyone else keep out of his district. He can keep out of mine, too.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I say to my colleagues of the House that I hold no brief for the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], I repeat that I am not concerned in his campaign.

As I said a moment ago, I have troubles of my own in my own district, but when the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] in the press states that not one or two, but apparently and by inference a comparatively large number of the Members of the House are engaged in elbow tipping, that they are tipsy, that because some of them get tipsy—the question carried with it the inference that when they get tipsy, members of the Atomic Energy Committee made up of Members of the other body and of this House, leaked secrets to the Communists—that I say, is going altogether too far.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I never made any inference in any way whatsoever that all the Members of the House were tipsy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not all of the Members of the House; no.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Or even a small number. But I will tell you this as I mentioned here before, that the people back home are concerned with the situation here in Washington and they say that it calls for clear thinking.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Undoubtedly the situation which confronts Congress does call for clear thinking. I venture this suggestion—and I have been here something more than 15 years—that there are 10 times as many Members of this House who do not use any kind of intoxicating liquor at all as there are who drink it to excess.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then why make the statement that tipsy Members of the House and members of the committee are going on elbow-tipping escapades?

Mr. HINSHAW. And leaking secrets to the Communists.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And leaking secrets to the Communists. Why ask the question? You know the old catch question: "Have you quit beating your wife?" carrying with it the inference that you have been doing it.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. When a Member of Congress asks his audience even the query as to whether or not secrets are leaking, is not that an implication that they are? And the fact that he has pointed his finger to that particular group, the Atomic Energy Committee, is not that innuendo enough?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman a thing that we all know. We can ask a question that is just as damning, more so sometimes, than a bald assertion, whether a statement is not true.

We all know how that is, a proper shading of the tone, the manner in which the question is asked. The question: Oh, did you not? With the proper inflection the answer is suggested—and the answer is: "Yes."

Here is the point of the whole thing. The gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]—and I bear him no ill will, I have never had an unkindly thought toward him except when he made extra unnecessary work for my office force by a silly because impossible proposal—by the questions which he was reported to have asked, by the statements which he is alleged to have made, has questioned the integrity in his official capacity—and if the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] does not want to raise a question of personal privilege that is his right—I repeat, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has questioned the integrity of a group of Members of the House, of a committee of the House, of the House itself.

He has in addition demanded, if he be quoted correctly, that he be called before the Atomic Energy Committee where he intimates he will prove his charges about that committee.

The resolution which I have offered, and which in my judgment, if the House is to protect itself from attacks of this kind, from alleged statements at least, which question its integrity and intelligence, should be adopted.

The resolution merely complies with his request with this exception: That he be called before the bar of the House and then asked and required to answer whether or not he made those statements, that if he denies they were made that evidence be taken, if evidence there be to the contrary, that it be determined whether he made those statements. If he made them, whether they are true, and if they are not true then, Mr. Speaker, the matter should proceed in accordance with the rules and procedure of the House, which is well established.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I say, if the gentleman's resolution is passed, it is an attempt to prejudice the voters of my congressional district, and the gentleman is coming into my district apparently trying to defeat me for Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will reply to that by saying that I have not the slightest concern with what happens in your district, but when you charge, as you do charge by implication, if not directly, if you made those statements, and you did not today here on the floor of the House answer frankly as to whether you did or did not make them, you evaded answering. I say, if the gentleman made the statements, he is attacking me in my representative capacity. I have an interest in the conduct of Congress. He is attacking the Congress and the Congress has an interest in what he says and does.

He charges the Congress with being a group of tipsy—whatever you want to call them, he charges a committee of the Congress with leaking secrets to the enemy; he charges the Congress as a whole with not attending to business, with drinking too much liquor, not being sober when it is transacting business.

I say he should have the opportunity, he should welcome the opportunity, to meet every witness face to face, either here at the bar of the House or before a committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for adoption of the resolution.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I feel impelled, first of all, to express my very deep appreciation for the very generous remarks that were voluntarily made by my colleagues with reference to me on last Thursday. I also want to apologize to the House for my small part in the incident which resulted in having interrupted the public business on last Thursday and again today to discuss this question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just a moment, before I yield further. I did not realize you interrupted. When did you interrupt?

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, I had nothing to do with it except have my name and reputation implicated in the discussions which took place. I recognize that statements are made occasionally in the heat of debate by candidates for public office, inferences, and innuendoes are created which upon further reflection are admitted to be extravagant and unjustified even to the point of being regretted by the person uttering them. I am ready to treat this incident as one in that category. What I wanted the gentleman to do was to verify the fact that I had urged him not to press this resolution that he has presented.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let me answer that right now. The gentleman did ask me not to press the resolution. But let me say to the Members of the House that this resolution and what becomes of it is not exclusively the concern of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] nor the concern of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]. This is a question as Thomas Reed said so long, long ago for the House.

Here is what Mr. Speaker Reed said on August 9, 1890:

> The rights and privileges of the Members of the House in the discharge of their functions are sacred and the House can undertake no higher duty than the conservation of those rights and privileges intact. Even if the case arises under dubious circumstances, it is proper for the House to pause and give suitable heed to any question which any Member raises with regard to his rights and privileges as a Member. It is for the House alone to determine what they are.

I say this question transcends the personal interest of these two gentlemen. These charges, if they were made, are a reflection, I repeat again, upon the Membership of the House, upon a joint committee of the House and Senate, and upon the House itself.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Very briefly.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In presenting this resolution to the House you are trying to crucify me and persecuting me out of Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman certainly overestimates my interest in his campaign and I think the interest of other Members in the same subject. Perhaps the gentleman fired a shotgun blast at his primary opponent and blasted other colleagues, a joint committee, and the whole Congress. The truth of the matter is, and you will see it in subsequent speeches, in newspaper releases and radio comments made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]—you will see that he will attempt to use and perhaps may be able to use what has been said here, and any action that may be taken, for his own advantage, claiming he is a martyr and is being persecuted by his colleagues when in truth and in fact all any of us ask is that in his campaigning he attend to his own business and leave us out of his talks and charges.

My colleagues know that the resolution is not introduced because of my personal feeling for one man——

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It is pure politics.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Or against the other. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Speaker be authorized to refer the pending resolution to a committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules.

FLOOD DISASTER INSURANCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 458)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States

Last summer, following the great floods in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, I recommended that the Congress establish a national system of flood disaster insurance. As I said then, the lack of such an insurance system is a major gap in the means by which a man can make his home, his farm, or his business secure against financial loss.

In order to be of help to the Congress in its further consideration of this matter, I have had draft legislation prepared embodying the views of the executive agencies concerned as to the best way to set up a sound and workable flood insurance system. A copy of this draft legislation is attached to this message, and the agencies that prepared it, particularly the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, stand ready to give the Congress any further help they can.

The reasons for enacting such legislation are very clear. At present, insurance against flood damage is virtually unobtainable from private insurance companies, nor does it seem likely that the private companies, by themselves, will find it possible to write flood insurance at reasonable rates. The need for such insurance, however, is urgent. Home owners, farmers, and businessmen may have their assets and their savings of years wiped out in a few hours if a disastrous flood strikes their property. We have seen it happen year after year.

To meet this situation, we can and should make available to those in potential flood areas the opportunity to protect themselves against the financial losses which such floods bring. I am sure that the great majority of the people concerned want to provide in advance out of their own resources for protection of their property against floods, just as they do now against fire and other hazards.

A Federal system of flood insurance is the logical answer. It would enable individual property owners to pool their risks, and to meet a large part of their losses out of their common funds, rather than forcing them to rely upon emergency relief, as is too often the case now. It would provide funds needed to restore property damaged in floods, without requiring people to borrow heavily against their future incomes.

Insurance is especially important under present circumstances when our system of protection against floods is so incomplete. Flood insurance, however, has more than short-run significance. It is also necessary as part of our long-run attack on the flood problem. Dealing with floods at their source, by doing the necessary work on the land and in the stream beds to catch and hold flood waters, will always be our major weapon for preventing flood damage. Limits also need to be placed on the use of the flood plains, through State and local zoning laws, wherever the cost of complete protection from floods would be prohibitive. But flood insurance will always be necessary to protect people against the financial losses which may be caused by unexpected and catastrophic floods which it is impossible to prevent.

The attached draft legislation would authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to provide either insurance or reinsurance against losses resulting from floods. If private insurance companies wish to do so, under this bill they could write insurance against floods and could then reinsure themselves against excessive loss by paying appropriate premiums to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Or, alternatively, the Corporation would be authorized to issue insurance policies directly. The Corporation, of course, should not compete with private insurance companies. The draft bill would prohibit the issuance of Federal policies in cases where private insurance is available at reasonable rates. In addition, it would require the Corporation to work through private insurance companies in administering the program.

This draft bill would authorize insurance to be made available for homes, for business and farm properties, and for agricultural commodities. It would also establish a maximum amount of insurance for any one person or business of $250,000. While this would not cover some of the large losses in a flood, it would take care of the homeowners, businessmen, and farmers who are least able to afford flood losses because their total assets are small. As experience is gained, it may be desirable to change this maximum amount.

Furthermore, the bill would limit the insurance payment on any given property to 90 percent or less of the loss sustained. Such a limitation will preserve the incentive for the property owner to do what he can to protect his own property.

I believe that this flood-insurance program should be set up on a basis that is designed to permit the Government to break even. To do so, it will be necessary that rates be set high enough to cover all expenses, including a proper reserve for losses.

However, since there is only limited experience upon which to rely in determining such rates, it will be necessary to start the program on an experimental basis, both with respect to rates and areas covered. Accordingly, the draft legislation provides for limitations on the total amount of insurance to be written in each of the first 3 years, and for a report to the Congress by the Corporation before the end of that period, making recommendations concerning the nature and extent of the program thereafter.

In addition, the draft legislation authorizes Federal agencies that make or guarantee loans to require borrowers to purchase flood insurance where it is available. Thus the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for example, might require its borrowers to carry flood insurance, where appropriate, just as it now requires them to carry fire insurance.

All in all, I believe this draft legislation represents a sound and workable approach, and I heartily recommend it to the consideration of the Congress. I strongly believe that legislation along these lines is most urgently needed. There is no reason whatever for continuing to rely on inadequate and emergency relief programs to take care of the thousands of people every year who suffer extensive flood damage to their homes and farms and businesses.

We can and we should provide a businesslike system of insurance to finance the restoration of such losses. I hope the Congress will enact such a system without delay.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 5, 1952.*

A bill to provide for national flood insurance, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the National Flood Insurance Act of 1952.

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to promote the national welfare by alleviating the widespread economic distress suffered from time to time within the United States, its Territories and possessions as a result of floods, and the attendant impairment of the free flow of interstate and foreign trade and commerce, by providing direct governmental insurance against certain flood risks or by making insurance against such risks available through private insurance companies by means of governmental reinsurance.

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 3 (a). To carry out the purposes of this act, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the Corporation) is authorized to provide either insurance or reinsurance, or both insurance and reinsurance against loss resulting from damage to or loss of real or personal property (including agricultural commodities, and property owned by the State or local governments) due to flood as defined by the Corporation occurring within the limits of the United States, its Territories and possessions: *Provided,* That no insurance or reinsurance shall be issued for losses resulting from (A) any hostile or warlike action by (i) any government or sovereign power (de jure or de facto) or any authority maintaining or using military, naval, or air forces, or (ii) an agent of any such government, power, or forces, or (B) any action taken by any Federal, State, or local government agency in hindering, combating, or defending against any such hostile or warlike action (whether actual, impending, or expected) or (C) disorder or other lawlessness accompanying the collapse of civil authority determined by the President to have resulted from any action referred to in clause (A) or (B) or from control by enemy forces.

(2) The Corporation shall from time to time prescribe (1) premium rates for each type of insurance and/or reinsurance which it shall make available under authority of this act, and (2) the terms and conditions under which and the areas and subdivisions thereof within which each rate shall be applicable. All such rates shall be based upon consideration of the risks involved and shall be adequate, in the judgment of the Corporation, to cover all administrative and operating expenses arising under this act, as well as reserves for probable losses. The Corporation may receive from or exchange with any State or territorial insurance commission or agency or with any private corporation or association engaged in the writing of insurance against property loss within the United States such loss experience information as may be necessary for the establishment of such premium rates.

(c) The Corporation shall by regulation provide for the determination of (1) the types and location of property with respect to which insurance and/or reinsurance shall be granted, (2) the nature and limits of loss or damage in any area or subdivisions thereof which may be covered by such insurance or reinsurance, (3) rates, terms, and conditions of such insurance or reinsurance, and (4) such other matters as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The Corporation may decline such applications and risks and may establish from time to time such regulations with respect to the classification, limitation, and rejection of risks as it shall deem advisable for the purposes of this act.

(d) In providing insurance and/or reinsurance, the Corporation may by contract arrange for the financial participation of private insurance companies or other insurers in the underwriting of risks assumed, and for their proportionate participation in premiums and in any profits or losses realized or sustained. The Corporation shall utilize the facilities and services of other public agencies, of private insurance companies, and of established insurance agents and brokers and established insurance adjustment organizations to the maximum extent which the Corporation shall deem practicable and consistent with minimum cost of providing insurance protection.

(e) The aggregate amount of insurance issued by the Corporation in favor of any person or State or local government shall not exceed $250,000. No claim shall be approved in an aggregate amount which exceeds the actual cash value or the cost of replacing, repairing, or rebuilding the damaged property with material of like kind and quality—less depreciation at the time of damage—whichever is lower: *Provided,* That the approved amount of any claim shall be reduced by $300 plus 10 percent of the remainder, or by such larger amount or percentage as may be prescribed by the Corporation in the insurance contract. The Corporation shall prescribe such regulations applicable to reinsurance as it may deem appropriate to give effect to the intent of the limitations in this subsection. The Corporation may from time to time prescribe such regulations regarding coverage available to subsidiary and affiliated corporations as it shall deem appropriate to effectuate the purpose of this subsection.

(f) The Corporation, on and after the first day of the sixth month following the enactment of this act, may provide insurance or reinsurance in an aggregate amount not to exceed $500,000,000 outstanding and in force at any one time, which limit may be increased, with the approval of the President, by further amounts of $500,000,000 each on July 1, 1953, and July 1, 1954.

COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

SEC. 4. (a) In carrying out the functions authorized in this act, the Corporation shall consult with other agencies of the Federal Government and interstate, State, and local agencies having responsibilities for flood control and flood-damage prevention in order to assure that the insurance facilities offered are consistent with the programs of such agencies.

(b) No insurance or reinsurance shall be issued (1) for risks eligible for insurance provided by other Federal programs or to the extent that coverage is available on reasonable terms from other private or public sources, or (2) for properties whose use is in conflict with State or local flood-zoning laws.

(c) Any department or agency of the Federal Government engaged in making direct loans or advances, or in participating in, insuring, or guaranteeing loans made by private lending institutions, for the construction, modernization, repair, or purchase of property eligible for insurance under this act may require as a condition for such future financial assistance that such property be insured against flood damage to the extent such insurance is available.

FINANCING

SEC. 5. (a) To carry out the functions authorized by this act, there is authorized to be established in the Treasury of the United States a national flood insurance fund (referred to hereinafter as the "fund"). The capital of the fund shall consist of such amounts as may be advanced to it from appropriations. Such sums as may be required are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitations for the purposes of the fund.

(b) Advances shall be made to the fund from the appropriations made therefor when requested by the Corporation. The Corporation shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury at the close of each fiscal year, interest on such advances at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average rate on outstanding interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States.

(c) Premiums paid to the Corporation for insurance and reinsurance under this act, interest earned on investments of the fund, and receipts from any other operations under this act shall be credited to the fund. The fund shall be available for the payment of liabilities under such insurance and reinsurance and for payment of all expenses of the Corporation under this act.

(d) Whenever any capital in the fund is determined by the Corporation to be in excess of its current needs, such capital shall be credited to the appropriation from which advanced where it shall be held for future advances. After liquidation of all outstanding advances, any cash in excess of current needs may be invested or reinvested by the Corporation in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to interest and principal by the United States. The proceeds from the sale or redemption or the obligations held by the Corporation pursuant to this act shall be credited to the fund.

ADVISORY, CONSULTANT, AND OTHER PERSONNEL

SEC. 6. (a) The Corporation (1) shall appoint an advisory committee, consisting of not less than three individuals experienced in the writing of insurance against property loss, to advise the Corporation with respect to the execution of its functions pursuant to this act, and (2) may also employ such part-time consultants and advisory personnel as the Corporation may deem necessary in carrying out the purposes of this act. Persons so employed who, while so serving, hold other offices or positions under the United States shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other persons required under the provisions of this subsection may

be employed as authorized in section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per diem.

(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Corporation is hereby authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place not more than five positions in grades 16, 17, or 18 of the general schedule established by said act, and such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by said section.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

SEC. 7. (a) Under such regulations as the Corporation may prescribe, it shall adjust and pay valid claims either directly or through agents for losses covered by insurance and reinsurance under this act. The Corporation shall collect from participating insurance companies such amounts as they may be obligated to contribute toward such losses.

(b) Upon disallowance of any claim against the Corporation or upon refusal of a claimant to accept the amount allowed by the Corporation, the claimant, within 1 year after the date of mailing notice of disallowance or partial disallowance by the Corporation, may institute an action against the Corporation on such claim in the United States district court for any district in which the insured property or a part thereof is situated. Exclusive jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such courts, sitting without juries, to hear and determine such actions without regard to the amount in controversy.

REPORTS

SEC. 8. (a) The Corporation shall make a comprehensive annual report of its operations under this act for the fiscal year ending on the preceding June 30 to the Congress as soon as practicable in each year, but in no case later than the third day of the following January.

(b) The Corporation shall make a study and investigation of (1) the work, activities, personnel, and functions authorized under this act for the period from the enactment of the act to June 30, 1954, and (2) the practicability of providing insurance or reinsurance for loss resulting from business interruption due to floods. It shall report to the Congress the result of the study and investigation and make such recommendations as it may deem appropriate on or before January 3, 1955.

SUCCESSION

SEC. 9. The powers, functions, duties, and authority arising under this act shall be exercised and performed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation while that Corporation has succession, and thereafter by such officer, agency, or instrumentality of the United States as the President may designate: *Provided*, That for the purposes of carrying out this act by any such officer, agency, or instrumentality the authority granted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in section 3 of the act of January 22, 1932, as amended (15 U. S. C. 603), shall be available to such officer, agency, or instrumentality, notwithstanding dissolution of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. WILLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

TAX LOOPHOLES

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, I wish to call attention to the various efforts that are presently being made to make new loopholes in our tax structure, and to open up old ones recently closed.

I learn from the Wall Street Journal that the Ways and Means Committee is to hold public hearings beginning May 13 on a proposal to divert millions of tax dollars into retirement funds of one sort and another. And our genial and distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has introduced two bills to repeal the tax upon the business earnings of educational, charitable, and religious organizations that were taxed in the 1950 Revenue Act.

Mr. Speaker, the whole Nation has been shocked by the corruption, graft, and tax evasion in our revenue department recently exposed by the senior Senator from Delaware, Mr. WILLIAMS, and by the King committee. However, the loss of revenue resulting from a few mink coats, trips to Florida, and even the large fees collected by former Revenue Bureau officials amounts to only a drop in a bucket compared to the loss to the Treasury stemming from the legal tax exemption of co-ops, mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, credit unions, and sundry other devices that are now costing the Government probably $1,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, if these proposals to reopen old loopholes, now closed, and to open up new loopholes are to come before our committee, I serve notice, here and now, that I shall demand consideration and public hearings, at the same time, upon my bill H. R. 240, a bill that has been pending for almost 2 years.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 25 minutes on May 14, following the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

AUTHORIZING TRANSFER OF LAND FROM JURISDICTION OF THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk, the bill H. R. 4199, an act to authorize the transfer of lands from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Interior to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, 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:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the transfer of certain lands of the Blue Ridge Parkway from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is an amendment which merely changes the title of the bill?

Mr. BENTSEN. That is correct, it is merely a change in the title of the bill, as passed by the other body.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TANANA VALLEY SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 586, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land on the Chena River to the Tanana Valley Sportsmen's Association, of Fairbanks, Alaska, 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:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "$1.25" and insert "$10."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this merely increases the price that the Government will get for this land?

Mr. BENTSEN. That is correct. In the House bill, we provided that the Government should get $1.25 an acre, and the other body raised it to $10 an acre.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PARTICIPATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN OLYMPIC GAMES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1184) to authorize the training for, attendance at, and participation in, Olympic games by military personnel, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have objected to this particular legislation for some time principally because I have certain questions which I thought were legitimate, but no effort has been made to contact me to explain the whys and wherefores and consequently, I have repeatedly asked that the bill be put over without prejudice.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PRESERVING HISTORIC PROPERTIES IN AND AROUND BOSTON, MASS.

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 254) to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have an agreement with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] to prepare an amendment to this joint resolution, and to submit it to him. I have not had the time to do so, and therefore ask unanimous consent at this time that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SUMMIT LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION, NEV.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4285) to reserve certain land on the public domain in Nevada for addition to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by our colleague, the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] to ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4323) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 5 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5990) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso of subsection 201 (e) and the third proviso of subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1249; 50 U. S. C., App. 2281), are hereby repealed.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURHAM: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the second proviso of subsection 201 (e) and the third proviso of subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 249), are both amended to read as follows: '*Provided further*, That the Administrator is authorized to lease real property required for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection, but shall not acquire fee title to property unless specifically authorized by act of Congress'."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CORRELATION AND COORDINATION OF RESEARCH OF WATER SUITABLE FOR AGRICULTURAL, INDUSTRIAL AND MUNICIPAL CONSUMPTIVE USES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6578) to provide for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7085) to provide for an addition to the George Washington Memorial Parkway by the transfer from the Administrator of General Services to the Secretary of the Interior of the tract of land in Arlington County, Va., commonly known as the Nevius tract.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. TABER, and Mr. FORD objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

CONTROL AND EXTINGUISHMENT OF OUTCROP AND UNDERGROUND FIRES IN COAL FORMATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5383) to provide for the control and extinguishment of outcrop and underground fires in coal formations, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby recognized that outcrop and underground fires in coal formations involve serious wastage of the fuel resources of the Nation, and constitute a menace to the health and safety of the public and to surface property. It is therefore declared to be the policy of the Congress to provide for the control and extinguishment of outcrop and underground coal fires and thereby to prevent injuries and loss of life, protect public health, conserve natural resources, and to preserve public and private surface property.

SEC. 2. As used in this act:

"Coal" means any of the recognized classifications and ranks of coal, including anthracite, bituminous, semibituminous, subbituminous, and lignite.

"Outcrop" means any place where a formation is visible or substantially exposed at the surface.

"Formation" means any vein, seam, stratum, bed, or other naturally occurring deposit.

"Coal mine" means any underground, surface, or strip mine from which coal is obtained.

"State" means any State or Territory of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof.

"Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representative, or any organized group or persons.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior, in order to effectuate the policy declared in section 1 of this act, is hereby authorized—

(a) to conduct surveys, investigations, and research relating to the causes and extent of outcrop and underground fires in coal formations and the methods for control or ex-

tinguishment of such fires, to publish the results of any such surveys, investigations, and researches; and to disseminate information concerning such methods; and

(b) to plan and execute projects for control or extinguishment of fires in coal formations.

SEC. 4. The acts authorized in section 3 of this act may be performed—

(a) on lands owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, with the cooperation of the agency having jurisdiction thereof; and

(b) on any other lands, upon obtaining proper consent or the necessary rights or interests in such lands: *Provided, however,* That expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose in any privately owned operating coal mine shall be limited to the acts authorized in section 3 (a).

SEC. 5. As a condition to the extending of any benefits under section 3 (b) of this act to any lands not owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, except where such action is necessary for the protection of lands or other property owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, the Secretary of the Interior may require—

(a) the enactment of State or local laws providing for the control and extinguishment of outcrop and underground fires in coal formations on State or privately owned land and the cooperation of State or local authorities in the work; and

(b) agreements or covenants as to the performance and maintenance of the work required to control or extinguish such fires.

SEC. 6. In carrying out the provisions of section 3 of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

(a) to secure, by contract or otherwise, and without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act, for work of a temporary, intermittent, or emergency character, such personal services as may be deemed necessary for the efficient and economical performance of the work;

(b) to hire, with or without personal services, work animals and animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles and equipment, at rates to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior and without regard to the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5);

(c) to procure all or any part of the surveys, investigations, and control or extinguishment work by contracts with engineers, contractors, or firms or corporations thereof;

(d) to acquire lands or rights and interests therein, including improvements, by purchase, lease, gift, exchange, condemnation, or otherwise, whenever necessary for the purposes of this act;

(e) to repair, restore, or replace private property damaged or destroyed as a result of, or incident to, operations under this act; and

(f) to receive and accept money and property, real or personal, or interests therein, as a gift, bequest, or contribution for use in any of the activities authorized under this act; and to conduct any of the activities authorized under this act in cooperation with any person or agency, Federal, State, or private. Any money so received shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a special fund or funds for disbursement by the Secretary of the Interior as the terms of the grant may require, and shall remain available until expended for the purposes for which received and accepted.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this act.

SEC. 8 There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $1,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, line 10, strike out "a special fund or funds" and insert "an available trust fund."

Page 5, line 18, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$500,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ADVANCES OR LOANS TO FEDERAL PRISONERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1365) to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, acting for himself or through such officers and employees as he may designate, is authorized to use so much of the trust funds designated as "Commissary funds, Federal prisons" (31 U. S. C. 725s (22)), as may be surplus to other needs of the trust to provide advances to Federal prisoners as an aid to their rehabilitation.

SEC. 2. An advance made hereunder shall in no instance exceed $150 except with the specific approval of the Attorney General, and shall in every case be secured by the personal note of the prisoner conditioned to make repayment monthly when employed, or otherwise possessed of funds, with interest at a rate not to exceed 6 percent per annum and subject to an agreement on the part of the prisoner that the funds so advanced shall be expended only for the purposes designated in the loan agreement. Repayments of principal and interest shall be credited to the trust fund from which the advance was made. Any unpaid principal or interest on said note shall be considered as a debt due the United States.

SEC. 3. The Attorney General is authorized in his discretion to accept gifts or bequests of money for credit to the said trust fund, which gifts or bequests, for the purpose of Federal income, State and gift taxes, shall be deemed to be gifts or bequests to or for the use of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That chapter 315 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding the following new section:

"'§ 4284. Advances for rehabilitation.

"'(a) The Attorney General, under such regulations as he prescribes, acting for himself or through such officers and employees as he designates, may use so much of the trust funds designated as "Commissary Funds, Federal Prisons" (31 U. S. C. 725s (22)), as may be surplus to other needs of the trust, to provide advances at the time of their release, as an aid to their rehabilitation.

"'(b) An advance made hereunder shall in no instance exceed $150 except with the specific approval of the Attorney General and shall in every case be secured by the personal note of the prisoner conditioned to make repayment monthly when employed, or otherwise possessed of funds, with interest at a rate not to exceed 6 per centum per annum and subject to an agreement on the part of the prisoner that the funds so advanced shall be expended only for the purposes designated in the loan agreement. Repayments of principal and interest shall be credited to the trust fund from which the advance was made. Any unpaid principal or interest on said note shall be considered as a debt due the United States.'

"SEC. 2. The Attorney General may accept gifts or bequests of money for credit to the 'Commissary Funds, Federal Prisons,' which gifts or bequests, for the purpose of Federal income, State, and gift taxes, shall be deemed to be gifts or bequests to or for the use of the United States.

"SEC. 3. The analysis of chapter 315 of title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 4281, is amended by adding the following new item:

"'4284. Advances for rehabilitation.'"

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

ADMITTING PRISONERS COMMITTED BY STATE COURTS TO FEDERAL PRISONS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2160) to authorize the Attorney General to admit persons committed by State courts to Federal penal and correctional institutions when facilities are available.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 401 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof, immediately after section 5002, a new section as follows:

"§ 5003. Custody of State offenders.

"(a) The Attorney General, when the Director shall certify that proper and adequate treatment facilities and personnel are available, is hereby authorized to contract with the proper officials of a State or Territory for the custody, care, subsistence, education, treatment, and training of persons convicted of criminal offenses in the courts of such State or Territory: *Provided,* That any such contract shall provide for reimbursing the United States in full for all costs or other expenses involved.

"(b) Funds received under such contract may be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation or appropriations from which the payments for such service were originally made.

"(c) Unless otherwise specifically provided in the contract, a person committed to the Attorney General hereunder shall be subject to all the provisions of law and regulations applicable to persons committed for violations of laws of the United States not inconsistent with the sentence imposed."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 401 of said title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end of such analysis a new item, "5003. Custody of State offenders."

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

AMENDING FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4924) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the transfer to

the Administrator of General Services of functions relating to the acquisition and assignment of passenger-carrying motor vehicles and to the control of office furniture and equipment.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.) as amended, is amended by—

(a) redesignating section 210 thereof as originally enacted (redesignated as section 212 by section 5 (a) of Public Law 754, 81st Cong.) as section 214, and, wherever such section No. 210 appears in such act as originally enacted, it is amended to conform to the redesignation prescribed by this subsection;

(b) inserting in the table of contents appearing in the first section of such act, as amended by section 5 (b) of said Public Law 754, immediately after the line in which "SEC. 211." appears, the following:

"Sec. 212. Acquisition and assignment of passenger vehicles.

"Sec. 213. Control of office furniture and equipment."

(c) inserting immediately after section 211 thereof, as amended by section 5 (c) of said Public Law 754, the following new sections:

"ACQUISITION AND ASSIGNMENT OF PASSENGER VEHICLES

"SEC. 212. All functions with respect to acquiring passenger-carrying motor vehicles by purchase or lease for use by executive agencies, and all functions with respect to assigning and reassigning such vehicles heretofore or hereafter acquired for use by executive agencies within the United States, its territories and possessions, are hereby transferred to the Administrator, who shall prescribe regulations governing the use, custody, repair, and disposition of, and accountability for, vehicles so assigned. The provisions of this section shall not apply to the Department of Defense, but this exemption shall not be construed as limiting any authority vested in the Administrator by other provisions of this or any other act with respect to motor vehicles used or to be used by the Department of Defense. For the purposes of this subsection the term 'passenger carrying motor vehicles' shall include, in addition to the standard types, busses, station wagons, carry-alls, suburbans, and all other types of motor vehicles primarily designed or equipped for carrying passengers, except such as the Administrator may by regulation specifically exempt herefrom.

"CONTROL OF OFFICE FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT

"SEC. 213. The control, including custody, repair, disposition, and accountability, of all office furniture and furnishings and office equipment, owned or leased by any Federal agency, now or hereafter located on or within any building or space under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, is hereby transferred to the Administrator."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out all of lines 6, 7, and 8, all of page 2, and all of page 3 down to and including line 17, and insert:

"(a) inserting the following new subsection in section 3:

"'(l) The term "motor vehicle" means any vehicle, self-propelled or drawn by mechanical power, designed to be operated principally on the highways in the transportation of property or passengers.'

"(b) deleting the word 'and' immediately preceding clause (2) of the final sentence of subsection (a) of section 109, and revising said clause (2) to read as follows: '(2) for paying the purchase price of supplies and services, transportation, including related costs, to first storage point from which redistribution is made to Federal agencies and their authorized representatives, and the cost of personal services employed directly in the repair, rehabilitation, and conversion of personal property,'

"(c) adding to clause 2 of the final sentence of subsection (a) of section 109, as revised, the following: 'and (3) for paying all elements of direct cost incident to the establishment and operation of motor vehicle pools or systems and pools of equipment for lease or rent to Federal agencies.'

"(d) revising the third sentence of subsection (b) of section 109 to read as follows: 'On and after July 1, 1950, such prices shall be fixed at levels so as to recover so far as practicable the applicable purchase price, transportation, including related costs, to first storage point from which redistribution is made to Federal agencies and their authorized representatives, inventory losses, the cost of personal services employed directly in the repair, rehabilitation, and conversion of personal property, and the cost of amortization and repair of equipment and all other elements of direct cost incident to the establishment and operation of motor vehicle pools or systems and pools of equipment for lease or rent to Federal agencies'.

"(e) changing the period at the end of subsection (b) of section 109, as revised, to a colon, and adding thereto the following: '*And provided further,* That the Administrator, in the operation of motor vehicle pools or systems, may make provision for the furnishing, sale, and use of scrip, tokens, tickets, and similar devices for utilization in the transportation of property or passengers'.

"(f) deleting the word 'and' before the word 'repairing' in subsection (a) (1) of section 201 and inserting in said subsection after the word 'converting' the following: ', maintenance and use of motor vehicles, and establishment and operation of motor vehicle pools or systems and pools of equipment for lease or rent to Federal agencies'.

"(g) inserting after 'facilities' in subsection (a) (2) of section 201 the following: ', pools of equipment for lease or rent to Federal agencies, and motor vehicles for the purpose of establishing and maintaining motor vehicle pools or systems to serve Federal agencies'.

"(h) by adding at the end of section 210 the following new subsection:

"'(f) Whenever an agency, in whole or in part, is required to move to another location, only such furniture and furnishings as the Administrator shall determine, and only such office equipment as the Administrator, after consultation with the head of the agency concerned, shall determine, cannot more economically and efficiently be made available at the new location, shall be moved. Remaining furniture, furnishings and equipment shall promptly be reported as excess property.'

"(i) by inserting after the period following the figure '211' in section 211 the letter '(a)', and adding at the end of said section the following new subsection:

"'(b) Whenever, during the regular course of his duties, there shall come to the knowledge of the Administrator any violation of the provisions of section 5 of the act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U. S. C. 78), or of section 641 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 641) involving the conversion by a Government official or employee of a Government-owned or leased motor vehicle to his own use or the use of others, the Administrator shall report such violation to the head of the agency in which the official or employee concerned is employed, for further investigation and either appropriate disciplinary action under said section 5 or, where appropriate, referral to the Attorney General for prosecution under said section 641'."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to establish and operate motor vehicle pools and systems and to provide office furniture and furnishing when agencies are moved to new locations, to direct the Administrator to report the unauthorized use of Government motor vehicles, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5350) to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there are no departmental reports accompanying this bill. In addition, I notice the Department of Defense is opposed to it. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ARMY LAND CONVEYANCE TO SAVANNAH, GA.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1650) to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Savannah, Chatham County, Ga.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey, relinquish, and release to the city of Savannah, Chatham County, State of Georgia, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted to such city under the act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of real property no longer required for military purposes," approved March 4, 1923. Such land is situated in such city and is more particularly described as follows:

All of the land known as Fort Jackson (formerly Fort Oglethorpe), Georgia, being the property conveyed to Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States, and his successors in office, by deed dated May 16, 1808, from Nichol Turnbull, recorded in the clerk's office of Chatham County, in book BB, folio 162, May 17, 1808, said property being described therein as follows: "All that wharf lot known by the number 12 situate in New Deptford, formerly known by the name of Five Fathom Hole on the Savannah River, east of the city of Savannah, containing two hundred feet front on said river, three hundred and forty-five feet running nearly a southeast course from the front to the back line adjoining a lane of twenty-five feet which divides the aforesaid lot from lot 11,

two hundred feet on the said back line and on the northeast side of said lot adjoining lot number 13 and two hundred and ninety-two feet from the aforesaid back line to low water mark; bounded southeastwardly by land of the said Nichol Turnbull, northeastwardly by lot number 13 and southwestwardly by the aforesaid lane of twenty-five feet dividing the aforesaid lot number 12 from lot number 11 and northwestwardly by Savannah River, which said lot number 12 is designated on a general plan of the same by the remains of Mail-fort, as will more fully appear reference being had to the said general plan on record in the surveyor general's office of the State of Georgia, taken and laid off by the county surveyor the 9th day of May 1798, as will further appear by reference to a plat of record in the office of the clerk of superior court, Chatham County, Ga., bearing the legend, 'Fort Jackson Military Reservation, photostatic copy of map on file with the National Archives and Records Service, Washington, D. C., RG 77. Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers. Fortifications Map File, map: Dr. 189, Ga. 5-5'."

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

APPOINTMENT OF QUALIFIED FEMALE PHYSICIANS IN THE MEDICAL SERVICES OF THE ARMED SERVICES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2552) to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FORT SCHUYLER, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4021) to amend the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950 (Public Law 755, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the people of the State of New York all that portion of the United States Military Reservation at Fort Schuyler, in the borough and county of Bronx in the city of New York, State of New York, together with all improvements thereon, bounded and described as follows, to wit: Commencing at a point (latitude forty degrees forty-eight minutes twenty-three seconds north; longitude seventy-three degrees forty-seven minutes fifty-two seconds west) fixed on the south sea wall which is approximately twenty-five and five-tenths feet westerly from an angle in said sea wall and running thence in a northeasterly direction five hundred ninety-two and five-tenths feet, more or less, to a point on the north sea wall which is approximately one hundred ninety-six and five-tenths feet westerly from an angle in the north sea wall (said line running along the easterly edge of a concrete curb for an eighteen-foot concrete road running in a northeasterly and southwesterly direction); thence continuing in the same course to the point where said line intersects the northerly exterior line of a grant of lands under water made by the State of New York to the United States of America by letters patent dated May 26, 1880, and recorded in the office of the secretary of state of the State of New York in Book 44 of Patents at page 604; thence running easterly, southerly, and westerly along the exterior northerly, easterly, and southerly line of said grant to a point in the exterior southerly line thereof which is in range with the course first above described; thence running in a northeasterly direction to the point and place of beginning, intending to include within said bounds a portion of the uplands which were conveyed by William Bayard, Jr., and Charles Henry Hammond to the United States of America by deed dated July 26, 1826, and recorded in the office of the clerk of the county of Westchester, N. Y., on November 30, 1826, in Liber 28 of Deeds at page 225, and by Charles H. Hammond and Thomas Bolton, one of the masters in chancery of the State of New York, to the United States of America by deed dated August 25, 1828, and recorded in the office of the clerk of the county of Westchester, N. Y., on December 11, 1828, in Liber 33 of Deeds at page 296, together with a portion of contiguous lands under water which were granted by the State of New York to the United States of America by letters patent dated May 26, 1880, and recorded in the office of the secretary of state of the State of New York in Book 44 of Patents at page 604; together with such easements for highway or other purposes, over that portion of such reservation which is not herein authorized to be conveyed to the people of the State of New York, as may be necessary for theh proper use and enjoyment of the portion so conveyed as may be determined by agreement between the Secretary of the Navy and the appropriate officials of the State of New York."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 4, following line 4, add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Section 3 of the act is amended to read as follows: 'Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that during any emergency declared by the President or the Congress of the United States in existence at the time of enactment of this act, or whenever the President or the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Air Force that the property so conveyed is useful for military, air or naval purposes or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without charge, except as indicated below, to the full, unrestricted possession, control and use of the property conveyed, or any part thereof, including any additions or improvements thereto made by the State subsequent to this conveyance: *Provided, however*, That the United States shall be responsible during the period of such use for the entire cost of maintaining all of the property so used, and shall pay a fair rental for the use of any structures or other improvements which have been added thereto without Federal aid.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes,' approved September 5, 1950."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BAD CONDUCT DISCHARGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6769) to amend section 301, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to further limit the jurisdiction of boards of review established under that section.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen withhold his motion to permit me to explain the bill to see if I can clear up his objection?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request and reserve the right to object.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the gentleman that this is purely a technical correction in the law in order to deal substantial justice to these men who do receive a bad conduct or dishonorable discharge. It is entirely technical but it is in the interest of justice for men who are in trouble there.

Mr. BYRNES. I understand it is technical, and that is probably the reason why I do not understand it. I admit frankly I do not understand all the implications of it, and that is why I asked that the bill go over without prejudice in order that I might get some information on it and not take the time of the House to discuss it, because most of the Members of the House probably know more about the details of this matter of the Administrative Review Board than I. It was my understanding that some years ago we made a reorganization, I think it was under the Legislative Reorganization Act, in which we eliminated the proposition of private bills to give relief in the matter of discharges or review of discharges; we set up a review board. Is that the board referred to in this bill?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes. In military discharges, we have authorized the issuance of administrative discharges.

Mr. BYRNES. Did we not also at that time permit a review of all discharges? Not just administrative discharges but any discharge was supposed to be reviewed by a board, and that the review was a substitute for what prior to that had been the possibility of a congressional review?

Mr. BROOKS. This does not touch upon that; this is due to the fact that in 1948 we amended a bill and this amendment affected the issuance of bad-conduct discharges by administrative processes; and it affects the problem in only this way: That at the present time a man with a dishonorable discharge under general court martial has one right of review. He goes only through the Military Court of Appeals, whereas a man who gets a bad-conduct discharge

through administrative processes has two appeals. He first appeals to the Board. If he does not get what he wants from the Board, then he has the right to go to the Military Court of Appeals. This will simply correct that hiatus in the law and will give that man a right to go to the Military Court of Appeals just like a man who gets a dishonorable discharge as a result of a general court martial can go to the Military Court of Appeals. As it is now a man with an administrative bad-conduct discharge has a superior right over the man with a general court martial and dishonorable discharge. One has only one appeal and the other has two appeals.

Mr. BYRNES. One of the evils we run into once in a while is apparently the fact there is no appeal on these discharges to a civilian agency or within the department. They always end in the military tribunal. That is your only review.

Mr. BROOKS. We spent many, many months about a year ago setting up a Uniform Code of Military Justice. Under that we set up a Military Court of Appeals to correct what the gentleman has in mind. Under the set-up at the present time the Military Court of Appeals is the proper court to which those with bad-conduct and dishonorable discharges can go. But it is not fair in the general sense to say that if you get an administrative bad-conduct discharge, which is by a special court martial—not a general one—which is less serious, we will give you two rights of appeal, but if you get a general court martial and a dishonorable discharge, which is, in my judgment, worse than a bad-conduct discharge, you only have one right of appeal. It is to correct that hiatus which came in through error when we amended the law in 1948.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. This is nothing more than an amendment to section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 established, in each of the military departments, administrative review boards to review discharges and dismissals from the service.

It was obviously intended that the administrative review board's jurisdiction would be limited to administrative discharges and dismissals. In 1948 the Congress amended the articles of war in such a manner that it became possible for an Army or Air Force special court martial, the intermediate court martial of those services, to grant a punitive discharge which was designated a "bad conduct discharge." Prior to that time, the only punitive discharge that an Army or Air Force court martial could grant was a dishonorable discharge and that could be granted only by a general court martial. Subsequently the Uniform Code of Military Justice was enacted and in that law we provided for the finality of court-martial sentences and provided a military court of appeals composed of civilians which would constitute the final reviewing authority of both dishonorable and bad-conduct discharges.

Obviously a technical conflict now exists since section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act does not preclude the review of bad-conduct discharges by the administrative board which reviews administrative discharges and dismissals. This bill would not disturb the jurisdiction of the 301 board to review administrative discharges and dismissals. It would, in keeping with the original intent, deny this board any jurisdiction over punitive discharges which are granted by action of courts martial, reserving the right to review such punitive discharges in those judicial tribunals which have been created for that specific purpose.

Since the purpose of this bill is merely to correct a technicality, its enactment would have no fiscal effect.

Mr. BROOKS. The man with the lesser type of discharge—that is, the bad conduct type—has two rights of appeal; but if he gets a dishonorable discharge through a general court martial for a more heinous offense, he only has one right of appeal.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES. The gentleman's position may be entirely sound. All I would ask of the gentleman is that the matter be passed over without prejudice so that it may come up again. What you are doing here is cutting out some right of appeal.

Mr. BROOKS. No. Everybody has the same right through the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES. Will you answer this question: Does not the passage of this bill remove the right of review in at least one group of cases?

Mr. BROOKS. No.

Mr. BYRNES. The right of appeal in one group of cases?

Mr. BROOKS. No. In every case there would still be the right of appeal finally to be decided by the Uniform Military Court of Appeals, which is civilian in its character.

Mr. BYRNES. My understanding is that the gentleman has been arguing that some people have two rights of review and, therefore, that is the reason for this bill.

Mr. BROOKS. This bill would make uniform the right of procedure for appeal in all cases. That is all it does.

Mr. BYRNES. Can the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] answer this question? As I understand at the present time there is a certain group of cases that have dual right of review.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES. Would this bill remove one of those rights where they have a dual right?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It would. When Congress passed a bill setting up a military code of justice it did so to establish a fairer and more uniform procedure in handling military disciplinary matters. This amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act further establishes the uniformity provided by the military code of justice.

Mr. BYRNES. Does this eliminate one appeal in an area that now has dual right of appeal?

Mr. BROOKS. It does not deny anybody——

Mr. BYRNES. That is not my question. Did this come out of the committee unanimously?

Mr. BROOKS. Unanimously.

Mr. BYRNES. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances, I am not going to object and go counter to the opinion of the Committee on Armed Services that passed on it, and if there is just that small technicality that the Members assure me, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether this bill deals with physical review.

Mr. BROOKS. It deals with the type that gets a bad-conduct discharge from administrative processes and does not deal even then with the reasons for the discharge; but merely the procedure for an appeal. The procedure in all cases is the same, whether you get a bad-conduct discharge or whether you get an honorable discharge.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, that I am very much interested in raising the iron curtain, and I hope that legislation will be brought in here to compel the Physical Review Board, in the Air Force, at least, to divulge the reasons for some of their actions today. To date I cannot find out the identity of the Physical Review Board. I assure the gentleman that I will have more to say on that soon.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 286), as amended (38 U. S. C. 693h), is further amended by deleting therefrom the word "general" wherever it appears immediately before the words "court martial."

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

AMENDING THE AMERICAN RIVER DEVELOPMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6531) to amend the American River Development Act, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I find in this bill a rather unusual provision which says that the Congress must appropriate funds or take some action on a rivers and harbors and flood-control project within a definite limit of time before the authorization expires. In other words, it seems as though this legislation is a shotgun at the Committee on Appropriations. As a member of Civil Functions Subcom-

mittee, if that interpretation is correct, I certainly object to that approach.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection. I will be glad to discuss the matter with the author of the bill, but I do feel it desirable to ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION VISAS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 411) to authorized completion and termination of the issuance of immigration visas authorized under the act of June 25, 1948, as amended.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there are no departmental reports accompanying this resolution. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMEND ACT EXTENDING THE TERM OF CERTAIN PATENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4413) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II."

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II," approved June 30, 1950 (Public Law 598, 81st Cong.), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5. (a) No person shall be held not to be the sole owner of a patent within the meaning of this act, by reason of any interest of his spouse in such patent.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of the first section fixing the time for filing application for an extension under this act, such application, in the case of any patent held by the applicant and his spouse as community property under the laws of any State, Territory, or possession, may be filed at any time within 1 year following the date of enactment of this section."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "as community property under the laws of any State, Territory, or possession."

Page 2, line 8, strike "one year" and insert "six months."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

WATERS OF THE CANADIAN RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4628) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico relating to the waters of the Canadian River.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 1798) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of the Congress is hereby given to the compact authorized by the act of April 29, 1950 (64 Stat. 93), signed by the commissioners for the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on December 6, 1950, and thereafter ratified and approved by the Legislatures of the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico, which compact reads as follows:

"CANADIAN RIVER COMPACT

"The State of New Mexico, the State of Texas, and the State of Oklahoma, acting through their Commissioners, John H. Bliss for the State of New Mexico, E. V. Spence for the State of Texas, and Clarence Burch for the State of Oklahoma, after negotiations participated in by Berkeley Johnson, appointed by the President as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed respecting Canadian River as follows:

"ARTICLE I

"The major purposes of this Compact are to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversy; to make secure and protect present developments within the States; and to provide for the construction of additional works for the conservation of the waters of Canadian River.

"ARTICLE II

"As used in this Compact:

"(a) the term 'Canadian River' means the tributary of Arkansas River which rises in northeastern New Mexico and flows in an easterly direction through New Mexico, Texas and Oklahoma and includes North Canadian River and all other tributaries of said Canadian River.

"(b) The term 'North Canadian River' means that major tributary of Canadian River officially known as North Canadian River from its source to its junction with Canadian River and includes all tributaries of North Canadian River.

"(c) The term 'Commission' means the agency created by this Compact for the administration thereof.

"(d) The term 'conservation storage' means that portion of the capacity of reservoirs available for the storage of water for subsequent release for domestic, municipal, irrigation and industrial uses, or any of them, and it excludes any portion of the capacity of reservoir allocated solely to flood control, power production and sediment control, or any of them.

"ARTICLE III

"All rights to any of the waters of Canadian River which have been perfected by beneficial use are hereby recognized and affirmed.

"ARTICLE IV

"(a) New Mexico shall have free and unrestricted use of all waters originating in the drainage basin of Canadian River above Conchas Dam.

"(b) New Mexico shall have free and unrestricted use of all waters originating in the drainage basin of Canadian River in New Mexico below Conchas Dam, provided that the amount of conservation storage in New Mexico available for impounding these waters which originate in the drainage basin of Canadian River below Conchas Dam shall be limited to an aggregate of 200,000 acre-feet.

"(c) The right of New Mexico to provide conservation storage in the drainage basin of North Canadian River shall be limited to the storage of such water as at the time may be unappropriated under the laws of New Mexico and of Oklahoma.

"ARTICLE V

"Texas shall have free and unrestricted use of all waters of Canadian River in Texas, subject to the limitations upon storage of water set forth below:

"(a) The right of Texas to impound any of the waters of North Canadian River shall be limited to storage on tributaries of said River in Texas for municipal uses, for household and domestic uses, livestock watering, and the irrigation of lands which are cultivated solely for the purpose of providing food and feed for the householders and domestic livestock actually living or kept on the property.

"(b) Until more than 300,000 acre-feet of conservation storage shall be provided in Oklahoma, exclusive of reservoirs in the drainage basin of North Canadian River and exclusive of reservoirs in the drainage basin of Canadian River east of the 97th meridian, the right of Texas to retain water in conservation storage, exclusive of waters of North Canadian River, shall be limited to 500,000 acre-feet; thereafter the right of Texas to impound and retain such waters in storage shall be limited to an aggregate quantity equal to 200,000 acre-feet plus whatever amount of water shall be at the same time in conservation storage in reservoirs in the drainage basin of Canadian River in Oklahoma, exclusive of reservoirs in the drainage basin of North Canadian River and exclusive of reservoirs east of the 97th meridian; and for the purpose of determining the amount of water in conservation storage, the maximum quantity of water in storage following each flood or series of floods shall be used; provided, that the right of Texas to retain and use any quantity of water previously impounded shall not be reduced by any subsequent application of the provisions of this paragraph (b).

"(c) Should Texas for any reason impound any amount of water greater than the aggregate quantity specified in paragraph (b) of this Article, such excess shall be retained in storage until under the provisions of said paragraph Texas shall become entitled to its use; provided, that, in event of spill from conservation storage, any such excess shall be reduced by the amount of such spill from the most easterly reservoir on Canadian River in Texas; provided further, that all such excess quantities in storage shall be reduced monthly to compensate for reservoir losses in proportion to the total amount of water in the reservoir or reservoirs in which such excess water is being held; and provided further than on demand by the Commissioner for Oklahoma the remainder of any such excess quantity of water in storage shall be released into the channel of Canadian River at the greatest rate practicable.

"ARTICLE VI

"Oklahoma shall have free and unrestricted use of all waters of Canadian River in Oklahoma.

"ARTICLE VII

"The Commission may permit New Mexico to impound more water than the amount set forth in Article IV and may permit Texas to impound more water than the amount set forth in Article V; provided, that no State shall thereby be deprived of water needed for beneficial use; provided further that each such permission shall be for a limited period not exceeding twelve months; and provided further that no State or user of water within any State shall thereby acquire any right to the continued use of any such quantity of water so permitted to be impounded,

"ARTICLE VIII

"Each State shall furnish to the Commission at intervals designated by the Commission accurate records of the quantities of water stored in reservoirs pertinent to the administration of this Compact.

"ARTICLE IX

"(a) There is hereby created an interstate administrative agency to be known as the 'Canadian River Commission.' The Commission shall be composed of three Commissioners, one from each of the signatory States, designated or appointed in accordance with the laws of each such State, and if designated by the President an additional Commissioner representing the United States. The President is hereby requested to designate such a Commissioner. If so designated, the Commissioner representing the United States shall be the presiding officer of the Commission, but shall not have the right to vote in any of the deliberations of the Commission. All members of the Commission must be present to constitute a quorum. A unanimous vote of the Commissioners for the three signatory States shall be necessary to all actions taken by the Commission.

"(b) The salaries and personal expenses of each Commissioner shall be paid by the government which he represents. All other expenses which are incurred by the Commission incident to the administration of this Compact and which are not paid by the United States shall be borne equally by the three States and be paid by the Commission out of a revolving fund hereby created to be known as the 'Canadian River Revolving Fund.' Such fund shall be initiated and maintained by equal payments of each State into the fund in such amounts as will be necessary for administration of this Compact. Disbursements shall be made from said fund in such manner as may be authorized by the Commission. Said fund shall not be subject to the audit and accounting procedures of the States. However, all receipts and disbursements of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited by a qualified independent public accountant at regular intervals and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the Commission.

"(c) The Commission may:

"(1) Employ such engineering, legal, clerical and other personnel as in its judgment may be necessary for the performance of its functions under this Compact;

"(2) Enter into contracts with appropriate Federal agencies for the collection, correlation, and presentation of factual data, for the maintenance of records, and for the preparation of reports;

"(3) Perform all functions required of it by this Compact and do all things necessary, proper, or convenient in the performance of its duties hereunder, independently or in cooperation with appropriate governmental agencies.

"(d) The Commission shall:

"(1) Cause to be established, maintained and operated such stream and other gaging stations and evaporation stations as may from time to time be necessary for proper administration of the Compact, independently or in cooperation with appropriate governmental agencies;

"(2) Make and transmit to the Governors of the signatory States on or before the last day of March of each year, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding year;

"(3) Make available to the Governor of any signatory State, on his request, any information within its possession at any time, and shall always provide access to its records by the Governors of the States, or their representatives, or by authorized representatives of the United States.

"ARTICLE X

"Nothing in this Compact shall be construed as:

"(a) affecting the obligations of the United States to the Indian Tribes;

"(b) Subjecting any property of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, to taxation by any State or subdivision thereof, or creating any obligation on the part of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction or operation of any property or works of whatever kind, to make any payment to any State or political subdivision thereof, state agency, municipality or entity whatsoever, in reimbursement for the loss of taxes;

"(c) Subjecting any property of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent to which such laws would apply without regard to this Compact;

"(d) Applying to, or interfering with, the right or power of any signatory State to regulate within its boundaries the appropriation, use and control of water, not inconsistent with its obligations under this Compact;

"(e) Establishing any general principle or precedent applicable to other interstate streams.

"ARTICLE XI

"This Compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been ratified by the Legislature of each State and approved by the Congress of the United States. Notice of ratification by the Legislature of each State shall be given by the Governor of that State to the Governors of the other States and to the President of the United States. The President is hereby requested to give notice to the Governor of each State of approval by the Congress of the United States.

"IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Commissioners have executed four counterparts hereof, each of which shall be and constitute an original, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States, and one of which shall be forwarded to the Governor of each State.

"DONE at the City of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, this 6th day of December, 1950.

"[s] John H. Bliss
JOHN H. BLISS
Commissioner for the State of New Mexico

"[s] E. V. Spence
E. V. SPENCE
Commissioner for the State of Texas

"[s] Clarence Burch
CLARENCE BURCH
Commissioner for the State of Oklahoma

"APPROVED:

"[s] Berkeley Johnson
BERKELEY JOHNSON
Representative of the United States of America"

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal section 1 of this Act is expressly reserved. This reservation shall not be construed to prevent the vesting of rights to the use of water pursuant to applicable law and no alteration, amendment, or repeal of section 1 of this Act shall be held to affect the rights so vested.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 4628) was the table.

RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6525) to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 2639, an identical bill, be substituted for this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HALE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state whether the Senate bill is identical with the House bill?

Mr. CROSSER. It is identical, word for word.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by substituting for the table appearing in subsection (a) thereof the following:

"Column I Total compensation	Column II Daily benefit rate
$300 to $474.99	$3.00
$475 to $749.99	3.50
$750 to $999.99	4.00
$1,000 to $1,299.99	4.50
$1,300 to $1,599.99	5.00
$1,600 to $1,999.99	5.50
$2,000 to $2,499.99	6.00
$2,500 to $2,999.99	6.50
$3,000 to $3,499.99	7.00
$3,500 and over	7.50"

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "not less than $150" and inserting in lieu thereof "not less than $300."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall become effective with respect to benefit years beginning on and after July 1, 1952.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to make just a few observations on this very meritorious legislation which is passing the House by unanimous consent. It is a splendid tribute to the work of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; it is a splendid tribute to the soundness of the legislation and the consideration extended by all Members of the House.

However, I think a special tribute, if I may do so without being misunderstood by any of my colleagues, can be paid to our distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. He is in a campaign. His primary is tomorrow. Yet he came back from Ohio to be here today in order to handle this bill in case there was any opposition to it, coming all the way back at personal inconvenience and expense to himself. We all know without regard to party what the day before a primary or general election contest means to any of us.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has not the least idea that I intended to say this, but in a little talk outside the Chamber he told me how he came back especially for the considera-

tion of this bill. I evaluated it and felt it was my duty to make these few remarks so that the railroad employees covered by this bill will know of the deep personal debt of gratitude they owe to our distinguished friend from Ohio, and know that in him they have, as the people throughout the United States also have, one of the finest men I have ever met and one of the ablest and most courageous, as well as conscientious legislators that ever served in this body, in the person of our distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I merely want to make a few observations. I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts completely, but at the same time I do want to call attention to the fact that there are some of us on this side of the aisle who stayed to attend this session because we knew this bill was coming up, and we wanted to aid in getting it through and to see that it was adopted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Correct.

Mr. SHAFER. It is meritorious legislation.

May I say also that I think a great deal of the gratitude the railroad men will have for this legislation being passed is due to a fine work of the gentleman, Dave Bodary, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Carmen, who has worked incessantly to see that information concerning this legislation was made available to the House Members. Dave is a resident of my own State of Michigan. The members of the Michigan delegation are deeply grateful to him and indebted to him for the fine work he has done as legislative liaison man for the railway carmen. He will soon retire, having reached retirement age, and I know I speak for all of the Michigan Members of Congress that he will be greatly missed in Washington, especially when legislation benefitting railroad workers is being considered.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I just want to confirm what our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, said regarding Mr. Bodary on the subject of this legislation.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the fine statement made by the majority leader on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering at this time, namely S. 2639, has been substituted for H. R. 6525, a similar bill that has passed the Senate. This legislation is a very important measure to approximately 1,500,000 railroad employees in this country. The bill would increase benefits paid under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Except for the addition in 1946 to the present scale of a daily benefit rate of $4.50 for the compensation range of $2,000 to $2,499.99, and a daily benefit rate of $5 for the compensation range of $2,500 and over, the daily benefit rates set forth in present scale have not been changed since 1940.

We well know how the cost of living has increased since 1940. The schedule of daily benefit rates for unemployment insurance established in 1940 certainly is not fair and equitable at present-day price levels. Why, only since 1946 the Consumers' Price Index has increased by 36 percent. The benefits provided for by this bill would help to alleviate the great disparity which now exists between unemployment benefits and the cost of living.

An important feature to be kept in mind in connection with this bill is the fact that unless some unforeseen situation should arise it will not be necessary to change the contribution rates paid by the railroads for the support of this program. There is a balance in the Unemployment Insurance Account of some $765,000,000. This amount in reserve is equivalent to over 14 years of benefit payments at the rate of expenditure during the last fiscal year.

Actuaries tell us that even under the new scale of benefit rates provided under H. R. 6525 the railroads would continue to contribute only one-half of 1 percent of payroll until 1959. Hence, this bill would not cost the carriers any more than what they are paying now for some years to come.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the proposed legislation favorably without a single dissenting vote. It has the support of all railroad brotherhoods and unions.

I urge every Member of the House to support this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of H. R. 6525 to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. It is a forward step in the right direction and, although it does not go as far as my own bill now pending before the Congress, I am happy to support it because it gives much needed relief. I trust that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will continue its study of this important question with a view to reporting additional legislation in the future. I commend and congratulate the committee for reporting H. R. 6525.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have two legislative days within which to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House bill 6525, to amend the Railroad Retirement Unemployment Insurance Act and to increase the daily benefit rates as therein set out.

During the 15 months of this session of the Eighty-second Congress it has been apparent that the cost of living has steadily risen. Last year Congress gave the Federal employees, including postal employees, a raise in pay approximately equal to the rise in the cost of living since June 1950.

It was my feeling last year that there should have been commensurate increases under the Railroad Retirement Unemployment Insurance Act. However, nothing was done at that time so we have the present bill as introduced in February of 1952.

The new bill has eliminated payments to those earning less than $475. In other words it has practically eliminated the itinerant workman. However, it has handsomely increased those who are considered regular employees and who would make up 95 percent of those included under the act. In order to set this out in greater detail, I am including immediately hereafter the table of benefits for unemployment and sickness under the present Railroad Retirement Unemployment Insurance Act and under the schedule proposed in House bill 6525.

Benefits under present act:

Total compensation:	*Daily benefit rate*
$150 to $199.99	$1.75
$200 to $474.99	2.00
$475 to $749.99	2.25
$750 to $999.99	2.50
$1,000 to $1,299.99	3.00
$1,300 to $1,599.99	3.50
$1,600 to $1,999.99	4.00
$2,000 to $2,499.99	4.50
$2,500 and over	5.00

Proposed benefits under House bill 6525:

Total compensation:	*Daily benefit rate*
$300 to $474.99	$3.00
$475 to $749.99	3.50
$750 to $999.99	4.00
$1,000 to $1,299.99	4.50
$1,300 to $1,599.99	5.00
$1,600 to $1,999.99	5.50
$2,000 to $2,499.99	6.00
$2,500 to $2,999.99	6.50
$3,000 to $3,499.99	7.00
$3,500 and over	7.50

It can be readily seen that the percentage increase which this bill would make in the daily benefit rates range from 30 to 60 percent depending on the employee's base-year earnings. Based on the years 1950 and 1951 the over-all increase would be 38.6 percent—35.6 percent for unemployment due to lack of work, and 41.2 percent for unemployment due to sickness.

The new table provides for 10 daily benefit rates, beginning with $3 a day and increasing by 50-cent intervals to $7.50 a day. At present there are nine daily benefit rates, the lowest being $1.75 and the highest $5.

It will be noted further that the unemployment and sickness program is supported by contributions collected by the Railroad Retirement Board from employers alone. However, in view of the balance in the unemployment insurance

account, it is not anticipated that there will be any change relating to contributions from employers. If the minimum rate should eventually prove insufficient, the contribution rate would rise automatically to a level sufficient to provide all funds which would be needed under any reasonable foreseeable circumstances. As of June 30, 1951, the balance in the unemployment insurance account was $765,833,000. According to the report submitted by the committee, this amount in reserve is equivalent to about 5½ years of benefit payments at the expenditure rate in the fiscal year 1949–50, and to over 14 years of benefit payments at the expenditure rate in the fiscal year 1950–51.

About 35 to 40 percent of the benefits normally paid under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are for sickness and maternity. Only four States have laws for the payment of sickness benefits and those laws provide for the employees to pay all or part of the cost of sickness benefits. In contrast, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act provides sickness and maternity benefits for railroad employees Nation-wide and requires that the entire cost be borne by the railroads. Consequently, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, in providing such sickness and maternity benefits entirely at the employer's expense, is already much more liberal than the State systems to the extent of about $28,000,000—$26,000,000 sickness and $2,000,000 maternity—per year.

This legislation contained in H. R. 6525 is badly needed at the present time and I feel sure will do the job that is intended. This is one of the most constructive pieces of legislation developed in this Congress. We all recall that during World War II the railroads did a marvelous job of carrying the goods and the boys. I happen to have been one of those in World War II who rode the railroads as a member of the armed services. The legislation that is contained in this bill is one of the guarantees that we will have railroads operating should we ever be faced with another situation like World War II. It will further guarantee that the personnel operating those railroads will be happy and contented with their jobs.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, both the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held complete hearings on companion measures to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, the House version being H. R. 6525 which is now before us. Both committees unanimously reported the respective bills.

On April 24 the Senate version was passed unanimously. H. R. 6525, with the committee amendment, is identical to the bill passed by the Senate.

The report accompanying the bill describes briefly but fully the compelling reasons for favorable action and, in addition, outlines the best available information as to the effect of the increases upon the unemployment insurance account.

Further, the material presented during the hearings contained conclusive evidence of the wide disparity between the benefits paid under current law, which, except for the two highest daily benefit rates, were established in 1940, and the current wage rates, weekly earnings, and substantially increased living costs. The increases as contained in the bill will go far toward restoring the ratio of benefits to earnings to where it was in 1946.

Evidence presented during the hearings indicated forcibly that the administration of this law has been of a very high quality and I was unable to determine any evidence of abuses. On the contrary, it does seem clear that there is an excellent record that the beneficiaries have sought protection under the law only when it was absolutely necessary.

This is a bill which merits our support. In view of the identical nature of the provisions as it passed the Senate and the legislation now before us, it is obvious that our action here today can send a completed bill promptly to the White House, and I have every reason to believe that such a bill would be signed and become effective at an early date.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 6525, a bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

As every Member of this House knows, it was 1946 when Congress enacted Public Law 599, Seventy-ninth Congress, which liberalized unemployment and sickness benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

According to House Report No. 1727, on H. R. 6525, the bill before us is necessary:

> Since 1946, wage rates in the railroad industry have risen about 57 percent, and weekly earnings have risen 33 percent. However, the average payment per week of unemployment due to lack of work in the benefit year ended June 30, 1951, was $17.38, or only a few cents higher than in the first year after the 1946 amendments, when the average payment per week was $17.30. The average payment per week for unemployment due to sickness was $22.02 for the year ended June 30, 1951, and this average has shown little change during the 4 years this part of the benefit program has been in operation. With this same average benefit payment, the unemployed railroad worker must meet living costs which, according to the Consumers' Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, has risen 36 percent from 1946 through December 1951.
>
> In the year ended June 30, 1946, benefits per week of unemployment were 30 percent of the average earnings per week. In the year ended June 30, 1951, these benefits were only a little over 22 percent of the earnings per week. It is clear, therefore, that benefits payable under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act now constitute a much smaller proportion of the regular wages of railroad employees than they were in 1946, and that they meet the needs of these employees less adequately in periods of unemployment and sickness. The increase proposed by this bill will do little more than restore the ratio of benefits to earnings to where it was in 1946.

This bill, H. R. 6525, will provide a new table of benefit rates for the rates now payable under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

In a few words, the new schedule of benefits provides for 10 daily benefit rates beginning with $3 a day and increasing by 50-cent intervals to $7.50 a day. At the present time, there are 9 daily benefit rates, the lowest being $1.75 and the highest $5.

Without taking further time to discuss the details of the bill which have already been mentioned in this debate, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate and thank the members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for the fine job they have done in looking after the interest of the unemployed and sick employees of the railroad industry.

Representing as I do, a large railroad population, I assure you railway employees join me in saying, "Thanks for a job well done."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, today I urge the House to pass H. R. 6525, which seeks to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

It is particularly necessary that the benefits to be paid should be materially increased as the benefits under the present Unemployment Insurance Act have lagged behind during the increases in commodity prices and wages. We, also, have railroad workers whose unemployment has been caused by dislocations in the economy during the present national emergency. In my opinion, there is more need for the passage of Mr. CROSSER'S measure, H. R. 6525, than at any other period in recent years.

I introduced an identical bill, H. R. 6605, only because it was my desire to indicate to the committee that there is real interest in amending the Unemployment Insurance Act and that there is, also, a grave necessity for its amendment. However, I am wholeheartedly supporting Mr. CROSSER'S measure.

Mr. CROSSER'S measure would boost the daily minimum from $1.75 to $3 and boost the maximum daily benefit from $5 to $7.50. It is estimated that this increase in benefits would not result in any increase in tax on the carriers for at least 10 years.

Speaking of the tax, in 1948 the railroad organizations were successful in getting through Congress an amendment to the act which reduced the tax paid by the carriers for unemployment insurance from 3 percent to one-half of 1 percent. Over the 4-year period, this

reduction in payroll tax has constituted a considerable saving to the carriers.

I am reliably informed that for the past 4 years, while the carriers have been paying only a tax of one-half of 1 percent, the original 3-percent figure is the one figured in their freight rates. Under this arrangement, the carriers are reimbursed not only for the tax they do pay, but, also, for the tax they do not pay.

It is my understanding that all the employee organizations are in agreement on this legislation for the benefit of building up and maintaining morale among the employees of our great railroad institutions. This measure, in my opinion, should receive the wholehearted endorsement of the House today.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting H. R. 6595, which will give all railway employees an increase in their unemployment insurance, including sick leave.

Hearings have been held before the Interstate Commerce Committee, the members of which have reported the bill to the floor of the House by unanimous vote. I understand there is practically no opposition to increases carried in the bill and it should be passed by a substantial vote.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to raise another question with reference to railroad legislation.

I want to ask John Steelman, assistant to the President and White House handyman in helping to handle labor disputes, why has there not been a settlement of the railroad strike that was shut off by seizure which affects three transportation groups of approximately 150,000 railroad employees? It would seem a settlement should have been reached a long time ago.

The railroads were seized over 2 years ago. During all that time the Government has not brought about a settlement. Many transportation workers affiliated with certain of the brotherhoods say they are suffering financially because of the manner in which this matter has been handled by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the Government could and should take appropriate action to bring about a settlement, fair to the workers, and fair to railroad management.

In these three brotherhoods there are approximately 150,000 men who are a living example of the failure to settle labor disputes by Government seizure rather than resorting to collective bargaining.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, last fall we passed an amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act granting various increases in the benefits provided by that law. It was therefore entirely logical that in the present session the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, should feel concerned to report a bill making amendments to the railroad unemployment insurance law increasing the benefits conferred by that bill. I would particularly emphasize the fact that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was unanimous in wishing to increase the benefits provided by both these salutary pieces of legislation. Last year when we dealt with proposed amendments to the railroad retirement law there were unfortunately sharp differences of opinion as to the form and content of amendatory legislation. These differences of opinion were entertained not only in the committee but by the railway brotherhoods. But this year when we were dealing with the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act there were no differences of opinion in or out of the committee, and the utmost harmony prevailed.

The passage of these two bills will, I believe, meet with general approval among railroad employees but the Congress must always be careful to scrutinize the retirement fund and the unemployment fund to see that they are not depleted in such a manner as to endanger the security of future railroad employees. Such a scrutiny of the retirement fund was specifically contemplated at the time we passed the 1951 act.

I am glad that it was possible to bring this bill up on the Consent Calendar and I hope that it will be passed unanimously. The character of its provisions is clearly set forth in the committee report.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to say how much I appreciate the nice things said by Members of the Congress in regard to my connection with this very meritorious bill. It is altogether unnecessary to speak for something that has been unanimously approved by all of the Members of the House.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in order to explain fully the provisions of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced H. R. 6525 it was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The committee held full hearings on it and after considering all the evidence presented made a unanimous report recommending enactment of the bill with only one technical amendment designed simply to perfect its draftsmanship and not affecting the substance of the bill.

In the Senate an identical bill was sponsored by 18 Senators, some from each party. It was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which likewise held full hearings and, also, in a unanimous report, recommended enactment of the bill with the same technical amendment that our committee has recommended. It came up for consideration on April 24 and was passed by the Senate in accordance with the committee's recommendation.

All the standard railway labor organizations, representing in the aggregate virtually all the employees who look to the railroad unemployment insurance system for their protection, unqualifiedly support the bill.

The bill is a simple one and has only one purpose. It will adjust the unemployment insurance protection that the railroad unemployment insurance system provides to the changes in values that have occurred during the last 12 years.

Benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are paid for days of unemployment not in excess of 5 days per week. The amount of the daily benefit rate applicable to any individual in any particular benefit year—July 1 through June 30 the next calendar year—as well as his eligibility for benefits in that benefit year is related to the total amount of his creditable earnings from railroad employment in the preceding calendar year, called the base year. The act sets forth a table in which base year earnings are set forth in nine groups or brackets and opposite each there is shown the daily benefit rate applicable to that range of base year earnings. The base year earnings of which the present law takes account range from $150 to $2,500 and the daily benefit rates range from $1.75 to $5. Earnings of over $2,500 in the base year do not entitle the individual to any higher daily benefit rate.

The table of earnings brackets and daily benefit rates appearing in the present law was, for the most part, set up in 1940 and reflects 1940 values. The only change in the table that has been made since 1940 was made in 1946 by adding two additional brackets and daily benefit rates so that earnings from $2,000 to $2,500 and $2,500 and over would be reflected in the benefit rates.

The principal change that my bill would make is to revise this benefit-rate table to correspond more nearly to present rates of earnings and living costs. The revised table set forth in the bill drops out the lowest bracket of base-year earnings and changes the second lowest so as to raise the minimum qualifying earnings to $300. At the other end of the scale the present top bracket of $2,500 and over is changed to cover the range of $2,500 to $2,999.99, and two new brackets are established covering the ranges of $3,000 to $3,499.99 and $3,500 or more. The revised daily-benefit rates range from $3 to $7.50.

What this revision of the benefit table would do is to restore in part, but not entirely, the protection against loss of wages through unemployment that we provided in 1940. During the inflationary period we have experienced since 1940 the cost of living has gone up and wages have gone up, too. As a result, the unemployed individual has suffered progressively greater losses in wages, and his living costs have been progressively higher. If under these conditions unemployment-benefit payments remain at a fixed amount, it necessarily follows that those payments cover a progressively smaller proportion of the loss suffered and the protection provided by unemployment insurance progressively diminishes.

This diminution of protection has not been as severe under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act as it would have been if each individual's benefit rate had remained absolutely fixed. As wage rates increase individuals tend to move from one base-year earnings bracket into the next higher bracket, and in that

way offset to some extent the loss of protection that change in values would otherwise cause. But the evidence before our committee leaves no doubt that this tendency has not prevented a most serious decline in the degree of protection we thought we were providing. A few examples will illustrate this. If an employee in 1940 was working at the minimum wage rate established for the railroad industry under the Fair Labor Standards Act he would have had a weekly wage of $17.28. That would be the wage loss that he would suffer per week of unemployment. The unemployment-benefit payments that we provided to cover that loss would come to $12.50 per week, covering 72 percent of the loss. An employee now working at the minimum wage rate suffers a wage loss of $55.80 per week when he is unemployed. Under the present law his benefit payments would be $25 per week, or less than 45 percent of the loss suffered. Under the bill the benefit payment would be raised to $32.50, which would still cover only 58 percent of the wage loss as compared with the 72-percent protection we established in 1940 for minimum-rated employees.

If you consider average rates of pay rather than minimum rates, the picture is no better. A person working in 1940 at the average rate for the industry would have had a weekly wage of $35.52 and when he lost it through unemployment his benefit payments would come to $20 per week, covering 56 percent of the loss. Now an employee earning the average rate for the industry loses $70.80 when he is unemployed for a week. His benefit payments are $25 per week, covering only 35 percent of his loss. Under the bill the benefit payment would be increased to $37.50 so as to cover 53 percent of the loss as compared with the 56 percent coverage provided in 1940.

These illustrations demonstrate without question that the prompt enactment of this bill is desperately needed to give back to railroad employees the protection we gave them in 1940 and which changing times have taken away.

Aside from the changes in daily benefit rates that I have discussed, the bill makes one other adjustment. Under the present law the minimum base year earnings that an individual must have to be eligible for benefits is $150. In 1940 that represented the equivalent of approximately 1 month's full time employment at the average rate of pay. Because wage rates have increased employees can now qualify for benefits with much less employment in the base year than was necessary in 1940. In this respect changing times have operated to permit people with a less substantial attachment to the industry to become eligible for benefits. Under the bill that condition, too, would be corrected. The minimum qualifying base year earnings would be raised to $300 which at present average rates of pay is again almost exactly the equivalent of 1 month's full-time employment.

The present provisions for financing the railroad unemployment insurance system need not be changed to carry out these adjustments. The funds for the support of the system are derived from a payroll tax on creditable compensation at a basic rate of 3 percent, the same as under the Federal-State system that applies to other industries. Until 1948 the full basic rate was collected irrespective of how large the reserves might become. Since we were paying out much less in benefits that we were collecting, the reserve had grown in 1948 to almost $1,000,000,000 and was still increasing. In order to avoid accumulating an unnecessarily large reserve we provided in 1948 for a sliding scale of contributions ranging from 3 percent down to one-half of 1 percent depending upon the amount in the reserve. It was expected that in that way the reserve would gradually be reduced through collection of only the one-half of 1 percent minimum until the reserve reached the point at which a higher rate would go into effect. Since 1948 only the one-half of 1 percent minimum has ever been collected and the reserve is still over $300,000,000 above the point at which the sliding scale would operate to increase the collection to 1 percent. It is clear, therefore, that even with the additional payments that would be made under the bill no more than the minimum rate would actually be collected for some years.

Such opposition to the bill as was expressed at the hearings did not impress the committee as convincing. No one contended or offered any evidence to show that the proposed changes would result in benefit rates that were unnecessarily high in relation to wages or that they were not needed to restore the 1940 degree of protection. The facts leave no room for any such contention.

Spokesmen for the railroad companies objected to the bill on the grounds that it would make the railroad system more liberal than the State systems and that in the long run it would cost the railroads more money. Neither objection is valid.

It has been clearly shown that railroad employees have lost a substantial proportion of the protection we meant to provide for them with respect to unemployment. That protection needs to be restored. Whether the railroad law is now more or less liberal than the State systems or would be more or less liberal when the bill is enacted has no bearing on our obligation to give back what changing times have taken away. We know that the same problem has presented itself with respect to the State systems and has not been adequately met. Because it has not been adequately met we now have pending in Congress proposals to use Federal funds to supplement State-benefit payments on an emergency basis. Certainly under these circumstances the injection of comparisons with State systems represents the use of an irrelevant and inadequate standard of comparison.

The second objection made by the railroad companies is just as fallacious. They have been allowed for some years to pay contributions at a rate of only one-half of 1 percent, not because it would have been improper to collect the full 3-percent basic rate if that amount had been needed, but simply because a lesser amount was necessary to support the benefits that Congress had seen fit to provide. Our enactment of the sliding-scale method of fixing the contribution rate cannot now be used to hamper us in determining what are proper benefit rates. The grant of relief from making payments higher than are needed is no commitment against providing needed benefit rates and allowing the sliding scale to fix the contributions at the rate necessary to meet those benefit payments. The railroads make no contention that the enactment of this bill would cause them to pay more than the minimum one-half-of-1-percent rate for some years nor that it would ever require them to pay more than the 3-percent basic rate.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 6525) was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 1498 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3975) to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit a joint patentee to bring suit on a patent in the Court of Claims in certain cases where one or more of his copatentees is barred from doing so.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1498. Patent cases.

"Whenever an invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States is used or manufactured by or for the United States without license of the owner thereof or lawful right to use or manufacture the same, the owner's remedy shall be by action against the United States in the Court of Claims for the recovery of his reasonable and entire compensation for such use and manufacture.

"The court shall not award compensation under this section if the claim is based on the use or manufacture by or for the United States of any article owned, leased, used by, or in the possession of the United States prior to July 1, 1918.

"This section shall not confer a right of action on any patentee who, when he makes such a claim, is in the employment or service of the United States, or any assignee of such patentee, and shall not apply to any device discovered or invented by an employee during the time of such employment or service; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to deprive a joint patentee of any right of action which would otherwise be conferred upon him by this section solely on the ground that one or more of his copatentees is in the employment or service of the United States at the time such claim is made, or was in the employment or service of the United States at the time of the discovery or invention."

With the following committee amendment:

That the first two sentences of the fourth paragraph of section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by substituting the following therefor:

"A Government employee shall have the right to bring suit against the Government under this section except where he was in a position to order, influence, or induce use of the invention by the Government. This section shall not confer a right of action on any patentee or any assignee of such patentee

with respect to any invention discovered or invented by a person while in the employment or service of the United States, where the invention was related to the official functions of the employee, in cases in which such functions included research and development, or in the making of which Government time, materials or facilities were used."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6922) to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, so as to extend the benefits of such section to certain colleges in the Territory of Alaska.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 22 of the act of June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C., sec. 329), is amended by striking out "colleges in the several States and the Territory of Hawaii" and inserting in lieu thereof "colleges in the several States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (a) of such section 22 is amended by striking out "$980,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000,000."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of paragraph (b) of such section 22 is amended by striking out "$1,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,501,500."

SEC. 4. The second and third sentence of paragraph (b) of such section 22 are amended to read as follows: "The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) shall be paid annually to the several States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (b) small be in addition to sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid annually to each of the several States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii in the proportion which the total population of each such State and Territory bears to the total population of all the States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, as determined by the last preceding decennial census."

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this act shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this act.

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

CONSOLIDATING PARKER DAM POWER PROJECT AND DAVIS DAM PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2643) to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of effecting economies and increased efficiency in the construction, operation, and maintenance thereof and of accounting for the return of reimbursable costs, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to consolidate and administer as a single project to be known as the Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada, the projects known as the Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California, and the Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to alter or affect in any way the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), or the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Washington on February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande from Fort Quitman, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to alter or affect in any way any right or obligation of the United States or any other party under contracts heretofore entered into by the United States.

SEC. 2. Funds heretofore appropriated for the Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California, and the Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada, shall be consolidated and shall be and remain available for the purposes for which they were appropriated.

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

LEASING RESERVED PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA FOR DOCK, WHARF, AND LANDING-SITE PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3882) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease withdrawn or reserved public lands in Alaska for dock, wharf, and landing-site purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion and subject to such regulations, terms, and conditions as he may prescribe, issue a lease or permit for the use of any tract of withdrawn or reserved public land in the Territory of Alaska for dock, wharf, and landing-site purposes.

Where lands have been withdrawn or reserved in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency other than the Department of the Interior, or of the Territory, or of a municipality, water district, or other local governmental subdivision or agency, the Secretary may issue leases or permits under this act only with the consent of such Federal department or agency, or of the Territory, or of such local governmental unit, and subject to any conditions which that department or agency, or the Territory, or that local governmental unit may prescribe to insure the adequate utilization and protection of the lands for the primary purposes for which they have been withdrawn or reserved, or are administered.

SEC. 2. The Secretary may issue a lease or permit for the use of lands under this act for a period not exceeding 20 years. Any renewal of such lease or permit may likewise be issued for a period not exceeding 20 years. The Secretary shall include a provision in the lease or permit that the public shall have access to and proper use of the docks, wharves, and landing sites on the lands covered by the lease or permit, at such reasonable rates of toll as may be prescribed by the Secretary. The Secretary shall also include a provision in the lease or permit reserving a roadway, of such width as he may find reasonable, adjacent to the shore line as near as may be practicable, for the use of the public as a highway.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to lands in any national forest, or national park or monument, or to any Indian lands, or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for the use of Indians.

SEC. 4. All moneys received from any lease or permit for the use of lands under this act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands.

SEC. 5. That portion of the second proviso of section 10 of the act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. 413; 48 U. S. C., sec. 462), which reads as follows is hereby repealed: ", and that the Secretary of the Interior may grant the use of such reserved lands abutting on the water front to any citizen or association of citizens, or to any corporation incorporated under the laws of the United States or under the laws of any State or Territory, for landings, and wharves, with the provision that the public shall have access to and proper use of such wharves, and landings, at reasonable rates of toll to be prescribed by said Secretary, and a roadway 60 feet in width, parallel to the shore line as near as may be practicable, shall be reserved for the use of the public as a highway."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 13, insert "The Secretary shall include a provision in the lease or permit giving the lessee or permittee the first right to any renewal of such lease or permit."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL LAND TO APPOMATTOX COURT HOUSE NATIONAL HISTORICAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6439) to authorize the addition of land to the Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument, Va., and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, in such manner as he shall consider to be in the public interest, any land or interests in land, within a distance of 1½ miles from the historic Appomattox Court House site, Virginia, which he shall consider to be suitable for addition to the Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument. The Secretary is authorized also to dispose of any surplus monument lands in such manner as he shall consider appropriate, or to exchange any monument lands for non-Federal lands of approximately equal value when, in his opinion, such action is in the interest of the United States. Properties acquired pursuant to this act shall become a part of the monument upon acquisition of title thereto by the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, after the words "United States.", insert "The total area of this national monument as it may be revised pursuant to this act shall be no greater than its present acreage."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

GOVERNMENT-OWNED MAGNESIUM FOUNDRY AT TETERBORO, N. J.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2223) to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy the Government-owned magnesium foundry at Teterboro, N. J.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement or exchange of funds, the facility at Teterboro, N. J., known as the Government-owned magnesium foundry, comprising Plancors 8 and 132.

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

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE BUREAU OF PRISONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4241) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6773) to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of April 24, 1939 (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), as amended by section 707, title VII, of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, concerning cooperative extension work is amended by striking out the figure "$555,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,071,000" and immediately following the word *"Provided,"* the following: "That $555,000 of the appropriation made pursuant to this authorization shall be apportioned to the States in accordance with the apportionment of the like sum in the fiscal year 1944 and $516,568 of this authorization shall be apportioned to the States in the proportion that the net loss to a State as a result of the reallocation following the 1950 census bears to $516,568."

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration has been worked out by the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. CARL ALBERT, and myself, after many conferences and hearings on the subject.

Under the laws governing the Extension Service funds, the various States receive a share which is apportioned in accordance with the farm and rural population. In the 1950 census 17 States showed a shrinkage in farm population, according to the formula established by the Bureau of the Census. Among these the heaviest losers were Texas and Oklahoma. That the present formula is inadequate and faulty is perfectly apparent.

The agricultural output has uniformly increased in the States which, along with Texas and Oklahoma, would have their Extension Service appropriation reduced. However, more and more farmers and ranchers are taking advantage of good roads and mechanization to move their families into the nearby towns. According to the census, any community of 2,500 or more population is classified as urban, even though the greater proportion of the citizens may be employed directly or indirectly in agriculture.

In Texas, one of the most important functions of the Extension Service is the 4–H Club work. Certainly it is not necessary to point out to the House the tremendous importance of the 4–H Club activities. In Texas the number participating has consistently increased since 1940, when the figure stood at 88,091. At the end of 1951 this figure stood at 116,979.

The House will, I am sure, give consideration to the fact that the cost of every undertaking has increased in recent years. In spite of this fact the work of the Extension Service has continued to expand. To reduce it in any State in the Union at this time would be a very serious mistake and would reflect a policy which, I believe, is extremely shortsighted.

This bill would merely keep the States which would otherwise suffer a reduction on exactly the basis where they now stand.

I urge the passage of the measure immediately so that it may receive early consideration in the other body and may then be considered in a supplemental appropriation bill during the current session. Thus the great work of the Extension Service will continue uninterruptedly.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my great appreciation to the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. CARL ALBERT. He and I have worked side by side in all phases of the legislation. He certainly deserves the greatest credit for bringing it to the House at this time. I know that the membership of this body appreciates what he has done, and that every man, woman, and child whose life is made better and more fruitful through the Extension Service will join me in applauding work so well done.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank my colleague for his fine tribute. Second, I desire to take this means of expressing my personal appreciation for the efforts of the gentleman from Texas who was coauthor of the measure which we are now considering. Without his assistance this matter could not have progressed to the point of passage.

I am sure that all those interested in the 4–H Club program and other activities of the Extension Service in the great State of Texas and in 14 other States join me in expressing appreciation for the gentleman's fine contribution.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H. R. 6773.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING TIME FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7496) to amend the act of August 7, 1946, providing for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to extend to June 30, 1957, the period for authorization for appropriations for carrying out the purposes of the act as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, this is simply extending the time for the completion of this work?

Mr. TRIMBLE. That is right. The gentleman is correct.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946, as amended, by striking out "June 30, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957."

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum 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. 67]

Abbitt	Baring	Bolton
Adair	Barrett	Bow
Addonizio	Battle	Boykin
Andrews	Beall	Bray
Anfuso	Beamer	Brehm
Armstrong	Beckworth	Brownson
Ayres	Bender	Bryson
Bailey	Bolling	Buckley

Burdick	Hedrick	O'Toole
Burnside	Heffernan	Passman
Burton	Heller	Patterson
Bush	Herlong	Philbin
Canfield	Hess	Polk
Carlyle	Hoffman, Ill.	Potter
Carrigg	Jarman	Poulson
Case	Jenkins	Powell
Celler	Jensen	Rabaut
Chelf	Johnson	Rains
Chiperfield	Jonas	Ramsay
Chudoff	Jones, Mo.	Redden
Church	Jones, Hamilton C.	Reece, Tenn.
Clemente	Jones, Woodrow W.	Ribicoff
Combs	Judd	Roberts
Cooley	Kee	Robeson
Corbett	Kelley, Pa.	Roosevelt
Coudert	Kennedy	Ross
Crumpacker	Kerr	Sabath
Davis, Ga.	Kersten, Wis.	Sadlak
Dawson	King, Calif.	St. George
DeGraffenried	King, Pa.	Sasscer
Delaney	Klein	Saylor
Dempsey	Lane	Scott, Hardie
Denton	Lantaff	Sheehan
Dingell	Latham	Sheppard
Dollinger	Lesinski	Short
Donohue	Lind	Sieminski
Donovan	McCarthy	Sikes
Dorn	McConnell	Smith, Wis.
Elliott	McCulloch	Stanley
Elston	McGrath	Steed
Engle	McGregor	Stigler
Fallon	McKinnon	Stockman
Feighan	Mack, Ill.	Sutton
Fine	Madden	Tackett
Flood	Marshall	Taylor
Gamble	Miller, Md.	Vail
Garmatz	Miller, N. Y.	Van Pelt
Gary	Morano	Velde
Gore	Morris	Watts
Graham	Morrison	Weichel
Granahan	Morton	Welch
Grant	Multer	Werdel
Green	Mumma	Wharton
Greenwood	Murdock	Wheeler
Gwinn	Murphy	Wickersham
Hall, Leonard W.	Norrell	Williams, Miss.
Halleck	O'Brien, N. Y.	Williams, N. Y.
Harden	O'Konski	Wilson, Ind.
Hart	O'Neill	Wood, Ga.
Harvey	Osmers	Woodruff
Hays, Ohio		Yates

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 248 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

DEFENSE CATALOGING AND STANDARDIZATION ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7405) to prove for an economical, efficient, and effective supply management organization within the Department of Defense through the establishment of a single supply cataloging system, the standardization of supplies and the more efficient use of supply testing, inspection, and acceptance facilities and services, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Defense Cataloging and Standardization Act."

SEC. 2. There is hereby established within the Munitions Board of the Department of Defense, the Defense Supply Management Agency, hereinafter referred to as the "Agency." This Agency shall develop a single catalog system and related supply standardization program.

SEC. 3. There shall be a Director of the Agency and a Deputy Director, who shall act as Director in the absence or disability of the Director, and shall perform such other duties as are prescribed by the Director. The Director and Deputy Director shall be appointed by the Secretary of Defense, without regards to the civil-service laws. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year, and the Deputy Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 a year. With the exception of the first Director appointed under this Act, the Director and Deputy Director shall be appointed from civilian life.

SEC. 4. (a) In cataloging, the Agency shall name, describe, classify, and number each item repetitively used, purchased, stocked, or distributed, by the Department of Defense or any of the departments thereof, by such methods and in such manner that only one distinctive combination of letters or numerals or both will identify the same item either within a bureau or service, between bureaus or services, or between the departments. The single item identification shall be used for all functions of supply from original purchase to final field or area disposal. There shall be a single catalog, which may consist of a number of volumes, sections, or supplements, in which all items of supply shall be included and in which there shall appear information on each item needed for supply operations such as descriptive and performance data, size, weight, cubage, packaging or packing data, a standard quantitative measurement unit, and such other related data as is determined by the Director of the Agency to be necessary or desirable.

(b) In supply standardization, it shall be the duty of the Agency to achieve the highest practicable degree possible in the standardization of items used throughout the Department of Defense, through the development and use of single specifications, in the elimination of overlapping and duplicating item specifications, and in the reduction of the number of sizes, kinds, or types of generally similar items. The greatest practicable degree of standardization of methods of packing, packaging, and preservation of such items shall be achieved, together with the most efficient use of services and facilities concerned with the inspection, testing and acceptance of such items.

SEC. 5. The Director shall—

(a) establish, develop, and maintain the single supply catalog and standardization program herein established;

(b) provide for, direct, and coordinate the progressive utilization of the single supply catalog provided for herein in all supply functions within the Department of Defense, its departments, bureaus, and services from requirements determination through ultimate disposal;

(c) provide for, direct, review, and approve all item names, item descriptions, and description patterns, the screening, consolidation, classification, and numbering of item descriptions and the publication and distribution of the single supply catalog;

(d) establish and maintain liaison with industry advisory groups to coordinate the development of the single supply catalog and standardization program herein established with the best practices of industry in order to obtain to the greatest extent practicable the cooperation and participation of industry in the program;

(e) review, amend, revise, promulgate, and establish within the Department of Defense military specifications, standards, and qualified product lists and resolve differences between military departments, bureaus, and services with respect to the same;

(f) assign among the military departments, bureaus, and services within the Department of Defense when practical and consistent with their capacity and supply interest, the responsibility for portions of the cataloging and standardization programs herein established, and establish time schedules for the completion of such assignments; and

(g) make final decisions in all matters concerned with the cataloging and standardization authority established in this act, subject to review and modification by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 6. When portions of the single supply catalog provided for herein are complete and ready for use they shall be distributed by the Agency and all existing catalogs shall be replaced. Thereafter all departments, bureaus, and services within the Department of Defense shall use such single supply catalog and no other. All property reports and records shall use the nomenclature, item numbers, and descriptive data as published in the single supply catalog.

SEC. 7. Following the publication and promulgation of the single supply catalog or portions thereof as provided herein only those items of supply listed therein shall thereafter be procured for repetitive use in the departments, bureaus, and services of the Department of Defense: *Provided, however,* That items so cataloged may be changed from time to time to include new items and to delete obsolete items: *Provided further,* That nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the military departments in the Department of Defense from acquiring new items required to carry out their missions: *And provided further,* That such new items when and if acquired shall be immediately submitted to the Director of the Agency for inclusion in the cataloging and standardization program established in this act.

SEC. 8. The Munitions Board shall provide such personnel facilities and other administrative services as may be required by the Agency to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 9. The Director of the Agency shall transmit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives on January 31 and July 31 of each year, progress reports on cataloging from each of the military departments within the Department of Defense for the previous 6 months between July 1 and December 31 and January 1 and June 30, respectively. These reports shall contain—

(a) the number of single supply catalog sections or portions published and the titles;

(b) the number of Munitions Board item identification numbers which have replaced, for all supply purposes, former item identifications, stock or catalog numbers;

(c) the reduction in the number of separate item identifications achieved; and

(d) such other information as the Director considers will best inform the Congress of the status and progress of the cataloging program herein established.

SEC. 10. The Director of the Agency shall transmit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives on January 31 and July 31 of each year, progress reports on standardization within the military departments in the Department of Defense for the previous 6 months between July 1 and December 31 and January 1 and June 30 respectively. The report shall contain—

(a) the number of separate specifications which have been consolidated into single specifications for the use of all of the military departments, bureaus, and services;

(b) the reduction achieved in the number of sizes, kinds, or types of generally similar items;

(c) duplications eliminated in services, space, and facilities; and

(d) such other information as the Director considers will best inform the Congress of the progress of the standardization program herein established.

SEC. 11. Nothing in this act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Administrator of General Services to coordinate the cataloging and standarization programs of the General Services Administration with the cataloging and standarization program of the Agency under this act, by delegation of authority under the Federal Property and

Administrative Services Act of 1949, or by such other means as may be agreed upon by said Administrator and the Director of the Agency.

SEC. 12. Nothing in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 shall impair or limit the authority of the Director of the Agency under this act.

SEC. 13. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for an economical, efficient, and effective supply management organization within the Department of Defense through the establishment of a single supply cataloging system, the standardization of supplies and the more efficient use of supply testing, inspection, packaging, and acceptance facilities and services."

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the bill, and that the bill, with committee amendments, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is any Member of the minority opposed to the bill who demands a second? If not, without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before you today as the result of a long study by a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services. A study which began last September and which culminated in a series of public hearings during which time every phase and facet of this complex problem was explored. I think it well that I pay public tribute at this time to the splendid work done by every member of the subcommittee, which was in attendance at all public hearings, and participated very actively in the development of the bill, which we now bring before you. I think special mention should be made of our staff members, Paul Monahan, who developed the items which we discussed, the committee counsel, John Courtney, and his assistant, Dick Webb, and certainly the able assistance given us by the sage of the committee, our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, who sat in with the subcommittee and participated in writing the final draft of the bill, which is introduced in the name of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], who really has carried the torch for a single catalog for the Department of Defense for many years.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which comes before you today is a bill, putting into law and giving the effect of statute to that which has already been put into effect by directive by the Department of Defense. The bill before you spells out in positive and affirmative terms the exact policy and conduct for the establishment of a single supply catalog in the Department of Defense. It spells out the duties and powers of the Director and it sets up the entire operation within the framework of the Munitions Board. It is a definite and positive approach to the subject which has been under discussion for many, many years, but about which nothing definite has been done.

In order that you might better understand the problem, and in order that the country might better understand the problem, we placed on exhibit in our hearing room specific and definite examples of what we believed to be inefficient buying practices of the Armed Forces. That exhibit came to be known, as you well know, as the chamber of horrors. I might say it was a horrible example of waste in the military.

Out of that exhibit and out of those hearings have been adduced many, many pages of testimony which indicates the positive necessity for taking an affirmative and definite approach to this subject by way of legislation. I believe, however, that the most eloquent testimony in favor of this legislation was given by the man who has been placed in charge of the cataloging program, as it now exists in the General Services Administration. As you know, Mr. Jess Larson, Administrator of that Administration, is charged with the responsibility for what is known as a single Federal catalog such as may or may not exist at the moment. Under the terms of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, he is allowed to delegate authority for producing a single catalog to the armed services. He is allowed to delegate that authority and he has delegated it. After a trial run of this delegation and after an attempt on the part of his own Administration to set up a civilian catalog, it is interesting to quote Mr. Larson's own words in this connection; and which I do, referring you to page 3696 of the printed hearings. Mr. Larson made this statement before our committee:

It became apparent that after about a year of operation under Public Law 152 the really tremendous job was of course, as we always knew, in the military, and that the military was in the best position to finance their operation, much more expeditiously than were the civil agencies of the Government. Therefore, it would have been impracticable and imprudent, I think, for me to have tried to obtain funds for my agency to do this job, which I sincerely believe the military is better equipped to do in the first place, because they have more funds, more people, more items, more technicians, and more experience, and a lot of cataloging already accomplished to start with. I would have, I think, seriously hampered the whole security, at least the whole defense effort, to have just thrown my arms around this and kept it to myself.

I do not believe I can supplement those words and that testimony. What more effective and more logical argument can be given than that presented by Mr. Larson himself? I take cognizance of the fact that this is a cataloging bill for the Defense Department, and is not a general cataloging bill. The Committee on Armed Services has no desire to legislate for those departments over which it has no cognizance or jurisdiction. Our jurisdiction is the Department of Defense, comprising the three branches of the service. In this bill we legislate for those different agencies of the Defense Department.

Let me impress upon you one important factor, perhaps the most important of all factors in the proposed legislation. That is the savings which will be made to the taxpayers of this country. Estimates have run from millions into billions, as to the amount of money which will be saved. Based on the Hoover Commission report, on a $25,000,000,000-budget, $2,500,000,000 will be saved; and logically, on a $52,000,000,000-budget some $5,000,000,000 would be saved.

The testimony before the committee by Navy witnesses was that the savings would be astronomical. The Army said it would run into the millions; and the Air Force said it would be substantial. Everybody testifying before the committee is in full agreement: That a single catalog is not only a step in the right direction but is also an affirmative approach to saving money.

This is the opportunity for the House to assert itself to save these billions. Only last week Admiral Fowler who was in charge of the program made the statement that a complete catalog would save some $4,000,000,000; and he is the Director. Whether it is $4,000,000,000, $10,000,000,000, or $1,000,000,000, certainly billions will be saved.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. So that the House can understand the conflicting theories in view of the communication sent to the membership today by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] let me state that his position is that there should be a Federal catalog, of which the Department of Defense should be a part.

The position of the Committee on the Armed Services is that we should now commence, immediately, a Department of Defense catalog which has nothing whatsoever to do with, and does not interfere, at all, with ultimately having a Federal catalog.

Mr. HÉBERT. In that connection I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that Mr. Larson had this to say before the committee as to the conflict between the Federal catalog and the Armed Services catalog——

Mr. VINSON. Read that to us.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Larson testified, as shown by page 3679 of the hearings:

I personally do not believe that a single catalog that includes all supply items used by the Armed Forces can be used by all departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

That is Mr. Larson speaking, and continuing to speak, he says:

That is the reason that the delegation of authority made provision for a joint program. It is necessary that items used solely by civil agencies be identified. MBCA—

That is Munitions Board catalog—

has jurisdiction of numbering 500,000 items.

There are that many that will be included in the catalog, 500,000. This bill will bring about, and in fact invites, a continuation of the present program.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the case is clear, the logic is sound; and I believe the results should be inevitable if we are sincere and desire to save the taxpayers of this country not millions, but billions of dollars.

In conclusion I desire to insert the letter the committee has received from Admiral Fowler showing possible savings:

MUNITIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1952.

HON. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In compliance with your request, I am glad to furnish you with the following opinion:

I estimate that the wholehearted and effective employment of a Federal Catalog for supply purposes by all of the procurement agencies of the Federal Government, the standardizing of all common-use items tailored to fit the actual needs of the Government, the standardizing of inspection procedures and streamlining of those functions, and the standardizing of packaging and preservation of all items purchased by the Government will result in approximate annual savings of $4,000,000,000 at the present annual rate of Federal expenditures.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FOWLER,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy, Director, Supply Management Agencies.

Further, I call to your attention a letter from Assistant Secretary Coolidge requesting withdrawal of a suggested amendment.

The bill, as drawn, does not interfere with military missions.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1952.

HON. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With reference to my letter of April 21, 1952, on the subject of H. R. 7405, upon further consideration the Department of Defense requests that its recommendations be modified to the extent that section 13 which reads: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to mitigate the authority of the military departments in the Department of Defense to carry out their assigned missions," be eliminated from the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. COOLIDGE.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am going to dispose of the argument of the gentleman from Louisiana by calling the attention of the House to Mr. Larson's letter on page 14 of their own report. In the third paragraph he says:

Basically, our system of government does not contemplate two sets of laws, one for the Military Establishment and one for the other agencies of the Government. This principle was recognized in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and also in House Concurrent Resolution No. 97, both of which provide for a single Federal catalog system which would be applicable to all agencies of the Government, including the military department.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have time really to argue this bill before the House, because this is an important bill, and we should have 4 or 5 hours in which to discuss it. It should not be brought up under a suspension of the rules where only 40 minutes is allowed to discuss a matter which affects the complete program of the procurement of both military and civilian agencies; but I am going to try to cover as much as I can, and I am going to extend my remarks, having received permission of the House to do so. So, anybody who wishes to can read the complete analysis of this bill.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 7405 AND ACCOMPANYING HOUSE REPORT NO. 1838

Mr. Speaker, we are presented with a most extraordinary situation with regard to House Resolution 7405 reported recently by the Committee on Armed Services and proposing to set up a military catalog and standardization agency. This bill was rushed out of committee and Members are asked to consider it under suspension of the rules. I am greatly disturbed about this procedure. The bill contains very important provisions which, in my opinion, would jeopardize the Federal catalog program which is already established by law and making substantial progress.

This bill should be carefully examined and an opportunity afforded for full debate on the merits. Certainly, I do not question any Member's sincerity or motives in proposing legislation, but I fail to see the need for such rush action. This bill and the report accompanying it show evidence of hasty preparation; and there are a number of inconsistencies in the bill and serious errors or omissions in the report. With all due deference to the sponsors of this legislation, I wish to state that they have received poor staff advice and that, accordingly, if the House acts upon this bill today, it will be acting without full and accurate information.

House Resolution 7405 does not have the approval of the Department of Defense, of the Munitions Board, of the Bureau of the Budget, of the General Accounting Office, or of the General Services Administration.

It flies in the face of established catalog policies that have been worked out in the past 4 or 5 years.

It is directly contrary to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

It overlooks the fact that basic enabling legislation for the Federal catalog program has been established in section 206 (a) and (b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949—Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress.

It discards the declaration of the Congress in House Concurrent Resolution 97—Eighty-first Congress—that the Federal catalog for economy and security be a joint military and civilian effort. House Concurrent Resolution 97 came from the Armed Services Committee.

Finally, the bill represents a definite step away from civilian control over the Military Establishment.

Some months ago a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee set up a so-called chamber of horrors in a committee room and invited the public and the press to see the evidence of poor buying practices and duplication among the military departments. Perhaps the subcommittee did some good in bringing about greater public awareness of the fact that unification in the Military Establishment has more form than substance. Certainly the efforts of the Armed Services Committee to effect greater unification will be appreciated, but if the only result from a legislative standpoint of the subcommittee's hearings is this bill, H. R. 7405, then we have gained nothing, and we will lose a great deal if the bill is passed.

The Members, in considering legislation reported by a committee, ought to have sufficient information in the committee's report to evaluate the legislation fairly. If the Members will examine House Report No. 1838, accompanying H. R. 7405, they will find what purports to be a history of this legislation beginning on page 2, but they will find no mention whatever that there already exists basic enabling legislation for a uniform Federal catalog system in Public Law 152 of the Eighty-first Congress. That fundamental enabling legislation may or may not be adequate; the Members can properly debate the extent to which details of administration of a statutory policy should be prescribed in the statute. But at least the basic statute should be recognized and analyzed in relation to this proposed new legislation which has a serious and, in my opinion, detrimental effect upon what has already been accomplished.

The only clue in this report to the fact that Congress has already enacted basic catalog legislation is tucked away in one or two sentences in a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee by the Administrator of General Services printed on page 14 of the report.

Clause 2 (a) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the so-called Ramseyer rule, requires that all reports of committees submitted to the House on bills or joint resolutions which repeal or amend any part of a law shall include a comparative print of existing law proposed to be repealed or amended and the proposed new legislation appropriately marked. If the Members will consult the portions of the report beginning on page 15 which purports to comply with clause 2 (a) of rule XIII, they will notice references to certain sections of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949—Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress—but curiously enough, they will find no references to the catalog section of that law, namely, section 206 (a) and (b).

If it is contended that section 206 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 was not set forth under the Ramseyer rule because

it is not specifically repealed or amended by H. R. 7405, then I can only say that the repeal or the amending is made indirectly and the effect is the same. Section 206 (a) of Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, states simply and clearly that the Administrator of General Services shall "establish and maintain such uniform Federal supply catalog system as may be appropriate to identify and classify personal property under the control of Federal agencies: *Provided*, That the Administrator and the Secretary of Defense shall coordinate the cataloging activities of the General Services Administration and the National Military Establishment so as to avoid unnecessary duplication."

It will be noted that the enabling authority is vested in the Administrator of General Services. He has an additional duty under that subsection to coordinate both civilian and military cataloging activities so as to avoid unnecessary duplication. The effect of these provisions would be nullified by section 12 of H. R. 7405 as reported out of committee, and which reads as follows:

SEC. 12. Nothing in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 shall impair or limit the authority of the Director of the Agency under this act.

Section 12 would have the effect also of nullifying section 206 (b) of Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, which provides as follows:

(b) Each Federal agency shall utilize such uniform Federal supply catalog system and standard purchase specifications, except as the Administrator, taking into consideration efficiency, economy, and other interests of the Government, shall otherwise provide.

In other words, the statutory authority for cataloging vested in the Administrator of General Services by Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, would not be repealed in so many words; it would be repealed by a catch-all provision prohibiting the Administrator from having anything to say about the cataloging functions vested in the proposed Director in H. R. 7405. This is poor legislative drafting, to say the least, and it does not present a true picture of the relationship between the bill and existing legislation.

Another curious feature of H. R. 7405 is the gesture made in section 11 of the bill as reported by the committee. This section reads:

SEC. 11. Nothing in this act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Administrator of General Services to coordinate the cataloging and standardization programs of the General Services Administration with the cataloging and standardization program of the Agency under this act, by delegation of authority under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, or by such other means as may be agreed upon by said Administrator and the Director of the Agency.

On its face and read alone, section 11 of H. R. 7405 might appear to some to preserve intact the cataloging authority of the Administrator of General Services. The pertinent observation is that section 11 refers only to the coordinating authority of the Administrator of General Services in cataloging and standardization. The coordinating authority under section 206 (a) of Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, as quoted above, is simply an extension of the Administrator's authority to establish and maintain a uniform Federal supply catalog system. That basic authority would be nullified by section 12 of H. R. 7405.

Consequently, sections 11 and 12 of the bill are inconsistent and ambiguous in their meaning. The Administrator of General Services would be left with a shadow of his present authority. He would be allowed to coordinate cataloging activities of his agency with those of the Military Establishment even while being deprived of authority and responsibility for the over-all catalog program. Furthermore, his ability to coordinate would be contingent upon agreement between him and the director of the proposed new agency. If they failed to agree, there would be no coordination, and no single responsible head to resolve the disagreements.

It may be that some of the Members of the Armed Services Committee were unaware of the existence of catalog legislation in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. The advice they received from a staff member was not calculated to clarify the legislative situation. Judging from the information presented to the Special Subcommittee on Procurement of the House Armed Services Committee by its counsel at the commencement of the hearings on February 11, 1952, a certain amount of confusion is understandable. Counsel for the subcommittee outlined the agenda of the subcommittee's projected hearings, stating in that connection as follows:

The subject of cataloging has been considered at various times by the Armed Services Committee. Public Law 152 of the Eighty-first Congress, commonly referred to as the Procurement Act, directs the establishment of a single catalog system. It was preceded by House Resolution 97. Both were passed out of this committee. (House Armed Services Committee, Special Subcommittee on Procurement, hearings (No. 67), p. 3144.)

Counsel for the subcommittee made four simple errors in these four sentences: First, Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, was not passed out of the Armed Services Committee; second, it is not commonly referred to as the Procurement Act; third, it was not preceded by, but was followed by, House Concurrent Resolution 97; and, fourth, that resolution is a House concurrent resolution and not a simple resolution. The committee report also states that the concurrent resolution passed February 6, 1950, but the Senate did not act upon it until April 19, 1950.

Perhaps counsel for the Armed Services Subcommittee was thinking of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, which was reported out by the Armed Services Committee and enacted into law in February of 1948. However, that law did not address itself specifically to cataloging. Neither in the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 nor in the National Security Act of 1947, two basic laws directed to the organization and operation of the National Military Establishment, is there to be found any statutory prescription for a Federal catalog program. It was not until the enactment of Public Law 152 of the Eighty-first Congress, providing a broad and comprehensive statutory basis for Federal property management, after hearings by my subcommittee of the Expenditures Committee, that cataloging received the proper recognition from Congress. I am aware, of course, that the printing of a Federal standard stock catalog was authorized in the Navy appropriation bill for fiscal year 1930.

The impression left by House Report No. 1838, accompanying H. R. 7405, is quite a different one. On page 4 the report contains the following under the caption "Reasons for the legislation":

Notwithstanding the positive expressions of the Congress commencing in 1929, of the Executive in 1945 and 1946, and notwithstanding the broad grants of authority and the directions in the National Security Act and in the Armed Services Procurement Acts, the program was found on examination by the Special Procurement Subcommittee to have been a desultory one.

Although the Armed Services Subcommittee in 1952 found the catalog program to be desultory, 5 years ago a similar subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman who sponsored H. R. 7405, reported as follows:

The services are now actively pursuing an identification and cataloging program. This program is significantly advancing standardization and interchangeability of military and naval equipment, and is also contributing to improved purchasing of spare parts and subassemblies. (80th Cong., 1st sess., H. Rept. No. 109, March 10, 1947, p. 11.)

It may be that the subcommittee's observations 5 years ago on cataloging progress were unduly optimistic, but they suggest that more progress has been and is being made in this field than the report on H. R. 7405 indicates.

House Report 1838, accompanying H. R. 7405, states, on page 2, under the caption, "History of this legislation":

In 1949 H. R. 321 was introduced in the Eightieth Congress by Congressman JACK Z. ANDERSON, of California. It directed the establishment of a single cataloging system and, for the first time, undertook to fix responsibility for its establishment. After extensive hearings and the representations of the Department of their willingness to cooperate in the establishment of a program, the Congress, in April 1950, decided to express its policy in terms of House concurrent resolution instead of positive legislation. This resolution passed February 6, 1950, and expressed the sense of the Congress that a Federal Cataloging System should be established and within its framework each property item should have but one name, one description, and one identification number with a classification system suitable for all supply needs.

Some important history has been left out of this account. On the point that in 1949 H. R. 321 "directed the establishment of a single cataloging system and, for the first time, undertook to fix responsibility for its establishment," the Members are advised that legislation providing for the establishment and maintenance of a uniform Federal supply catalog system and fixing responsibility for its establishment in the Federal Works Agency was introduced in the Eightieth Congress as part of comprehensive legislation to reorganize and sim-

plify procurement and property-management functions of the Government. A bill to this effect, S. 2754, was reported out unanimously by the Senate Committee on Expenditures, but was not taken up by the Senate prior to adjournment. It remained for the Eighty-first Congress, and specifically for my subcommittee in the House, to bring such legislation into effect.

It is interesting to note that the only witness at the hearings on H. R. 321 who favored the legislation, besides the sponsor, was one W. A. Kelley, who introduced himself as "carrying on organizing, management, and engineering responsibilities in the Office of the Secretary of Defense." The then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson, saw fit to advise the subcommittee—by letter dated May 11, 1949—in connection with the hearings on H. R. 321, that Mr. Kelley did not officially represent the National Military Establishment and his views were to be considered as his own personal ones—House Armed Services Committee, subcommittee hearings on H. R. 321, No. 114, May 16, 1949, page 3922.

Secretary of Defense Johnson expressed opposition to that bill—H. R. 321—as being too broad in its attempt to cover major aspects of procurement and packaging under the heading of cataloging; as being unnecessary in view of cataloging progress already made and procedures already worked out; as misdirected in its subordination of the entire procurement and distribution process to the cataloging process; and as serving only to introduce confusion and delay in the catalog program.

The bill was also opposed by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Munitions Board, as violating the principle of a uniform Federal catalog system for all agencies of the Government, and preference was expressed for the catalog provisions in the then pending legislation which became Public Law 152 of the Eighty-first Congress. Finally, H. R. 321 was opposed by Mr. Russell Forbes, who had headed up the Hoover Commission task force on Federal supply, as being "wholly gratuitous, wholly unnecessary, and exceedingly harmful for a number of reasons," including the fact that it was contrary to recommendations of the Hoover Commission and failed to establish a single catalog for the use of all agencies of Government. Mr. Forbes believed that the enactment of H. R. 321 would obstruct and impede progress then being made on a commodity catalog for the Federal Government.

Practically all the objections then expressed to H. R. 321 are equally applicable to the most recent version of that bill, H. R. 7405, which is before us now.

The fact that the sponsor of H. R. 321 was persuaded to take into account those criticisms and offer in lieu of that legislation a proposal that became House Concurrent Resolution 97 of the Eighty-first Congress was testimony to his recognition that these criticisms were valid and that the principle of a uniform Federal catalog system for all agencies of Government should be preserved. It is difficult, therefore, to understand why the gentleman has decided to revert to his previous stand, particularly since progress in the cataloging program has now advanced far beyond the stage it was in 2 or 3 years ago.

It is true, as counsel for the Armed Services Subcommittee noted, that House Concurrent Resolution 97 was referred to the Armed Services Committee of the House, but the Members are advised that the original resolution which was drawn in a narrow fashion to apply only to the Military Establishment was amended to be consistent with Public Law 152 and to register the policy of Congress that the catalog system be jointly developed by the civilian and military agencies under the authority conferred upon the Administrator of General Services.

In its amended form the resolution undoubtedly would have come before the House Committee on Expenditures and in fact, when it went to the Senate, it was referred to the Senate Committee on Expenditures. I say advisedly that House Concurrent Resolution 97 would have come before the House Expenditures Committee if it were introduced as finally amended, because I have the opinion of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee to that effect. At the time House Concurrent Resolution 97 was presented to the full committee after amendment to make it consistent with Public Law 152, the chairman stated:

> This is a committee print because under the rules of the House I doubt very seriously whether this committee would have jurisdiction if we introduced a new resolution, amended as it is. (House Armed Services Committee, hearings on H. Con. Res. 97, January 17, 1950 (No. 154), p. 4913.)

On the point cited above in House Report No. 1838, that Congress decided to express its policy in terms of a concurrent resolution instead of positive legislation, the Members are advised that my subcommittee did enact positive legislation in 1949—the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949—which I just mentioned and which contained authorization for a uniform Federal catalog system. Public Law 152 was passed prior to House Concurrent Resolution 97.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to get involved in jurisdictional controversies. I cite this matter only to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the Members are being asked to pass, in a hurried form and without debate, a bill, the report on which does not present an accurate account in relation to existing legislation.

House Report No. 1838, accompanying H. R. 7405, again states under the caption "History of this legislation"—page 2:

> The Congress recognized in its resolution the report of the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government which had reported that the interests of national defense demanded a single Standard Federal Commodity Catalog.

Since the Congress did so recognize, I fail to understand why this bill is proposed to overturn that recognition. The Members should not be misled by the references in H. R. 7405 to a single supply catalog. This bill would establish such a catalog only for the military departments. The military catalog would not necessarily serve all the purposes of the civilian agencies. It is possible and practicable to work out a single catalog system for all agencies. The Hoover Commission so recommended; the Congress so recognized. But now we have a bill which seeks to throw this principle and program overboard.

House Report No. 1838, accompanying H. R. 7405, notes that the bill in its committee-amended form "accepted several recommendations made by the Department of Defense."

First, it must be clearly understood, as I indicated above, that the Department of Defense is opposed to this bill. However, the Department recommended certain amendments in the event the committee decided to report the bill favorably. These recommended amendments are set forth at length on pages 7 and 8 of the committee's report. Only 5 of 16 suggested amendments were accepted by the subcommittee; in particular, they also inserted a little joker which appears as section 13 of the bill, as amended by the committee:

> SEC. 13. Nothing in this act shall be construed to mitigate the authority of the military departments in the Department of Defense to carry out their assigned missions.

This seemingly harmless and sensible provision actually could be used to gut the whole cataloging program. One of the primary justifications asserted for this legislation, particularly in the course of the hearings of the Armed Services Subcommittee, was the reluctance of military agencies to convert to the uniform Federal catalog system upon the completion of item identifications for all items of supply. The bill purports—in section 6—to make mandatory the use of a single supply catalog. By addition of section 13 the military departments will have an excellent out by arguing that conversion to a single system, even though confined to the Military Establishment, will impair military effectiveness and their authority to carry out assigned missions.

House Report No. 1838, accompanying H. R. 7405, states on page 2 that—

> The Special Subcommittee on Procurement undertook a study of the development of the single supply cataloging program in November 1951, when the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee referred H. R. 1033 to it, which would have created a single Supply Catalog System.

The information given out publicly by the Chairman of that Subcommittee in commencing hearings on February 11, 1952, was somewhat different. Chairman HÉBERT stated on that date:

> I want the record to show that we are not considering H. R. 1033 at this hearing. This committee is not a legislative committee and it merely gets into the picture because of the base of our investigation and exploration. (Armed Services Committee, Special Subcommittee on Procurement, hearings (No. 67), p. 3160.)

It is true, of course, that considerable testimony was taken by the Subcommittee on cataloging and in the latter stages of the hearings, specifically on March 4, 1952, H. R. 1033 was referred to the Subcommittee for consideration. I merely cited the discrepancy in the committee's report as to the date when H. R. 1033

was referred to it to indicate that all the facts are not in order.

House Report No. 1838, accompanying H. R. 7405, states on page 3, under the caption "Cost under the bill":

The only costs which are directly chargeable to this legislation are the salaries of the Director and Deputy Director, a total of $26,500 annually. All other expenses are now being incurred by the Department of Defense in the present Cataloging Agency which this bill will make statutory.

It seems obvious—and the Secretary of Defense will bear me out on this point—that huge additional costs would result from enactment of this bill because of the requirements in section 4 (a) that the military catalogs carry descriptive data in connection with each item such as size, weight, cubage, packaging, etc. It would be necessary, in complying with this requirement to review several millions of items already identified in the catalog program and to make numerous and extensive revisions. Consider merely the variety of sizes, weights, and packaging descriptions for supplies to be used under every conceivable condition of combat, on the ground, at sea, and in the air, in every clime from the burning tropics to the frozen Arctic wastes. Frankly I do not believe that this requirement in the bill is grounded upon any very extensive acquaintance with military supply operations, and certainly it will be costly to comply with it. I hazard the estimate that the catalog program would be set back a full year, aside from the extra-heavy costs involved, in recataloging to include the information of the kinds specified in section 4 (a) of the bill.

House Report No. 1838 to accompany H. R. 7405 states on page 3:

In addition, the bill provides that there shall be no duplication in the personnel set-up, by providing that the Agency be housed in and personnel procured by the present Munitions Board set-up (sec. 10).

I pass over the fact that this provision is contained in section 8 of the bill and not in section 10, as the report states.

More important is the fact that duplication in personnel will necessarily result from the establishment of a Defense Supply Management Agency within the Munitions Board. At the present time, the Munitions Board is vested by law with certain duties and responsibilities in the supply management field. As all management experts and experienced supply personnel know, supply operations throughout the whole Military Establishment and in fact throughout the whole Government are interrelated and efficient supply management requires that these functions be properly coordinated or integrated. By vesting in the Director of the proposed new agency certain important supply functions, such as cataloging, standardization, et cetera, while leaving other integral supply management functions where they now repose in the Munitions Board, it will be necessary to have a substantial number of personnel in duplicating work. Supply management functions could not be divided and compartmentalized between the Munitions Board and the new agency within it to avoid such duplication if H. R. 7405 were enacted.

Associated with the matter of duplication between the proposed new agency and the Munitions Board is the confusion of authority and responsibility that would be created by H. R. 7405. Thus the report accompanying H. R. 7405 states on page 3 that the Director of the proposed Defense Supply Management Agency shall have among his duties—

(g) To make a final decision on matters relating to cataloging and standardization subject only to final appeal of the Secretary of Defense.

Here we have the proposition that the new agency would be established within the Munitions Board, but its Director would have complete authority in matters assigned to his jurisdiction that would not be subject to modification by the top man of the Board, that is to say, the Chairman. There has been enough difficulty trying to get the statutory position of the Munitions Board in the Department of Defense and the relationship of its Chairman to the Secretary of Defense clearly defined, and the National Security Act amendments of 1949 considered by the House Armed Services Committee were directed to this problem. To come now and interpose another authority within the Board whom the Chairman of the Board cannot control, compounds the problem. Also, it violates sound principles of Government administration constantly stressed by the Hoover Commission.

Section 3 of H. R. 7405, in providing for a Director and a Deputy Director of the proposed Defense Supply Management Agency, specifies their annual rate of compensation respectively at $14,000 and $12,500, and requires that with the exception of the first Director to be appointed, the Director and Deputy Director shall be civilians. The interesting feature of this provision is that presumably it was intended to allow the retention within the Munitions Board of the present Director of the cataloging program, Rear Adm. Joseph W. Fowler; but in fact, the saving provision that the first Director could be a military official is nullified by the requirement as to compensation. As a rear admiral recalled to the Department of Defense from inactive duty, Rear Admiral Fowler is not entitled to receive such compensation as specified in the bill, and therefore his dismissal would be forced by enactment of H. R. 7405.

House Report No. 1838 accompanying H. R. 7405 states on page 4:

It was not until the commencement of the open hearings by the subcommittee on February 11, 1952, when Deputy Secretary of Defense Foster testified before the committee that he returned to the Department on the completion of his testimony and for the first time signed a directive which established a cataloging and standardization agency.

This statement would seem to suggest that the directive, which sets forth in great detail the organization and functions of the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency, was conceived in the morning and delivered in the evening of the first day of the subcommittee's hearings. Contrary to the statement in the report that a catalog and standardization agency was established for the first time by Deputy Secretary Foster's signature on February 11, 1952, a Munitions Board Cataloging Agency has been established and in operation for several years.

Specifically, the Army-Navy Cataloging Agency was established on July 3, 1947. It was reestablished as the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency on May 11, 1948, after the Munitions Board was given its present name and statutory functions under the National Security Act of 1947. On July 21, 1950, the Department of Defense issued a charter for the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency prescribing that the agency would be headed by a full-time director, a full-time agency staff, and a part-time advisory group. That was the charter revised and reissued on February 11, 1952.

The purpose of the February 11, 1952 directive, which, of course, was prepared over a period of months, was to restate the terms of the agency's charter in clearer and more comprehensive fashion. Further, contrariwise to the above-quoted statement in the committee's report, the February 11, 1952 directive revising the charter of the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency did not set it up as a "cataloging and standardization agency." The Standardization Agency within the Munitions Board is a separate organization with its own charter, although its work is now geared more closely to that of the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency by the directorate of which Admiral Fowler is the head.

The directive of February 11, 1952, referred to, was preceded by a directive of November 28, 1951, which Deputy Secretary of Defense Foster discussed in the hearings on the status of the Federal catalog program, held by my subcommittee on January 28, 1952. As explained by Mr. Foster, the purpose of the November 1951 directive "was to bring up to date our activities in this field to give emphasis to the requests of the Congress that we put authority and responsibility in an outstanding person's hands, since none of these things can be effective unless you have the right people. It was under this that Admiral Fowler was brought back to head this activity, and the other parts of it are to assure the full cooperation of the services in making his work easier, to obtain personnel and to give him the power of administration and the full authority to get on with this job"—House Committee on Expenditures, Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, hearings on the Federal catalog program, January 28, 1952, pages 6 and 7.

House Report No. 1838 accompanying H. R. 7405 states on pages 4 and 5:

It was not until the subcommittee commenced the assembly of material for exhibits and the data for an investigation into the progress of the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency that an experienced head was placed at the helm and made the Director of Cataloging and Standardization.

Therefore (sic), all of the functions relating to cataloging had been handled by committees within the organization.

The testimony before the subcommittee was that General McNarney as head of the Management Group set up in the Department of Defense abolished committees some-

time during 1951. But the program thereafter was carried on by an administrator who had many other duties than the management of this important operation.

Contrary to this statement in the committee's report, the Munitions Board cataloging program was not handled by committees prior to the appearance of Admiral Fowler. Possibly the Report is confused since the earlier direction of the program was under an executive group composed of two representatives from each of the military departments and two from the Bureau of Federal Supply, with a chairman of the group.

This executive group was not abolished by General McNarney in 1951, as the committee's report suggests, but was replaced by a full-time Director of the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency in July 1950, as noted above.

House Report No. 1838, accompanying H. R. 7405, states on page 5:

> The committee caused an assembly of sample items to be taken out of the cataloging system and displayed for consideration. The items disclosed, picked at random, showed widespread confusion in numbering, description, and above all, no concerted effort at standard items. The exhibit quickly got the name "Chamber of horrors," because of the examples of confusion, conflict, duplication, and overlapping which it clearly demonstrated.

Department of Defense officials felt, rightly or wrongly, that the subcommittee's "Chamber of horrors" did not fairly present the situation in regard to procurement practices, since price variations were due in part to buying under different market conditions or to differences in quality to serve different uses.

It was pointed out, for example, that a light bulb to be used in military barracks might be far less costly than a light bulb to be used on a battleship under conditions of gunfire. Or a blanket containing shoddy which was manufactured in a Federal prison and procured by the General Services Administration, as required by law, was far less expensive than a pure wool military blanket to be used in hospitals and frequently sterilized. The reasons for the price variations among similar items were not set forth in the subcommittee's exhibit.

It is not my purpose to evaluate that demonstration. I simply want to emphasize the fact that some of the evidence of duplication was made possible as a result of the cataloging program. Thus the committee's report recites on page 6 that there were over 200,000 descriptions and numbers for lumber items and 9,000 descriptions for venetian blinds. Assuming those figures are accurate, the existence of all these variations was made known only in the process of cataloging. The figures are evidence that the cataloging program is turning up the information necessary to institute a more effective standardization program. It does not seem reasonable to point to the variety of numbers and descriptions of common items of supply revealed by the cataloging project as grounds for asserting that the program is a failure.

Incidentally the discovery by the House Armed Services Committee 5 years after the so-called Military Unification Act was passed that there is considerable overlapping and duplication within and among the military departments should be helpful in determining whether that act needs revision. It is my recollection that the National Security Act of 1947, which was handled by the House Committee on Expenditures, in section 202 (a) creating the office of Secretary of Defense and prescribing the Secretary's duties, directed him among other things to "take appropriate steps to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, and research." When the amendments to that act were considered by the Armed Services Committee in 1949, that provision was struck out of the law. It may be, as it was then argued, that the Secretary received broader authority in the 1949 amendments to bring about some degree of unification. However, as far as overlapping and duplication are concerned, the specific statutory directive for their elimination was taken out of the legislation by the House Armed Services Committee.

The committee's report emphasizes that large savings will result from a single supply catalog and standardization program. I concur, but H. R. 7405 if enacted, would not bring about those savings. It would create a separate catalog for the Military Establishment and require costly revisions in the cataloging program now under way.

In calling attention to savings through cataloging, the committee's report states on page 6:

> The Hoover Committee on the Executive Departments estimated that over $2,500,000,000 could be saved annually.

I am not aware that the Hoover Commission itself made any official estimates of dollar savings for specific departments if its reorganization proposals were to be put into effect. The figure of $2,500,000,000 is sometimes used as an estimate of savings by thoroughgoing reorganization of the whole Military Establishment.

The committee's report accompanying H. R. 7405 states further on page 6:

> The disagreement between the Departments and the subcommittee considering this bill was that the Department (sic) felt that it could accomplish everything by directive that could be accomplished by law. The subcommittee reported to the full committee and the full committee joined in its opinion that what was a good directive was good law; and that the long history of delays, indecision, and frustration of the congressional intent did not warrant expressing further confidence in the executive branch; and that positive legislation was required.

This paragraph fails to point out that the departments not only felt that they had sufficient authority to conduct the Federal catalog program, but that they objected to substantive provisions in H. R. 7405. The representation in this portion of the committee's report that H. R. 7405 in effect would write into law the present directive under which the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency is carrying on the catalog program, is not exactly to the point. That directive—February 11, 1952—starts out by reciting as follows:

> With the approval of the Secretary of Defense and consistent with the provisions of Public Law 152, House Concurrent Resolution 97, and the delegation of authority by the Administrator of General Services to the Secretary of Defense, dated July 19, 1950, there was established the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency.

The charter reissued by that directive for the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency is consistent with Public Law 152 and House Concurrent Resolution 97 of the Eighty-first Congress, but H. R. 7405, which claims to write that directive into law, is not consistent with existing legislation, as explained above in detail.

The assertion in the committee's report that further confidence in the executive branch was not warranted and that positive legislation was required, not only overlooks the fact that positive legislation is already in existence, but does not do justice to the careful planning and hard work that the executive agencies have put into the cataloging program. There have been errors and delays, and I would be the last one to argue that there will not be resistance among the old-line departments to utilizing a single catalog. But in my opinion, this report of the committee not only deals loosely with the facts; its net effect is to undermine the confidence of the public in our military defenses.

In summary:

The report continuously justifies its purpose by using the term "single commodity catalog," but the bill provides for a military catalog throughout its provisions.

Congress has adopted a policy on this point, not once but twice. That policy is the development of a single uniform Federal catalog for the use of procurement and supply personnel in both the military departments and the civilian departments.

Section 11 makes a pious gesture toward coordination with the civilian agencies but makes it contingent on agreement with the Director of the Defense Supply Management Agency.

Section 12 badly states that the present civilian administrator of the present single Federal uniform catalog who has the basic authority and responsibility for cataloging, shall have no authority to impair or limit the new military department director.

The substantive authority is repealed by indirection.

If we are going to repeal or nullify a well-established and twice confirmed policy of the Congress, let us do it openly and honestly and after full debate.

Let us not make the mistake of hasty and inconsiderate action on an important matter which will vitally affect the billions of dollars spent by all Federal agencies.

This is not an inconsequential matter to be disposed of by suspending the rules which insure orderly consideration of legislation. The Hoover Commission recognized that a single uniform Federal catalog would provide the most important tool for efficient procurement—for

decreasing the $27,000,000,000 Federal inventory by elimination of duplicate stocks in inventory and by uniform identification, make it possible to transfer excess inventory to other Federal agencies and finally to properly identify surplus property for proper disposition in the best interests of the taxpayer.

I want to make one last and, I believe, very important point. There is a great fear of the growing power of the military in our Nation. I believe there is just reason for this fear. The world crisis forces an accent on military strength. Personally, I see no alternative. But God help us if that rapidly growing military accent eliminates civilian control.

H. R. 7405 is a drastic step away from civilian control. Federal cataloging responsibility rests today in a great civilian department of our Government—the General Services Administration. Adopt H. R. 7405, and you transfer that responsibility, authority, and accountability to the Pentagon.

The Pentagon will write the specifications and standards, not only for guns, jet planes, and tanks, but for 1,500,000 items which civilians use every day.

What will the impact in purchasing power of billions of dollars of items which have been frozen into military molds be upon our civilian economy?

For the convenience of the Members I have outlined 10 basic reasons why H. R. 7405, the military catalog bill, should be defeated.

First. Legislation authorizing the establishment and maintenance of a uniform Federal catalog system already has been enacted in section 206 (a) and (b) of Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress. This law provides for joint civilian and military participation in the Federal catalog program under authority granted to the Administrator of General Services.

Second. The Congress has reaffirmed and amplified the basic catalog legislation by a declaration of policy in H. Con. Res. 97, Eighty-first Congress. This declaration of policy, made in accord with a recommendation of the Hoover Commission, sets forth guiding principles for the conduct of the Federal catalog program and endorses a joint civilian and military effort under civilian control.

Third. Considerable progress already has been made in the Federal catalog program. A substantial amount of time, money, and effort has been invested in planning the Federal catalog program, and operations are now well under way. An estimated 2,500,000 items will be identified by July 1, 1952, leaving 1,500,000 yet to be identified.

Fourth. Civilian control over the Federal catalog program is not hampering the cataloging work of the military agencies since they are already doing the largest share of the work under a delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services to the Secretary of Defense and in turn to the Chairman of the Munitions Board. The whole Federal cataloging program is being directed by the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency.

Fifth. H. R. 7405 would cut this joint catalog effort in two by freezing military cataloging operations into a separate statutory agency. This division of effort flies in the face of established law and congressional policy as well as the accepted principle of a uniform Federal catalog for all agencies. The Department of Defense, the Munitions Board, the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the General Services Administration are opposed to splitting off military cataloging activities in a separate statutory agency.

Sixth. The bill proposes to establish a Defense Supply Management Agency within the Munitions Board, but confers upon its proposed Director statutory authority and duties which in some respects are broader than those already authorized for the Chairman of the Munitions Board and which will necessarily overlap or duplicate supply management functions already being performed by the Board. This vesting of broad authority by statute in a subordinate agency or activity violates principles of good management endorsed by the Hoover Commission and only adds confusion to existing lines of authority and responsibility.

Seventh. The report accompanying H. R. 7405 makes no direct mention of the fact that catalog legislation already exists in Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress and fails to include the catalog section of that law—section 206 (a) and (b) in the comparative print of proposed new legislation and existing legislation proposed to be repealed or amended, as required by clause 2 (a) rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the so-called Ramseyer rule.

Eighth. Huge additional costs would result from the enactment of this bill despite the statement in the accompanying report that only the salaries of a proposed Director and Deputy Director would be directly chargeable to this legislation. The requirement in the bill that catalogs include various additional descriptive and performance data, such as size, weight, cubage, packaging, and so forth, would mean that several million items already catalogued would have to be reexamined and revised. In my opinion, aside from the huge costs, the catalog program would be set back a full year.

Ninth. The requirement in the bill that the proposed Director of the new agency be compensated at the rate of $14,000 a year would force the dismissal of the present Director of the cataloging project in the Munitions Board, Rear Adm. Joseph W. Fowler, who has been recalled from inactive duty and is doing an excellent job.

Tenth. Enactment of H. R. 7405 would constitute a definite step further away from civilian control of the Military Establishment. Legislation of this character, which vitally affects one of the most important programs ever undertaken by the Federal Government for greater efficiency and economy in the spending of many billions of dollars, should not be enacted without full debate on the merits or without a complete and accurate presentation of the facts.

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman made reference to the fact that the report does not comply with the Ramseyer rule. I call his attention to pages 16, 17, 18 and 19. There is complete compliance with the Ramseyer rule.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; there is not. You cannot find section 206 (a) of the Federal Property Act in the comparative print of the report and this particular act that set up the Federal Catalog Agency. This report leaves out the important part of Public Law 152 which this bill drastically revises.

H. R. 7405 completely negates the present authority of the General Services Administrator, in section 12.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am very much interested to note the gentleman's argument that this would place in the hands of the military greater power.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. HÉBERT. Yet the gentleman brings forth as his witness the military which does not want it, according to his statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The military does not want it, and I am glad the gentleman mentioned that.

Mr. HÉBERT. How can the gentleman blow hot and cold then?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am not blowing hot and cold. The military have all they need under the delegated authority of the General Services Administration, as the gentleman knows. They do not seek additional power which the gentleman from Louisiana gives them in H. R. 7405.

Let me read at this time a letter dated May 5 from the Assistant Secretary of Defense:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1952.

Mr. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: In compliance with your request of May 2, 1952, the following information is herewith furnished in reply to the questions contained in your letter of this date:

1. I believe that the Department of Defense has sufficient authority under present legislation to direct the development and maintenance of a single uniform catalog system for use by all military and civilian agencies.

2. I do not believe that new legislation would speed up the program, or that it is necessary to provide authorization for any improvements.

3. I am of the opinion that the Federal catalog program should embody a joint working arrangement of the civilian and military agencies to insure that the eventual catalog will, to the maximum extent practicable, meet the needs of both the military and civilian supply requirements.

4. In my opinion, H. R. 7405 prescribing detailed statutory requirements for only certain specified parts of military supply management will tend to create an imbalance with other supply management functions which were not mentioned in the bill.

5. I believe that the type of data required by H. R. 7405 which must be specified in connection with each item in the Federal catalog will entail a reworking of cataloging already performed at a considerable increase

in cost, as well as an increase in the time of completion for publication and utilization of the catalog.

6. Up until the present time, approximately 1,650,000 items have been completed (a large percentage of these items being processed by the descriptive method), and it would be necessary to reexamine all of such items to determine whether or not the statute applied to each of them and to research a large percentage in order to include the data required.

7. In addition to the 1,650,000 items mentioned in paragraph 6, approximately 1,000,000 items will be assigned Federal identification numbers by July 1, 1952. The bulk of these items will have been processed by the cross-reference program and they will be identified only by the manufacturer's name and number. Their peculiar nature would not lend itself to the application of most of the additional data required by H. R. 7405, such as size, dimensions, and weight, and it is not believed that it would be possible to re-search them further in the interest of including any additional data. Accordingly, I do not believe that from a practical point of view it would be necessary to reexamine these items that are in the cross-reference program.

Sufficient authority has been delegated to the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency to permit it to accomplish its task, the development and maintenance of a uniform catalog system. Procedures have been worked out and tested under the direction of Admiral Fowler and I believe the proposed legislation (H. R. 7405) is not only unnecessary but that if it should become law it would delay the catalog completion date.

In view of the fact that your letter asking the seven questions which I have replied to above was received on Saturday, May 3, with a request that the answer be in your hands by noon May 5, time has not permitted the submission of this report to the Bureau of the Budget for advice as to the relationship of H. R. 7405 to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT,
General Counsel
(For Charles A. Coolidge).

The letter I have just read is in answer to a letter of May 2, which I addressed to the Secretary of Defense. This letter is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1952.

HON. ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you may know, my subcommittee was the sponsor of basic legislation relating to Federal property management, enacted as Public Law 152 of the Eighty-first Congress, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

Section 206 (a) of that act authorized the Administrator of General Services to, among other things, establish and maintain a uniform Federal supply catalog system. In connection with this authorization the Administrator was to give due regard to the requirements of the National Military Establishment.

Pursuant to this law and a directive by the President of the United States that areas of agreement be worked out between the General Services Administrator and yourself for effective administration, the Administrator delegated to you, and in turn to the Munitions Board, the responsibility for conducting the uniform Federal catalog project.

Subsequent to the enactment of Public Law 152, the Congress by House Concurrent Resolution 97 (after amendment to make it consistent with Public Law 152) endorsed the principles of a uniform Federal catalog system, recognizing that for economy and security it must be applicable to all agencies of the Government, civilian and military, and that the Hoover Commission had recommended that a "declaration of congressional policy be made to insure participation and cooperation of the military and civilian agencies in the development of uniform property identification."

Your office and representatives of the Munitions Board have many times endorsed the basic enabling legislation and declaration of policy as embodied, respectively, in Public Law 152 and House Concurrent Resolution 97; have testified as to the satisfactory working arrangements under the delegation of catalog responsibility by the General Services Administrator to the Munitions Board; have recounted progress under the present catalog program in testimony before my subcommittee and other subcommittees; and have emphatically stated opposition to new legislation along the lines of H. R. 1033 as causing a disruption of the program and as freezing administrative relationships that should be flexible under your direction to meet changing needs.

Since H. R. 1033 has been redrafted somewhat, reintroduced as H. R. 7405, approved by the House Armed Services Committee with certain amendments, and may be considered on the floor of the House this coming Monday, May 5, I would appreciate having prompt answers to the following questions:

(1) Do you believe you have insufficient authority under present legislation to direct the development and maintenance of a single uniform catalog system for use by all agencies, military and civilian?

(2) Do you have any reason to believe that new legislation would speed up the program or provide authorization for improvements not now permitted?

(3) Do you still adhere to the principle that the Federal catalog program should embody a joint working arrangement of the civilian and military agencies under authority of the General Services Administrator delegated to the Department of Defense?

(4) Do you believe that H. R. 7405 by prescribing detailed statutory requirements for certain specified aspects of military supply management will tend to create an imbalance with other supply management functions not included?

(5) Do you believe that the types of data required by H. R. 7405 to be specified in connection with each item in the Federal catalog will entail considerable reworking of cataloging already performed and entail huge additional costs?

(6) If the answer to No. 5 is yes, how many item identifications now completed will have to be revised?

(7) How many item identifications now scheduled for completion June 1, 1952, will have to be revised?

In view of the fact that this bill, H. R. 7405, has been scheduled for hearing under suspension of the rules Monday, May 5, I trust that I may receive an answer to these questions before noon Monday.

Sincerely yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Member of Congress.

(Copies to Mr. Roger Kent, Rear Adm. Joseph W. Fowler, Mr. Charles A. Coolidge.)

In answer to the statement as to whether it conforms to the program of the President, may I say that both President Roosevelt and President Truman have enunciated time and time again the principle of a single uniform Federal catalog for both the military and civilian agencies, and we have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget for that in our hearings already.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from California to use his remaining 5 minutes, as there is only one more speech to be made in support of the bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If there is only one more speaker in support of the bill, I will use the balance of my time myself, because I recognize the right of the committee to conclude the debate.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], will close the debate on behalf of the committee.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Is it the gentleman's contention that there already exists official authority to accomplish everything that is sought to be accomplished under this bill?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right—but wait just a moment, all that they need to complete the cataloging project—but there are a lot of things in this bill, H. R. 7405, which they do not need and which they say they do not need.

Mr. HARDY. It is your contention that there exists under present law and directives, as implementing existing statutes in the Munitions Board now, all the authority which it needs to perform essential cataloging functions.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right, and I will go further and say they have not requested H. R. 7405, but they have requested us not to adopt any additional legislation at this time because they are in the process of finishing up this tremendous job of identification. I have on my desk there, a box of IBM cards which they are using. I want the committee to know there are over 12,000,000 items on the Federal procurement list, and they are seeking to reduce that to between 3,500,000 and 4,000,000 items, and they cannot reduce them until they identify them.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman means numbers.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I decline to yield to the gentleman. The gentleman has some time left of his own in which he can make any statement he cares to make.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I compliment the gentleman on his very fine statement, and want to state that I am in full accord with the expression of his views.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Members can find an analysis of what this bill does here on the desk in a mimeographed sheet. As I understand the parliamentary situation, there is an agreement between the leadership not to have a vote on this until next Thursday. Before the vote comes, between that time and this, I will put additional information into the RECORD, which I think, if any reasonable-minded man will read, he will see that H. R. 7405 is absolutely unnecessary, and that it is interfering with a work that is two-thirds

accomplished at this time, work upon which millions of dollars have been spent in the 3 years since it was authorized in 1949. I am not saying there was not any cataloging project before, but the single Federal catalog was authorized in June 1949, by Public Law 152, and later on the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] introduced another bill—House Concurrent Resolution 97, Eighty-first Congress—which concurred with the principle that was established therein. Today he will come before you and advocate a complete separation of the military catalog from the civilian catalog. Do not let him tell you that section 11 in the bill will give the General Services Administration the right to coordinate. It gives the General Services Administrator the right to coordinate if the director of the agency will agree to his coordination in section 11, and then it takes all of his rights away from him in section 12.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman who is a member of our committee.

Mr. MEADER. From what the gentleman has said, I understand his position is that this bill seeks to take the military from out of the Federal cataloging system; is that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. MEADER. If that is true, will the gentleman say whether or not it will save $4,000,000,000 or whether it will cost more than if the military went into the single Federal cataloging system.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. A single Federal catalog will save money, as the gentleman from Louisiana mentioned, and I think he reported correctly the savings that might be brought about by the Hoover Commission recommendations. But this is not a single Federal cataloging system. This is a division, which is dividing off the military on one side, and leaving the civilian agences on the other. There has been a little clique in the Defense Department that has for years been trying to grab this thing strictly from the military side. The bill H. R. 7405 will be an encouragement to eliminate the civilian agencies from any part in this program, and will have the effect of splitting and delaying and confusing the cataloging program, and the single cataloging program for the military and civilian agencies will not be put into effect completely.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HÉBERT. Is it not a matter of fact that at the present time we do not have a single catalog system under existing law, and is it not further a matter of fact that the Department of Defense has its own catalog, on delegation of the General Services Administrator?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No.

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes; there is.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman very clearly made a statement. I will tell the facts. The General Services Administration is a civilian agency, and the administrator is given full responsibility and accountability to the Congress for a single cataloging system. He has delegated the military part of it to the military, and he has retained the civilian part. What they are seeking to do is to take out from under the civilian agency any scrutiny or any control and any accountability on the part of the military, and make it accountable only to the Pentagon, to the Director of Defense and you are attempting this notwithstanding the Director of Defense says he does not want it. So, the Department of Defense is asking for H. R. 7405. Let me make it plain: a little clique in the Department of Defense supported by the gentleman's committee [Mr. HÉBERT] are the ones who are asking for it, and not the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has rendered valuable service in the Congress. He has produced great legislation during his long years of service. But, this is not great legislation. It is not well drafted.

Hearings on this bill have not been held in the regular way. The hearings by the Hébert committee were held prior to the drafting of H. R. 7405 and on the subject of procurement primarily.

I regret to see the gentleman from Georgia put in the position of sponsoring ill-conceived and poorly drawn legislation. H. R. 7405, as I said, is not great or good legislation.

By disrupting and dividing the present program it will cost many millions of dollars and will delay completion of the single Federal catalog activity.

The report is mischievous and faulty in its draftmanship. It is deceptive in its failure to report accurately the history of cataloging and if considered under regular rules of the House, would—in my opinion—be subject to a point of order for failing to substantially comply with the Ramseyer rule.

This legislation should be voted down.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], the author of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is always nice to see the tree bear fruit. This tree was planted about 4 years ago, in the Eighty-first Congress. This is the first opportunity we have had to vote on a single supply catalog bill on the floor of the House.

It is quite true, as the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] said, that permissive authority is granted under Public Law 152. Also the House passed House Concurrent Resolution 97, expressing the intent of Congress that a single supply catalog should be established. It is apparent now that neither of these acts was sufficient. We need mandatory legislation. I wish to call your attention, as the gentleman from California indicated that I would, to the fact that under section 11 of the bill before the House there is nothing that prevents the Administrator of General Services from joining with the military in establishing a single Federal catalog.

Let me read to the House the language of section 11:

SEC. 11. Nothing in this act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Administrator of General Services to coordinate the cataloging and standardization programs of the General Services Administration with the cataloging and standardization program of the Agency under this act, by delegation of authority under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, or by such other means as may be agreed upon by said Administrator and the Director of the Agency.

There is nothing particularly mysterious about a single supply catalog. It is an attempt to standardize, to classify, to describe and to number every item of supply, by one name and one number, and one name and one number only, thereby eliminating duplicate purchases of the many items of supply that flow into the Federal Government.

It is almost impossible for the military or for the Federal Government to know what items of supply they have or what new items should be purchased when they cannot identify the items that they have in stock or the items that are continually flowing into the service. We have varying estimates of the number of items. The Armed Forces originally estimated 5,000,000 items to be identified and cataloged, and they later revised that to 3,300,000. The Administrator of General Services, in a letter which I have, said that it was originally estimated 3,000,000 items were to be included in the Federal catalog system, and it was estimated that 1,500,000, or 50 percent, are miiltary service or combat items; 1,000,000, or 33 percent, are used for both military and civil agencies, and 500,000, or 17 percent, are items used solely by civil agencies.

Based upon these estimates the military uses 83 percent of the total items purchased by the Federal Government, and civilian agents use 50 percent.

Now, let us get down to whether or not this is a military catalog. I agree that this bill provides just exactly that. Why should we not? In testimony before the committee it was brought out time and time again that only the military had the money and the necessary technical advisers and people to do the work. It was also revealed that the GSA had been cut off at the pockets this year when the appropriations Subcommittee for Independent Offices refused to grant them any money for their cataloging program, indicating in their report that the program was unrealistic, that it would take 10 years to complete it, and that therefore the appropriation of funds was denied. Does that mean that because the Appropriations Committee failed to appropriate funds to the General Services Administration to carry out their small portion of this cataloging program that we should then fail to pass a bill today which not only authorizes but makes it mandatory upon the Military Department that they establish a single supply catalog, and eliminate the duplications that occur today in the bureaus and the technical services of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force?

Here is what Jesse Larson, Administrator of the General Services Administration had to say to the Hébert subcommittee:

Mr. ANDERSON. * * * if this committee were to write legislation, giving * * * to the present Director of Cataloging, Admiral Fowler, by statute the authority which

he now holds by directive, you can see nothing undesirable about that?

Mr. LARSON. So far as I am concerned there wouldn't be anything undesirable * * * any way to expedite would certainly not be undesirable if Congress is convinced that this is necessary I think Congress should make it mandatory * * *. To me, very sincerely speaking, the question before this committee is one which I have stated. Whether you wish to guarantee by enactment of this legislation or whether you are willing to take a chance on the soundness of the procedures that are now being successfully carried out.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I have only a few minutes.

The witnesses who appeared before our committee on possible savings under this bill made statements such as those quoted by my chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]: "Fantastic savings," "substantial savings," "astronomical savings." But again I say you cannot put a dollar mark on what can be saved when you do not properly identify it.

Let me read from the Hoover Commission report:

Needless to say, with standardization of procedures, close central control and unified operations will come monetary savings. Dollar savings are relatively intangible factors which are difficult to prove and are invariably controversial. In the military services, however, the expenditures involved in inventories and in personnel engaged in the functional area of storage and issue are so tremendous that even a small percentage-wise saving will represent many millions of dollars. For example, a mere 10-percent reduction in military inventories through merger of stocks and depot facilities would reduce the inventory investment by more than $2,500,000,000. A 10-percent reduction in military personnel engaged in stores activities would save more than $26,000,000 annually. Comparable savings will follow through reduction in space requirements, supplies consumed, and equipment used in the operations. These figures are merely indicative of savings possibilities. They are, in our opinion, highly conservative, since these recommendations, if fully adopted and properly administered, should result in more than 10-percent reductions in inventories, personnel, and other costs.

Ten percent of a $50,000,000,000 budget is not to be sneezed at.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Not just now.

Mr. BONNER. I just want to say to the gentleman——

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I do not yield to the gentleman because I have only a very short time at my disposal.

Mr. BONNER. It seems unfortunate that such interesting information must be brought out in this way.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in regard to possible savings let me read you a quotation from one of the Air Force witnesses who appeared before the committee:

Mr. DAHM. For one time in our Air Force supply system, we had through procurement a total of 9,000 different hose assemblies. These were used in hydraulic or pneumatic systems and other systems of various pieces of equipment. We found through research and identification interchangeability, after we had these items, that basically the items were composed of only 32 different sizes of hose. There were 113 hose clamps. There were only 48 hose connectors in the whole group. So as a result we started thereafter to procure bulk hose lengths and these separate clamps and connectors. thereby having a total of 193 items to procure, store and issue, as opposed to 9,000. As a result, you have savings in these areas of cataloging and warehouse space and inventory and procurements and in cost.

That is only one example of the vast savings that are possible if the bill before the House becomes law.

I know the gentleman from California is sincerely interested in this catalog problem. His committee has held extensive hearings on it, but certainly no longer than ours; we have been at it 4 years. I do not know why he is afraid of our scuttling the program. What program?

After 9 years the Navy Department itself admits the job is only 65 percent complete; the Army admits the program is only 48 percent complete, and the Air Force cannot give us any percentage of completion at all. Are we going to continue a program which the Committee on Appropriations says is not realistic and then withhold funds from the Administrator of General Services? Are you going to continue a program which permits the Defense Department to identify and number 200,000 different items of lumber in the Department of Defense alone? That is part of the million and a half or two million items to which the gentleman from California has referred.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I decline to yield; I do not have the time.

Two hundred thousand items of lumber in the Department of Defense. There is a perfect example of duplication. Another one: 20,000 venetian blinds and roller shades. Duplication and waste. What good is a program where the work is so poor that not even common nails received the same identifying numbers and where the Munitions Board has recognized that the 40,000 descriptions of bolts have been so poorly done that it is going to have to be done over? Why not try to correct a program that permits the services to purchase typist chairs at prices ranging from $18 to $48?

The Defense Department purchases six-sevenths of all items procured by the Federal Government even in peacetime. Why then should we go along with the argument of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], that because the civilian agencies of the Government—one-seventh of all purchases—are not specifically included in H. R. 7405, the bill should be defeated? I favor a single catalog that is Government-wide in its scope but I do not favor letting the tail wag the dog and if we cannot have everything in one bite I will take six-sevenths and be at least partially satisfied for a starter.

To those of my collegeaues who are perplexed about how they should vote on H. R. 7405, I should like to say—please read the following letter from Adm. J. W. Fowler, present Director of the Supply Management agencies in the Munitions Board:

MUNITIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1952.

Hon CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In compliance with your request, I am glad to furnish you with the following opinion:

I estimate that the wholehearted and effective employment of a Federal catalog for supply purposes by all of the procurement agencies of the Federal Government, the standardizing of all common use items tailored to fit the actual needs of the Government, the standardizing of inspection procedures and streamlining of those functions, and the standardizing of packaging and preservation of all items purchased by the Government will result in approximate annual savings of $4,000,000,000 at the present annual rate of Federal expenditures.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FOWLER,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy, Director, Supply Management Agencies.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. [After a pause.] Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. [After a pause.] Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill, and consideration of the bill in its final passage, be postponed until Thursday next and that the suspension of rules principally apply as of that day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

HOSPITALIZED VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand some pictures together with a brief statement taken from a publication—Harper's Bazaar—of April 1952. These pictures were taken in a servicemen's hospital, and the caption is "Home from Korea."

Mr. Speaker, these pictures depict the wounded lying in hospital beds with their arms and legs in pulleys and no faces. As shown, some are lying on their faces. These photographs speak volumes. You cannot see the faces of the men in pain, these men who are making an effort to be cheerful and gay and kind, and who succeed when they talk to you. But you will see from their prone bodies the agony that is theirs.

Mr. Speaker, let me read one paragraph:

Ward 33 in Walter Reed Hospital in Washington is a place filled with men who are the end products of war. Some of them, old Army hands, are professionals at killing

and also at getting hurt. Others are youngsters who made one appointment with a draft board at home and kept a second one with a hill in Korea. Much has been written about death in war but not enough about impairment.

These are pictures of men taken at Walter Reed Hospital recently who donated their means of locomotion, their means of making a living, their arms and legs, to what many people think are proper concepts of patriotism, honor, and courage.

Some of these men, Mr. Speaker, were in the service twice before; some were wounded once before and wounded again in the Korean war. Some were wounded not in World War I or World War II, but who served in all three wars, but were wounded in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, there is a man at the hospital today who has given both his arms and who is blind. He reminded me of a boy, Karl Bronner, I introduced to the Congress after I first came here. He had given both his hands and he was blind. I never saw that boy during his lifetime when he was not smiling, when he was not courageous. When I introduced him to the House, the House rose in a body in tribute to him. The first time I talked to this Korean wounded boy several times he said, "I have no regrets. I like to serve my country and I would like to have fought longer in Korea." The boy comes from North Carolina. He is a great hero, a great soldier, a great patriot who served so nobly for a few brief weeks and who sacrificed so much.

Mr. Speaker, we soon go to conference on a bill that this House passed and the Senate passed with amendments, which gave to all of our service-connected veterans, those getting pensions, an increase in compensation. Yet, boys like this boy, so-called statutory award cases, boys with two legs off or two arms off, or all four limbs missing, boys who are blind—in this case a man who is blind and has given both his hands—received no additional compensation under the bill. We gave all of the other cases of our disabled men increased compensation. It was our fault, Mr. Speaker. We should have seen that it came out of our committee that way. We did not give those permanently disabled boys an increase in compensation; the so-called statutory award cases. I remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that every legislative employee, everyone in the Government, I think, with the exception of Members of Congress, received an increase in pay under a bill passed some weeks ago. I sincerely hope that this will be rectified in these most seriously disabled cases and that they will receive an increase, due to the rise in cost of living, that all the other disabled receive. I am sure they will. It is an oversight, and it should be rectified. It will be, I know.

Let us make their appointment as understanding and just as possible.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

NAVIGATION AND POWER DEVELOPMENT ON THE RHONE RIVER IN FRANCE

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 6, 1952, I addressed the House under special order and set forth my views on the St. Lawrence seaway project. In discussing the cost of the project I referred to a similar project now under way on the Rhone River in France which is being financed in part under the Mutual Security Program by funds derived from United States taxpayers. I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, on pages 1947–1949, an article on that subject by Mr. Richard Frost of the Detroit Board of Commerce which appeared in the magazine Inside Michigan published on that date.

The article by Mr. Frost has aroused a great deal of interest both throughout the press and among Members of Congress. I sent a copy of the article to each Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Subsequently the United States Chamber of Commerce made certain comments on this Rhone River project, and columnists, among them Mr. Ray Tucker, wrote articles on the subject. Probably because of this widespread public interest the Mutual Security Agency saw fit to issue a release under date of March 23, 1952, describing the Rhone River project.

In addition, the Mutual Security Agency addressed a letter to the magazine Inside Michigan in which it severely criticized the article by Mr. Frost. The current issue of Inside Michigan contains this letter in full on page 26, as well as Mr. Frost's reply on pages 27 to 30. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include the Mutual Security Agency letter, its release of March 23, 1952, and Mr. Frost's reply.

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

There was no objection.

(The matters referred to follow:)

[From Inside Michigan of May 1952]

HERE IS MSA LETTER—STRONG IN DENIAL, WEAK IN FACT

MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. WARREN ZAISS,
Editor, Inside Michigan Magazine,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. ZAISS: The article Congress Spends Billions for French Seaways, by Richard B. Frost, in the March 1952 issue of the Inside Michigan magazine, is so grossly erroneous that I feel compelled to set the record straight by supplying factual information on the French development project for the Rhone River Valley.

Since the misstatements in the article gained wide dissemination through the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Associated Press, and other media, and were inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you may wish to correct the misrepresentations which have been made.

To help set the record straight, the Mutual Security Agency has issued a factual statement to the press, which is attached for your information. I believe this statement is self-explanatory, and that a sentence-by-sentence refutation of the article is unnecessary.

In brief, however, I should like to comment further on several aspects of the article.

The caption "Congress spends billions for French seaways" is ludicrous. The United States is not constructing any inland waterways in the Rhone Valley, nor is the American taxpayer. The French are engaged in the development of this river valley; they have been working on this undertaking since 1937, and it may take another generation or two to complete. Obviously, not even the French can at this time state the cost of projects which may be started years from now, many of which have not even passed the survey stage.

American dollars have not gone specifically into this project, beyond the furnishing through the Marshall plan several years ago of about $3,250,000—million, not billion—in credits, with which the French Government purchased from American manufacturers some huge earth-moving equipment which has been used on one of the Rhone Valley dams and which probably will be used for years to come for earth-moving on various kinds of French undertakings all over the country. And it must be remembered this $3,250,000 was matched by the French in its own currency, and eventually used for recovery projects.

Since the French projects on the Rhone Valley were begun in 1937 by the French themselves, it follows that hearings of the United States Congress were not held to authorize the undertakings.

The statement that "the entire cost of the program is a gift, a gift to be paid for by the already overburdened United States taxpayer," is about as far from the truth as it is possible to get. Neither ECA nor MSA has ever considered the Rhone Valley development work as a Marshall plan project, because it was so wholly conceived and carried out by the French with their own resources.

The United States Government has never been, and is not now, committed in any way to support of the Rhone Valley undertaking of the French, although it must be conceded that such a project could well have been the subject of American aid under either the Marshall plan or the Mutual Security Program. The assertion that "there is no limit to our commitments to carry out the French project, now that we have started," is an utter falsehood.

It is our understanding that the French are primarily financing these projects through the sale of bonds to their citizens, and that they plan for the entire Rhone Valley development to be self-liquidating. Since the article asserts that French taxation is low compared to ours, however, I want to advise you that this does not agree with our information. Under the burden of rearmament which France is carrying, her tax receipts including all levels of government and social insurance taxes are equal to 30.7 percent of that country's gross national product, compared with 25.8 percent in the United States.

The total United States aid allotted to France since 1948 by both ECA and MSA, including mutual defense assistance aid as well as loans and conditional aid (in payment for which France grants aid to other countries), on March 28, 1952, amounted to roughly $2,760,000,000.

Because the French people actually have to pay, in francs, for all the commodities imported with United States-grant dollars, the French Government has had at its disposal, to use with United States approval, over $2,000,000,000 worth of francs for projects that would promote industrial and agri-

cultural production. One such category of projects comprised the rehabilitation and expansion of the Nation's electric, gas, and power facilities upon which her economic and military strength are dependent.

It so happens that out of France's $2,000,000,000 worth of francs which the Marshall plan indirectly generated she has invested only $35,000,000 in the Rhone Valley undertaking. This project is actually and overwhelmingly French conceived and French financed. It might be factual to state, however, that without the lift which the Marshall plan provided throughout the French economy that country perhaps could not have gone ahead with its Rhone development work—nor with many other undertakings.

The assertion that millions of tons of American steel have been diverted to France for use in the Rhone project is refuted by cold statistics. During the entire life of the Marshall plan, ECA financed the export of only $45,000,000 worth of steel to France, which, at an average of $130 a ton, would amount to about 350,000 tons. During this same period, France, a great steel producer herself, produced over 40,000,000 tons of steel. During 1950 and 1951 alone, France shipped to the United States more than $90,000,000 worth of steel, twice the amount received by France under the Marshall plan.

I trust that these and the many other misrepresentations in the article will be clarified by this letter and the accompanying factual statement.

Yours very truly,

NED NORDNESS,
Acting Director, Office of Information.

(Copy to Mr. Richard B. Frost, care of Inside Michigan magazine.)

[Mutual Security Agency—For release on or after Sunday, March 23, 1952]

FRENCH HARNESSING RHONE RIVER FOR POWER TO MEET DEFENSE NEEDS

WASHINGTON, March 22.—The French are harnessing the mighty, turbulent Rhone, from the Swiss frontier high in the craggy Alps near Lake Geneva, to sunny Marseilles, 323 miles away, where it flows into the Mediterranean Sea.

They have plotted an ingenious network of dams, canals, hydroelectric plants, and irrigation systems along the swift river's course, and are already beginning to reap the benefits of the portions which have been completed since the war.

From the gigantic Genissiat Dam alone—started in 1937 and recently completed—more than 2,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power annually is being poured into France's national electric grid system to feed her industries which are producing such items as jet aircraft and engines, tanks, armored cars, and artillery for France and her North Atlantic Treaty partners.

When the entire valley project is completed with some 22 dams and 46 power stations—and it is generally agreed that another generation or two may be required to finish the job—this "stairway of dams" from the Alps to the sea will produce an estimated 14,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power annually. This is equal to nearly half of France's total consumption in 1949, and exceeds the 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours output of our own big Tennessee Valley Authority.

No good estimate can be given of the eventual cost, since some of the proposed work has not even gotten past the preliminary survey stage. So far, the initial projects in the plan have cost the French about $200,000,000 in their own currency, including $35,000,000 in francs from the French Government's Marshall plan counterpart fund—francs which the French deposited to match the value of United States-financed commodity imports and earmarked to be spent for such internal development projects.

During the life of the Marshall plan, $3,250,000 worth of heavy American earthmoving machinery was purchased by the French Government with United States financing for use on the Rhone and other projects. France has obtained with her own resources, from manufacturers in France and neighboring countries, the materials and equipment such as generating units, transformers, and switchgear, which are going into the Rhone project.

The French Electric Company, to meet France's need for increased power to mechanize industries and increase productivity, has restored or built 85 major power plants with their transmission and distribution systems between 1948 and 1951. For all of these projects, many of them thermal plants, the Marshall plan financed $35,000,000 worth of American equipment and authorized the use of the equivalent of nearly $500,000,000 worth of francs from the French counterpart funds.

The Rhone Valley development, however, is not specifically a power project. Under the French law enacted back in 1921 which authorized the development of the valley, it was specified that a threefold objective should be achieved: Improvement of navigation, creation of a farmland irrigation system, and development of hydroelectric power.

The completed project will create from Marseilles to Geneva and thence into the Rhine Canal to Central Europe, an international waterway open to tugs, barges, and lighters. It will permit the establishing of a mighty industrial region along the banks of the Rhone. And the spent waters, through an irrigation network, will turn thousands of parched acres into fertile farmland producing up to five times what it does now.

This is France's dream. It existed when the Panama Canal was mere talk—and the burden of military rearmament which France has assumed as a partner in the defense of Europe under Gen. Dwight Eisenhower has made her need for this expansion of electrical power more urgent.

From time immemorial the Rhone has been used as a waterway between the north and south of France. It has been a dangerous one because of its swift current, its gorges, and defiles and roads and railways have robbed it of its one-time volume of cargo. Made easily navigable by the series of wide canals which will skirt the dams, it will resume new importance as a trade lane to and from Marseilles, largest port on the Mediterranean.

Use of the Rhone's waters for irrigation is a main factor in the development of the valley, where the land is fertile but arid. Already, important irrigation works have been completed transforming more than 200,000 acres into what the French describe as "garden spots," and plans call for wide expansion of the irrigation as the Rhone work progresses. The Rhone project as a whole will increase the total French food yield by 5 percent, it is estimated. This would mean millions of tons of grains, meats, and fruits for French use and for export.

The Rhone's volume and rate of flow—heaviest of all French rivers—make its electric power potentialities choice. As far back as 1902 French engineers suggested that a great dam be built to feed a power station. The 1921 authorizing legislation specified that the Rhone development should be set up as a joint undertaking by the communities concerned, and in 1934 the "Compagnie Nationale du Rhone" was formed as a general holding company. It was made up of the communities, cooperatives, chambers of commerce, the state railways, power companies, and other organizations with an interest in the river.

The people of the Rhone Valley, rich and poor, literally "dug into their woolen socks" to gather the francs to get the work started. The preliminary program called for the harnessing of the Genissiat Falls on the upper Rhone, and the building of a compensation dam a few miles below it at Seyssel, the building of an industrial port on the Rhone below Lyons, and the improvement of the waterway below Lyons. A second stage of the program involved primarily the harnessing of the Donzere-Mondragon falls on the lower Rhone.

Completion since the war of the colossal Genissiat Dam and power plant, began in 1937 and submerged by the French in 1940 to keep it from the invading Germans, is the first achievement of the Rhone pioneers. Genissiat's gigantic wall straddles the river where it flows through a canyon 360 feet deep and 460 feet in width. Its artificial lake covers 875 acres and retains 69,000,000 cubic yards of water.

Like the later, and even larger, Donzere-Mondragon project, the construction of the Genissiat installation involved baffling engineering problems. It was necessary to divert the river temporarily from its course and to send it through two long tunnels around the dam site. The next job was to completely dry the river bed and remove a 100-foot-deep layer of alluvial deposit to prepare a foundation for the dam.

Genissiat required almost 300,000 cubic meters of concrete to build, a new European record according to the French who set up the biggest concrete mixing plant in the country at the site. The waters drop 63 feet through six turbines which will produce more than 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity in an average year.

Seyssel, a few miles downstream from Genissiat, has been completed and is adding 150,000,000 to 200,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year to France's power, and nine other dams in varying size are planned between Geneva and Lyons. But the Rhone Co., for its second big installation, shifted for technical reasons to the Donzere-Mondragon site on the lower Rhone.

Now nearing completion, this project is considered one of the most unusual ever attempted. It involves blocking the Rhone at Donzere; diverting much of the river's waters permanently through a 19-mile long cement-lined canal which will cut around a particularly tortuous series of rapids and raise the level of the water for miles upstream; a vast irrigation system that will open tens of thousands of acres to agriculture; and a hydroelectric plant and dam will produce 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year.

Everything about Donzere-Mondragon runs into staggering figures. Begun late in 1946, it constituted the biggest excavation project in the world at the time, requiring the removal of 50,000,000 cubic meters of earth. It was here that use of the American earth-moving equipment enabled rapid progress on the project.

More than 5,000 men have been employed on the project. When its waters start pouring over their drop at the rate of 2,000 cubic yards a minute, sometime in 1953, this will be one of the largest power producers in Europe including the big Russian hydroelectric plant at Dnieperpetrovsk.

In various stages, from survey to actual construction, are other dams, generating plants, canals, and irrigation systems along the course of the Rhone and its tributaries. Next scheduled for completion is the project at Montelimar, above Donzere, which will produce 1,100,000,000 kilowatt-hours; to be followed by Loriol with 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and Valence with 650,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Others on the French timetable are at Champrion, Culoz, Sault-Brenaz, Loyettes Villette d'Anthon, Cusset, Rives, La Balme, Bregnier, Lyon, Estressin, Saint-Rambert, Tournon, Chateauneuf-du-Pape, Avignon, and Vallabregues.

As a French report stated it, "In this manner, and little by little, the Rhone will become what so many national and international interests have wanted it to become: A great stairway of calmed water, descending step by step to the sea."

[From Inside Michigan magazine of May 1952]

MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY FOGS THE ISSUE—HERE ARE THE FACTS

(By Richard B. Frost)

Foreign-aid officials have vigorously, if not wisely, objected to the article Congress Spends Billions for French Seaways, published in the March issue of this magazine.

The article revealed, for the first time, the fact this Nation is currently engaged in financing a multi-billion-dollar seaway and power project on the French Rhone River. The project consists of 22 dams and 46 power plants which will produce an anticipated 13,000,000,000 to 14,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours when completed. Along with the dams and power plants, eight systems of canals and locks will be constructed, including what will be the largest lock in the world, for barge and small vessel transportation on the Rhone River from Lake Geneva, Switzerland, through the French Alps mountains to the Mediterranean Sea—a distance of 354 miles.

The article pointed out that no over-all estimate of the cost of the French project has ever been made, but approximately 10 percent of the work has been estimated at over $685,000,000.

Sole purpose of the article was to inform the American people that this country is able and willing to undertake seaway and power projects in other countries of far greater cost and scope than our own St. Lawrence waterway, while refusing to join with our good neighbor, Canada, in jointly constructing a waterway and power project of direct benefit to our own people. The article proved our contention that if the St. Lawrence seaway were located in any nation on earth other than the United States or Canada, this country would construct it without even holding a congressional hearing.

However, the reaction in many of the numerous newspaper articles, editorials, and comments on the seaway story that were carried throughout the Nation was outraged astonishment at the liberality of United States foreign-aid officials when spending United States taxpayers' funds abroad. This attitude was heightened when the United States Chamber of Commerce released the article as support for their argument against any large appropriation of foreign-aid funds this year, and their request for a cut of $5,000,000,000 in the present appropriation.

The article came as a surprise to Washington officials of the Mutual Security Agency, the successor to ECA in administering the Marshall plan, and for weeks they were unable to intelligently discuss the Rhone River project as apparently very little accurate information was available in the Washington office of the agency. Feeble attempts were made to justify this tremendous American expenditure and to refute the article with the result that several highly inaccurate statements were carried in the New York papers and attributed to MSA officials.

Foreign-aid officials finally prepared an answer to the article which was issued as a press release on March 23. On March 28, Mr. Ned Nordness, acting director, Office of Information of the Mutual Security Agency wrote to the editor of this magazine demanding a retraction of statements carried in the March issue of Inside Michigan in the article, Congress Spends Billions for French Seaways.

It is obvious that the administrators of the Marshall plan are most sensitive whenever the question of administration arises and particularly when such questions touch upon the expenditures of the United States counterpart funds in Europe. This is not surprising as billions in United States foreign-aid funds have been misappropriated with a clear violation of the intent of Congress. More than $2,000,000,000 have already been wasted in Europe with our foreign aid officials exercising virtually no control over the expenditures of an additional $3,000,000,000. It is obvious they do not wish to have thise phase of the foreign-aid program brought too clearly to the attention of the public.

For the time being, however, we shall direct our attention solely to criticism by the Foreign Aid officials of the seaway article.

In this article on Congress Spends Billions for French Seaways, it was stated that this country was currently financing 90 percent of the cost of constructing of a seaway and power project in France of far greater scope that the St. Lawrence seaway project in the United States. It was stated the project would comprise 22 dams, 46 power plants and 8 systems of canals and locks covering a distance of 354 miles, opening the Rhone River for barge and small vessel transportation between Lake Geneva and the Mediterranean Sea. It said the power project would, when completed, produce 13 to 14 billion kilowatt hours, just slightly more than the power to be produced by the St. Lawrence waterway.

The article reported the project had been twice turned down by the French voters when it was presented to them in the package of the Monnet plan, an over-all plan for the development of water power in France, because of the great cost involved. The article said no estimate of the total cost had been made, but some 10 percent of the work to be done had been estimated at a cost of $685,000,000; therefore, the total cost of the project would obviously run well into the billions of dollars.

In his letter of March 28, Mr. Nordness stated:

"The article, Congress Spends Billions for French Seaway, by Richard B. Frost, in the March 1952 issue of the Inside Michigan magazine, is so grossly erroneous that I feel compelled to set the records straight by supplying factual information on the French development project for the Rhone River Valley."

The press release attached to Mr. Nordness' letter stated:

"The French are harnessing the mighty, turbulent Rhone, from the Swiss frontier high in the craggy Alps near Lake Geneva, to sunny Marseilles, 323 miles away, where it flows into the Mediterranean Sea." (This shows almost complete ignorance of the whole matter as the Rhone does not even flow to the city of Marseilles. It enters the Mediterranean Sea 50 kilometers west of Marseilles.)

"They have put in an ingenious network of dams, canals, hydroelectric plants and irrigation systems along this swift river's course and are already beginning to reap the benefits of the portions which have been completed since the war."

This, oddly enough, is in direct conflict with the statement by MSA officials which was quoted March 16 by the New York Times, stating that the project was not a billion dollar program, was not a waterway but rather a power project and consisted merely of one canal 15 miles long.

It is obvious that there is nothing in this statement that would contradict what was carried by this magazine in its article. So far we both agree that a tremendous waterway and power development is taking place on the Rhone River in France. It is also apparent that when the story in this magazine was first published, the MSA knew very little about a project they are spending billions of United States taxpayers' dollars to finance.

However, Mr. Nordness continues:

"The caption 'Congress spends billions for French seaways' is ludicrous. The United States is not constructing any inland waterways in the Rhone Valley, nor is the American taxpayer. The French are engaged in the development of this river valley; they have been working on this undertaking since 1937, and it may take another generation or two to complete. Obviously not even the French can at this time state the cost of projects which may be started years from now, many of which have not even yet passed the survey stage."

It would appear that the reason MSA objects to our statement "Congress spends billions for French seaways" is because we have not as yet spent quite a billion dollars. We are only in the process of spending billions. MSA in its own press release of April 23 reports:

"The Marshall plan financed $35,000,000 worth of American equipment (for French power and waterway developments) and authorized the use of the equivalent of nearly $500,000,000 worth of francs from the French counterpart funds."

Thus they admit that we have already spent $535,000,000 on water development in France and the end is not yet in sight. They also admit that to date no person has ever calculated the total expenditure to be made. In view of these facts how can they refute the assertion that our foreign aid officials are spending billions on French seaways?

We cannot and will not argue the claim that the United States is not nor are the American taxpayers actually constructing the Rhone River Valley project. All we claimed then and all we claim now is that all we are doing is paying for the construction. As for the French having begun work on the Rhone River in 1937, we carefully reported the entire history of the program as given to us by the French officials heading the project. Mr. Nordness goes on to state:

"American dollars have not gone specifically into this project, beyond furnishing through the Marshall plan $3,250,000 (millions not billions) in credits with which the French Government purchased from American manufacturers some huge earth-moving equipment which has been used on one of the Rhone Valley dams."

There is a most interesting sidelight regarding that $3,250,000 expenditure. The Paris office of MSA reports that it covered $1,350,000 worth of heavy earth-moving equipment and $1,900,000 for spare parts. We are wondering why nearly $2,000,000 was needed for spare parts for only $1,350,000 worth of machinery. Perhaps the MSA officials can answer that question.

Mr. Nordness also admits that some $35,000,000 in counterpart funds have also been invested in the Rhone River Valley. His letter stated:

"It so happens that out of France's $2,000,000,000 worth of francs which the Marshall plan indirectly generated, she has invested only about $35,000,000 in the Rhone River undertaking."

It seems that Mr. Nordness and other officials of the MSA do not consider counterpart funds as American funds. In fact, on March 16, the New York Times quoted a high MSA official as saying: "Counterpart funds come out of the French budget." This then is the crux of their disagreement with our article.

For the sake of our readers, we would like to explain exactly what counterpart funds are. If you should make a trip to Europe, you would find that it is not easy to spend American dollars in small stores and other places throughout Europe and receive in exchange American funds. Dollars are not the currency of those countries; thus you first take your dollars to the bank and exchange

them for the currency of the country, exactly the same as you do when you visit Canada. These funds received in exchange for your American dollars are what the Mutual Security people call counterpart funds. They are your money in somebody else's currency.

This is the way they accrued in Europe under the Marshall plan program. When a French manufacturer wants to purchase a machine in the United States, he must receive the permission of the French Government, which is short of American dollars. Once they approve, the approval is passed on to the Mutual Security Agency for its sanction and once all the government officials have given the shipment their O. K., the manufacturer places his order with a company—let us say here in Detroit—for a machine costing $10,000. The firm in Detroit ships the machine to the French manufacturer and is paid $10,000 by the Mutual Security Agency in Washington. When the machine arrives in France, the French manufacturer does not receive the machine for nothing. On the contrary, as in the case of any commercial shipment, he pays his bank $10,000 in French francs before he can even take delivery of the machine. Thus the French francs that he has paid into his bank become counterpart funds, supposed to be controlled by the United States Foreign Aid officials. They are United States tax dollars in French currency.

The legislation passed by Congress when it established the American foreign-aid program specifically states that these funds are to be controlled by our officials as long as the plan is continued and their use reported to Congress.

When MSA officials publicly report the funds "come out of the French budget" and refer to such funds as "France's $2,000,000,000 worth of francs which the Marshall plan indirectly generated—" there can be no doubt the intent of Congress has been violated, that many of these funds have been misappropriated.

If Mr. Nordness is correct in stating that these funds are not American funds, then our article is incorrect. However according to provisions of the act of Congress establishing the foreign-aid program, our article charging that United States funds were being used to build the Rhone project, is correct in every detail.

However, if Mr. Nordness' statement that United States counterpart funds are not subject to United States control represents the policy of MSA, then the Mutual Security Agency is guilty of violating a law of the land, of misappropriating funds on the greatest scale in history, not to mention perpetuating a fraud on the American people by taking credit for accomplishments in Europe resulting from the expenditure of counterpart funds that are not directly a part of the Marshall plan.

It is interesting to point out that on January 23, 1952, the Mutual Security Agency released a bulletin praising the effectiveness of our foreign-aid efforts. On the cover of their bulletin was a picture of one of the Rhone River Valley projects mentioned in our article and on page 10 of the bulletin was a picture of an Austrian power development carrying the following caption: "High among the peaks of the Austrian Alps, 3,000 workmen are engaged in construction of the Glockner-Kaprun power project. Aided by MSA's counterpart funds this hydroelectric project will not only serve Austria, but will become an important part of the integrated Western European power grid envisaged by MSA officials."

It would seem that in this instance counterpart funds suddenly become actual MSA funds. It would appear that it depends upon whether the project is being favorably or unfavorably reported upon as to whether counterpart funds are American or European.

Mr. Nordness goes on to state:

"Since the French projects on the Rhone were begun in 1937 by the French themselves, it follows that hearings of the United States Congress were not held to authorize the undertaking."

Apparently MSA officials are of the opinion that when this country finances a project already under way in Europe, regardless of the amount of the expenditure involved, it is no proper business for Congress or the American taxpayer.

Mr. Nordness further states:

"The statement that the entire cost of the program is a gift to be paid for by the already overburdened United States taxpayer is about as far from the truth as it is possible to get. Neither ECA nor MSA has ever considered the Rhone Valley development work as a Marshall-plan project because it was wholly conceived and carried out by the French with their own resources."

This statement will give the American people a close insight into how their funds in Europe are being handled. The actual statement that we made was that those funds being supplied by the Government for the Rhone River Valley project were a "gift to be paid for by the already overburdened United States taxpayer." This is absolutely true. We did not state that the entire cost of the Rhone River Valley development was being borne by American taxpayers. We merely stated, which has not been denied by MSA, that in 1950, 90 percent of the cost of the project was financed by American funds.

What really disturbs one is the statement by MSA that the valley project is not considered as a Marshall-plan project, because it was conceived by the French and carried out by the French with their own resources.

Again we come to the question of when are and when are not counterpart funds our money. According to the act of Congress they are always our funds until the program ends. It is obvious that even MSA is confused, as we have already quoted them on the Rhone River program as well as other power and waterway projects as referring to such undertakings as an important part of the Marshall plan.

Again, the statement that the project is carried out by the French with their own resources is tantamount to stating that counterpart funds are not controlled by the foreign aid officials. Perhaps a congressional investigation would clarify the responsibility for these funds.

Mr. Nordness further goes on to state:

"The United States Government has never been, and is not now, committed in any way to support the Rhone Valley undertaking by the French, although it must be conceded that such a project could well have been the subject of American aid under either the Marshall plan or the Mutual Security Program. The assertion that 'there is no limit to our commitments to carry out the French project, now that we have started,' is an utter falsehood."

In our article we did not state that the United States Government was under a firm, legal commitment to complete the Rhone River Valley project. We did state that by supplying the needed money for the project after the French taxpayers had turned it down we were under a moral commitment to see the project through. Certainly, unfinished dams and waterways in Europe that were started with American money would be a poor testimonial to the sincerity of our foreign-aid program.

The program will cost billions of dollars. Who's going to pay for it if the United States does not? We are presently financing 90 percent of the cost of this construction. Where do we stop? How much are we committed to? How much of the $2,000,000,000 counterpart funds now available in France will or will not be committed to such projects?

It seems that if the Mutual Security Agency wishes to question our statement that the United States has a moral commitment in this project, they must state exactly what our limitations are. What agreement has been made with the French? Obviously, none of these answers have been forthcoming from the Mutual Security Agency. We doubt if they can give an answer.

Mr. Nordness goes on to make the following statement:

"It is our understanding that the French are primarily financing these projects through the sale of bonds to their citizens; that they plan for the entire Rhone Valley development to be self-liquidating."

Now that statement raises a host of interesting questions. It is an agreed fact that we have already spent up to $40,000,000 for the Rhone River Valley development. Are we then to receive bonds in exchange for the United States funds supplied? If not, then are we not financing, as a gift from the American taxpayer, a project that will ultimately return profits to those who have privately invested in the Rhone power and waterway project? Who are the investors? This, too, could stand some first-class investigation.

Mr. Nordness goes on to state:

"Because the French people actually have to pay in francs for all the commodities imported with United States grant dollars, the French Government has had at its disposal to use with United States approval over $2,000,000,000 worth of francs for projects which would promote industrial and agricultural production."

With this statement the MSA officials are repudiating their previous statements to the effect that these were not United States funds; that they "come out of the French budget," and that the expenditure of those funds is of no concern to the Congress or the taxpayers. It should be obvious to even a school boy, or an MSA official, that if the United States must approve the expenditure of counterpart funds, then certainly those funds are of some interest to the United States, and we have some claim on those currencies.

It would appear that the foreign aid officials are suspiciously sensitive whenever the question of the expenditure of United States funds in Europe arises. In view of the confusion that apparently exists in Washington this comes as no surprise.

In fact, there may be even worse cases of American foreign-aid expenditures. In view of the touchiness of the foreign aid officials over the use of counterpart funds in Europe, an exhaustive study on the United States foreign aid program, including on-the-spot investigations in Europe, will be made in the immediate future.

The results of these investigations will be carried in a series of articles, Why the Europeans Hate Us, which will appear in Inside Michigan magazine beginning next month.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few observations on this controversy as a basis for suggesting that the subject matter is of sufficient importance and interest to the Congress and to the people of the United States to warrant thorough investigation by a congressional committee for the purpose of ascertaining the true facts.

A careful comparison of the statements by the Mutual Security Agency and the articles by Mr. Frost will reveal that there is not a great deal of disagreement with respect to the facts. The charges that the Frost article is "grossly erroneous," contains "misstatements," carried a "ludicrous" caption, and contains statements "far from the truth" or

a statement which is "an utter falsehood" proceed not from a difference on the facts but rather from disagreement as to interpretations and characterizations of the facts.

One of the major points of difference between the Mutual Security Agency and Mr. Frost concerns the nature of counterpart funds. Mr. Frost takes the position that counterpart funds are United States tax dollars converted into French francs. The Mutual Security Agency seems to take the position, although it does not clearly say so in its letter, that the counterpart funds are funds belonging to the French Government in which the United States, through the Mutual Security Agency, possesses only the right of veto with respect to any specific expenditure of those funds.

There is no misunderstanding about how these funds are generated. The French citizen desiring to purchase an American product pays the cost of that product to the French Government in francs. The Mutual Security Agency pays the United States manufacturer the cost of the product in dollars. The funds with which the Mutual Security Agency pays the American manufacturer are tax funds appropriated by the Congress for the Mutual Security Program. The result is that the French Government, which contributed nothing to the creation of the counterpart funds, has accumulated a great number of francs. Over $2,000,000,000 worth of francs have been placed in the hands of the French Government in this fashion.

Five percent of these counterpart funds are set aside for such use as the United States Government sees fit to make of them. Primarily they are used to defray administrative expenses in France. The remaining 95 percent of the funds are expended or loaned by the French Government presumably in furtherance of the purposes of the Mutual Security Program. Apparently only a rather weak veto is exercised by the Mutual Security Agency office in France.

It is hard for me to convince myself that these counterpart funds are anything but funds belonging to United States taxpayers regardless of the fact that they are in the form of francs. If this is so, it seems to me to follow inevitably that the Mutual Security Agency and the Congress owe a duty in the nature of a trust to supervise the administration and expenditure of these funds in much the same fashion as appropriated funds for domestic governmental purposes. It is my opinion that the Congress has altogether too little information on the purposes to which these counterpart funds are devoted and the extent to which our agents abroad exercise control of them.

Mr. Speaker, last March I inquired about the Rhone River project consisting of some 22 dams and 46 power projects extending all the way from Switzerland to the Mediterranean. I was able to get practically no information on that project here in Washington. I requested from the Mutual Security Administration here all the facts they had, and they had very little. I asked the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body, and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, both the members of the committees, and the members of their staffs whether any information was provided in the hearings of those committees, or whether otherwise they had any information on the nature of this huge project on the Rhone River, which is going to cost, before it is through, many billions of dollars, and there simply was no information available. That is what makes me believe that the agents of the Mutual Security Agency are not treating these United States taxpayers' funds, these counterpart funds in the hands of foreign governments, with the care that should be devoted to funds taken from our taxpayers for public purposes.

It was my privilege as a member of the Bonner subcommittee to participate in the overseas hearings of that subcommittee between October 20 and December 1 last year. In many of our hearings we listened to the testimony of representatives of the Mutual Security Agency. Without attempting to report in detail on the points which interested me in this phase of the Bonner subcommittee's investigative work, I may say that I have the general impression that our agents overseas are treating these counterpart funds in altogether too casual a fashion in view of their essential character as trust funds provided by the United States taxpayers for governmental purposes of the United States.

Reports to the Congress on the specific projects to which counterpart funds have been devoted are, in my opinion, altogether too general and superficial. For example, with respect to the Rhone River project, very little information could be obtained from the Mutual Security Agency officials in the United, States, either from the Information Division or other divisions. Apparently their news release was prepared only after special information had been obtained from overseas. It is significant that notwithstanding the general characterizations of inaccuracy indulged in by the Mutual Security Agency in its criticism of Mr. Frost's article, nowhere did the Mutual Security Agency flatly deny Mr. Frost's statement that currently 90 percent of the cost of the so-called Genissiat project was being defrayed from counterpart funds. The silence of the Mutual Security Agency release on this point would seem conclusive evidence either that the statement of Mr. Frost was true or that Mutual Security Agency in the United States did not know whether it was true or not. I think it is important to find out what the truth is on this Rhone River project and other similar projects financed with counterpart funds which, as I have said, belong to the United States taxpayer. I urge that appropriate congressional committees undertake to ascertain the facts on this subject as well as other aspects of the administration of our Mutual Security program.

The intemperate language used by Mr. Nordness, Acting Director of the Office of Information of the Mutual Security Agency, in a letter which I have inserted in the RECORD leads also to the suggestion that the activities of that office could well be subjected to congressional scrutiny. In this connection I am reminded of the letter of this same agency which was inserted in the RECORD by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], on March 13, 1952, which appears on page 2303 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date. It would appear from the circumstances that issuance of a letter to members of the union urging their support of the Mutual Security program raises questions of propriety of the use of public funds for propaganda and publicity. My colleagues will remember that time and again on appropriation bills I have sought to restrict the expenditures for and the activities of the executive branch of the Government for publicity and propaganda purposes designed to influence public opinion and thereby to control national policy. Any investigation of the administration of counterpart funds and other funds entrusted to the Mutual Security Agency should likewise encompass the publicity and propaganda activities of that agency.

I am not now proposing the creation of a special committee to investigate the Mutual Security Agency since authority to proceed with such an investigation already exists within at least six committees of the Congress—the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Appropriations Committee and the Expenditures Committee of the House, and the Foreign Relations Committee, the Appropriations Committee and the Government Operations Committee of the Senate. However, should efforts to induce these committees to explore this subject fail, I am of the opinion that the House of Representatives ought to create a special committee provided with funds so that it might acquire an adequate investigative staff and direct it to investigate the operations of the Mutual Security Agency. If any such investigation is undertaken, I here and now offer to be of whatever assistance I can be in assuring a successful and penetrating inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

H. R. 7696, A BILL TO REPEAL A DISCRIMINATORY ESTATE TAX ON LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill (H. R. 7696) to correct a discrimination against certain community-property States which has arisen under the present estate tax law.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue has come out with an interpretation of the Federal estate tax law which is not only contrary to the plain intent of Congress but offensive to any fair-minded person's sense of justice. The ruling strikes the State of Louisiana directly and probably also other community-property States, especially Texas; and it involves a man's most precious possession, his life insurance.

Here is how the ruling works. Louisiana is the original community-property State. Under our law all property acquired during marriage by the joint efforts of the parties constitutes community property. The husband is the

head and master of the community and as such manages the fruits thereof during marriage, but at the dissolution of the community, whether by separation, divorce, or death, one-half of all the common property belongs to the wife. And this is not a question of descent and distribution or inheritance. It is a matter of right. At the dissolution of the conjugal relationship the wife, in her own name, owns and has title to one-half of all community property. Therefore, if a husband dies leaving community property, say a farm, a home, cash, stocks and bonds, only one-half thereof is subject to inheritance taxation in Louisiana for the very simple reason that he died possessed of title to only one-half. The other half belongs to his widow and does not even form part of the deceased husband's estate.

In respect to real estate, cash, stocks, bonds, and so forth, the tax formula devised by the Revenue Act of 1948 in substance adopts the Louisiana community property theory, with the end result that throughout the United States only one-half of the value of such property is subject to the Federal estate tax.

But when we come to life insurance the situation is vastly different. In Louisiana the proceeds of a policy of insurance taken out by a man on his life, paid for with community funds, and payable to his wife at his death, constitutes the separate property of the widow. Consequently, such proceds are totally exempt from the State inheritance tax, and they cannot even be seized for the debts of the deceased husband. Now it was the intent of Congress, generally speaking, that one-half of such insurance proceeds should be uniformly subject to the Federal estate tax throughout the United States, just as in the case of community property in the above illustration. For my part, I believe the Louisiana rule is sound and I favor a total exemption of such proceeds for purposes of the Federal estate tax, and I think it would be in order to reexamine the whole subject matter. For the moment I can only say that taxation of one-half of a man's life insurance is half bad. But under the interpretation by the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the Revenue Act of 1948, the whole of such life-insurance proceeds is taxable in Louisiana, and probably also in Texas and some of the other community-property States, while only one-half is taxable in the noncommunity property States. The insult to the injury, so far as Louisiana is concerned, arises in this way.

Section 811 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code governs the includibility for estate-tax purposes of the proceeds of insurance upon a decedent's life. Insofar as it concerns insurance proceeds receivable by beneficiaries other than the estate of the insured, the Revenue Act of 1942 provided two basic alternative rules for their includibility in the estate: First, the proceeds are to be included to the extent purchased with premiums paid by the insured; and, secondly, even though the premiums were paid by others than the insured, the proceeds are to be included if the insured possessed at the time of his death any of the so-called incidents of ownership of the policy, such as the unrestricted right to change the beneficiary of the policy.

The following provision of section 811 (g) (4) was repealed by section 351 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1948:

SEC. 811 (g) (4). For the purposes of this subsection, premiums or other consideration paid with property held as community property by the insured and surviving spouse under the law of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any foreign country, shall be considered to have been paid by the insured, except such part thereof as may be shown to have been received as compensation for personal services actually rendered by the surviving spouse or derived originally from such compensation or from separate property of the surviving spouse; and the term "incidents of ownership" includes incidents of ownership possessed by the decedent at his death as manager of the community.

It was thought that the repeal of this provision would enable the proceeds of insurance policies paid from premiums from community property to be considered as having been paid one-half by the decedent and one-half by the surviving spouse. However, the payment of premiums is only one of the tests for determining how much of the insurance proceeds should be includible in the gross estate of the decedent. The other test is the possession by the decedent at the time of his death of any of the incidents of ownership, either alone or in conjunction with any other person.

A major purpose of the Revenue Act of 1948 was to achieve geographical equalization in the taxation of estates, as between community-property and non-community-property States, by means of universal estate splitting. Insofar as community property is concerned, estate splitting was achieved by operation of the local law. Upon the death of the husband, only his half of the community property is includible in his gross estate. In order to achieve a similar result in non-community-property States, the Revenue Act of 1948 provided for a so-called marital deduction for the value of the property interests included in the husband's gross estate and passing to his surviving wife. However, in order to insure that at least one-half of the estate is subject to estate tax at the husband's death, it was also provided that the marital deduction may not exceed 50 percent of the estate.

One of the classes of property to which the Revenue Act of 1948 specifically made the marital deduction inapplicable was life insurance purchased from community property and includible in the husband's gross estate. It was assumed that only one-half of the proceeds of such insurance would be includible in the husband's gross estate because of the operation of the community-property laws. This assumption was based upon the fact that under the laws of at least some of the community-property States the right of the husband to change the beneficiary of insurance policies taken out by him had been so restricted by local court decisions that, as to the half of the insurance purchased out of his wife's share of the community, the husband could not be regarded as possessing this incident of ownership in his own behalf. Therefore, in those States where the husband's right to change the beneficiary was restricted by law, it was held that with respect to that part of the policy purchased out of the wife's share of the community such part of the proceeds was not to be included in the husband's gross estate under the incidents-of-ownership test. That is the law today, and in those States where there is such a clear limitation on the husband's right to change the beneficiary there is no problem, because only one-half of the proceeds are subjected to estate tax. This same result is achieved in all the non-community-property States through the marital deductions.

However, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has interpreted the law of Louisiana as permitting the husband to change the beneficiary from his wife to whomsoever else he chooses without his wife having any say in the matter. It is believed that Texas law may receive a similar construction. There is at least some doubt as to whether the Bureau construction of Louisiana law is correct in this matter. However, whether the Bureau is right or wrong, the result is to make the entire proceeds of the policy subject to the estate tax. First, the marital deduction is not applicable because the policy was purchased out of community funds. Second, all such property is includible in the estate of the husband because the Bureau is holding that he has an unrestricted right to change the beneficiary and, therefore, retains incidents of ownership in the entire policy. Thus, the estates of decedents dying in Louisiana, and possibly in Texas, are being denied the tax treatment which is available throughout the other 46 States. In this one area, therefore, the geographic uniformity which Congress tried to obtain through the Revenue Act of 1948 has not been achieved. It was clearly the intent of Congress in 1948, as is amply borne out by the legislative history of the Revenue Act of 1948, that either one-half of the proceeds of such a policy should be excluded from the estate of the decedent as community property, or that a marital deduction should be allowed. The amendment which I have offered accomplishes this result. Because the amendment is designed to carry out the original intent of Congress, it is retroactive to January 1, 1948, the effective date of the Revenue Act of 1948.

When the Revenue Act of 1948 was adopted there was a hue and cry to the effect that the so-called community-property States enjoyed special treatment with regard to Federal estate taxation. So far as Louisiana was concerned the criticism probably failed to recognize that we did not create this situation. We are not newcomers in this field. Our community-property system is historical with us. We are governed by the civil law patterned after the Code Napoleon, which, in turn, was in large measure derived from the Roman law, codified by Justinian in 533 A. D. When the great jurisconsults of France, after years of labor, presented to Napoleon the final draft of the famous civil code which bears his name, the Emperor remarked: "I shall go down to posterity with my code in my hand."

Mr. Speaker, we in Louisiana like to feel that our civil code represents the wisdom of the ages. And in a way, by adopting the Revenue Act of 1948, Congress recognized our preeminence in the field of law, because it extended the benefit of at least the theory of our community-property system to all the States for purposes of the Federal estate tax. Certainly in extending our system to other States, by means of universal estate-splitting for purposes of estate taxation, Congress did not intend to take something away from us, or to penalize us; yet that is exactly the import of the ruling of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. In other words, heretofore the non-community-property States did not have the benefit of the theory of estate-splitting, but Louisiana did; and now we wake up to find out that the noncommunity-property States enjoy a splitting of the whole of the gross estate, including insurance proceeds, for estate tax purposes, while Louisiana does not. The irony is shocking.

I am happy to say that my colleagues from Louisiana are in accord with the objectives of the bill I introduced, H. R. 7696, and in fact we have all been working toward the same end.

Mr. Speaker, the interpretation of the Bureau of Internal Revenue is so contrary to justice and common sense, I submit that we have a right to expect that the palpable discrimination in the uniform administration of the Revenue Act of 1948, as intended by Congress, should be corrected without delay.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 1 hour.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY OF MAY 3

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, May 3 the people of Poland, and the people of Polish ancestry throughout the globe, commemorated the one hundred and sixty-first anniversary of the adoption of the constitution of May 3, 1791—the first written democratic constitution in Europe.

There are two things especially outstanding about the famous constitution: One, its contents; second, the manner in which it was adopted.

In its contents, the constitution was based on the principle that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." It assured the Polish nation a dual-chamber functioning Parliament, with the real and final power resting in the lower chamber. It initiated social reforms; equalized to a great extent the privileges of the burghers and the nobility; gave peasants equality under the law; and reaffirmed religious toleration, which was a fundamental element in Polish history.

This constitution laid down the essential directives for the nation to follow. The succeeding generations followed them not by way of social revolution, but by evolutionary reforms. As a result, when the new Polish State was restored to independent status in 1918, the nation at once took the line of parliamentary government in its broadest sense.

The second notable fact about the constitution was the way in which it was adopted. While in France similar objectives were achieved by a bloody revolution, and while most of continental Europe still adhered to the obsolete ideas and institutions of medieval ages, the Polish people adopted their new constitution joyfully and peacefully, and by unanimous agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the constitution of May 3 constitutes a great and memorable achievement in Polish history. It was, however, but one page in the long and honorable history of that valiant nation which today, through no fault of its own, remains enslaved by Communist oppressors.

Mr. Speaker, justice demands the liberation of Poland. It is my sincere hope and the people of that courageous nation, will once again regain their independence. To this end, the free world should dedicate itself.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on Polish Constitution Day.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the eighteenth century was an age of revolution. New ideas were developed and new ideas appeared throughout the Western World, especially during the last half of the period. In this country, the American Revolution produced the Declaration of Independence and a constitutional form of government. From France came the urging cry of "Liberty, equality, fraternity." And in Poland, despite the weight of three alien oppressors, a new spirit of freedom arose. It expressed itself in the constitution of May 1791.

The Polish Constitution, for the first time, placed a real check on the absolutism of the monarchy. Irresponsible cabinet government was cast aside and ministerial responsibility was introduced in its place. Many intricate and obsolete features of the old and unwieldy system were abolished, and all class distinctions were wiped out. Personal privileges formerly enjoyed by the few were made available to all townsmen and the peasantry was placed under the protection of the law. Absolute religious toleration was established.

These advanced features of the Polish Constitution represented a decided advance over anything yet known in Central and Eastern Europe.

Today, we join with Poles everywhere in commemorating the anniversary of the signing of that historic document, for it embodies the living Polish faith in freedom and independence, and constitutes a major contribution to the heritage of freedom.

It is a real tragedy that the Polish people cannot commemorate this anniversary in full liberty in their homeland. To the patriotic Poles, who today suffer under alien oppression just as their ancestors did 150 years ago, Constitution Day is of profound significance. It means a reaffirmation of faith in the eventual achievement of political and civil liberty, and national independence. It is a day of renewed hope for those whose freedom has been suppressed; a day of warning for the Communist tyrants who have suppressed it.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 freedom loving people throughout the world paid tribute to the God-fearing people of Poland, who, 161 years ago, established their Diet—a constitution guaranteeing the same righteous principles of liberty, justice, and freedom to their citizens as our founding fathers proclaimed for us.

The Polish people recognized the highest law—the moral law of God, and the principles which that law embodies. They have been steadfast in their adherence to those principles. They would not compromise with the law of the jungle, the law that might makes right. Because of their unwavering devotion to their principles, the scourge of war which later engulfed the whole world, came to them in 1939.

Only people imbued with the highest ideals of morality and justice, would have resisted the onslaught of the greatest military machine that the world had ever known up to that time. What courage it took to stand for principle when compromise with the ideology of the aggressors would have been so materially expedient.

What irony of fate, that Poland, which presented to the free world an example of steadfastness to the cause of freedom by resisting Nazi aggression, should now be subjugated by an equally brutal, conscienceless regime—the Soviets.

The free world must not, and cannot with honor, fail to make every effort to restore freedom to Poland. Poland's courage and sufferings have made her an immortal symbol of resistance to tyranny.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on this one hundred and sixty-first anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the nation which was capable of such a great document of human rights and of social justice as the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

What a pity and a travesty on our modern civilization that the freedom-loving Polish Nation which has made the greatest sacrifices of blood for the cause of world freedom and democracy, should today suffer under the heel of a tyrant and oppressor, and that the people of the free world can do so little to bring justice to them.

Today the oppressed people of Poland are not even permitted to celebrate publicly this great national holiday, the anniversary of their constitution. Their oppressors fear that the shining light which such celebration would cast upon the bright history of Poland, upon the gallant efforts of its people to free themselves from the yoke of slavery, would dim and blot out the false promises and the terrible changes brought into the life of Poland by the puppet Communist regime. They fear that the brightness

of that great constitution would bring to light the utter emptiness, filth, and wickedness of their orders, by which there is thrust upon the Polish people the project of the Communist Stalin constitution, intended to completely enslave the Polish Nation. I feel confident, however, that the Polish Nation, strengthened by the ideals of freedom and social justice contained in the May Constitution will never give up their rich heritage.

I have just returned from Europe, where our congressional committee has been gathering evidence to determine the guilt for the atrocious crime of genocide committed upon the Poles at Katyn. I return reaffirmed that the United States can always rely on the Polish people as a gallant and faithful ally in the cause of freedom and democracy.

But I also return with grave worries as to what the immediate future may bring. I have heard in Europe, reports from reliable sources that the Soviet Communists, in order to placate the Germans, may soon offer to Germany the western borders of Poland. I certainly hope that our Government will never lend a hand to such a dastardly plan to add new sufferings upon the Polish Nation. I hope that our Government will soon make a declaration reassuring the gallant Polish Nation that it should have no fear of new partitions, by which it would lose its western boundaries. Such a declaration would serve the cause of international justice and would bring new hope to a nation which has suffered immeasurably, and looks to America for its future.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, this is the tenth time that I have had the privilege to appear in the well of the House and freely and under no restrictions, address this august body in commemoration of the Constitution of Poland which was adopted on May 3, 1791.

Poland was the first country in Europe to have a written constitution. It came into being after the second partition of Poland and was the fruit of the famous Four Year's Diet, assembled in Warsaw to draw up a new constitution. The nation was in a fervish state, and Europe at large was shaken with poltical disturbances. The leaders of Poland perceived that social and economic reforms were needed if the country was to survive.

After years of unfortunate appeasement of Germany, during the dark days of September 1939, it was the Polish Nation which first took up arms against the evil forces of violence and aggression. The events of war developed in such a way that many of us subconsciously forget the part that Poland played in World War II. We forget the ideals and the principles, which Poland rose to defend, and which are being fought for today by almost the entire world. We forget that the chief slogan at the outbreak of war was the struggle for individual freedom, the defense of the weaker against the stronger, the struggle for justice above evil.

Today Poland's sons, scattered through the various parts of the globe, dare not place their foot upon Polish soil for fear of unjust reprisals, uncertain of their property and life in the land of their origin because Poland's political life is dominated by Soviet secret police and puppet agents of Soviet Russia who control its political life.

With almost 1,000 years of national existence, Poland ranks among the oldest European nations. Varied was her fortune through the centuries. There was a time when she constituted one of the major powers of Europe, when princes and monarchs sought her favor and aid; but at no time has she sought her neighbors' possessions, or sinned by invading and terrorizing their lands. If she grew territorially, it was not through conquest, but as a result of concord with the adjoining countries who freely desired a permanent union with her. For through alliance with Poland they found the realization of the freedom and personal liberties which no other country offered.

The 3d of May has ceased to be an official Polish national holiday in Poland, by decree of the present regime. But the 3d of May remains a Polish national holiday in the hearts of all true Poles, and in all centers in the United States where Poles or Americans of Polish extraction live. In numerous Polish national homes, the Polish flag hangs proudly on this day, side by side with the American stars and stripes. Thousands of people listen attentively to the voices of the past. They hope that there will again be a Poland which in the spirit of the constitution of May 3 will be independent once more and free from foreign invasions.

Poland and her people have been partitioned four times, ravaged, despoiled, murdered, and enslaved by greedy and imperialistic nations. No nation, no people, have suffered so much in the last two centuries. National honor, national integrity, the nation's boundaries, after two centuries of suffering, are sacred things to every Pole—young and old, rich and poor. Two long centuries of Polish tears, prayers, songs of sorrow, have made it so. For two long centuries their women and children were starved and slaughtered; husbands, fathers, and brothers shot and sabered or condemned to prisons for life. Two long centuries of the most cruel and inhuman practices upon a peaceful and agricultural people, of persecution, brutal barbarism and savagery have instilled in every Polish heart a deep consciousness of national honor, national integrity, and that the nation's boundaries be respected.

Mr. Speaker, as we join in this tribute to Poland on this anniversary, the United States of America is deeply indebted to Poland for its many contributions to our progress and well-being. It is also indebted to Poland for the millions of its citizens who came to this country to help build it into the greatest nation of all times. That same zeal and warm desire for freedom, that same resistance to persecution, and the same determination to develop, which characterized the Poles through the ages, has been a dominant factor in the growth and development of our great Nation.

Let us give Poland our most sincere assurance of our moral support; to cheer them; to encourage them in the continued fight for freedom in the full sense of the word.

Poland must be free, since without a free Poland, there will be no true peace.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the people of Poland, by action of its Parliament on May 3, 1771, adopted what historians believe to be the first constitution embodying the basic tenets of human dignity and liberty, and established the basis for real democracy and the democratic development of that nation. Laboring under the tremendous strain and stress of surrounding dictatorships, with Russia, Prussia, and Austria carving out or attempting to appropriate huge areas within its rightful boundaries, the Polish leaders of that day stood firm in their resolve to give to the people of Poland a form of government founded on the same democratic principles which later became the foundation stone of our great Government. Those were dark days for the liberty-loving Polish people, with dictators on all sides threatening to obliterate all Polish culture—yes, even the Polish language—and replacing them with the cultures and the languages of these autocratic neighbors. But the National Diet stood firm in proclaiming the new constitution, thus giving to the world this new concept of orderly, humane government.

Unfortunately, the adoption of this new form of government did not end the trials and tribulations of this great land and its people. The sinister influences of greed and aggression which has characterized her neighbors throughout the centuries and her inability because of her geographical and physical make-up to ward off the constant encroachment and attacks by her neighbors, brought about the further partitioning in 1836. Notwithstanding the continuing burdens of foreign oppression, the stalwart Poles never gave up their quest for freedom and independence. There has remained within the heart and minds of Poles throughout the years the undying belief and determination that their culture, their patriotism, their democratic principles would ultimately triumph and that they would be permitted to live within their rightful borders in peace and tranquillity. That hope and that belief is still fervently alive in the present population of Poland, crushed as it has been by present-day Communist dictatorship.

During the oppressive years of the nineteenth century many of the cultural and political leaders were forced to flee their homeland, taking refuge in France, in England and in our own land of the free. Chopin fled to France, and there gave to the world his immortal works. Earlier Kosciusko and Pulaski, fired with the spirit of independence and liberty, came to our shores to contribute immeasurably to our successful struggle for freedom.

After many years of foreign rule and domination, Poland again became a free nation as a result of our intercession following World War I. Its leaders were then faced with the struggle of establishing democracy after the tortuous years of autocratic rule. Great progress was being made, at times against almost

insurmountable obstacles, but again, before their dreams had been fulfilled the iron heel of conquerors and oppressors took over their fair land in 1939, and the all too recurrent struggle for freedom and liberty has been renewed. To the eternal credit of Polish people everywhere, the light of liberty remains undimmed. It is being carried and preserved by the underground within and by faithful and determined Poles throughout the world. The struggle for freedom will not end until Poland has once more been returned to the circle of free nations, its people assured of the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. They rightfully look to our nation for this relief; they know that the triumph of liberty and justice throughout the world for which we are expending our all will be shared by her brave people.

On this anniversary date of their adoption of the first constitution of democracy I want to urge the Polish people to continue their faith in the ultimate triumph of right over might. The day is not far distant when they will again breathe the air of freedom, when their nightmares will have been forgotten and the joys of liberty and constitutional democracy will return to their beloved land.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, the Polish Constitution was adopted. Throughout the course of her history the people of Poland have always desired to live peacefully with their neighbors. Her constitution was adopted not many years after the Constitution of the United States had been adopted and was an outstanding milestone in the evolution of democracy in Europe.

Following centuries of strife, Poland emerged at the end of World War I as a member of the free nations of the world. Order was brought to a people who for centuries had nurtured the hope of a freedom-loving people—order and sovereignty which was expressed in the now historic first constitution of a restored Poland, passed on March 17, 1921.

On this May 3, 1952, Americans of Polish origin will join with others of Polish origin, whether they be in our own country, in Canada, Europe, South America; yes, even in captive Poland herself. With all Americans we hope and pray for Poland's future or the day when she will again take her place in the society of free nations and that her future will be a guaranty of relief as a captive of the Soviet slave world.

When the peoples of the world are brought to the realization that peace of the world can only come through a meeting of the minds of the men and women governing nations, then we will have peace and not before. Wars never accomplish the objectives sought. It can come only when the leaders of the nations return God into their hearts after casting out hate.

And so, on this 3d day of May, the one-hundred and sixty-first anniversary of the adoption of the first Constitution of Poland, Americans of every faith and national origin pray that once again the people of Poland will be released from her captivity and take her rightful place beside the other real democracies of the world.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 of each year, freedom-loving nations throughout the world pause to commemorate Polish Constitution Day.

It is always a privilege for me to join in paying tribute to those splendid people of Poland who have been tireless in their efforts for freedom. It is not necessary to recount their glorious history—theirs is a priceless heritage, a record of courage unsurpassed.

The spiritual and political ties between the United States and Poland are strong bonds. When the Polish Constitution was adopted 161 years ago, it marked a milestone for democracy in Europe. It had about the same effect as did the efforts of our own America and France in breaking the age-old system of one-man or class rule. It was a very definite step toward the recognition of the basic right of a people to be free.

Besides the spiritual bond, because the ideals of democratic government of Poland and the United States were contemporaneous, America can never forget the magnificent services given to our revolutionary cause by Sobieski, Pulaski, and Kosciusko, and others. Their contributions to the cause of American democracy were legion.

Unfortunately, shortly after the Polish Constitution was adopted, Russia, through treachery and deceit, invaded Poland and within a short time Poland was partitioned among Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

However, the spirit of Polish democracy and liberty went underground and generation after generation kept the flame of liberty flickering. The Poles preserved from father to son the ideals of democracy embodied in their original constitution. It remained until 1918 before Poland again attained her sovereignty and became one of the best examples of a free government to be found anywhere.

Again Poland is under the heel of Russia, but knowing Poland's background and history as we do, we can take heart that democracy is not dead in Poland and will emerge again more triumphant than ever before.

On this day, we want Poles in their own country and in exile to know that we in America are in spirit with them and again pledge our real help for them to attain the democracy which they have proven over and over again they want sincerely.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, of all the participants in World War II, none suffered so much as did the people of Poland. They were the first to suffer in that war, and today, more than 12 years later, they remain the helpless victims of wartime and postwar events. They are among the largest national groups of Europe who presently are forced to bear the yoke of Soviet tyranny.

Having fought valiantly and for a while almost alone, against hordes from both west and east, having suffered and sacrificed for independence, the Polish people had a right to hope for a restoration of freedom at the end of the conflict. Instead, they reaped a bitter harvest of defeat in victory. More than a third of their country was to be annexed by their self-professed big brother and wartime ally, the Soviet Union, and what was left to them of their land was sealed off from the west.

National calamities often lead people from despondency to despair, and then tragedy on a national scale becomes almost inevitable. But the Poles, the descendants of brave forebears, are not likely to be deflected from the goals set before them in the constitution of 1791, whose anniversary is being celebrated today. They want freedom, liberty, and national independence unalloyed by a Soviet alliance and protectorate. They will not bow their heads to foreign oppressors. They want neither the powerful protection of the Soviet Union nor the blessings of the Soviet system. They are jealously and rightly proud of their heritage.

In these times of trouble that heritage is a mainstay in the determination of the Polish people to regain their independence. They need not brood over sad events of recent years but, instead, can find inspiration in the great and noble deeds of their forebears. Among these deeds, the promulgation of the Constitution of 1791 is a landmark, a milestone in Poland's long and eventful history. The Constitution was conceived, drafted and adopted at a time when Poland's greedy neighbors were on the verge of partitioning Poland once more among themselves. With that democratic and constructive document, the Polish people ushered in a new historical era. Poland became a limited constitutional monarchy. A liberal parliamentary system was introduced and ministerial responsibility was established. The electorate was enlarged and certain privileges formerly enjoyed by the few were made available to the many. The entire peasantry was brought under the protection of the law and the landlords' prerogatives were sharply curtailed. Absolute religious freedom was introduced. Most of these provisions represented sweeping political innovations for Central and Eastern Europe. The promulgation of the Constitution was a symbolic assertion of Poland's determination to link her fortunes with the West.

This annual commemoration of the Polish Constitution provides a way for all those who believe in freedom to pay tribute to the men who forged the inspiring document, and also to those brave souls who through the years have sacrificed their lives so the ideals embodied in the Constitution of 1791 might take root and prosper.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, it has become customary these past few years for the Members of this House to commemorate the adoption of the Polish Constitution, which occurred on May 3, 1791, and thereby apply the lessons of that great document of human rights, social justice, and religious toleration to our own day.

On the occasion of the one hundred and sixty-first aniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, which is regarded as one of the earliest democratic documents of its kind, I wish to

extend my greetings to all Americans of Polish descent and to pay tribute to the Polish people for having contributed this great document to our heritage of freedom. Coming shortly after our own Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution, and only 2 years after the great French Revolution of 1789, this notable document indicates the strong desire for freedom and democracy on the part of the Polish people in those days.

That desire for freedom is even stronger today. I wish it were possible for the Poles to celebrate this anniversary in a free Poland, free from the oppression of a ruthless tyrant who has so mercilessly crushed every form of liberty in their homeland. Today the citizens of Poland dare not commemorate publicly the anniversary of this historic event for fear of life and limb. Freedom and liberty, democracy and tolerance, social justice and human dignity are in hiding in present-day Poland. Only the hope of a better day to come still flickers in the hearts of the people, a day when the great principles enunciated in this historic document will once again be revived in a truly liberated Poland.

On this anniversary, freedom-loving people in America and throughout the world hope and trust that the present Communist nightmare in Poland will soon end and constitutional democracy will shortly return to its people. The people of America at this time offer their moral support and encouragement to the people of Poland and express the hope that their sufferings will soon end and that they will know true freedom and true peace.

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. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. VORYS).

Mr. GWINN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) in two instances and to include excerpts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts in two instances and to include a newspaper article in one.

Mr. POTTER (at the request of Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan).

Mr. SCUDDER and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho in two instances and to include statements by Frank Holman, past president of the American Bar Association.

Mr. MASON and to include a letter.

Mr. D'EWART and to include an address by Mr. Steiwer, president of the National Wool Growers Association.

Mr. POULSON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LOVRE and to include various articles.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL and to include an editorial.

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DURHAM and to include an editorial.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia in two instances and to include excerpts in each.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI and to include an address by Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY in Chicago yesterday.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and also to include extraneous material in his remarks today on the bill H. R. 7405.

Mr. DOYLE in three instances, in each instance to include appropriate material.

Mr. MILLER of California and to include a speech by the President of the United States before the National Civil Service League on Friday, May 2.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee and to include an address by the Honorable Robert Ramspeck.

Mr. MAGEE and to include a telegram.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an editorial.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado (at the request of Mr. GRANGER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RIEHLMAN and to include an essay.

Mr. ARENDS and to include an editorial.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include a newspaper article.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1258. An act to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Louie H. Emfinger; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1324. An act for the relief of Dr. Nicola M. Melucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1360. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of John J. Snoke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1363. An act for the relief of Ceasar J. (Raaum) Syqyia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Sister Stanislaus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1903. An act for the relief of Toshiko Minowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2043. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 2256. An act for the relief of Col. Julia O. Flikke and Col. Florence A. Blanchfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2324. An act to amend the law relating to the disposition of wages and effects of deceased seamen in order to require that such wages and effects must be delivered to a legal personal representative of the deceased only when they exceed $1,000 in value; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2334. An act for the relief of Miguel Narciso Ossorio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2379. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2498. An act for the relief of Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2546. An act to provide for attorneys' liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2561. An act for the relief of Susan Patricia Manchester; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2573. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Anson Pease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2605. An act to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2696. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2706. An act for the relief of Sister Julie Schuler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2729. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer, without reimbursement, to the Department of the Army the Birmingham General Hospital, Van Nuys, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 2731. An act to authorize the transfer of hospitals and related facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 2735. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2736. An act to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2805. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Kerr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2871. An act relating to the manner of appointment of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, the deputy recorders, and the employees of the Office of Recorder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 755. An act for the relief of Dr. Eleftheria Paidoussi;

H. R. 836. An act for the relief of Harumi China Cairns;

H. R. 1968. An act for the relief of Senta Ziegler;

H. R. 1969. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic;

H. R. 2355. An act for the relief of Nobuko Hiramoto;

H. R. 2608. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act;

H. R. 2676. An act for the relief of Andrijana Bradicic;

H. R. 3136. An act for the relief of May Quan Wong (also known as Quan Shee Wong);

H. R. 3271. An act for the relief of Toshiaki Shimada;

H. R. 3524. An act for the relief of Jan Yee Young;

H. R. 3598. An act for the relief of Lydia Daisy Jessie Greene;

H. R. 3830. An act to authorize the construction and equipment of geomagnetic station for the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 4220. An act for the relief of Hazel Fong Hee;

H. R. 4337. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions;

H. R. 4397. An act for the relief of Mingian Hammerlind;

H. R. 4535. An act for the relief of Nigel C. S. Salter-Mathieson;

H. R. 4764. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the participation of certain Provinces of the Dominion of Canada in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4772. An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Harris;

H. R. 4788. An act for the relief of Yoko Takeuchi;

H. R. 4911. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Maria Kuebler;

H. R. 5187. An act for the relief of Rodney Drew Lawrence;

H. R. 5437. An act for the relief of Motoko Sakurada;

H. R. 5590. An act for the relief of Marc Stefen Alexenko;

H. R. 5609. An act to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of poisons in the mails to persons or concerns having scientific use therefor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5922. An act for the relief of Karin Riccardo;

H. R. 5931. An act for the relief of Holly Prindle Goodman;

H. R. 5936. An act for the relief of Kunto Itoh;

H. R. 6012. An act for the relief of Gylda Raydel Wagner;

H. R. 6055. An act for the relief of Anne de Baillet-Latour;

H. R. 6088. An act for the relief of Hisako Suzuki;

H. R. 6101. An act to extend the provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, to the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 6172. An act for the relief of Manami Tago;

H. R. 6480. An act for the relief of Elaine Irving Hedley;

H. R. 6561. An act for the relief of Monika Waltraud Fecht; and

H. R. 6805. An act to increase the salary of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absense was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Missouri (at the request of Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), from April 10 to May 8, on account of official business for the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MACK of Illinois, for 10 days, on account of hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 6, 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:

1387. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of an investigation by the General Accounting Office of a series of questionable grain transactions in 1949 between Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, and Cargill, Inc. (reference to this report included in H. Doc. No. 674, 81st Cong.) to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1388. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, fiscal year 1953, in the amount of $9,000,000 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 450); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1389. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $5,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 451); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1390. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $716,536 and a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for 1952 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 452); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1391. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $320,000 for the judiciary (H. Doc. No. 453); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1392. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $190,000 and drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations for said fiscal year for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 454); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1393. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $11,570,000 for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 455); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1394. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $525,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 456); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1395. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to proceed with construction at stations of the Alaska Communications System"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1396. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 17 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (60 Stat. 801) (H. Doc. No. 457); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

1397. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1398. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the activities of the war risk and marine insurance for the quarter ending March 31, 1952, pursuant to section 1211 of Public Law 763, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1399. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 1, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination and survey of Blue Hill Harbor, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1400. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 6, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Queens Creek, Mathews County, Va., with a view to determining if improvement in the interest of navigation is advisable at this time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on November 20, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

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. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3438. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska," approved March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 80); without amendment (Rept. No. 1839). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 7496. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, providing for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to extend to June 30, 1957, the period for authorization for appropriations for carrying out the purposes of the act as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1840). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. BOSONE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 8. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction to determine their qualifications to manage their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government; with amendment (Rept. No. 1841). 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. BROOKS:

H. R. 7714. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amend-

ed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. D'EWART (by request):

H. R. 7715. A bill authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make available a loan to the Montana State Coordinator of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 7716. A bill to promote the national defense and protect the public welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7717. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7718. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7719. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 7720. A bill to extend national service life insurance benefits to certain members of the Armed Forces who died in combat with the Japanese forces prior to April 20, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. R 7721. A bill to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 7722. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 7723. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 7724. A bill to authorize the conversion of certain mortgage insurance under the National Housing Act to defense housing insurance thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7725. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to proceed with construction at stations of the Alaska Communication System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 7726. A bill to provide for national flood insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 7727. A bill to provide for the temporary free entry of certain impure dicalcium phosphate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the 7-day period beginning May 18, 1952, as Olympic Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 631. Resolution supporting a question of the privilege of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 632. Resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the 7-day period beginning May 18, 1952, as Olympic Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. Res. 633. Resolution to withhold funds for the construction of the quartermaster depot at Natick, Mass.; 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. AYRES:

H. R. 7728. A bill for the relief of Ciro Magliulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 7729. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Matook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 7730. A bill for the relief of Francoise Bresnahan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7731. A bill for the relief of George Mikroulis, his wife, Dora Mikroulis and his daughter, Madonna G. Mikroulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 7732. A bill for the relief of Debra Louise Turks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 7733. A bill for the relief of Edwardo Romua Arabe and Galicano Tadem Achacoso; 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:

710. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of Miss Viola E. Gillander of Palo Alto, Calif., and others in support of H. R. 2188; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

711. Also, petition of Bessie C. Scott, of Palo Alto, Calif., and others, urging the passage of H. R. 2188; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

712. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of residents of Cecil County, Md., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio and television, and in our magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

713. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Milwaukee, Wis., requesting favorable consideration to restore the necessary appropriations to the United States Department of Labor's budget so that the Consumers' Price Index will be continued for the city of Milwaukee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

714. Also, petition of Jennie I. Miller, and others, New Port Richey, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

715. Also, petition of the president, American Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors, Dallas, Tex., relative to stating their opposition to Senate bills 2325 and 2714 respectively; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

716. Also, petition of the grand master, Grand Masonic Lodge of Puerto Rico, relative to stating opposition to the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and requesting that Congress do not approve this measure; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 6, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou spirit of the living God, we thank Thee for our moments of prayer in the midst of days that are strange and strenuous, and at times so very dark and gloomy.

Thou knowest that always and everywhere we need Thee; in our struggles to sustain us; in our sorrows to comfort us; in our perplexities to guide us; in our trials and tribulations to keep us from yielding to discouragement and despair.

Inspire us to put our minds and hearts on the side of faith in Thee and in ourselves and in our fellow men, and may our souls be sensitive and responsive to the promptings and persuasions of Thy holy spirit.

Lead us in the ways of righteousness and justice and in the paths of good will and peace. Temper our minds with the spirit of forgiveness and forbearance, and may we seek one another's welfare.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

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

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

IMMIGRATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, at long last I have been able to ascertain what the real objection is to the immigration bill that passed the House by such an overwhelming vote a few days ago.

The Washington Post this morning finally lets me, and those of us who are interested in a good immigration bill, know what the objection to the bill is. Here it is:

Section 252 (b) of the Walter bill authorizes immigration officers to deport without a