

Bank of Washington. (Rept. No. 2284). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 6167. A bill to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 25 or more years; with amendment (Rept. No. 2285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6366. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the receipt in bond and tax payment at rectifying plants of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines for rectification, bottling, and packaging, or for bottling and packaging without rectification; and the production in bond and tax payment of gin and vodka at rectifying plants; with amendment (Rept. No. 2286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 704. Resolution for consideration of S. 241, an act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2287). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 705. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8122, a bill to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2288). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 706. Resolution for consideration of 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 2289). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 698. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct an investigation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; without amendment (Rept. No. 2290). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 707. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6544, a bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 2291). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 708. Resolution for consideration of S. 1203, an act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2292). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8315. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8316. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels

under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2294). 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. CROSSER:

H. R. 8347. A bill to expedite and facilitate the termination of railroad reorganization proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act by amending section 20 (b) (13) of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 8348. A bill to extend preference in public-housing occupancy and the benefits of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to certain widowed mothers of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 8349. A bill for the relief of John Demetrius Mbales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 8350. A bill for the relief of Karoline Mahr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 8351. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Daisy M. Soros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 8352. A bill for the relief of Stefan Jankielewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 8353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 8354. A bill for the relief of Eugene Albert Bally; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

769. Mr. HOEVEN presented a petition of the residents of Sioux City, Iowa, urging support of the President's veto of tidelands legislation and transfer of tidelands revenue to the Social Security Administration, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1952

(Legislative day of Saturday, June 21, 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, amid all the strident voices of this vast and varied world, save us from the supreme tragedy of missing Thy call. Rising above the violence and

turbulence of human strife and all the deafening prejudices of our embittered days we would be the hearers and doers of Thy word and of Thy will.

We come today solemnized by the agony and heroism of two long years on Korea's devastated soil where, in the name of the God of righteousness, the forces of freedom have faced and fought pagan hordes of ruthless regimentation. On this sobering anniversary day may our conceptions not be darkened by irrelevant issues. May we see clearly that that ravaged eastern peninsula has global significance as the battlefield of freedom, where liberty is at death grips with slavery plotting the domination of the world.

We would pause to honor our brave sons and those of other nations who have fallen on the barren wastes of that far land, and for the sorrowing families in the homeland. Standing in awe of the divine destiny of our Nation in the molding of a new world, may we here make a new covenant, sealed in the patriots' blood of the past and in the crimson sacrifice of today. Keeping steadfast the faith of true democracy and facing the principalities and powers of darkness, may we never doubt the ultimate fulfillment of the ancient prophecy to tyrants of old: "Your covenant with death shall be annulled, your agreement with hell shall not stand, your refuge of lies shall be swept away; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, you shall be trodden down by it. The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

We ask it in the name of that Holy One whose truth is marching on. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 24, 1952, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 24, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 216. An act to amend section 631b of title 5 United States Code, by adding a new subsection to be cited as subsection (c); and

S. 2552. An act to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2198) to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6854) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6007. An act to authorize the improvement of Humboldt Bay, Calif., as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 143, Eighty-second Congress, first session;

H. R. 6175. An act to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Port Mansfield Harbor in Texas and the channel connecting such harbor to the Gulf of Mexico for the purpose of determining action necessary to enable such harbor and channel to accommodate deep-draft navigation;

H. R. 6812. An act to provide that the existing project for a navigation channel on the Guadalupe River, Tex., be incorporated with and made a part of the project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway; and

H. R. 7855. An act for improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, N. Y.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KERR was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week and Monday of next week.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

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

#### NATIONAL CEMETERY FOR NEW ENGLAND—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the General Court of the State of Massachusetts, relating to the location of a national cemetery for the New England area in the State of Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution urging the establishment of a national cemetery for the New England area, to be located within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Whereas the Congress of the United States has provided for the establishment of national cemeteries, dedicated as final resting places for those who gave their lives in the service of their country; and

Whereas such honoring of our heroic dead is a constant reminder of, and an inspira-

tion to greater devotion to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of sacrifice; and

Whereas many national military cemeteries have been established, no one of which is located in New England; and

Whereas the burial in a national military cemetery of New England men and women who served in the Armed Forces of the United States entails considerable expense to their families: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary for the establishment of a national cemetery for the New England district, said cemetery to be located within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

#### GENOCIDE PRACTICES OF SOVIET RUSSIA—RESOLUTION OF ESTONIAN, LATVIAN, AND LITHUANIAN COUNCILS, BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, recently the Baltimore Council of the Lithuanian Society submitted to me a resolution relating to genocide practices of Soviet Russia. I present the resolution for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### PARKWAY ALONG CHESAPEAKE & OHIO CANAL—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF NATURAL RESOURCES OF MARYLAND

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, in any Federal programs intimately affecting the lives of people of any section, it is most desirable that the views of the citizens of such areas be given fullest consideration. For this reason I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Board of Natural Resources of Maryland, opposing the programs of the National Park Service with regard to construction of a Federal Parkway along the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, adjacent to the Potomac River.

The Board of Natural Resources is the coordinating group of the various official conservation groups of the State. It represents the State position in all such matters. The resolution, therefore, and the reasons therefor, deserve to be given thorough study on the Federal level in connection with the proposals mentioned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2720. A bill to approve contracts negotiated with the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district, the Goshen irrigation district, and the Pathfinder irrigation dis-

trict, and to authorize their execution; to authorize the execution of contracts with individual water-right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project and with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1809);

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. 1810); and

H. R. 3494. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Catholic Bishop of Northern Alaska for use as a mission; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1811).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1238. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Eileen Ida Sanders; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1812);

S. 2407. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to George Scott; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1813);

S. 2453. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Donald B. Billedeaux; without amendment (Rept. No. 1814);

S. 2810. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Winona Yellowtail; without amendment (Rept. No. 1815);

H. R. 6556. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1816); and

H. R. 7302. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1817).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 4407. A bill to amend sections 213 (b), 213 (c), and 215 of title II of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1818);

H. R. 4408. A bill to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1819);

H. R. 4797. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 291 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949, section 2 of Act 152 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, and section 2 of Act 171 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, which included Maul County Waterworks Board, Kauai County Waterworks Board, and the Board of Water Supply, County of Hawaii, under the definition of "municipality" in the issuance of revenue bonds pursuant to the Revenue Bond Act of 1935; without amendment (Rept. No. 1820);

H. R. 4799. A bill to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1821); and

H. R. 4800. A bill to further amend section 202 (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, relating to membership on the Hawaiian Homes Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 1822).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 107. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Papago Tribe, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1823).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. R. 7656. A bill to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1824).

**EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE ACTIVITIES OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE**

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I report an original resolution extending the authority to investigate the Commodity Credit Corporation activities, and I submit a report (No. 1808) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 338) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the authority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, investigating Commodity Credit Corporation activities, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 256, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 24, 1952, is hereby extended to August 31, 1952.

**BILLS INTRODUCED**

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

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 3385. A bill for the relief of Andrew D. Sumner; and

S. 3386. A bill for the relief of Norman F. George; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 3387. A bill for the relief of Frank B. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 3388. A bill to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; to make the Farm Credit Administration an independent establishment of the Federal Government; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself, Mr. NIXON, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 3389. A bill to direct the United States Tariff Commission and the Secretary of the Interior to make certain investigations with respect to the United States tuna industry; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 3390. A bill to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

S. 3391. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bentivegna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOODY:

S. 3392. A bill for the relief of Ruth Mangold; and

S. 3393. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Gasowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moody when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GEORGE (by request):

S. 3394. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3395. A bill for the relief of Wadh Bakhos Boula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1952**

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to be known as the Farm Credit Act of 1952. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a summary thereof, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3388) to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; to make the Farm Credit Administration an independent establishment of the Federal Government; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain officers; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. AIKEN), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,*

**TITLE**

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Farm Credit Act of 1952."

**DECLARATION OF POLICY**

SEC. 2. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress to encourage and facilitate increased borrower participation in the management, control, and ultimate ownership of the permanent system of agricultural credit made available through institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration, and the provisions of this act shall be construed in keeping with this policy.

**FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION**

SEC. 3. The Farm Credit Administration is hereby made an independent establishment of the Federal Government. There are hereby transferred to the Farm Credit Administration all functions, powers, and duties of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and all other officers therein, and of the Secretary of Agriculture with reference to the Farm Credit Administration.

**FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD**

SEC. 4. (a) There shall be established in the Farm Credit Administration, a Federal Farm Credit Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). Said Board shall consist of twelve members, one from each of the farm credit districts of the United States, to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, upon nominations made as follows: The district farm credit board of each such district shall by resolution spread upon its minutes, at least 60 days before an appointment is due to be made, nominate three persons, each of whom shall have had, in the judgment of the board, sufficient agricultural and financial experience to enable him to properly perform the duties of his office, and from the three persons so nominated in each district, one shall be appointed in the manner stated. Subse-

quent appointments shall be made upon like nominations and in like manner.

(b) Each member of said Board shall be a citizen of the United States and shall have been a resident of the farm credit district from which appointed for not less than 10 years next preceding his appointment, and the removal of residence from the district during his tenure shall operate as a termination of his membership on said Board; no member of said Board shall be eligible to serve for more than one full term of 6 years, and, in addition, a term of less than 6 years if he is one of the first members to be appointed or the unexpired portion of one term expiring before his appointment to a full term; and no person shall be eligible for appointment to membership on said Board if such person has within 1 year next preceding the commencement of the term been a member of a district farm credit board, a salaried officer or employee of the Farm Credit Administration or a salaried officer or employee of any corporation operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; and no person hereafter appointed as a member of said Board shall be eligible to continue to serve as a member of said Board, if such person is a member of any district farm credit board or an officer or employee of the Farm Credit Administration or an officer or employee of any corporation operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration.

(c) The term of office of the members of said Board shall be 6 years, beginning with the first day of the calendar month in which this act takes effect, and members shall serve until their successors are duly appointed and qualified; however, of the first members appointed hereunder, 2 shall be appointed for a term of 1 year from said date, 2 for a term of 2 years, 2 for a term of 3 years, 2 for a term of 4 years, 2 for a term of 5 years, and 2 for a term of 6 years. All vacancies on said Board shall be filled for the unexpired portion of the term upon like nominations and by like appointments as herein provided for the appointment of the first members of said Board.

(d) As soon as practicable after their appointment, the members of said Board shall meet, subscribe the oath of office, and organize by electing from their number a chairman and a vice chairman; and said Board shall appoint a secretary from within or without its membership as it may see fit. The chairman, vice chairman, and secretary shall each be elected for a term of 1 year and until their successors are elected and take office, and the Board shall elect such officers each year. The chairman shall preside at all meetings and the vice chairman shall preside in the absence or disability of the chairman. The Board may, in the absence of both the chairman and vice chairman, elect a member to act as chairman pro tempore. Seven members shall constitute a quorum of the Board for the transaction of business. The Board may function notwithstanding vacancies provided a quorum as herein established shall be present. The Board shall meet at such times and places as it may fix and determine, but shall hold at least four regularly scheduled meetings a year; and special meetings may be held on call of the chairman or any three members of the Board.

(e) Each member of the Board shall receive the sum of \$50 for each day or part thereof spent in the performance of his official duties, which compensation, however, shall not be paid for more than 75 days (or parts of days) in any calendar year; and in addition, shall be reimbursed for necessary travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of his official duties, without regard to other laws with respect to allowances which may be made on account of travel and subsistence expenses of officers and employed personnel of the United States.

(f) The Board shall adopt such rules as it may see fit for the transaction of its business, and shall keep permanent and complete records and minutes of its acts and proceedings.

#### GOVERNOR OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall appoint a Governor of the Farm Credit Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Governor") who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board, and who shall, subject to the general supervision and direction of the Board as to matters of a broad and general supervisory, advisory, or policy nature, and except as otherwise herein specifically provided, be responsible for the execution of this act, all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, and all acts creating the powers, functions, and duties of the Farm Credit Administration.

(b) The Board shall fix the compensation of the Governor: *Provided*, That the salary of the Governor shall not exceed \$20,000 a year, together with necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, or per diem allowance in lieu thereof within the limitations prescribed by law, while away from his official station upon official business.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Governor to comply with all orders and directions, which he receives from the Board; as to all third persons, all acts of the Governor shall conclusively be presumed to be in compliance with the orders and directions of the Board.

(d) The Governor shall appoint such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions, powers, and duties vested in the Farm Credit Administration. The Farm Credit Administration shall consist of the Board, the Governor, and such other personnel as are employed in carrying out the functions, powers, and duties vested in the Farm Credit Administration. All functions, powers, and duties of the Farm Credit Administration, except those herein conferred upon the Board, shall be exercised and performed by the Governor and may be exercised and performed by him through such officers and employees of the Farm Credit Administration as he shall designate.

(e) The term of office of the incumbent of the office of Governor of the Farm Credit Administration appointed before the effective date of this act and holding office on that date shall terminate on that date and said office shall thereby become vacant.

#### RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 6. It shall be the function and duty of the Board (1) to see that the policies fixed by the Board hereunder are carried out; (2) to exercise adequate budgetary control over the Farm Credit Administration; (3) to require such reports as it deems necessary from the Governor and from any of the officials or corporations under the control or supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; (4) to make an annual report to Congress, including therein any recommendations of amendments to the laws relative to Federal agricultural credit; and (5) to exercise general direction and supervision over the performance of all functions, powers, and duties vested in the Governor when relating in the judgment of the Board to matters of a broad and general supervisory, advisory, or policy nature. It shall function as a unit without delegating authority to individual members and shall not operate in an administrative capacity; and all administrative powers, functions, and duties of the Farm Credit Administration shall be exercised and performed by the Governor.

#### OFFICES ABOLISHED AND FUNDS TRANSFERRED

SEC. 7. (a) The offices of the Land Bank Commissioner, Production Credit Commissioner, Cooperative Bank Commissioner, and Intermediate Credit Commissioner are hereby abolished. The Governor shall designate

an officer or employee of the Farm Credit Administration to serve at the pleasure of the Governor as a member of the board of directors of the Central Bank for cooperatives, as chairman of said board of directors, and as executive officer of said bank, in lieu of the Cooperative Bank Commissioner. The Governor shall designate an officer or employee of the Farm Credit Administration to serve at the pleasure of the Governor as a member of the board of directors of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, in lieu of the Land Bank Commissioner. The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation and its functions and activities are hereby transferred to the Farm Credit Administration and shall be administered therein under the general direction and supervision thereof.

(b) Employees in the Department of Agriculture who are being utilized on the effective date of this act primarily for the performance of functions, powers, and duties heretofore or by this act vested in the Farm Credit Administration, shall be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Farm Credit Administration in those instances in which the Governor determines that they are qualified and necessary to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Farm Credit Administration.

(c) All assets, funds, contracts, property, and records used and employed in the execution of the functions, powers, and duties heretofore or by this act vested in the Farm Credit Administration are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Farm Credit Administration.

(d) So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available or to be made available for salaries, expenses, and all other administrative expenditures as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine for use in the execution of the functions heretofore or by this act vested in the Farm Credit Administration, shall be transferred to and vested in the Farm Credit Administration.

(e) All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds, other than those mentioned in subsection (d) of this section, available (including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952) for the Farm Credit Administration and/or for the Secretary of Agriculture on account of the functions and activities of Farm Credit Administration, shall be transferred to the Farm Credit Administration and shall remain available for the exercise of the functions and activities of the Farm Credit Administration.

#### DELEGATIONS TO DISTRICT INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 8. The Farm Credit Administration is authorized and empowered, by order or rules and regulations, to delegate to a Federal land bank such of the duties, powers, and authority of the Farm Credit Administration with respect to and over National Farm Loan Associations, their officers and employees, in the farm credit district wherein such Federal land bank is located, as may be determined to be in the interest of effective administration; and, in like manner, to delegate to a production credit corporation such of the duties, powers, and authority of the Farm Credit Administration with respect to and over production credit associations, their officers and employees, in the farm credit district wherein such production credit corporation is located, as may be determined to be in the interest of effective administration; and, in either case the duties, powers, and authority so delegated shall be performed and exercised under such conditions and requirements and upon such terms as the Farm Credit Administration may specify. Any Federal land bank or production credit corporation to which any such duties, powers, or authority may be delegated is hereby authorized and empowered to accept, per-

form, and exercise such duties, powers, and authority as may be so delegated to it.

#### DIVISION OF COOPERATIVE MARKETING TRANSFERRED

SEC. 9. There is hereby transferred from the Farm Credit Administration to the Agricultural Research Administration in the Department of Agriculture, as a bureau of such agency, the Division of Cooperative Marketing (by whatever name now called) authorized and created under and by virtue of an act of Congress of July 2, 1926 (Public, Numbered 450, Sixty-ninth Congress), entitled "an act to create a Division of Cooperative Marketing in the Department of Agriculture; to provide for the acquisition and dissemination of information pertaining to cooperation; to promote the knowledge of cooperative principles and practices; to provide for calling advisers to counsel with the Secretary of Agriculture on cooperative activities; to authorize cooperative associations to acquire, interpret, and disseminate crop and market information, and for other purposes", together with all functions pertaining to the work and services of such Division, its personnel, property (including office equipment), assets, funds, contracts, and records used and employed in the execution of its functions, powers, and duties, and so much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available or to be made available for salaries, expenses, and all other administrative expenditures as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine, for use in the execution of the functions, powers, and duties of said Division in said Department.

#### FRANCHISE TAX PROVISIONS

SEC. 10. Section 23 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, in the case of a Federal land bank having outstanding capital stock held by the United States during the whole or any part of a fiscal year, said bank shall, after complying with the reserve requirements of the preceding paragraphs of this section and before declaring any dividends to shareholders, pay to the United States a franchise tax equal to 25 percent of its net earnings then remaining, not to exceed, however, a rate of return on such Government capital equal to the average net interest cost of financing direct obligations of the United States during the fiscal year of the United States ending next before such tax is due (such rate to be determined by the Farm Credit Administration upon the basis of data obtainable from the Secretary of the Treasury)."

SEC. 11. Section 6 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(e) Each production credit corporation shall, at the end of each fiscal year (1) apply its earnings described in subsection (c) of this section in accordance with the provisions of subsections (c) and (d) of this section; and (2) apply its earnings from all other sources, first, to the payment of any operating expenses for the year remaining unpaid; second, to restore losses and impairment of capital, if any, of the corporation; third, to the creation and maintenance of a surplus equal to 25 percent of the paid-in capital of the corporation; fourth, to the payment of 25 percent of its earnings from all sources then remaining to the United States as a franchise tax, and fifth, to the payment of the remaining earnings into its surplus account."

SEC. 12. Section 36 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"The Central Bank for Cooperatives shall, at the end of its fiscal year, apply the amount of its earnings in excess of operating expenses during such fiscal year:

First, to making up any losses incurred; second, to the restoration of the amount of the impairment, if any, of capital and guaranty fund as determined by the chairman of the board; third, 25 percent of the remainder of such excess of earnings shall be applied to the creation and maintenance of a surplus equal to at least 25 percent of the amount of the capital and guaranty fund; fourth, if said bank shall have outstanding capital stock held by the United States during the whole or any part of the fiscal year, it shall next pay to the United States as a franchise tax, a sum equal to 25 percent of its net earnings then remaining, not exceeding, however, a rate of return on such Government capital equal to the average net interest cost of financing direct obligations of the United States during the fiscal year of the United States ending next before such tax is due (such rate to be determined by the Farm Credit Administration upon the basis of data obtainable from the Secretary of the Treasury); and fifth, any sums remaining shall be carried into its surplus account or devoted to the payment of dividends, as may be determined by the chairman of the board. Subscribers to the guaranty fund shall be entitled to dividends in the same amounts as the subscribers to the stock. No rate of dividend in excess of 7 percent per annum shall be paid. Dividends on stock held by the Farm Credit Administration or the Governor thereof, when paid, shall be credited to the revolving fund created under section 6 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended."

SEC. 13. Section 42 of the Farm Credit Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"The provisions of section 35, as amended, and the provisions of section 36, as amended, shall apply in the case of banks for cooperatives in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions are applicable to the Central Bank for Cooperatives, except that powers conferred on the chairman of the Board of the Central Bank for Cooperatives shall be exercised by the boards of directors of the banks for cooperatives, subject to the approval of the Farm Credit Administration."

#### MEMBERSHIP OF DISTRICT FARM CREDIT BOARDS

SEC. 14. Section 5 (b) of the Farm Credit Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) There shall be in each farm credit district a farm credit board which shall be selected as hereinafter specified and shall be composed of seven members. Each farm credit board shall include in its title the name of the city in which the Federal land bank, Federal intermediate credit bank, production credit corporation, and regional bank for cooperatives of the district are located. Three of the seven members of said board shall be known as elected directors, of whom one shall be chosen by national farm loan associations and borrowers through agencies of the district, one shall be chosen by production credit associations of the district and one shall be chosen by cooperatives which are stockholders or subscribers to the guaranty fund of the regional bank for cooperatives in the district. Subject to the other provisions hereof, three of the seven members shall be known as district directors and shall be appointed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration by and with the advice and consent of the Federal Farm Credit Board. The seventh member of such board shall be known as director-at-large and shall be appointed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration by and with the advice and consent of the Federal Farm Credit Board. Each farm credit board shall elect from its members a chairman and vice chairman, and shall appoint a secretary from within or without its membership as it may see fit. The chairman, vice chairman, and secretary shall each be elected for a term of 1 year and until their successors are

elected and take office and the board shall elect such officers each year. The chairman shall preside at all meetings and the vice chairman shall preside in the absence or disability of the chairman. The board may, in the absence of both the chairman and vice chairman, elect a member to act as chairman pro tempore."

SEC. 15. Section 5 of the Farm Credit Act of 1937 is amended by striking out the entire text of subdivision (d) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) (1) The member of the farm credit board of each farm credit district known as the 'third district director' who is in office on the effective date of this act, shall serve as such until his term of office expires. Thereafter, there shall be no member of the district farm credit board to be known as the 'third district director'.

"(2) Notwithstanding the above provision with respect to the appointment of district directors, one additional member of said board shall be elected by each of the groups aforesaid (national farm loan associations and borrowers through agencies, production credit associations, and cooperatives which are stockholders or subscribers to the guaranty fund of the regional bank for cooperatives of the district), and serve in lieu of a district director, under the following circumstances and conditions:

"(A) Whenever, as determined by the Farm Credit Administration, the sum of the capital stock held by national farm loan associations and borrowers through agencies, surplus, and reserves of a Federal land bank shall equal or exceed 66 $\frac{2}{3}$  percent of the total of the capital stock, surplus, and reserves of such bank as of the date 3 months before the expiration of the term of office of the district director (or third district director) whose term next expires, the successor to such director shall be elected by the national farm loan associations and borrowers through agencies of the district in the manner herein provided, shall be known as an elected director, and successors to that office shall be so elected and known from term to term while such conditions obtain: *Provided*, That if and when, as determined by the Farm Credit Administration, such conditions do not obtain as of the date 3 months before the expiration of the term of office of any director so elected under the provisions of this subparagraph, the successor to such director shall be appointed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration by and with the advice and consent of the Federal Farm Credit Board, shall be known as a district director, and successors to that office shall be so appointed and known from term to term for such terms as appointment is not precluded by the election of an additional director by one of the groups aforesaid as herein provided: *And provided further*, That such national farm loan associations and borrowers through agencies shall again, and from time to time, elect one additional director as aforesaid if and when the required conditions named in this subparagraph shall be determined to obtain as aforesaid.

"(B) Whenever, as determined by the Farm Credit Administration, the sum of the capital stock held by persons other than the production credit corporation of the district, surplus and reserves of the production credit associations (collectively) of a farm credit district shall equal or exceed 66 $\frac{2}{3}$  percent of the total of the capital stock, surplus, and reserves of the production credit associations (collectively) of said district as of the date 3 months before the expiration of the term of office of the district director (or third district director) whose term next expires, the successor to such director shall be elected by the production credit associations of the district in the manner herein provided, shall be known as an elected director, and successors to that office shall be so elected and known from

term to term while such conditions obtain: *Provided*, That if and when, as determined by the Farm Credit Administration, such conditions do not obtain as of the date 3 months before the expiration of the term of office of any director so elected under the provisions of this subparagraph, the successor to such director shall be appointed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration by and with the advice and consent of the Federal Farm Credit Board, shall be known as a district director, and successors to that office shall be so appointed and known from term to term for such terms as appointed is not precluded by the election of an additional director by one of the groups aforesaid as herein provided: *And provided further*, That such production credit associations shall again and from time to time elect one additional director as aforesaid, if and when the required conditions named in this subparagraph shall be determined to obtain as aforesaid.

"(C) Whenever, as determined by the Farm Credit Administration, the sum of the capital stock and subscriptions to the guaranty fund held by cooperatives which are stockholders or subscribers to the guaranty fund of a regional bank for cooperatives, surplus and reserves of said bank shall equal or exceed 66 $\frac{2}{3}$  percent of the total capital stock, subscriptions to the guaranty fund, surplus and reserves of said bank as of the date 3 months before the expiration of the term of office of the district director (or third district director) whose term next expires, the successor to such director shall be elected by the cooperatives which are stockholders or subscribers to the guaranty fund of said bank in the manner herein provided, shall be known as an elected director, and successors to that office shall be so elected and known from term to term while such conditions obtain: *Provided*, That if and when, as determined by the Farm Credit Administration, such conditions do not obtain as of the date 3 months before the expiration of the term of office of any director so elected under the provisions of this subparagraph, the successor to such director shall be appointed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration by and with the advice and consent of the Federal Farm Credit Board, shall be known as a district director, and successors to that office shall be so appointed and known from term to term for such terms as appointment is not precluded by the election of an additional director by one of the groups aforesaid as herein provided: *And provided further*, That such cooperatives which are stockholders or subscribers to the guaranty fund of said bank shall again and from time to time elect one additional director as aforesaid if and when the required conditions named in this subparagraph shall be determined to obtain as aforesaid: *Provided*, That at no time and under no conditions shall there be in office less than one or more than two members of said board who are serving by election of any one of the groups aforesaid (national farm loan associations and borrowers through agencies, production credit associations, and cooperatives which are stockholders or subscribers to the guaranty fund of the regional bank for cooperatives of the district): *And provided further*, That if two or more of said groups shall, under the terms and provisions hereof, become qualified to elect an additional director pending the expiration of the term of office of the district director (or third district director) whose term next expires, preference shall be given, first to national farm loan associations and borrowers through agencies, next to production credit associations, and next to cooperatives which are stockholders or subscribers to the guaranty fund of the regional bank for cooperatives, to elect an additional director as herein provided as the terms of office of district directors, including the third district director if he be still in office, expire."

SEC. 16. (a) Any other provisions of law to the contrary notwithstanding, after the effective date of this act any production credit association may, with the approval of the President of the Production Credit Corporation and of the Farm Credit Administration, issue nonvoting preferred stock, to be known as class C stock, which may be purchased and held by production credit corporations and by investors: *Provided*, That the issuance of such stock shall be authorized by vote of not less than two-thirds of the outstanding shares of class A stock (other than shares held by the Production Credit Corporation) and two-thirds of the outstanding shares of class B stock of the association; and for this purpose holders of class A stock (other than the Production Credit Corporation) and holders of class B stock shall be entitled to one vote for each share of stock held by them.

(b) Such class C stock of such associations shall be divided into shares of \$5 each. The resolution of the stockholders authorizing the issuance of class C stock and every certificate of class C stock issued shall state and express the privileges, restrictions, limitations and qualifications affecting said stock, and the total amount of the authorized issue to which it belongs.

(c) Such class C stock may (1) be made subject to redemption in such manner, at such time or times, and at such price or prices; (2) be given such preferences as to net assets upon dissolution of the corporation, whether voluntary or involuntary; (3) be given the right to receive such cumulative or noncumulative dividends payable quarterly, semiannually, or annually, and payable as a whole or in part before any dividend shall be set apart for or paid on class A and class B stock; and (4) be made subject to such other restrictions, limitations, and qualifications; as shall be stated and expressed in the resolution of the stockholders authorizing the issuance thereof and in the face of the stock certificates.

#### APPROPRIATIONS AND EXPENDITURES

SEC. 17. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or appropriate for administering the provisions of this act.

(b) Farm Credit Administration may, within the limits of funds available therefor, make necessary expenditures for personnel services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, newspapers, expenses of attendance at meetings and conferences; purchase, operation, and maintenance, at the seat of government and elsewhere, of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and other vehicles; printing and binding; and for such other facilities and services as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper administration of this act.

SEC. 18. This act shall take effect 90 days after the date of its enactment: *Provided, however*, That the members of the Federal Farm Credit Board shall be appointed sufficiently in advance of the effective date of this act to enable said Board to prepare to enter upon the discharge of its duties upon the effective date of this act; and after the effective date of this act, the compensation and expenses of the Board members shall be paid, as provided herein, from the date on which their appointments became effective, out of any funds available for the payment of administrative expenses of the Farm Credit Administration.

SEC. 19. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

SEC. 20. (a) If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder

of the act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(b) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

#### The summary is as follows:

##### PROPOSED FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1952

##### DECLARATION OF POLICY

It is declared to be the policy of the Congress to encourage and facilitate increased borrower participation in the management control and ultimate ownership of the permanent system of agricultural credit made available through institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration. The provisions of the act are required to be construed in keeping with this policy.

##### AT NATIONAL LEVEL

1. Farm Credit Administration: The FCA, as supervising agency, will be established as an independent agency of Government.

2. Federal Farm Credit Board: A 12-man bipartisan board, one member from each farm credit district, is established to exercise direction, supervision, and control of the Farm Credit Administration.

(a) Appointment, etc.: Each district farm credit board will nominate three persons, from which the President will appoint one, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The term of office will be 6 years and appointments will be made on staggered terms so that the terms of two members will expire each year. The Board will name its own chairman, vice chairman, and secretary; will hold at least four scheduled meetings a year, and as many special meetings as are needed; seven members will constitute a quorum; the members will be paid \$50 per day plus expenses for time devoted to their duties; and the Board will keep minutes and records which will be public.

(b) Duties and functions: The Board will employ the Governor and fix his compensation (not to exceed \$20,000 a year, plus expenses) and the Governor will serve at the pleasure of the Board; exercise direction and supervision of all affairs of FCA; see that the declared policies of the Congress are carried out; and make an annual report to Congress, including any recommendations as to farm credit legislation.

3. Offices consolidated: The offices of the Land Bank Commissioner, Production Credit Commissioner, Cooperative Bank Commissioner, and Intermediate Credit Commissioner are abolished and their functions are vested in the Farm Credit Administration.

4. Delegation of authority: The Governor is authorized to delegate to a Federal land bank such of his supervisory authority over National Farm Loan Associations of the district as he may see fit, and to a Production Credit Corporation, such of his supervisory authority over the production credit associations of the district as he may see fit.

5. Board supervision: All functions of the Farm Credit Administration, and of the Governor as its chief administrative officer, are, however, expressly placed under the direction, supervision, and control of the Board.

6. Functions transferred: All functions of the Cooperative Research and Service Division of FCA which arise under the act of July 2, 1926, establishing a "Division of Cooperative Marketing" are transferred to the Agricultural Research Administration in the Department of Agriculture. Ample statutory authority remains for such research functions as are actually needed in connection with the operations of FCA.

##### AT DISTRICT LEVEL

1. District Farm Credit Board: The Board remains seven in number and there follows a comparison of the present method of election or appointment with the method provided in the bill.

(a) Present method: At present the Board is constituted as follows:

One elected by national farm loan associations.

One elected by production credit associations.

One elected by cooperative borrowers.

One appointed by the Governor from three nominations made by National Farm Loan Associations and known as third district directors.

Two appointed by the Governor and known as district directors.

One appointed by the Governor and known as director at large.

(b) New method: The bill provides for this to be changed to the following:

One elected by national farm loan associations.

One elected by production credit associations.

One elected by cooperative borrowers.

Three appointed by the Governor with the approval of the Federal Farm Credit Board and known as district directors (see below).

One appointed by the Governor with the approval of the Federal Farm Credit Board and known as director at large.

*Provided, however—*

(1) When, and as long as, the sum of the capital stock held by NFLA's surplus and reserves of a Federal land bank equals or exceeds 66% percent of the total capital stock, surplus, and reserves of the bank, the NFLA's of the district will elect one additional director, who will serve in lieu of a district director. This condition now obtains in all 12 districts, hence immediately upon passage of the bill, NFLA's in the several districts will elect one additional director when there is a vacancy in the office of a district director (or third district director). If the time should come when these conditions did not obtain in a district, the NFLA's would lose the privilege of electing the additional director, and he would be appointed by the Governor with the approval of the Board, until such time as the associations again qualified to elect him.

(2) When, and as long as, the capital stock privately owned, surplus and reserves of production credit associations (collectively) of a district equal or exceed 66% percent of the total capital stock, surplus and reserves of the production credit associations (collectively) of the district, the FCA's may elect one additional director to serve in lieu of a district director, in like manner and with like provisions as stated above.

(3) When and as long as, the capital stock and subscriptions to the guaranty fund held by cooperatives in a regional bank for cooperatives, surplus and reserves of said bank, equal or exceed 66% percent of the total capital stock, subscriptions to the guaranty fund, surplus and reserves of the bank, the cooperatives which are borrowers may elect one additional director to serve in lieu of a district director, and with like provisions as stated above.

2. Assessment of expense: Under existing law, the Farm Credit Administration assesses the district and local institutions with the cost of examinations and administrative supervision. Under the present bill, it will also assess the district institutions with the cost to the United States of contributions to the civil-service retirement and disability fund and to the Federal employees compensation fund, arising in connection with personnel of the central office on account of examinations and administrative supervision of the district and local institutions. Thus, the Government will be reimbursed for all expense of the examination service and the administrative supervision of the district and local institutions.

3. Franchise taxes: In order to afford the United States a return upon capital invested

in the district institutions, provisions are made for the payment of franchise taxes as follows:

(a) Any Federal land bank or regional bank for cooperatives in which the United States holds capital stock is required, after meeting reserve requirements, to pay to the United States a franchise tax equal to 25 percent of net earnings remaining, not to exceed, however, a rate of return on the Government capital equal to the net interest cost on United States Treasury financing of direct obligations of the United States during the preceding fiscal year.

(b) Production credit corporations, in which the United States owns all the capital stock, are required, after meeting reserve requirements, to pay 25 percent of net earnings to the United States as a franchise tax. This is without the alternative with respect to a rate of return equal to net interest cost, etc., as stated above, since the corporations are wholly owned by the United States. It is the same franchise tax basis as that fixed for Federal intermediate credit banks by existing law.

#### TADEUSZ GASOWSKI

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Tadeusz Gasowski.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement regarding his record, which was written by John J. Najdych, one of the best newspapermen in my home city of Detroit, Mich., be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3393) for the relief of Tadeusz Gasowski, introduced by Mr. Moody, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. Moody is as follows:

STATEMENT BY JOHN J. NAJDYCH, REPORTER, STAFF OF THE DETROIT NEWS

Tadeusz Gasowski was a Polish soldier when the Nazis invaded Poland in September 1939. When the Red armies joined in the attack from the rear, he, like much of the Polish Army, had to escape the trap through Rumania.

He worked his way to France, where he enlisted in the newly formed Polish Army and fought against the Germans until he was forced into the sea. Saved, he enlisted in the Polish Navy and was attached to the British fleet.

General Sikorski, general of the Polish armies, selected him for several special missions of vast importance to the Allies.

When the war ended in 1945 he found himself without a country, since the British were trying to force the Poles to return to Poland, although he was one of those marked for death by the Red-dominated Polish Government.

He sought a visa to the United States, but after delays of more than a year he could wait no longer. He took a ship to Brazil and thence to Argentina. When he could not find a job there he secured a position on a Swedish ship. He was discharged with most of the crew in Boston, and there he stayed.

This was in 1948. It was illegal entry, of course, and now he faces deportation.

His case came to light when he tried to enlist in the United States Army at the beginning of the Korean war. He held a good job, but he believed he owed this country a responsibility.

He still holds a good job, is well liked by the people who know him, and would make a good addition to this country.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CASE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO EXEMPTION FROM TAXES OF CERTAIN RECREATION FACILITIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a noncontroversial amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 5734) to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein. The amendment is identical to House bill 6583, introduced by Representative NOBLE GREGORY.

The purpose of the amendment is to extend a deadline for the application for renegotiation rebates.

There is no objection on the part of any of the Government agencies, the General Services Administration, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, or the Bureau of the Budget, which I have contacted, thus far on this issue.

The amendment in effect merely provides for the protection of the rights of companies which have not filed for such rebate because the previous provision for deadline extension in their behalf was offered as a relatively obscure amendment to the Income Tax Law of 1951 and the deadline was reached but a short time after the law was enacted.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

It is my earnest hope that the Senate Finance Committee will adopt the amendment to H. R. 5734, when the bill comes over from the House side, and that it will clear both Chambers well in time prior to the recess.

There being no objection, the amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. Subsection (a) (4) (D) of the Renegotiation Act, as amended by section 201

(c) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 and by section 617 of the Revenue Act of 1951, is hereby amended by striking out 'October 31, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1952.'"

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 6007. An act to authorize the improvement of Humboldt Bay, Calif., as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 143, Eighty-second Congress, first session;

H. R. 6175. An act to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Port Mansfield Harbor in Texas and the channel connecting such harbor to the Gulf of Mexico for the purpose of determining action necessary to enable such harbor and channel to accommodate deep-draft navigation;

H. R. 6812. An act to provide that the existing project for a navigation channel on the Guadalupe River, Tex., be incorporated with and made a part of the project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway; and

H. R. 7855. An act for improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, N. Y.

#### REPUBLIC OF INDIA—CORRECTION AND REPRINTING OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on June 5, along with several other Members of the Senate, I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 82, relating to our relations with the Republic of India. On June 6, the following day, I made two corrections in that resolution. I understand that a number of requests are being made for copies of the resolution but that the only ones that have been printed are the uncorrected versions. I ask unanimous consent that permission be given to print the resolution in its corrected form.

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

#### PRINTING OF COMPARISON OF POTENTIAL VOTERS AND ACTUAL VOTES CAST BY COUNTIES IN EACH STATE—(S. DOC. NO. 150)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, 45,000,000 eligible voters did not choose to vote in 1948—48 percent of the potential vote of the country. This was the lowest percentage of participation in many years—52 percent.

Apathy and indifference on the part of the voters can destroy representative government. A stimulated and aroused electorate can do much to preserve this Republic. Thousands of our leading citizens are disturbed by the decreasing percentage of participation in our elections.

The response to a tabulation of figures which I placed in the RECORD of April 8, 1948, showing a comparison of potential voters and actual votes cast in 1944 and 1948 for each State resulted in requests that required the subsequent printing of 100,000 copies to supply the demands.

The American Press, a monthly magazine for home-town newspapers, conducted a get-out-the-vote contest in 1950 which was based on giving awards to those weekly, semiweekly, and tri-weekly newspapers which, in the opinion of competent judges, did most to stimulate voting in their communities on November 7, 1950. This magazine used the tabulation referred to above to show the voting situation in 1944 and 1948.

This contest elicited much praise from governors, Senators, Congressmen, business and labor leaders, and I ask to have included at the conclusion of these remarks that portion of the article appearing on pages 14, 15, and 34 of the September issue—1950—which contains the statements of many of these leaders.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the excerpts may be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BREWSTER. I may interpolate that one of the statements is by the present Governor of Maine, who demonstrated the wisdom of this stimulated vote, because while I received more votes than any Republican ever received before in a primary, he received a few more. That was the result of a get-out-the-vote campaign. I feel rather like a Daniel Come To Judgment in urging that we proceed along this line to continue to get out the vote.

With almost every State political organization functioning as a county unit numerous requests were received asking for a similar comparison for their respective counties. Mr. L. W. Jeffery, who prepared the table on comparison of 1944 and 1948 votes, replied to these requests as far as possible. As a result of this interest—requests are still being received—and because of his keen interest in the subject, Mr. Jeffery has begun preparation of figures showing for each county in every State the potential voters as shown in the 1950 census and the vote cast for President in 1948 and the votes cast for Senator or governor whichever was the greater in 1950. Where no senatorial or governor contest was held the figures used are the total votes cast for all Members of Congress in the respective counties.

It has been impossible for Mr. Jeffery to complete this work because the figures are not all yet available from the Census Bureau. It has been my intention when completed to ask permission to have this tabulation printed as a Senate document. Owing to the fact that Congress anticipates an adjournment before this work can be completed I respectfully request that permission be granted to have a Senate document printed containing this information, after adjournment and at such time as all the figures are available.

I believe that with the cooperation of the printing clerk that this can be accomplished in time to be of great service to all those service clubs and other civic organizations that are now awake to this peril to our Republic.

I think Mr. L. W. Jeffery is to be highly commended for the great amount of time and effort he has put into making this compilation.

I can think of no greater service that this body can render to the citizens of this Nation than to make available to their elected officials, to political leaders regardless of party, to civic and business organizations, all possible material which will be helpful in their fight against the apathy and indifference which has been developing among the electorate.

I have before me a "mockup" of the proposed publication. I have discussed it with Mr. Ives, the printing clerk of the Senate, who feels that the work can be readily done within the 50-page limit, which is the limitation with respect to Senate documents without further reference.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Maine has spoken to me about the proposed printing. I think this is a highly important document, and that it ought to be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter referred to will be printed as a Senate document.

#### EXHIBIT 1

##### GOVERNORS, CONGRESSMEN, BUSINESS, LABOR LEADERS PRAISE GET-OUT-THE-VOTE PLAN

Expressing the conviction that democracy can be greatly strengthened if weekly newspaper editors throughout the Nation will enter the American press' Get-out-the-vote contest, and thereby compete to see who can do the most to stimulate voting, letters praising the program have been pouring in from leaders of government and business.

Deeply concerned over the drastic decline in voting in recent years, State governors, Congressmen, and other public figures have stressed the vital importance of voting and the part that weekly newspapers can play in getting people to vote.

Bernard M. Baruch, known as the adviser to Presidents, summarized the opinion of many when he wrote:

"The man or woman who does not vote, does not deserve to be a citizen."

The get-out-the-vote contest, described in detail elsewhere in this issue, is based on giving awards to those weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers which, in the opinions of competent judges, do the most between now and November 7 to stimulate voting in their communities.

Excerpts from some of the many letters received by the American press regarding the contest follow:

##### COMMENTS FROM STATE GOVERNORS

Governor James E. Folsom, of Alabama: "I am especially pleased to learn of your efforts in behalf of a get-out-the-vote contest. During recent months in Alabama, we have carried on an extensive similar campaign. Efforts were exerted to get people to register before the deadline, and then focus was put upon a get-out-to-vote plan. Always the drive was to increase the number of the electorate. I believe that is good democracy. That is why I am so glad to hear of your plans to get local newspaper editors to join you in a broad national scheme designed to arouse interest in our people in the democracy of voting. I trust that you will enjoy bountiful success."

Gov. Sid McGrath, of Arkansas: "I wish you every success in your worth-while endeavor. The keystone in the arch of democracy is the right of the people to express their choice by secret ballot. The greatest enemy of a free people is the lack of interest in decisions which vitally affect them. Citizens of the recently liberated countries of

the world who know first-hand the effect of disfranchisement welcome the return of the ballot by almost 100-percent participation in elections. Their example should teach us to exercise this precious right—or face the consequences."

Gov. Earl Warren, of California: "I wish there was some way in which we might fill the mind of every Californian with an understanding of the sacredness of the right which he is able to exercise with such ease. Men have fought and died for that right and there are places in the world today where men will still have to fight and die to restore that which has been lost to them through lack of vigilance. The privilege of voting is a privilege nourished by use. It is entrusted to the individual alone, to cherish and to exercise. Its importance transcends the ambitions of any and all candidates."

Gov. Walter W. Johnson, of Colorado: "My compliments and congratulations to the American Press for the contest you are sponsoring. To me there is nothing more important in the political life of our country than to see that every individual who has the right should cast his or her ballot."

Gov. Herman E. Talmadge, of Georgia: "The most far-reaching issues ever before the American people are being decided by local, State, and National elections throughout the country. It is incumbent upon all good Americans to make their feelings felt in going to the polls and voting their convictions on election day. Blood has been spilled everywhere for this right. By exercising it, we can keep it—by treating it lightly, we will lose it."

Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois: "I applaud most heartily the effort which you are making to stimulate renewed interest in this most basic cornerstone of our political system. And I also know of no group which can do more to quicken this interest than the weekly newspapers of America. They are now—they always have been—on the firing line of democracy in action. The comfortable knowledge that the vote exists seems to cause too many of us fellow citizens to ignore the occasions for its actual exercise. Such indifference is not only dangerous to the continued strength and vigor of the political principle of self-government but, in the context of our time, it is a breach of faith with those who are defending that principle in a remote corner of the earth."

Gov. Frederick G. Payne, of Maine: "The American Press is to be commended very highly for this splendid contribution to furthering good government. It is my belief that through the concerted efforts of all our civic organizations, in conjunction with programs sponsored by our radios and newspapers, that the American people will realize the importance of doing something about voters' apathy, which has been very evident in recent elections. We must all make use of this right to insure the future of our country."

Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan: "In a democracy like ours it is the duty of every citizen to exercise his right to vote. The low percentage of eligible voters who turn out to express their wishes at the polls has long been a matter of national concern. Any effort to impress our citizens with the fact that it is not only their right but their responsibility to vote on election day meets with my hearty approval."

Gov. Luther W. Youngdahl, of Minnesota: "I am pleased to note the plans of the American Press for a get-out-the-vote contest. The weekly newspaper editors of the Nation will contribute a high public service by joining in this important educational campaign to impress each American voter with the fact that he does a disservice to his country and to himself by his failure to vote. In these crucial days when democracy is endangered by an ideology that holds the right of free elections in contempt, it is tragic to find the great percentages of

qualified American voters who fail to exercise their franchise at the polls. This apathy, indifference, and neglect can undermine our heritage of 'government by the people' unless we take steps to overcome it."

Gov. John W. Bonner, of Montana: "I do feel that efforts along these and similar lines could and should be used on an extensive basis throughout the Nation to stimulate and encourage our citizens to go to the polls. Surely, the weekly newspaper editors of the country whose periodicals offer complete coverage of our rural areas could certainly do a splendid job of aiding in this work. Let me congratulate the American press for sponsoring this project."

Gov. Edward J. Reichart, of New Hampshire: "I think the idea is a fine one and hope that some tangible results can be achieved through this program."

Gov. Thomas J. Mabry, of New Mexico: "I want to congratulate your organization on the plan to award plaques to newspapers for distinguished achievement in getting out the vote. I believe this is a very worthwhile movement and will be productive of beneficial results. Public officials have, in many cases, been elected by a minority of the eligible voters. This is a condition that the people, for their own protection, should not allow to continue."

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York: "Failure to perform your duty to register and vote causes your right to vote to become weaker. Power residing in the people tends to wither away by so much as they do not use that power. Someone will always exercise the power of government. In America that power must forever rest with the people. But it will be kept in the people only if they use it."

Gov. Frank J. Lausche, of Ohio: "Admittedly, the American citizen has been indifferent to his great privilege to participate in the formulation of governmental policies and the selection of public officials. Any course taken that will bring a greater number of people to the ballot box is a contribution to the stability and security of our country."

Gov. J. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina: "We, Americans, cannot expect to withstand the onslaughts against our democracy from without, if we allow our own indifference to weaken it from within. Lack of interest in public affairs is far more dangerous to democracy than communism or any other 'ism.' It is encouraging, therefore, to learn that the American Press is sponsoring a contest among home-town newspapers to get out the vote in future elections. All Americans should wish you success."

Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, of Washington: "My sincere commendation to you and your associates on the national get-out-the-vote contest being sponsored by the American press. It has probably never been more important in our national history that every American citizen go to the polls. Every American owes it to his country and to himself to study all the issues on the ballot, to inform himself about the candidates and the programs they espouse, and then to cast an informed, conscientious vote. I hope your contest will be most successful."

Gov. Oscar Rennebohm, of Wisconsin: "I am happy to learn of your project to stimulate a greater interest in civic affairs in this country. It is my opinion that the weekly newspaper editors of the United States can be a great force in improving our democracy if they will take an active interest in stimulating their readers to vote and participate in public affairs."

#### COMMENTS OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota: "You have a wonderful idea and I am 100 percent for it. The lack of interest shown by the voters in some regions certainly calls for some remedial action and I believe you have started a very good plan to familiarize

the people with the importance of this great American privilege."

Senator LESTER C. HUNT, of Wyoming: The get-out-the-vote contest by the American press is a commendable effort to bring to the people their most important responsibility in our Government, that of voting. Constructive criticisms and suggestions by our people are a guide to Government activities, but no force of public opinion is greater than that expressed at the polls."

Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan: "I think this is a very fine undertaking on your part and I am sure it will prove exceedingly helpful in stimulating the interest of the American voters in this coming campaign. It is a fine public service you are rendering and I want to congratulate you on it."

Senator ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey: "I want to commend you for giving this very important matter your personal attention as I am of the firm conviction that the apathy of our citizens in regard to elections is, to say the least, unpatriotic. Active participation in elections at all levels is a solemn duty and responsibility which must be assumed and discharged by all who believe in the ideals and principles of representative government."

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts: "I believe the 'get-out-the-vote' contest currently being sponsored by the American Press deserves the highest praise and the participation of every newspaper and newspaper publisher sincerely concerned with our national political health and future. Nothing is more important in the effective functioning of a democracy than the maximum participation of those of our citizens eligible to vote. Let me stress especially, as a most important practical matter, the necessity of registration. Unless every citizen registers first, it is impossible for him or her to vote. Registration is the necessary first step in the casting of the ballot. I hope the American Press will receive an overwhelming response to its invitation to the Nation's press to participate in this 'get-out-the-vote' contest. I hope, too, that it will be the forerunner of a new awakening of our people to the deep significance of our birthright of the ballot."

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio: "I think any project which would stimulate the people to vote would be very helpful, and I am convinced that unless the people take an interest in their Government, they will lose control of it. With best wishes."

Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah: "When one realizes how long men have fought for the right to vote, one can hardly believe that those who have the right fail to embrace it. I am sure that it is just the thoughtless in America who do not vote."

Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont: "The contest which you are sponsoring for getting out the vote does credit to your patriotism as well as your enterprise. There is nothing more important in carrying out the responsibilities of citizenship than the simple act of going to the polls on election day. I have been told that the citizen in Belgium is subject to a fine if he doesn't cast his vote. We do not have that provision here. There should be a sufficient sense of conscience in this matter so that the appeal of the papers you represent will be effective in bringing out a high percentage of the American electorate of all parties."

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama: "This is an excellent public service on your part and I want to commend you for it. The privilege of voting is one for which most Americans would fight if necessary. Yet, when time comes to exercise that privilege, far too many qualified American citizens fail to use it. This neglect of one of the strongest bulwarks of American democracy is a constant threat to stable government and to the Nation itself."

Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington: "This is a most worthy effort. The system of government in which Americans take such pride actually is as good as they make it through their own interest and participation. We prove that interest by going to the polls. The free ballot is something this Nation has paid dearly to gain. Everyone should make the effort to keep it—by using it."

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island: "Such a contest is probably valuable in attracting attention to this important subject. I do not think the American public needs to be convinced of its importance, but simply aroused to the need of present attention. However, anything that results in improvement of the percentage of voters—regardless of how they vote—is worth while."

Representative CHARLES R. HOWELL, of New Jersey: "The American press deserves the highest praise for its initiative in sponsoring such a worth-while contest. I endorse the program you have outlined and wish you every possible success. When one analyzes historically the voting trend in so-called off-year elections in this country, it would appear that the United States is losing democracy by default. I urge every American citizen to be sure to register for the fall elections, and once registered, to be sure to vote on November 7."

Representative J. K. JAVITS, of New York: "As the author of House Resolution 641 seeking a congressional investigation of why people do not vote, let me emphasize how important it is that the vote be gotten out through such efforts as you are sponsoring. Secondly, I would like to point out to our people that America's responsibilities in the world are so great that we must get the greatest collective judgment and collective responsibility in the interests of our peace and security. How can we expect the other peoples of the world to believe in our good faith and in the judgment of our people if they do not come out to manifest and exercise it on election day? No, the duty to vote goes far beyond civic duties and is now a question of the highest patriotism."

Representative JOHN P. DAVIES, of New York: "The American Press is to be commended for the sponsorship of the get-out-the-vote contest. Never before in our history has it been so vital that every eligible person exercise his blood-bought privilege of voting. Remember if you are casual about voting today, you may be a casualty tomorrow."

Senator BRIEN McMAHON, of Connecticut: "Voting is the highest privilege of citizenship. In fact, the use of the ballot is the very foundation stone of democracy. The total number of votes has fallen off alarmingly in some recent national elections. When this happens, democracy is in danger. It is my earnest wish that each citizen will do his primary patriotic duty next November by voting."

Senator CLYDE R. HOEY, of North Carolina: "I think your effort to interest the American citizen in voting is most commendable. Certainly participation by as many people as possible in government adds to the strength of our democracy. I congratulate you upon the effort which you are putting forth to secure a larger participation on the part of the people in our Government."

#### COMMENTS FROM BUSINESS AND LABOR LEADERS

Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, president and general manager of Eastern Air Lines, Inc., and well-known air war hero: "Your campaign to get out the vote is most commendable. Citizens who fail to exercise their prerogative to select able leaders for their city, county, State, and National Governments are not only breaking faith with those American men and women pioneers who built this great Nation but they are falling their children—and the generations to come."

E. S. Bowerfind, director of public relations, Republic Steel Corp.: "You are certainly carrying on a very useful and worthwhile promotion in sponsoring this contest. Too many of us have been too careless about exercising our greatest privilege, namely, voting."

Claude A. Putnam, president, National Association of Manufacturers: "Democracy compels very little. Democracy depends mostly on voluntary support from those who share the abundance of blessings she bears. The least every one of us can do to keep democracy healthy in America is to vote—to vote as we choose, for the candidate of our choice, after carefully studying the records and programs of those standing for election, no matter what office they seek."

William Green, president, American Federation of Labor: "The idea which is reflected in your contest is commendable, and I heartily approve it. The one thing we need to do in the political campaign is to concentrate our efforts to prevail upon working men and women to vote. If we can get them to put their votes in the ballot box, we can win in almost all the States where we carry on political campaigns."

Walter P. Marshall, president, the Western Union Telegraph Co.: "I heartily applaud the announced objectives of your campaign, which I am confident, will have the support of all thoughtful citizens. Please accept my sincere good wishes for the substantial degree of acceptance and success your public-spirited campaign deserves."

E. V. Lahey, chairman and president, United States Brewers Foundation, Inc.: "The right to vote is one of the great privileges of citizenship. In a democracy such as ours, it is only through the ballot that the people may exercise their constitutional right to govern. If we fail to exercise this right, we may eventually lose it. I believe you are performing a valuable public service in impressing upon your readers the importance of voting at all elections and I wish you success in your work."

#### CHAIRMEN OF BOTH MAJOR POLITICAL PARTIES SEE CONTEST AS SERVICE TO COUNTRY

Both political parties attach equal importance to the get-out-the-vote contest being sponsored by the American Press, it is indicated by letters received from the chairman of each party. The comments follow:

Guy George Gabrielson, chairman, Republican National Committee: "May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on a program which should be of enormous service to our country. Our Republican can survive only if we, as freemen, faithfully fulfill our primary civic duty—our obligation to vote. It is an appalling tragedy—it is a reflection on both our citizenry and our candidates—that 45,000,000 Americans eligible to vote failed to do so in the 1948 election. In view of world turbulence and the certain drift toward world war III, the American people even yet may have time to choose their own weapons—bullets or ballots. I hold it is the most solemn of obligations for each of us to ponder well the problem our country faces and issue ballot commands to our leaders. We must arm ourselves with this weapon lest we lose our way of life."

William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman, Democratic National Committee: "At a time when the whole concept of democracy, as we in the United States understand it, is under challenge all over the world by the forces of communism, I can think of nothing more important than an all-out nonpartisan effort to have a truly representative vote in the 1950 congressional elections. I believe the get-out-the-vote contest being conducted by the American Press is a fine contribution toward this goal and I hope it is highly successful."

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,  
The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Anthony J. Teti, to be postmaster at Toughkenamon, Pa., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,  
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Phelps Phelps, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Dominican Republic, vice Ralph H. Ackerman, resigned;

Angus Ward, of Michigan, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Afghanistan, vice George R. Merrell; and

Julian F. Harrington, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America;

William J. Barnsdale, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America; and

Eugene V. Prostov, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service Staff officer to be a consul of the United States of America.

#### 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 before the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia at its second annual dinner commemorating Armenian Independence Day.

By Mr. MARTIN:  
Text of radio broadcast by him of program No. 62 in the series entitled "Happenings in Washington."

By Mr. GILLETTE:  
Editorial entitled "Korea Helped Make Free World Strong," published in the Des Moines Register of June 21, 1952.

By Mr. WILEY:  
Memorandum of American Bar Association in support of the resolution of the Association regarding appointments to the Federal judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:  
Editorial entitled "An American Foreign Policy," published in the New York Times of June 25, 1952.

By Mr. LEHMAN:  
Editorial entitled "Colony or Commonwealth," published in the New York Times of June 25, 1952, and an editorial entitled "Nullification," published in the Washington Post of June 25, 1952.

By Mr. BENTON:  
Article entitled "Steel Agreement Reached, Dropped," written by Joseph Loftus, and published in the New York Times of June 25, 1952, relating to the steel strike.

#### DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR AND REPRESENTATIVE JAMES W. WADSWORTH, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, at 5:30 this afternoon one of the greatest and most distinguished legislators in the history of our country will be buried, the Honorable James W. Wadsworth. Mr. Wadsworth served two terms in the Senate and nine terms in the House of Representatives.

His contributions to two world wars in the service of his country have been tremendous. He himself was a veteran of the Spanish-American War. During World War I, Mr. Wadsworth served as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. In World War II, he rendered outstanding service in the legislative field at a time when most members of the Government and the administration were fearful of the effect of the proposed draft act.

Representative Wadsworth sponsored the Selective Service Act and was instrumental in its passage more than 15 months before the outbreak of World War II at Pearl Harbor. It was his foresight and diligence in proposing the enactment of that legislation which helped to give America the early start it had and helped to bring about military victory as a result of our preparedness.

Mr. Wadsworth was a believer in the strength of our country in seeking victory for democracy. One of his last great and courageous acts was his service again for his country after his retirement, following a distinguished career in both Houses of Congress, in the sponsorship of universal military training. Despite the advice of physicians to care for his physical condition, Mr. Wadsworth stayed on the job to make a report on universal military training.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated as a part of my remarks editorials regarding Mr. Wadsworth published in the Washington Post, the Washington Star, and the Washington Daily News.

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

[From the Washington Post of June 24, 1952.]

#### JAMES W. WADSWORTH

The death of James W. Wadsworth removes from the American political scene one of the Nation's most effective advocates of a strong defense system and a man of great skill and experience as a legislative leader. He campaigned intelligently and effectively for a powerful military defense long before it was popular to do so. As a member of the Senate he advocated selective service before the United States entered World War I and as a member of the House he advocated it again before World War II. The able report of the National Security Training Commission, of which he was chairman by appointment of President Truman, is the basis for the present proposal for universal training.

While he came to believe firmly in international cooperation, his strong conservative instincts and party loyalty led him to oppose the League of Nations and the World Court and to advocate high tariffs. He had an abiding interest in agriculture and gave his support to many causes to aid the farmer. He strongly objected, however, to interference

by the Federal Government in farm affairs. He was an early opponent of woman suffrage and prohibition, and in 1926, having incurred labor's opposition, lost the Senate seat he had held since 1914. After 6 years on his enormous ancestral farm in New York he won election to the House in 1932 and served until his retirement in 1950. He was in Congress a total of 30 years and was one of the three men in our history who served first in the Senate and later in the House. Mr. Wadsworth was a disciple of Elihu Root, whom he succeeded in the Senate. He fought most of the New Deal and Fair Deal proposals, but his support of recent administration foreign and defense policies was of inestimable value in the struggle to make this country militarily secure.

Mr. Wadsworth will be remembered on Capitol Hill with admiration and affection, for he was no stiff-necked aristocrat, but a warm and engaging person, a man who almost reached the heights—he was several times mentioned for the Presidency—but was content to serve his country wherever it was possible for him to do so.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 23, 1952]

MR. WADSWORTH

Probably James Wolcott Wadsworth, Jr., will be remembered longest for his work in behalf of preparedness. It was a basic principle with him that America should be strong enough to stand alone in a chaotic and hostile world. Lacking confidence in made-to-order schemes of universal pacification, he argued that the military power of the United States should be maintained at its most effective apex. During more than half of his career he specialized in legislation relating to the development of a citizen army and navy. He worked and fought for universal military training even when it was most unpopular.

Mr. Wadsworth himself was a soldier. The family to which he belonged is a dynasty of public servants tracing back to colonial times, and he was a worthy scion of the clan. Born in the beautiful Genesee Valley in 1877, he went to Cuba and the Philippines at 21, was a member of the New York State Legislature at 25, a member of the United States Senate at 37. In the latter position he served two very busy terms. Then, defeated largely because of his opposition to prohibition, he sought election to the House of Representatives and became one of its most distinguished personalities in 1932. Until his retirement in 1950—and even afterward as a private citizen—he was a respected authority in the fields in which he specialized. The first and foremost of these was national defense, but he also labored constructively in foreign and domestic commerce, labor relations, interior affairs, and agriculture. A conservative by conviction as well as by birth and breeding, he opposed certain liberal and progressive movements because he simply did not believe that they could be made to stick. Much of the New Deal was distasteful to him, but prior to and during World War II he supported the foreign policies of the Roosevelt-Truman administrations, and they depended on him for the unpleasant sponsorship of the selective draft legislation. Even before Pearl Harbor he called for national unity behind lend-lease.

Tall, quiet, polite, a helpful neighbor, Washington counted him among its most interesting residents. He has left his mark in Congress—a man who won deep respect for the courage of his convictions, when many of his convictions were unpopular and politically dangerous.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 23, 1952]

WADSWORTH, STATESMAN

James Wadsworth could change his mind, as any wise man can. But when he had made it up, he stood like a rock for what he believed was right no matter how large the majority against him.

This distinguished public servant, who died Saturday at 74, once lost his Senate seat because he refused to approve the prohibition amendment. He fought for aviation when most people sneered at it. Though once an isolationist, he was one of the first to realize the threat of Hitlerism, and advocated preparedness when most Americans were complacent.

He saw years ago that universal military training is the soundest foundation for our security, and was still fighting for it when stricken by his fatal illness.

Jim Wadsworth was a great American. He never trimmed his sails.

#### AWARD OF CERTIFICATE OF MERIT TO DEAN S. S. STEINBERG

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, when outstanding achievements for the welfare of human kind are recognized, it is an incentive to other citizens, as well as a just recognition of the abilities of the individual concerned.

Such a gratifying development has just occurred in the presidential award made to Dean S. S. Steinberg of the University of Maryland School of Engineering. Dean Steinberg has long been known to me as an educator of unusual attainments, a public-spirited citizen, and a well-qualified ambassador to other countries of the Western Hemisphere which he has visited in an official capacity.

I rejoice in the honor accorded him, and request unanimous consent that an article in the Baltimore Evening Sun of June 13, 1952, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

TRUMAN HONORS DEAN S. S. STEINBERG

COLLEGE PARK, Md., June 13.—Dean S. S. Steinberg, of the University of Maryland College of Engineering, has been awarded a special certificate of merit by order of President Truman for his outstanding contribution as chairman of the Committee on Education of the President's Conference on Industrial Safety, according to an announcement.

The presentation was made by Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor, during the conference at which the President praised the University of Maryland for its program of integration of safety into the engineering curricula.

#### COMPLETION AND DELIVERY OF LINER "UNITED STATES"

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared regarding the completion and delivery of the new superliner, *United States*, now entering the oceanic service under the operation of the United States Lines.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONNOR

Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer deserves the gratitude of the citizenry of this Nation for his forthright attitude supporting the completion and delivery of the new superliner, the *United States*, now entering the oceanic service under the operation of the United States Lines. Secretary Sawyer has exhibited commendable courage in preventing undue delay and difficulty in the initiation of service of this much-needed addition to our maritime fleet.

One of the immediate needs of the American merchant marine, as we have pointed out upon the Senate floor on numerous occasions during recent years, is a fleet of modern, fast, passenger vessels capable of conversion to troop carriers in an emergency.

This need was stressed when our first long-range shipping bill was introduced several years ago. Throughout all the hearings on this bill before the subcommittee during the present and previous Congresses we have continued to stress this need. It has been generally conceded that other nations not only are better prepared at this time in the matter of troop-transport facilities, but their construction program has consistently kept ahead of that of the United States.

One of the points that it seems to me pertinent to keep ever in mind is that we might not always have available passenger liners from other nations as was the case in World War II. It is a dangerous policy to count upon any such contingency, just as I think it is contrary to sound reason to neglect the dry-cargo phase of the American shipping in the hope that, in an emergency, there will be sufficient shipping owned by friendly nations that can be borrowed.

I take occasion to stress the present condition of affairs at the very time when the magnificent modern liner, the *United States*, is to start upon regular trips overseas. Anyone so fortunate as to be able to see and inspect this great ship would agree that we now have realized the ideal of a speedy, thoroughly modern passenger liner that would be available for troop transport should the need arise.

In the past, on frequent occasions, it has been necessary to carry overseas thousands of American fighting men in unsatisfactory transports. In many cases the ships were too slow to offer any security against attacking submarines, while living conditions aboard them oftentimes were such as to be unworthy of American patriots who were offering their lives to preserve the Nation's security.

Let it be remembered also about World Wars I and II, that even though there were on both occasions more passenger liners available than we have now, the supply was thoroughly inadequate. The men carried aboard these ships were aware of the hazards they were facing due to lack of speed, a fact which certainly did nothing to bolster their morale.

All this has been kept uppermost in mind in the design and construction of the steamship *United States*. The largest ship ever built in this country, with a gross tonnage of 51,500 tons, it can be converted rapidly, should occasion arise, into a troop transport that would house with reasonable comfort 12,000 to 14,000 members of the Armed Forces.

Capable of a speed in excess of 30 knots, and structurally designed for utmost safety, it represents the most advanced ideas along such lines. Its extra speed and ease of maneuverability, combined with its exceptional cruising range, make it an extraordinarily

efficient addition to our peacetime and war-time fleets.

Thus its completion is in furtherance of the objective we had in mind in proposing the long-range shipping bill. While it does not by any means give us the total troop-carrying capacity that will be urgently needed in any sudden emergency, it does add greatly to present facilities and it furnishes a standard of design and usability that will be of tremendous help in accelerating construction of other fast passenger liners in the future.

In the two wars that have been fought by this country, and during the present hostilities in Korea, the United States fortunately has gotten away from the policy of looking at our fighting men as so many objects to be transported by whatever means were available, without any particular regard to convenience or safety. The steamship *United States* gives to this Nation the No. 1 troop transport in existence in the world today. Our maritime officials and all who assisted in the design and construction of this great vessel deserve congratulations and the appreciation of all citizens.

My one regret with regard to this magnificent new vessel is that it is but a single ship rather than an entire new fleet of passenger ships. I sincerely hope that the long-range shipping bill, now pending in the House, will be passed speedily and differences with the Senate version resolved so that, with the steamship *United States* as an inspiration, our American shipping industry and ship construction facilities will be given the needed stimulus to initiate construction of other vessels of this general type.

No one can say when, if ever, it may be necessary to draft all the passenger-carrying capacity at the Nation's command for military purposes. It can be said with certainty, however, that such a need today would find us very greatly unprepared, even with this splendid new ship which is now ready to be put into active service.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that this country needs a number of fast modern vessels. Unless the Congress acts quickly, to make possible their construction, we will be laying the country open to danger in the event of sudden hostilities.

#### EXTENSION OF TERM OF CERTAIN PATENTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1537) 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," which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

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 may be filed at any time within 6 months following the date of enactment of this section."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill was passed by the Senate on May 1,

1952, and has been amended by the House.

The bill concerns patents in which a husband and wife may share an interest.

A comparative study of the bill, as passed by the Senate, with the amendment of the House, indicates that there is no substantial difference between the two versions except that the House provides a 6-month time limit for filing an application for an extension of a patent, while the Senate bill made this time limit 1 year. The House provision seems unobjectionable.

I therefore move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair calls attention to the fact that House bill 4413, relating to the same subject is on the Clerk's desk. Does the Senator from Nevada wish to have the House bill indefinitely postponed?

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that House bill 4413 be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to; and 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," was indefinitely postponed.

#### AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO THEFT OR RECEIPT OF STOLEN MAIL MATTER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2198) to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally, which were, in line 4, strike out "striking out" and insert "changing"; in line 4, after "semicolon", insert "to a period", and in line 5, after "and", insert "by striking out."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the House has approved the bill with an amendment which is entirely technical and does not change in any way the sense of the action taken by the Senate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 191) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a routine concurrent resolution relating to the adjustment of status of certain displaced persons. The resolution originated in the House. In the Senate, it was amended to eliminate the

names of certain persons, on the basis of information available to the Senate committee or questions raised in the Senate committee. The House has disagreed to the Senate amendments and has appointed conferees.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference on House Concurrent Resolution 191, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 206) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is another concurrent resolution relating to the adjustment of status of displaced persons. It is the same kind of a resolution as House Concurrent Resolution 191. The situation with regard to this resolution is also the same. Accordingly, Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference on House Concurrent Resolution 206, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which was, on page 5, to strike out line 4.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the House has amended this resolution by striking the name of one alien, whose case has been withdrawn by the Attorney General, after the resolution was agreed to by the Senate.

Since the resolution was approved by the Senate the Immigration and Naturalization Service has asked the withdrawal of an additional name. I am advised the other body will not object to this.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate Concurrent Resolution 72, with a further amendment as follows: On page 14, strike out line 18.

The motion was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, H. R. 7176.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the first amendment of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of the Interior—Office of the Secretary—Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act," on page 2, line 2, after the word "only", to strike out "\$170,000" and insert "\$187,000."

REPUBLICAN FOREIGN POLICY  
PLANK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have prepared for submission to the resolutions committee of the Republican National Convention a series of suggestions with regard to the foreign-policy plank to be adopted by the Republican Party.

These suggestions are not intended to be all-inclusive, but I submit them as my frank judgment as one of the greatest single issues facing my party.

I feel very keenly on the importance of other platform planks, for example, a specific, dynamic farm plank which will spell hope and opportunity for America's great agricultural segment.

But I have confined my formal suggestions to the field of foreign policy in commenting to my good and able friend, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]—a man we are indeed fortunate to have as chairman of the resolutions committee.

THIS MUST BE A CHARTER OF OPPORTUNITY

It is said, Mr. President, that no one ever reads party platforms but the platform drafters themselves. But I say that the Republican platform of 1952 must be a well-read, well-understood, well-respected document. It must become a charter of the atomic age, a charter written in simple Anglo-Saxon terms, meaningful to the farmer at the crossroads and the garage mechanic and the housewife, a charter for the common man—yes, a charter which will spell hope, too, to all the peoples of the world, as a model of what this constitutional Republic can produce.

WE DO NOT WANT REPUBLICAN SCLISM

On the foreign policy issue, itself, I do not of course want to see a schismatic condition develop in my party, with two rival wings, one stressing international cooperation, the other stressing a so-called American "Gibraltar" concept—built, in my judgment, on sand.

I do not want to see such a schismatic condition destroy the opportunity for victory of my party this coming November.

I believe that such victory is urgently necessary, if we are to bring in the new blood, the new approach, the firmer hand at the helm in the next four crucial years.

XCVIII—501

But, in our earnest efforts to avoid a schism, I do not want to see our Republican Party adopt a platform, as some individuals seem to want, so weasel worded, so ambiguous, so based on an empty play of words, meaning all things to all men, that we break the heart of thinking Americans and of the thinking people in the world. These thinking people recognize that leadership against Soviet communism cannot be provided by weasel words and timid souls.

SOME PEOPLE LIVING IN DARK AGES

I do not want to see the Republican Party surrender to a small group of well-intentioned, but apparently medieval-minded men who are living in an intellectual dark age—in which the intercontinental supersonic airplane, the guided missile, the germ bomb, the atomic bomb, do not seem to exist; a medieval dark age which does not recognize America's crucial dependence upon foreign raw materials, much less her crucial dependence upon European manpower, factories, and spiritual aid.

I do not want to see the Republican Party surrender to spurious cure-all devices which are supposed to banish the sickness of communism from the world body, cure-alls like the phony remedy of airpower alone, which is supposed to win all wars at bargain basement prices, with no sacrifice on our part.

NO MAGIC WAND CAN ELIMINATE FOREIGN  
SPENDING

I do not want to see the Republican Party delude the American people into thinking that by a wave of a magic wand, we can save billions of dollars overnight in foreign aid; whereas within the last month, not so much as one single Republican—or Democrat—in the Senate offered an amendment for formal vote to cut the mutual aid bill by more than a billion or so dollars below the amount recommended by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

WE HAVE VOTED FOR BIPARTISAN POLICY

I do not want to see the Republican Party be guilty of complete inconsistency by condemning actions which we ourselves have voted for. It is a man's and a party's votes, not just his words, which count.

Only 10 Republicans voted against mutual aid when the conference report came up in the Senate, out of 46 Republicans in the Senate. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other Senators, including myself, voted "yea." And every other single forward, international step—the United Nations Charter, the North Atlantic Treaty, has been supported overwhelmingly by the Republican Party.

LET'S DEBATE ISSUES, NOT PERSONALITIES

I do not want the Republican Party to attempt to climb to power by an unprincipled policy of pouring venom on individuals, on personalities, rather than by calm, reasoned analysis of issues and principles.

We Americans can, and must, get rid of the incompetent, the security risks, the disloyal individuals in Government—but we can do so in the traditional American way.

MILLIONS WILL SUPPORT US, BUT NOT FOR  
MUD-PIE THROWING

I know that there are millions of Americans who are ready, willing, and eager to switch from the Democratic Party or from independent ranks, and vote Republican, if we show that we are willing to rise to our responsibilities. This is indeed a time for greatness.

The millions will not, however, switch to our party and vote Republican if they think that we are mostly little boys who are capable only of making and hurling "mudpies," but not capable of leading the world—leading it at a time when it is threatened, not with just mass destruction of cities, but with the hydrogen bomb which can incinerate whole nations.

The Republican Party can be proud of its great contributions, its great leaders, its great history. We have fine candidates who can rise to great heights. But we Republicans can "snatch defeat from the jaws of victory," by mouthing of either meaningless generalities or irresponsible abuse which does not give the constructive solutions to the problems of our times, for which 100,000,000 voters hunger. I have not lost faith, I have faith in GENE MILLIKIN, in John Foster Dulles and our other platform writers.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the series of suggestions which I have prepared for the Resolutions Committee be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
OF WISCONSIN, RANKING REPUBLICAN, SENATE  
FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, TO  
SENATOR EUGENE MILLIKIN, TEMPORARY  
CHAIRMAN, RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE, RE-  
PUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

1. The Republican foreign policy plank must be fundamentally constructive and forward-looking in its emphasis, not negative and purely backward-looking.
2. It must be specific on the points it recommends and endorses. Weasel-worded generalities capable of widely ambiguous interpretations must be avoided.
3. So, too, it should refer to specific shortcomings and mistakes of the administration's foreign policy. In so doing, it should neither overemphasize nor underemphasize those deficiencies.
4. It must radiate confidence to, and in our allies, demonstrating that there will be an unbroken continuity in the program of American leadership in collective security action and American spearheading of spiritual resistance to the Kremlin.
5. Conversely, it should provide no basis for encouragement to the Soviet Union that there will be an interruption of so much as 1 day or 1 month in constructive international cooperation—an interruption which the Soviets might otherwise exploit for their own purposes, let alone exploiting the possibility of any reversal of United States leadership policies.
6. Wherever foreign policy particularly strongly impinges on domestic policy, we should indicate our awareness of that fact. Thus, in our condemnation of the administration's inflationary spending policy, we should indicate unequivocally that this inflation at home has seriously reduced the effectiveness of America's aid program abroad.

7. The Republican platform in 1948 stated our intention to "invite the minority party to join us under the next Republican administration in stopping partisan politics at the water's edge." I believe a similar decisive affirmation of patriotic unity at the shore line is indispensable.

#### SPECIFIC AFFIRMATIVE SUGGESTIONS

1. We should state in clear, emphatic and unequivocal terms that the Republican Party intends to continue every constructive procedure, program, and technique by which the aggressive march of Soviet imperialism has been curbed and can be curbed in the future.

Specifically, this means our Republican Party pledges its continued effort to strengthen the United Nations so that it may more assuredly realize the hope of the world for the elimination of the possibility of world war III.

(a) The Republican Party further endorses the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a regional instrumentality under the United Nations Charter for coping with the problem of Communist aggressive threats in Europe.

(b) Congratulates the countries of Western Europe on the splendid progress which they have made thus far in, (1) ratification of the Schuman plan, (2) formulation of the plans for a European army, (3) steps toward political unification of the continent.

(c) Urges intensified European allied effort, particularly along the lines of breaking down of customs and other economic barriers, political walls, psychological barriers which have prevented unity of the western powers and which in the face of the Soviet menace, prove extremely hazardous to the survival of Western Europe.

(d) Endorses the fullest contribution by every European power, including Western Germany and Spain to the economic and political strength and military defense of the continent against communism, while assuring necessary precautions against the re-emergence of aggressive activity by any state in the alliance.

(e) Reaffirms our historic friendship toward all peoples who have emerged or are emerging from colonialism into an era of independence and sovereignty; but recognizes clearly the necessity for blocking those efforts of Soviet communism aimed at exploiting this colonial transition to its own Red ends in order to create conditions of chaos and opposition to the United States and its allies.

(f) Pledges continuance of the program of mutual aid—military and defense support—toward the end of establishing and maintaining a situation of balance in which Soviet military might can be successfully discouraged from ever initiating an attack. Primary emphasis of such aid will, however, be to so establish the allied lands on a firm footing of self-help that America's financial contributions can be carefully but progressively reduced.

(g) Intends to stand by our commitments to continue appropriate military, aerial, and naval personnel contributions toward the defense of international law and security, but again emphasizes the importance of self-help and duly proportionate contributions by other lands.

(h) Reaffirms its support for technical aid to underdeveloped areas with emphasis, however, on encouragement of a climate in foreign lands hospitable to maximum private investment.

(i) Pledges its efforts toward a prompt, honorable end of the Korean conflict—without compromise of our basic principles.

#### SPECIFIC CRITICISMS

We condemn—

(a) Sell-out secret agreements entered into without the knowledge, consent, or approval of the Congress and the people.

(b) Existence in high diplomatic positions, as well as elsewhere in Government, of any security risks and disloyal individuals—a condition requiring in turn that when we assume office, we completely cleanse such individuals from the entire Federal establishment.

(c) America's remaining on the defensive and allowing the Soviet Union to retain the initiative in the world-wide battle of ideas and of action.

(d) Administration failure fully to exploit the immense areas of tensions and hatreds behind the iron curtain.

(e) Failure of the administration to consult the Republicans in the formulation of the Asiatic program, a failure which contributed to the downfall of Nationalist China.

(f) Failure to initiate a policy of destruction of Red Chinese bases in Manchuria at a time when such destruction could have permitted an earlier end to the Korean conflict.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendment on page 2, line 2, is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senate should undertake the consideration of a bill which is so important as the pending bill without having a quorum call. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Alken	Green	Millikin
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Benton	Hendrickson	Moody
Brewster	Hennings	Morse
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Nixon
Cain	Humphrey	O'Connor
Capehart	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Case	Ives	Pastore
Clements	Jenner	Robertson
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Johnson, S. C.	Smathers
Douglas	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Lehman	Stennis
Ecton	Long	Taft
Ellender	Magnuson	Thye
Ferguson	Malone	Tobey
Flanders	Martin	Underwood
Frear	McCarran	Watkins
Fulbright	McClellan	Welker
George	McFarland	Wiley
Gilletts	McKellar	Williams

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent because of illness in her family.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction, Southeastern Power Administration," on page 2, line 9, after the word "expended," to strike out "\$959,500" and insert "\$115,000"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That no part of the funds appropriated by this paragraph or any part of the unobligated balance appropriated under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1952 shall be available for the construction of transmission lines and related facilities in the Southeastern power area until (1) a contract with the affected power companies in the area of substantially the type which has heretofore been executed in other power areas for transmission of electric power and energy from Government-owned projects to preferred customers has been executed, or the said companies have refused to execute such contracts, and (2) the Secretary of the Interior has so informed the Congress."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the Senator in charge of the bill. On page 2, beginning in line 15, we find the following language:

(1) a contract with the affected power companies in the area of substantially the type which has heretofore been executed in other power areas—

And so forth. Is that provision intended to exclude a type of contract which will comply with all requirements, such as that which has been discussed by the president of the Georgia Power Co.?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, not at all, because I am certain it would comply with the law, as it is of the type of bus-bar contract heretofore made.

Mr. GEORGE. It is not intended to exclude a particular contract?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, beginning in line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in order that the consideration of the bill may be expedited, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the amendments be limited to 30 minutes in total, or 15 minutes to a side, to be controlled, respectively, by the proponent of the amendment and my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN],

in the event he is opposed to the amendment; or if he is in favor of the amendment, then by the distinguished minority leader or some other Senator whom he may designate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I do not think that will be sufficient time to debate my amendment "B" which is lying at the desk, and which proposes a reduction of \$31,000,000 in the appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation, nor do I believe it will be sufficient time for debate on my amendment "C," which proposes a change in the so-called revolving fund. In the case of those amendments, I should like to have the time limited to 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggest that we can arrange for that by excepting the amendments relating to the Bureau of Reclamation, and having the debate on the other amendments limited as now proposed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if we are going to extend the time for debate on some amendments, we might as well extend the time for debate on all amendments. After all, I might wish to use a little additional time myself. I have an amendment to take care of some of the Indians. Fifteen thousand of them are not in school and cannot get into school. I believe it is just as important to use a little more time in debate on an amendment which will be of benefit to those Indians, as it is to use additional time in debate on an amendment relating to irrigation.

In the case of one of the amendments relating to the Indians, I ask that an hour be available for debate. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is joining me in submitting the amendment. Fifteen minutes to a side will be sufficient for debate on the first amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let us arrange to have 30 minutes available to a side in the case of amendments pertaining to the Bureau of Reclamation or the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and 15 minutes to a side available for all other amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair state his understanding of the pending unanimous-consent request. The Chair understands that the request is that in the case of all amendments not affecting the Bureau of Reclamation or the Bureau of Indian Affairs, debate be limited to 15 minutes to a side; and that in the case of amendments relating to the Bureau of Reclamation or the Bureau of Indian Affairs, debate be limited to 30 minutes to a side.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Let the Chair inquire whether that agreement will apply to the committee amendments which now are being considered?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I ask that the limitation apply to all amendments.

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

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Continuing fund, Southwestern Power Administration," on page 4, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$231,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bonneville Power Administration," on page 6, after line 9, to insert:

"The Bonneville Power Administrator," is hereby added after "the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration," in subsection (a) of section 5 of the act of October 15, 1949 (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Land Management—Management of lands and resources," on page 6, line 21, after the word "Management", to strike out "\$9,722,605" and insert "\$11,172,605."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 2, to insert:

#### CONSTRUCTION

For construction of access roads on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands; acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads adjacent to such lands; to remain available until expended, \$2,750,000: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated herein for road construction shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce: *Provided further*, That said sum of \$2,750,000 is hereby made a reimbursable charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be reimbursed to the general fund in the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II, of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 875).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 7, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "thirty-six" and insert "forty-five", and on page 8, line 3, after the word "lands", to insert "(other than expenditures for construction of access roads and for acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads adjacent to such lands)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs—Health, education, and welfare services," on page 9, line 8, after the word "museums", to strike out "\$51,266,019" and insert "\$51,916,019."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, to this committee amendment, I submit an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 9, in line 8, it is proposed to strike out "\$51,916,019" and insert "\$43,916,019."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am proposing that the appropriation recommended by the committee at this place in the bill be cut in the amount of \$8,000,000. This cut will apply to the item for health, education, and welfare services for the Indian Bureau. I should like to give the justification for the proposed cut.

Last year the Congress appropriated \$41,800,000 for this purpose. The Bureau

of the Budget asked for a tremendous increase in this item for the year 1952-53. It requested a total of \$61,900,000, representing an increase of more than \$20,000,000, or 50 percent.

The House cut the figure to \$51,266,019. The Senate committee voted to increase the figure to approximately \$52,000,000. I am proposing a cut of approximately \$8,000,000, to a figure which would be \$2,000,000 more than the amount provided last year. I should like to give the reasons for this proposed cut.

Of course, the first reason is the obvious one of the huge deficit, which will be between \$10,000,000,000 and \$15,000,000,000 for the current year, indicating that this is not a time in which we should expand expenditures unduly.

#### RATIO OF EMPLOYEES OF INDIAN BUREAU TO INDIANS

The second reason which I should like to give is that we sometimes mistake appropriations for the Indians with appropriations for the Indian Bureau.

I have tabulated the figures pertaining to the Indian Bureau. I find that the total number of Indians under the care of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is 404,787, or just a little short of 405,000.

Mr. President, how many employees are there in the Bureau of Indian Affairs itself? There are 12,950, or approximately 13,000. We therefore have approximately one governmental employee for every 30 Indians. I submit that this is an unduly high ratio—one governmental employee to every 30 Indians.

I have tried to obtain a breakdown of the percentage of the appropriations for the Indians which goes, not to the Indians, but to the governmental employees who are presumably taking care of the Indians. Because of the shortage of time, I have not been able to obtain an entirely satisfactory breakdown.

I may say that, in order to speed up the processes of the Senate, I agreed to waive the 3-day requirement between the time this appropriation bill was reported and the time of its consideration. I agreed to reduce that to 2 days—really a day and a half, from the evening of Monday until the morning of Wednesday. I knew this would handicap my efforts; but I did it in view of the pressure of time.

However, if 13,000 Indian Bureau officials are to be paid from the current year appropriations of approximately \$70,000,000 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and if my assumption is correct that the average governmental salary is not far from \$3,500, it is obvious that the administrative costs of personnel will run \$45,500,000 or 65 percent of the total amount expended.

Mr. President, I think there should be a review of the Indian policy of the United States. For at least 60 years we have been expending enormous sums of money on the Indians. But the condition of the Indians get no better; in fact, it may well be that the condition of the Indians has actually deteriorated despite the enormous sums we have expended, presumably for their benefit. I believe a revamping of our whole Indian

policy is called for. I know it is said that we are now trying to assimilate the Indians into the normal population of the country, and, reversing the policy which was established in the thirties by Mr. John Collier, then head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, some of the increases in requested expenditures were for this purpose. About \$8,000,000 was to be for placement. My proposal would allow a gross increase of \$2,000,000, but it would eliminate some of the additional sums.

We then come to the item of construction. There we can make economies, but, it seems foolish for us on the one hand to say we should be assimilating the Indians into the population as a whole, and, on the other hand, that we should be providing large amounts for construction in order to take care of them upon the reservations. I do not think my amendment would cause any injustice to the Indians, but it would make the Indian Bureau function with greater efficiency, and it would check their tremendous expansion in personnel.

I want to emphasize that my amendment would permit a moderate increase in funds for the Indian Bureau's activities in health, education, and welfare service. But I do not think we should grant these huge increases until we can be assured of a definite plan for assimilating the Indians into our population.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

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

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator realize that in order to assimilate the Indians it is necessary to train them and prepare them to enter upon a civilized life?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There would still be \$43,000,000 with which to do that. My amendment makes no reduction in the amounts we have been spending for this purpose.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator realize that a great many Indians who ought to be in school are not in school simply because the facilities to educate them have not been provided?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have seen handsome buildings and more buildings than many colleges possess, which are used in Western States as schools for the Indians. I have seen them with my own eyes.

Mr. WATKINS. In the Navajo Reservation alone there are more than 15,000 children who cannot go to school, simply because there are no facilities, although the Federal Government has been under obligation for more than 80 years to furnish those Indians with at least one teacher in each classroom of 30 pupils. That has never been done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are a great many schools in this country in which the ratio of 1 to 30 is not observed, although it is an ideal ratio and a proper ratio. I would not say it is necessary to build an elaborate school building. Equally good education can be received in modest structures as in elaborate buildings. Furthermore, if there are not enough teachers, the Bureau should de-

crease some of its administrative employees in order to hire more.

Mr. WATKINS and Mr. McFARLAND addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to Senators from the Indian country. I first yield again to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Can the Senator from Illinois name an elaborate Indian school on any Indian reservation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. On an Indian reservation?

Mr. WATKINS. Or anywhere else, for that matter—an elaborate Indian school that has been constructed for the Indians?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not asserting that all Indian schools are elaborate affairs. I happened to spend a very beautiful month in the State of Arizona, in the city of Phoenix, and, since the Senator has challenged me, I would say that the Indian school in Phoenix is a very handsome school, indeed. But I should think that a program of assimilation would be aimed at placing Indians in public schools.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I may say there is not a building connected with that school which is not 40 years old.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the buildings of that school would compare favorably with those of Harvard, Yale, Princeton, or any other college in the Ivy League.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think a comparison of the buildings of the school at Phoenix with those at Princeton would prove very disappointing.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator desire me to yield in my time, or in the time of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President—

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not ask the Senator to yield, unless he has the time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Illinois yields at all, he will yield in his own time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In order to be generous, I yield first to the Senator from Wyoming, in my own time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has 30 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have more time than I thought. I am very glad to yield. Perhaps I should yield first to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I shall be glad to have the Senator from Wyoming proceed first.

Mr. HUNT. I shall only take a moment of the time of the Senator from Illinois. I should like to say that possibly he has overlooked the fact that in many instances it is necessary for the Indian Bureau to pay tuition per school pupil, when the Indians are sent to schools under State jurisdiction. I know that is the situation in my State, and I think the cost runs considerably higher than the figures which the distinguished Senator from Illinois may have in mind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But this does not justify a figure of 65 percent of all expenditures for Bureau personnel.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely want to make a statement, after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

I am permitting an increase of 5 percent in the amounts appropriated for this purpose to the Indian Bureau. If the Indian Bureau is anxious to give good service to the Indians, as I assume it is, I believe there is sufficient fat in its administrative overhead to enable it to squeeze out some of the excess personnel and devote the money to the purposes of the Indians. I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I visited the Indians on the Navajo Reservation, last Saturday, and I should like to tell the Senator what they said. I know that, had the Senator been there to hear those Indians, he would be asking the Senate for more money for the construction of schools. The Indians said they did not care about any fancy schools, and that they did not care about any of the frills. They wanted to build the schools with the material they have on the reservation—the lumber, and cement from the cement plant. All they want is good, comfortable schoolrooms.

As has been pointed out by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] 15,000 of those Indian children do not have an opportunity to enter school. We shall offer some amendments later to increase the facilities, and I hope the Senator from Illinois will join me in them, because I know he has a big heart and wants to see the downtrodden given a chance in life.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope my heart is large, but I should like to point out that in the past 10 years we have spent for this specific purpose \$265,000,000. It is now proposed that we spend \$53,000,000 more. It is proposed to proceed now at double the rate at which we have been operating during the past 10 years; and we have been operating at a rather high rate, too.

Of course, these appropriations are popular in the States where Indians are located and are popular among the Indians. We all love the Indians, because we have a smarting sense of inferiority in that we have treated them badly in the past; and that is true. But we should not think that appropriations to the Indian Bureau in themselves constitute appropriations for the Indians. "There's many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip," and there is a lot of stuff that does not trickle down.

Mr. WATKINS and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To which one of the Senators from the Indian States shall I yield? I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. No; I suggest that the Senator yield first to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well. I yield first to the Senator from the Indian State of Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to know from the Senator whether he has any information pointing to any waste in administration within the Indian Bureau.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I submit that the ratio of one employee in the Indian Bureau for every 30 Indians is an excessive ratio, and I submit that 65 percent of all funds going for employees is far too high. We do not need to blow the noses of the Indians in order to take care of them. There has been a little bit too much of that. The Indians want to be citizens, not wards.

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

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to point out that there is an entirely different situation with reference to the Indians than that which pertains to any other people. What we are attempting to do is to train them in order to enable them to take their places in society. In the past few years there has been a decided improvement in the program. I happen to know that the Indian Bureau itself is attempting to put the Indians on their own feet. In order to do that within the next few years they must step up the program; and that is one of the reasons for the requested increase in the appropriations.

If we are going to get the Indians on their feet, the Bureau must have the money. We must remember also that Indians, for many years, were almost prisoners of war, confined on reservations. The reservations did not actually have a wall around them, but the Indians could not leave them. We have now assumed an obligation; we have become their guardians, and in common decency we ought to put them on their feet.

If the Senator from Illinois will point out where there is any "fat" in this program, where money is actually being wasted and is not being expended as intended, I should be glad to hear about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have cited the ratio of 1 employee to every 30 Indians and I have cited the huge percentage of these funds which go to employees. Now, let me quote from the House committee report, at page 7. The House committee goes into these questions pretty thoroughly. The House committee said it was in agreement with the program of assimilation, and then it went on to say:

However, it finds itself without assurances that the program presented will meet the objective in the foreseeable future. In fact, it is of the opinion that certain of the proposals in this greatly expanded program could retard attainment of the ultimate objective rather than help to accomplish it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I would simply say, in answer to that, that I doubt very much that the House committee has been among the Indians and made investigations on the spot to see whether any money has been wasted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think we should attach great weight to the statement of our corresponding committees in the House. The House Committee on Appropriations has to do with original appropriations, and without any reflection upon our eminent Senate Committee on Appropriations, the House committee does at least as careful a job as we do, and its opinions, I think, should be very persuasive.

I now yield to the Senator from the Indian State of South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I would not disagree with what the Senator from Illinois says with respect to the high ratio of employees to Indians. I think the ratio is too high. I also think that there is many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip, so far as concerns the money reaching the Indians.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to have this commendation from the Senator from South Dakota. I hope he will support my amendment.

Mr. CASE. If the Senator would be specific, there might be more point to his proposal. But we are dealing with health and education services, with which I would think the Senator from Illinois would be greatly concerned. I notice in the committee report that it is suggested that the House made a reduction of \$45,031 in the item for educational assistance, expecting it to be applied against contracts with State departments of education. Personally, I do not see how that particular item could be reduced. State representatives of the office of the superintendent of public instruction came to Washington to point out that they were unable to meet the regular cost of providing education, and they needed more money rather than less money if they were to take over the job of providing education for Indian children in white schools rather than in Indian schools.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I point out to my good friend from South Dakota that the House committee stated that the Bureau of Indian Affairs had asked for an increase of 50 percent without specifying the plans they were going to use in spending the money. The House committee actually proposed that they pause for a year and establish a planning staff. In other words, the Bureau of Indian Affairs did a typical governmental stunt—they asked for many more millions of dollars without furnishing specific justification.

Mr. CASE. After having worked with the so-called Indian problem for many years, longer than I have been in the House and the Senate, it is my conviction that the more we can contract for the services of the local communities so as to have Indian children attend white schools, have Indians engaged in agriculture served by county agents, and have their welfare needs served by county welfare associations, the better off the Indians will be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That would bring about a decrease, whereas, here is an increase of 50 percent.

Mr. CASE. Provided the purposes of the Johnson-O'Malley Act were carried out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I welcome the support of the Senator from South Dakota, who, from his experience with the Indians of the Black Hills, has produced very eloquent testimony supporting my amendment.

Mr. CASE. Not Indians in the Black Hills, but in the prairie country. The Indians were ousted from the Black Hills.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to my good friend from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. From the Indian State of New York? We have a good many Indians there.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I cannot forget the fact that the Seven Nations had their seat in New York, and the Iroquois Confederacy was located along the line where the New York Canal now runs. There are "Indian givers" as well as Indians there.

Mr. LEHMAN. There are from 15,000 to 20,000 Indians in New York State. They deal direct with the State of New York. We give them better education and better social and welfare care than the Federal Government gives many of its Indian wards in other States.

A little more than 400,000 Indians are under the Federal Government. I have been a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for 3 years, and I have been shocked to see how little the Federal Government does for the Indians, people to whom we owe a great moral and political obligation. Our public help to the Indians is probably less than it is to any other group. We render a poor welfare and health services.

We talk about assimilation. I am strongly in favor of training the Indians to become a part of the life of their communities, but it is hopeless to expect such a result unless we raise the educational standards of the Indians, which today are far below those of white citizens of the various States. The schools are separated sometimes by as much as 10, 15, or 20 miles. There is difficulty in supplying an adequate teaching staff. I think the time has come when, if we are going to continue to recognize our responsibility to the Indians, we must see to it that substantial justice is done them. I think it would be a serious mistake to cut this item. I believe it would be a very great disservice to the Indian population in various States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will do a little figuring he will find that the Senate is proposing to spend approximately \$52,000,000 for the education, health, and welfare of 400,000 persons, which amounts to an average of \$130 for each person, or \$650 for a family of five. So far as the educational item is concerned, there cannot be involved more than 150,000 children of school age. If we use that as a divisor, we get a figure of about \$350 per child. Those figures are vastly in excess of the amounts expended in the States having the highest per capita expenditures for education, which I presume are Massachusetts and California. So we are already spending these enormous amounts upon Indians, and the condition of the Indian gets no better. The one conclusion I have been driven to is that somehow the appropriations acts are acts for the relief of the Indian Bureau, rather than primarily for the relief of Indians. Those are rough words, but I am somewhat driven to that conclusion.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not think the figures the Senator has given us of the per capita cost of education are very responsive to the real situation. In addition to education, the Indian Bureau carries on all the health activities and welfare services among the Indians.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Bureau's assistance includes the expenses of Indians for boarding homes, institutions, and schools, and granting of other assistance to needy Indians. This appropriation is not a matter of education alone it covers many other essential services.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Taking the per capita figures, the amount is \$130 per capita, or \$635 for a family of five.

Mr. LEHMAN. Not all of that is for education.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand; it is for education and health. That is an extraordinary expenditure, in view of the fact that, presumably, the Indians have some private income of their own, and I want them to have private incomes of their own.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. My examination of the situation has convinced me that the Indians, except in relatively few instances, cannot now possibly be wholly self-supporting.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They ought to be partially self-supporting.

Mr. LEHMAN. They are partially self-supporting; but, in spite of that, the \$50,000,000 which is now asked, is not exclusively for education. It includes education, which is probably the principal item, but it is also for welfare and health services. The health services rendered to Indians are, in my opinion, less than those rendered to any other group of our population.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We spent \$15,500,000 last year on health services for 400,000 Indians, which was an average health figure of about \$40 per capita, or \$200 for a family of five. The \$40 per capita figure would make \$6,000,000,000 for a population of 150,000,000, or 2 percent of the national income.

#### THE INDIANS PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from Illinois has put his finger on what is probably one of the most elaborate, expensive departments in the United States Government. The Indians were forgotten 50 years ago, and the Bureau has since been occupied with building itself.

There are more employees in the Indian Bureau, I am told, than there are full-blooded Indians in the United States of America, not counting the Navajos.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That must be an overstatement. My figures show there are 13,000.

Mr. MALONE. That may be but it is the information given me. I may say further to the Senator that I introduced a bill to abolish the Indian Bureau, but

providing a reasonable time for the Bureau to close its affairs, and providing for holding hearings to determine what the Government owes the Indians, then to pay them, make citizens out of them, just as we do in the case of people of any other nationality, and get them off the reservations, since they have been prisoners of war for a hundred years.

Even a former Vice President of the United States, Charles Curtis, was never liberated completely. The people of the country thought he was good enough to be President of the United States, if the President should die, but the Indian Bureau never allowed him to have complete control his property. The Indian Bureau settled his estate when he died.

So I am heartily in sympathy with what the Senator from Illinois has said; namely, that when we have such an expensive organization we must give them whatever money they believe is necessary, because we apparently have little control over the Bureau, and very little of the money trickles down to the Indians.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that in his last remark the Senator from Nevada was indulging in what logicians term a nonsequitur, when he said that so long as we have an Indian Bureau, we should give them what they want. I do not believe we should make budgets that way.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. If we could be assured that some of the money would be spent for the benefit of the Indians, I would agree with the Senator. But when we cut the budget of the Indian Bureau, the Indian Bureau cuts the amounts received by the Indians, and does not cut the Bureau's administrative expenses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a grave charge, if true.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that so far as Navajo Indians are concerned, in connection with the long-range program, we have a watchdog committee which, when money is to be spent for construction or any other purpose, is trying to see to it that all the water is squeezed out of the program.

As I told the distinguished Senator a few months ago, I conferred with the Navajo Indians last Saturday. One of the things they told me was that a Chicago architect was designing some of their buildings who did not know anything about what they needed. The Indians do not want buildings with frills, such as the Chicago architect had designed. So we are going to recommend that the Chicago architect be discharged and local architects be employed. We are going to get the water out of the program, but let us not, for the sake of a few dollars, take away the opportunity of the Indian youth to get educations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I point out that all I am proposing is that we hold substantially to the appropriation of last year, with an increase of about 5 percent.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I continue? Last year Congress appropriated \$41,800,000. I am saying, "All right. Let us appropriate \$43,000,000"—a 5-percent increase.

The Indian Bureau and the Budget Bureau have proposed tremendous increases. Last year Congress appropriated for all Indian purposes \$68,000,000. The appropriation which the Senate committee is now proposing aggregate, if my arithmetic is correct, \$95,000,000, or an increase of about 45 percent. In a period when we are facing a deficit of \$15,000,000,000, why should we skyrocket these expenditures, particularly in view of the lack of a definite plan and the somewhat dubious improvement which has been effected by the Indian Bureau itself?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it was kind of the Senator from Illinois to say he had confidence in the judgment of the House Committee on Appropriations. The Senate committee looked into these items carefully, and what the House recommended was generally approved. If Senators will examine the situation, they will find that all the Senate committee did was to add \$650,000 to the amount authorized by the House committee and adopted by the House in the appropriations for health, welfare, and education.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should probably have asked the Senator to yield for a statement. What the Senator says is, of course, correct. But the House committee pointed out that the Indian Bureau did not have a plan for the assimilation of Indians into the civil population of the country. In view of the lack of such a plan, why should we increase the appropriations by even 20 percent? Why not hold them to the figure of last year plus an amount to cover the increase in the cost of living?

Mr. HAYDEN. My point is that the House committee, which the Senator commended, authorized this appropriation in the amount of \$51,916,000. All the Senate committee added to it was \$650,000.

I should like to point out some very significant figures with respect to health, in connection with one tribe of Indians in which we are all interested, namely, the Navajos.

In the United States as a whole there is 1 doctor for every 750 population. In the Navajo country there is 1 doctor for every 3,000 Indians. There is 1 dentist for every 1,500 people in the United States. There is 1 dentist for every 10,000 population in the Navajo country.

The average life expectancy in the United States as a whole is 67 years. It is 52 years in the Navajo country. The infant mortality—I hope the Senator from Illinois will listen to these figures—in the United States as a whole is 32 per thousand. The infant mortality in the Navajo country is 138 per thousand. If that does not indicate the

necessity for better hospitals and medical care, I cannot find any better proof.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has chosen the Navajo Indians as his standard of comparison. Probably the conditions among the Navajos have been worse than among any other Indian group. Secondly, what about the ratio between the Indian population as a whole and the population of the country, or the ratio between the Indian population as a whole and those who live in the poorer districts of our cities, for example?

Mr. HAYDEN. The point I am trying to make is that the money in the bill for hospital development is primarily for the Navajos. We made an agreement to assist in that development.

With respect to the feature of education, let me point out to the Senator that we added nothing to this bill above what the House allowed for this item, except for certain developments in Minnesota.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to make an explanation as to why an item for Minnesota is included in the bill.

First, Minnesota is endeavoring to establish a foster-home-care program for the orphan Indian or the Indian child who has no home at the present time. In order to establish that orphan home or foster-parent program, in the best judgment of the State welfare department and other interested persons, \$200,000 will be required. The other \$135,000 is for the Indian school, Pipestone. There is also \$15,000 for welfare or relief assistance.

Mr. HAYDEN. The House directed that the Pipestone school be kept in operation, but provided no money for it.

Mr. THYE. That is entirely true. For that reason the Senate had to add \$135,000. For State welfare assistance, which service the Indian Bureau has never rendered, there is an additional \$15,000 in the bill. The Welfare Department of the State of Minnesota has taken care of all the welfare expenditures for the Indians in Minnesota without any Federal assistance. That is not true in most of the other States of the Union. They have always had assistance from the Federal Government. It is for that reason that the item of \$15,000 is in the bill.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not true that on the Navajo Reservation the cost of taking care of each patient, even in accordance with the standards which prevail there, runs higher than it does in areas of large population, near centers where facilities are available?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true.

Mr. WATKINS. The Indians are scattered over the desert. It is difficult to persuade nurses to go to the reservations. It is difficult to induce doctors to accept employment in the Indian Serv-

ice. We must pay fairly high salaries in order to get them to come at all. The same situation is true with respect to the schools, is it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is true with respect to both school teachers and those in the medical profession. They do not like to live far away from civilization. They like to be near towns. When they are asked to go away from the railroads and into the reservations, what is the result? If we pay low salaries we must accept doctors who have retired from practice, or who have been unsuccessful in their practice, or we must accept young doctors without experience.

With respect to school teachers, fortunately there are those among them who have a missionary spirit, who are willing to engage in that work even at a sacrifice to themselves. However, the situation is difficult.

I should like to add one further word for the benefit of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. He complains about the administrative expense. We have not increased it one cent above the House figure. So we are not putting in a large amount of fat which could be taken out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The existing amount of fat has not been reduced. I maintain that 13,000 employees are too many. That is too large a force to supervise 400,000 Indians. It is one for every 30 Indians.

Mr. HAYDEN. No one said that they were supervising them. It would be just as logical to say, in connection with a municipal or county government, that the school teachers and those employed in repairing streets and roads are supervisors. They are nothing of the kind. They are employed to do a specific piece of work. The supervisory personnel is exceedingly limited.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not a fact that many of the employees of the Indian Bureau are themselves Indians?

Mr. HAYDEN. Many of them.

Mr. WATKINS. Many thousands of them are Indians.

Mr. HAYDEN. Indians are given the preference, when they are qualified under the civil-service law, for appointment in the Indian Bureau. If two persons obtain the same grade in the civil-service examination and one of them is an Indian, the Indian gets the appointment—and very properly so.

Mr. WATKINS. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that over the years many plans have been proposed to put the Indians on their feet so that they could become a part of our civilization. The trouble has been that the plans have not been used. They have gathered dust in the archives of the Indian Bureau. However, within the past 2 or 3 years there has been a marked improvement in the program of the Indian Bureau for the assimilation of the Indians. I happen to know, because I have visited many of the reservations. I have been in close touch with the Indian Bureau in connection with many of these problems. I happen to know the present Commissioner, Mr. Myer, and his assistant, Mr. Lee. They

are doing a fine job among the Indians, in preparing them for assimilation.

Only recently the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I introduced measures to put two of these groups on their own feet, and gradually to get the Indian Bureau out. Money is now being spent, and work is being done on definite programs, to take care of land titles, and to have the property which is in the name of the tribes surveyed. The Bureau is moving in the direction of assimilation of the Indians as rapidly as possible.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has no definite, detailed plan for the assimilation of Indians into the civil population?

Mr. HAYDEN. Definite, detailed plans have been prepared. The first step is for the Indian who cannot speak English to learn how to speak English so that he may be assimilated into the civil population.

Secondly, in Indian reservations where there are no roads to civilization, it is necessary that the Government build some roads.

Third, a sick Indian cannot be expected to be assimilated very well. Therefore, hospitals must be provided.

There was also a rather extensive plan for replacement surveys, which the House did not allow and the Senate committee did not allow, because we thought that work could perhaps be done just as well by the employment service. Nevertheless, the plan is definite. It includes education to fit the Indians for assimilation, and training in schools and in industry, so that they may obtain employment.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that dozens of Indian schools have been closed, and that the Indian children have been sent to the public schools of the States, because the Indian lands are non-taxable by the States? The Government must, in all fairness, pay tuition. That is included in one item of the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is in this appropriation \$3,172,000 to pay for tuition of Indian children in the public schools. To my mind that is the best investment in the entire appropriation because not only do the Indian children learn what is taught them in the school room, but they learn much from the white children with whom they associate on the playground.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is precisely the case. I am sure that that is exactly what the Senator from Illinois wishes to have done. It is being done with the greatest rapidity possible. However, unfortunately many Indians live in the backwoods areas of the various States. They have been pushed there by the white people, who have taken over the better land. There are still some Indian schools which must be maintained.

Mr. HAYDEN. It should be remembered also that on some reservations

there is no way of avoiding the boarding school. It is made impossible to avoid maintaining by reason of long distances and road conditions. When the cost of maintaining the boarding schools is compared with the cost of maintaining our regular public-school system, we must not overlook the fact that many Indians are attending boarding schools.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Plus the fact that the Indians who attend the Indian schools today not only are taught reading, writing, and arithmetic, but they are also being given additional training in such subjects as agriculture.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who I know is interested in the welfare of Indians, that, contrary to some of the flossy day schools I have seen, I would not like to see the inmates of a reform school put in most of the facilities which are available to the Indians. Many of the buildings were built in 1880 or 1890. I have seen schools in which one toilet must serve more than 75 Indian boys, and they have to go down from the third floor of their dormitory to use the facility, which is located in the basement. That school is still in operation.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If such conditions exist, I say shame on the Indian Bureau which, given enormous amounts of money, still allows such conditions to exist.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall not try to defend the Indian Bureau against that charge, because I think in years past something better should have been done. However, the condition does exist, and attempts are being made to improve it. I believe we are on the right path in our effort to assimilate the Indians by putting them into white schools instead of sending them to schools which are limited to Indians.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Eighteen minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Members of the Senate that plans have been under way to assimilate the Indians. One of the most remarkable methods has been the establishment of the vocational school for Indians at Brigham City, Utah. The Indian Bureau did not have to pay for the buildings. The buildings were already built as a very elaborate hospital for wounded veterans of World War II. Immediately after the war the buildings were abandoned. They were either to be wrecked or sold for whatever could be obtained for them. In undertaking to care for the Indians on the Navajo Reservation, who had no school buildings, although at the time there were approximately 16,000 Indian children, I prepared and introduced a bill under which there was conveyed to the Indian Bureau these hospital buildings.

There are more than 104 buildings. I also sought an appropriation of \$3,750,000 to remodel the buildings in order to convert them to school purposes, and also to add some buildings.

Mr. President, in my opinion, it is probably the best plant which the Indians have for school purposes anywhere in the country. It is a boarding school, and the Indian students remain there most of the year. They are being taken care of under almost ideal conditions. The buildings are beautiful, Mr. President, because they were originally erected with the idea that nothing was too good for our veterans.

The Indians would not have that facility today if it had been necessary to get a direct appropriation of \$14,000,000, which was the cost of the original construction. It has been referred to as a lush, luxurious school. It is that when compared with other Indian schools. It was not constructed, however, at the cost of the taxpayers directly for the care of the Indian, but for the care of white boys, with the exception of some Indians who went there as patients in the hospital.

The school has been proceeding to train Indians and to prepare them to go into white communities. The only way we can train them to go into white men's homes and live in the white men's communities is to get them acquainted with the facilities that exist in white men's communities.

The Indians painted and decorated the buildings, without spending any more money to make them elaborate, and they did some wonderful art work in the painting and decorating.

A fine gymnasium was built. A swimming pool had been built at a cost of \$300,000. It is one of the finest swimming pools in the United States. The Indians now have the use of it. It was to be wrecked because no one could be found who would pay for it. We obtained all that for the Indians, and they are using those facilities today. When they step out of there they are trained and they speak the English language. Seventy-five percent of the Indians when they first go to that school can neither write nor understand English. After they go through the course of study at the school, which is a very practical course, they speak English, and are able to work in shops and homes and on farms, and they never go back to the reservation.

The reservation itself does not have facilities and resources sufficient to sustain the Indians who are now there. There are more than 75,000 Indians on the reservation, but the resources will sustain only about 30,000. The program is designed to train Indians so that they will be able to be assimilated in white men's communities.

We are always importing Mexicans and Puerto Ricans for the purpose of doing certain kinds of agricultural work. Indians are good workers when they are trained. In the school to which I have referred a very definite and concrete program is going forward in behalf of the Indians. I wanted the Senate to know about it.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. What the Senator has said brings me to the point of asking, in view of all the money the Government has spent on the Indians, how does the Senator account for the fact that we have not freed the Indians? Does not the Senator believe that the time has come when we ought to free the Indians?

Mr. WATKINS. The time has come when we should free the Indians. I am speaking from a knowledge of many years of the work of the Indian service, and I have been working on this problem ever since I came to Congress, as the Senator from Michigan knows.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know that the Senator has been doing fine work.

Mr. WATKINS. It is impossible to take an Indian who has lived on the Navajo Reservation, who does not speak a word of English, and put him in a community of white men and expect him to stay free. He will not be able to live there at all, and he will have to go back to the reservation. He must be taught to take care of himself first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twelve minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in May I had a conversation with Mr. Dillon Myer, Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. During my conversation with him I discussed the question of the personnel of the Bureau. I asked Mr. Myer to give me a breakdown of personnel in the field offices as well as in the home office, with respect to the number of people employed in each field office and the number of people employed in the Washington office; and also to break down the figures by area, appropriation, and activities, as the figures related to health, education and welfare services; resources management; construction; general administrative expenses; and other categories, such as trust funds and transfer of funds; and giving the aggregate total for the whole program and the amounts for the respective regional field offices.

Without making any evaluation of them or commenting on them too much, I believe the figures which have been furnished to me will afford valuable information to the Senate.

It is interesting to note, for example, that 7,681 persons are employed in health, education, and welfare services; 2,062 persons are employed under resources management, which includes forests and range lands, agricultural and industrial assistance, soil and moisture conservation, and so forth.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. Under construction, 964 persons are employed. Under general administrative expenses and trust

funds and transfer funds, 2,038 persons are employed. The total number is 12,745. In the Washington office there are 285 persons employed.

It is interesting to note that the highest figure for any field office is 1,872, at Sacramento. The Minneapolis office employs 543. That office supervises the area in the Midwest.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask if it is true that 15 employees in the Indian Bureau are engaged in weed control?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what the chart shows.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does that impress the Senator from Minnesota as a particularly important undertaking, to require 15 persons to control Indian weeds?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that I am always opposed to weeds, but I do not know whether it takes 15 persons to control them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Could not the Indians control the weeds themselves?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would seem to me that they could do so. I join with the Senator from Illinois in trying to get the Bureau of Indian Affairs to put this program on a declining basis, and thereby ultimately being able to close up shop, after making it possible for the Indians to be absorbed as a part of the general population. I feel very strongly about it.

My senior colleague has referred to the Pipestone School in Minnesota, and to the fact that we are establishing a foster home program so that Indian children may be integrated into the public-school system of our State. In our State public assistance is carried on by each of the counties and by the State. It is a part of the general program of welfare assistance.

The sooner the Indian population can be integrated into the general population and can take part in all the activities of the general population in terms of education, health, and so forth, the better off everyone will be.

The number one job is to get behind a program which will do that; in other words, to have the Indian Bureau diminish its activities stage by stage and year by year, and place more of these fine Americans into the regular American communities.

In this bill there is a small appropriation for my home State, and that appropriation deals primarily, as the Senator from Arizona and my colleague have pointed out, with the Pipestone school and foster home, \$135,000 is for the school.

Frankly, if we are going to maintain the school, we must repair it. If we are to eliminate these services on a stage-by-stage basis, we can use the school as long as it will hang together. But a decision must ultimately be made, namely, whether we are to continue with the reservation a paternalistic kind of program or whether we are to place the Indians on a basis of full citizenship.

I think it is well for the Congress to tell the Bureau of Indian Affairs that

Congress expects it to promote programs which will make the Indians self-sustaining and free American citizens.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona realize that this is being taken out of his time?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. How much time remains to me, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent to have the letter and tabulation from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to which I have referred, printed at this point in the RECORD, because I believe they tell the story of what the Bureau of Indian Affairs is doing, in terms of its personnel.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection to having that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT  
OF THE INTERIOR,  
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,  
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1952.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: In accordance with your request during our recent conversation I am enclosing a statement showing the March 31, 1952, employment in the Bureau of Indian Affairs by appropriations, activities, and areas. Footnotes to the statement show the geographical extent of the individual areas and include statistics on the number of agencies, hospitals, and schools.

There is much more to the story than is revealed in the statement and its footnotes. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is the only governmental agency rendering to Indians all of the manifold services which the ordinary citizen receives from Federal, State, county, and municipal agencies, and some additional services which the general population obtains from public or private sources. These services include medical care, education, relief assistance, forestry management, extension work, irrigation work, and soil and moisture conservation services. There are large Government agencies, Federal, State, or local, devoted exclusively to rendering some of these services to the general population, such as the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. In other instances the average citizen provides for needs out of income or through insurance such as in the case of medical care. These services are rendered to Indians through the Bureau of Indian Affairs because of laws, treaties, and national custom.

In addition to these special services there are related activities without which the services could not be operated such as those that provide for construction of buildings and utilities, for the maintenance of these facilities, for building roads, and for general administration. Furthermore, the more than 430,000 Indians do not live in one place, but are scattered throughout the United States and in Alaska, and to the normal complexities of operation of such a varied program must be added the special complexities which arise out of the dispersed nature of the operation.

The program complexity and dispersal of activities is illustrated in the attached statement which shows that 7,681 of the 12,745 employees on duty March 31 were engaged in health, education, and welfare services for

Indians. Included in this total, which represents slightly more than 60 percent of all employment, are the 4,469 employees who operate the Indian school system made up of 241 day schools and 93 boarding schools in 20 States and in Alaska. Also included here are the 2,969 people who operate the 62 Indian Service hospitals in 17 States and in Alaska and those who render general health services to the Indians such as is rendered by city or county health departments to the general population. Those two activities alone, which represent services which Indians could not otherwise get, account for 60 percent of the total Bureau employment.

The next largest group of employees is the 2,062 paid from the appropriation "Resources management." These employees are engaged in fulfilling the many obligations of the United States toward the Indians which arise out of the trust status of Indian property. They are managing the Indian forest lands, aiding Indian farmers and livestock operators, promoting soil and moisture conservation practices on Indian lands, operating Indian irrigation systems, maintaining roads on Indian reservations, promoting arts and crafts programs, managing the complex Indian real-estate business, maintaining the buildings needed for service operations and helping eradicate poisonous weeds. Practically all of these services are identical with similar services rendered to the general population or carried out on the lands belonging to all the people by other Federal and State agencies which do not operate among the Indians.

Less than 10 percent or 934 of the total employees on March 31 were engaged in construction activities on buildings, roads, and irrigation systems. Most of these, of course, are skilled, semiskilled, and nonskilled workers employed on a day basis. In addition to providing facilities needed for services to Indians, this phase of the work is a major source of employment for Indians. It should be noted here that this is not the only source of employment for Indians in the Bureau. Approximately 57 percent of all positions are filled by Indians at all levels and under all activities.

Only 642, or about 5 percent, of the total employment is in the field of general administration. The employees here must do the accounting, payroll, personnel processing, property management, and related administrative work, including executive direction and program coordination, without which the service programs of the Bureau could not be conducted.

The remainder of the employment is under special funds available for specific purposes such as the power revenues which are used to operate the power projects at Flathead, Mont., San Carlos, Ariz., and Colorado River, Ariz.; those employees engaged in operation of irrigation projects paid from collections from the water users; employees paid from funds belonging to the Indian tribes, some of whom such as the workers at the Menominee Indian mills are only technically employees of the United States; and those engaged on special projects such as the white-pine blister-rust control work for which we receive allocations from other agencies.

The 1953 budget which is before the Congress provides for some expansion in this employment. It provides for additional personnel for new hospitals for additional tuberculosis beds through contract with existing institutions and for relief of overworked doctors and nurses at existing hospitals. It provides the necessary employees for opening newly constructed schools; also, it provides for program expansion in the resources field in those areas and activities where intensified work is absolutely essential to carrying out any program for termination of Indian service business such as that proposed in California. Another source of increased employment in 1953 as proposed in the budget is

for construction work on the Navajo and Hopi Reservations to carry out the will of the Congress as expressed in the act of April 19, 1950, Public Law 474, the Navajo-Hopi Rehabilitation Act.

I hope that the foregoing will give some picture of the diversity and dispersal of Indian service employment that is an aid to understanding of the need for what in total appears to be such a large number. Your

interest in this problem and your continued interest in the welfare of Indians is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,  
D. S. MYER, Commissioner.

*Bureau of Indian Affairs: Distribution of March employment by area, appropriation, and activities*

Appropriation and activities	Total	Aberdeen <sup>1</sup>	Albuquerque <sup>2</sup>	Anadarko <sup>3</sup>	Billings <sup>4</sup>	Juneau <sup>5</sup>	Minneapolis <sup>6</sup>	Muskogee <sup>7</sup>	Phoenix <sup>8</sup> and Sacramento <sup>9</sup>	Portland <sup>10</sup>	Window Rock <sup>11</sup>	Washington, D. C.
<b>HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES</b>												
1. Hospitals, disease preventive and curative services.....	2,969	304	211	262	132	584	142	253	375	299	385	22
2. Educational assistance, facilities and services.....	4,469	712	424	374	88	432	109	241	591	121	1,363	14
3. Welfare and guidance services.....	90	17	4	4	2	6	4	13	12	3	18	7
4. Placement services.....	74	15	3	3	3	5	5	5	11	3	16	5
5. Maintaining law and order.....	79	18	1		6	2	4		18	9	19	2
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>7,681</b>	<b>1,066</b>	<b>643</b>	<b>643</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>1,029</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>1,007</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>1,801</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>RESOURCES MANAGEMENT</b>												
1. Forest and range lands.....	311	12	22		47		20		72	69	61	8
2. Fire suppression.....	100						100					
3. Agricultural and industrial assistance.....	243	30	12	13	25	10	5	19	41	21	38	29
4. Soil and moisture conservation.....	228	16	15	45	21		3	24	28	26	46	4
5. Operation, repair and maintenance of Indian irrigation systems.....	159	2	29		11				22	23	72	
6. Repair and maintenance of roads and trails.....	474	90	43	6	30		30	32	70	98	73	2
7. Development of Indian arts and crafts.....	4											4
8. Management of Indian trust property.....	238	37	8	27	15	5	18	42	29	19	20	18
9. Repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities.....	290	34	11	5	13	64	8	17	33	17	79	9
10. Weed control.....	15								13	2		
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,062</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>CONSTRUCTION</b>												
1. Buildings and utilities.....	387	2	10	34	12	54	1	4		1	246	23
2. Roads and trails.....	232	11	7	2	3		1	16	24	28	138	2
3. Irrigation systems.....	345	1	10		55				200	23	47	9
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>964</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>34</b>
General administrative expenses.....	642	85	38	24	68	43	17	32	87	65	59	124
Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, Oklahoma.....	14							14				
Proceeds of power.....	129				74				55			
Trust funds:												
Indian tribal funds.....	338	6	3	85		20	65	1	44	114		
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.....	346	70	70		25	27	10	4	48	14	78	
Operation and maintenance, etc., irrigation systems.....	454		1		98				99	256		
Transfer funds:												
Control of forest pests.....	1						1					
Missouri River Basin.....	70				67							3
Working funds, access roads.....	44										44	
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,038</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>12,745</b>	<b>1,462</b>	<b>922</b>	<b>884</b>	<b>795</b>	<b>1,252</b>	<b>543</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>1,872</b>	<b>1,211</b>	<b>2,802</b>	<b>12,285</b>

<sup>1</sup> Aberdeen area includes the States of Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota with 8 agencies, 10 hospitals, 10 boarding schools, and 55 day schools.

<sup>2</sup> Albuquerque area includes the States of Colorado and New Mexico, with 4 agencies, 6 hospitals, 4 boarding schools and 28 day schools.

<sup>3</sup> Anadarko area includes western Oklahoma and the State of Kansas, with 3 agencies, 4 hospitals, and 6 boarding schools.

<sup>4</sup> Billings area includes the States of Montana and Wyoming, with 7 agencies, 5 hospitals, 2 boarding schools and 7 day schools.

<sup>5</sup> Juneau area includes the entire Territory of Alaska, with 7 hospitals, 3 boarding schools and 96 day schools.

<sup>6</sup> Minneapolis area includes the States of Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, and Wisconsin with 4 agencies, 6 hospitals, 2 boarding schools and 5 day schools.

<sup>7</sup> Muskogee area includes eastern Oklahoma and the States of Florida and Mississippi, with 3 agencies, 4 hospitals, 6 boarding schools and 10 day schools.

<sup>8</sup> Phoenix area includes the States of Arizona, Nevada, and Utah with 6 agencies, 10 hospitals, 4 boarding schools and 25 day schools.

<sup>9</sup> Sacramento area includes the State of California, with 1 agency, 1 hospital, and 1 boarding school.

<sup>10</sup> Portland area includes the States of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington with 8 agencies, 3 hospitals, 2 boarding schools and 1 day school.

<sup>11</sup> Window Rock area includes the Navajo and the Hopi Reservations in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah and the Intermountain School in Utah, with 2 agencies, 6 hospitals, 14 area boarding schools, 37 community boarding schools, and 14 day schools.

<sup>12</sup> Includes 5 field employees paid on the Washington office payroll.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois, so that he may ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact that on the basis of 12,745 employees, according to his computation, or 12,950, according to mine, 1,138 are assigned to work on trust funds?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois is correct. He knows that I have a bill which proposes that the tribal funds be placed in the hands of the tribal councils. There is a place where a reduction in the personnel of the Bureau of Indian Affairs can well be made, namely, in connection with the administration of certain funds which the Bu-

reau of Indian Affairs apparently is never willing to let go of; apparently it simply wishes to hang on to them forever.

I wish my position to be crystal clear, namely, that the Indians deserve health, welfare, and educational services, and deserve them to the full extent to which we are able to provide them.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say that from my contact with the problems of the Indians—and their problems are very great—I have been particularly impressed with the fact that if we are going to integrate these fellow Americans of ours into the general economy of the communities, we must put them on an equal basis with their white brothers in

the field of education, training, and employment opportunities.

Today many Indians simply cannot compete with the whites, for many do not have sufficient education or training. Many of them are lacking even in the fundamentals of education. Many of them have not even had an opportunity to attend a grammar school. Many have difficulty in reading or writing English.

When the Indians have received an education, they have been able to compete with the whites. But if the Indians are without education, it is absolutely hopeless to try to bring about a real degree of assimilation and integration.

So I believe we cannot afford to cut down the funds available for the education of the Indians or for health services or for welfare services. All those serv-

ices are necessary to bring about such a situation that the Indians can become established on a fair level. We must see that that work is done in order to keep the Indians from continuing on a far lower level than that of the whites.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from New York?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MONRONEY. Perhaps the Senator from New York does not know it, but in the Hall of Fame, at the other end of the Capitol, both of the two great Oklahomans who represent our State were Indians who enjoyed superior education opportunities. One of them was Sequoia, who perfected the first written Indian alphabet. The other was the great Will Rogers. They showed by their lives the achievements to which Indians can aspire if they are given a proper opportunity.

On the other hand, if we are going to treat the Indians as "reservation Indians" and as the tool or pawn of bureaucracy, the Indians will not be able to develop to the extent to which they are capable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me ask whether it will remedy the matter to give larger appropriations to the bureaucracy.

Mr. MONRONEY. The bureaucracy needs direction and a mandate from Congress, such as will be given by this program. The Bureau of Indian Affairs must be directed to inaugurate programs to bring about the assimilation of the Indians. They must be given an adequate opportunity.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I fully agree with what the Senator from Oklahoma has said. It has been my experience that we encourage the Indians to draw up plans for their own welfare and to permit them to become integrated into the general communities; but after encouraging them to draft those plans, many of which we later approve, we do not do anything about them. We simply allow the Indians to exist as usual, without adequate help from us or sufficient opportunities to become assimilated into the communities and into the economic life of the Nation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I simply wish to point out that there seems to be a difference between the point of view of the Indians today and the point of view they have had in the past. A change has occurred in their point of view. It can best be illustrated by referring to the situation on the Navajo Reservation. In the early days it was necessary to use the services of policemen to get the children into school and to see that they stayed in school. The Indian children were somewhat like some of the white children in that way.

However, as of today, when it is announced that the busses will collect the

Indian children on a certain day and will take them to the Indian school at Brigham City, instead of having to have policemen to get the Indian children to the school, probably as many as 300 Indians will be found waiting, in the hope that they will be able to go to the school, in case some of the others do not show up. A big change has come about in respect to the desire of the Indians for education.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is absolutely true.

Mr. President, let us vote on this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois desire to use any further time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment on page 9, in line 8.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, in line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Resources management," on page 9, line 18, after the word "exhibits", to strike out "\$12,949,760" and insert "\$13,700,000."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, to this committee amendment, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. The amendment is offered to the committee amendment by me, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 9, in line 18, it is proposed to strike out "\$13,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$13,900,000."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this is a small item.

The \$200,000 increase proposed here is for range water development on the Papago Indian Reservation in southern Arizona.

This is one of the most important phases of the plan for the social and economic development of this tribe and the discharge of the Federal Government's obligation to these Indians. The object is to proceed constructively in establishing the 7,000 Papagos on an improved economic level, as a part of the purpose to integrate them into the social, economic, and political life of the Nation, and to terminate Federal supervision and control of the Indians.

The Papagos comprise about 1,200 family groups, and they live in 73 scattered villages. The total reservation area is 2,855,021 acres, divided into three units—the Papago, the San Xavier, and the Gila Bend Reservations.

There are about 7,000 Papago Indians, and they need this additional fund in order to prevent their soil from washing

away and to provide money with which to build water holes for their cattle.

I hope the Senate will adopt this amendment to the committee amendment.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. How much would this amendment to the committee amendment add to the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. \$200,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. How much was budgeted for this particular item?

Mr. HAYDEN. I can give that figure. The item was budgeted; but as it stands today, under "Resources management" we are—

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I mean to ask whether there was any budget estimate for this particular item.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; there was not.

Mr. McFARLAND. It was in a lump sum, and the budget estimate was \$500,000. Of course, we have had to split these items for irrigation.

Mr. FERGUSON. This item was before the Senate last year, was it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. HAYDEN. No, it was not.

Mr. FERGUSON. Were not some of these wells under consideration last year?

Mr. McFARLAND. No. This item is not for wells.

Mr. FERGUSON. This is for another location, is it?

Mr. McFARLAND. This is a small amendment far below the budget estimate in amount.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does it come under "Construction"?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; it comes under "Resources management."

Mr. McFARLAND. This item is for water development on the Papago Indian Reservation; it is to develop water-holes for range purposes. It is needed for the cattle on the reservation.

Mr. HAYDEN. If my colleague will permit, I may say that if the Senator from Michigan will look at the budget estimate for this item, he will observe that it was \$18,372,000. The House allowed \$12,949,760. The recommendation of the Senate Committee is still far below the budget. Had the full budget estimate been allowed, this work could have been taken care of.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, but this particular item is now sought to be earmarked.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what my colleague seeks.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator proposes to add \$200,000, to be earmarked.

Mr. HAYDEN. What I mean is that, had the full budget estimate of \$18,372,000 been allowed, the program which my colleague advocates would have been included.

Mr. FERGUSON. But does not this bill add \$1,700,000 to last year's appropriation for items of this kind?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; not over the appropriation of last year.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is \$1,660,000, approximately, which I spoke of as being \$1,700,000, over last year's appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. A very large budgetary increase was recommended.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would there not be sufficient in this item to cover the \$200,000? Why must we have that earmarked? If it is so important, would not the department do the work out of the amount of money we are giving them, in the sum of about \$13,900,000?

Mr. McFARLAND. No, there would not be sufficient money to do what my amendment contemplates. All I have done is to select a few items. The Senator speaks about earmarking. I have not offered amendments, and shall not do so, as to all the items included in the budget estimate. I selected a few items which I deemed most important to the Indians. In this instance only \$200,000 is proposed to be provided.

Mr. FERGUSON. "It is only" that amount. That is what we hear when it is proposed to add \$1,000,000,000. "It is only \$1,000,000,000."

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, but in the case of these items the proposed appropriation is \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 under the budget estimates.

Mr. FERGUSON. Similar situations come up in the committee from time to time. A Senator asks, "What is that item?" The reply is, "It is only \$1,000,000,000 or \$2,000,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for a division. On a division, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next committee amendment was, on page 10, line 1, to strike out "\$5,310,000" and insert "\$24,812,000."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I desire to call up.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed by Mr. McFARLAND for himself and Mr. WATKINS, to amend the committee amendment on page 10, line 1, by striking out "\$24,812,000" and inserting "\$31,312,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have an amendment to reduce the figure from \$24,812,000 to \$14,812,000, a cut of \$10,000,000. If the proposal of the Senator from Arizona were adopted, namely, an increase of approximately \$7,000,000, would it then be in order subsequently for me to propose a reduction to \$14,812,000, or would that be an amendment not in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to reduce the amount would

not be in order, if the amendment of the Senator from Arizona were adopted, except through reconsideration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have a similar parliamentary inquiry. The Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Michigan have an amendment on page 10, in line 1, to strike out "\$24,812,000" and insert "\$14,812,000." Would it be in order to offer that amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not yield any further in regard to this matter. I wish to address the Senate. I understand I have the floor. I have been willing to yield up to this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to provide for the construction of necessary roads in the Navajo and Papago Indian Reservations, to provide schools, on the Navajo Reservation, and to make provision for increased irrigation facilities on the Papago Reservation.

On a recent trip to the Navajo Reservation, I participated in a long conference on the reservation between representatives of the University of Arizona, the University of New Mexico, and the Navajo Tribal Council. We heard from many tribal leaders and from each came the same entreaty:

"Give us schools. If we can have schools we can work out many of our secondary problems. But we need schools for our children."

These are a definitely self-respecting people. One can see in the effort the parents have made to provide what they consider boarding facilities for their children the eagerness, the strength of their positive desire to help themselves. It is hard for many in the Senate to realize the magnitude of the problem of meeting our responsibilities to these fine people.

The Navajo Reservation is the size of West Virginia—and has 12 miles of paved roads. There are more than 65,000 Indians living in this area. Of the approximately 26,000 Navajo children, of school age, 15,000 have no schooling because there are no schools for them. Another 5,000 have spasmodic schooling but insufficient to turn them out as literate people.

This alarming situation exists in spite of the fact that since 1868 there has been a treaty between these people and the Federal Government which provides for the presence of a school and teacher for each 30 children.

A prime requirement for any honest school program is a highway system sufficient to get the children to the schools—and to the hospitals—which are few and far between.

Let me say to my good friends on the floor of the Senate, who talk about the condition of the Indians not being any better than it was years ago, that I can tell them why it is not any better. It is because the Federal Government has not done the right thing by the Indian.

Had we rehabilitated the Indian years ago, he would already have been assimilated into the life of the white people and would have been treated as one of them. But what did we do? We sent the Navajo, Hopi, and Papago Indians out to the desert, where they were virtually prisoners. As a matter of fact, they were prisoners, because they were not permitted to leave the reservation.

I heard an interesting story in regard to the Indians, when they were at Fort Sumter. The Army took them to the fort, where they were guarded. The Government supplied the Army with sufficient money to purchase 15,000 blankets for the Indians. The General Accounting Office recently discovered that only 5,000 of those blankets had ever been delivered. Ten thousand of them were lost, or were never purchased. If they ever were purchased, no one knew what had become of them. It is rather late now to undertake to find out what happened to 10,000 blankets in 1863. That illustrates the manner in which the Indians have been treated.

Senators talk about having a program. We have a program, for the first time. Twenty-three years ago we started to formulate a program for the benefit of these downtrodden citizens—the first citizens, if you please, Mr. President, of the United States of America.

The Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation program was the comprehensive plan approved by the Eighty-first Congress in 1950 after a careful study of the existing chaotic conditions in the Navajo country. The program contemplated an expenditure, over a 10-year period, of \$88,570,000. There are approximately 26,000 Navajo children of school age. Of this number 15,000 are without school facilities.

Mr. President, the Navajos made a splendid record in World War II. They fought for their country, and they should not be deprived of the privilege of sending their children to school. We send money overseas to rehabilitate foreign nations, but we cannot take care of our own Indians. We whittle down appropriations designed to take care of the Indians who are good citizens.

As I pointed out, Mr. President, the Indians say they do not want buildings with frills as provided by the architect from Chicago. I told them that so far as I was concerned, our committee would recommend the firing of the architect from Chicago, and they all cheered. All they want is good, substantial buildings and an opportunity for their children to attend school.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Referring to the bill and the item to which the Senator is addressing himself, there has been publicized to some extent a statement to the effect that the Bureau intended to remove some of the Navajos to other States and to colonize them in other States. The matter has been referred to in my own State. I hope it is not the intention of the Senator from Arizona to promote this appropriation for the purpose of removing Navajos from the Navajo country, Arizona, New Mexico,

and the Southwest, to some place which has not been Navajo country in any sense of the word.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not intend to touch upon that at all. All my amendment does is to provide for schools on reservations.

Mr. McCARRAN. Reading from page 9—

Mr. McFARLAND. But that is not the purpose of my amendment. There is a program to try to secure employment for these Indians off the reservation. Some of them are employed at mines at Morenci, Ariz. They are making good miners and are sending their children to school. But, Mr. President, they will not work there unless they understand the English language. Eighty percent of them do not know the English language.

Mr. McCARRAN. I very much favor the Senator's idea of education, but to move a Navajo out of the Navajo country and send him to till the soil in Utah, Nevada, Idaho, and other places where he has never been before, is contrary to the policy which I think is good for the Navajo. I certainly would object to their being so colonized. They vote in the State of Arizona and in the State of Nevada. I, in part, represent a State which has a voting population of 175,000 persons. If we move the Indians there it would be possible to gerrymander the State very easily.

Mr. McFARLAND. I can appreciate the fears of the distinguished Senator from Nevada. I know his State has a small population. I know there is not much opportunity in the State of Nevada for employment for the Indians.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am in favor of the Indians getting employment anywhere they can get it, because they make good mechanics and machinists when they are trained. There is no better worker than is the Indian when he is properly trained. I have noticed that all over the West.

Mr. McFARLAND. All we propose to do is to give the Indians an opportunity to work.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. May I point out that I am a member of the Navajo "watchdog committee." That is one of the reasons why I am trying to discharge my duty today.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator now bear the title of "Chief"? If not, I should like to give it to him.

Mr. WATKINS. The title will probably be "Chief Mud Catcher" when we get through. The Indian Bureau is trying to place the young Indians, as fast as they learn English, in various localities where they can obtain employment. Not in colonies, I will say to the Senator from Nevada, but in communities where help is needed. In Utah many agricultural workers are needed. There are 75,000 Navajos on the reservation, but resources are adequate to take care of only about 35,000. We are employing Mexicans. On my own farm Mexican labor is being employed. We would be only too glad to have Navajos, but I can not find a sufficient number of them who are trained to work. We can not get them. The idea is not to place them in

colonies, but to place them wherever they can make good as American citizens. I am against colonization.

Mr. McCARRAN. My observation has been that the Navajo, when first approached, does not know much English, but after a few minutes he can speak it about as well as any of us can.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I know of no idea of colonizing the Navajos. Personally, I would oppose it. On the other hand, if the Indian can be trained to take a job he should be able to take it anywhere he can find it in the United States.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have been listening to the reasons for the proposed amendment which the Senator from Arizona seems to base largely on the requirements for increased education for the Navajos and other Indians, with which I am completely sympathetic. I do not find, however, that in the section of the bill which he seeks to amend education itself is mentioned more than incidentally. What assurance is there that the proposed increase in the appropriation will go for the purposes which have been so well presented by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is, of course, for construction, and I am placing in the RECORD the justification for it. I think the Bureau will be duty-bound to follow the justification.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide sufficient funds to carry through on at least a token basis the projects promised these people. Even with the educational facilities provided for by this amendment, there will still be thousands of Navajo children without schools.

The sum of \$600,000 of the requested increase is for reconstruction of the Dennehotso boarding school to care for 150 pupils.

The sum of \$800,000 is needed for the reconstruction of the Piñon School, also a boarding-school project to accommodate 120 Indian children.

The sum of \$1,500,000 would be allotted for a new facility, the Keyenta School, a boarding school that would eventually accommodate 400 Navajo school children. The total cost of this facility will be \$7,000,000, and the \$1,500,000 requested here is to start construction.

There is no large boarding school on the entire west side of the reservations.

The sum of \$700,000 would be required to provide the Sanostee School. This is a reconstruction program, the present school not being in operation because the building is unsafe. It would be designed as a boarding school to accommodate 150 pupils.

The sum of \$800,000 is sought for a reconstruction program on the Steamboat School, also a boarding school, designed to care for 120 pupils.

On the long-range program \$7,000,000 has been appropriated so far. There was \$7,725,000 requested in the 1953

budget. Even with Senate restoration, too little can be done.

The appropriation thus far on the long-range program for roads is \$1,118,000. There had been \$2,280,000 requested in the budget. Even with the Senate restoration, this will take a cut. There should be built each year \$5,000,000 worth of roads and trails. The amendment adds \$1,000,000 and will still be under \$3,360,000 to be used for "resources, schools, and hospitals."

On the whole Papago Reservation there is only one State highway which is constructed to modern standards for less than one-third of its length across the reservation. From this highway lead two Indian Service roads, one south from Sells and the other to Casa Grande, neither of which is built to present-day standards. Less than 150 miles of secondary roads built to truck trail standards complete the entire reservation road system. Only 36 of the 73 Papago villages are reached by graded roads. Two schools are more than 8 miles from the nearest improved highway.

The Papago road program proposes intensive support for the rapid completion by the State of Arizona of Route 86, the east-west highway; reconstruction by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the road north from Sells to Casa Grande and of parts of the secondary road system to standards that will make them acceptable as part of the country road system. It also proposes the construction of a limited number of bus roads and access roads to the various villages.

The estimate capital investment for this feature is \$3,500,000 which should be made available at the rate of about \$350,000,000 per year.

This amendment authorizes \$500,000. Without this amendment but \$173,000 would be made available for this vital and much-needed project.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The breakdown of the budget shows buildings and utilities, \$14,810,000; roads and trails, \$10,000,000; irrigation systems, \$11,000,000, under the construction item. We cannot have schools and hospitals without building utilities.

Mr. FLANDERS. What was the first item which the Senator read?

Mr. HAYDEN. Buildings and utilities.

Mr. FLANDERS. It does not tell what they are?

Mr. HAYDEN. The only kinds of buildings and utilities are school buildings, day schools, boarding schools, and hospitals.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we talk about a long-range program. Congress authorized an appropriation of more than \$88,000,000 for the Navajos and Hopis in the authorization legislation for rehabilitation. A total of \$20,394,200 was recommended for this program for the fiscal year 1953. The House reduced the appropriation recommendation to \$2,483,500. If the totally inadequate \$2,483,000 appropriation is allowed to stand, it will mean a stalemate in the constitution program

already in progress and will result in financial loss and virtual abandonment of the long-range program promised by the act of April 1950.

Mr. President, these Indians have been relying on this program. They have been counting on having these schools for their children. If we are to establish the schools for them at some time, why not do so now, in order that they may rehabilitate themselves, and take their places as useful citizens.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The distinguished Senator from Arizona is making a very good point. Certainly what has impressed itself upon members of the committee who listened to the testimony has been the fact that our country has not been very successful in laying a foundation for the integration of Indians into normal American life. The sooner they can be properly educated and trained vocationally and otherwise, so that they can take their places as citizens of our great Nation, on a basis of full equality with other citizens, earning their own way, the sooner, in the final analysis, we will have discharged our obligations to the Indians.

I believe the Senator from Arizona would also agree that we have not been satisfied over the years with the way in which the Indian Bureau has operated. It is a little short of shocking to me that there should still be thousands of Indians who cannot speak the language of the country with which they are expected to be integrated, and in which they are expected to take their places.

The Indians have contributed much by their service in the Armed Forces. They can make a real contribution to the general economic development of the United States. I think a very strong case has been made for granting the increase recommended by the committee. However, I think we must keep the Indian Bureau constantly under the close observation of Congress and of the Appropriations Committee, so that as soon as possible we can change the policy of having the Indians as merely wards of the Government, and enable them to get on a self-supporting basis, so that they can make their full contribution to the welfare of the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from California for his statement. I agree with him that the appropriation suggested would be money well spent. It would be a good investment and, in the long run, would mean a saving to the United States. It is the only way in which we can relieve ourselves of the obligation we owe these Indians from year to year. After these Indians are educated, they will not want to live on reservations and eke out an existence under starvation conditions. I think we should act from a humanitarian standpoint, if for no other reason. I cannot conceive that the Senate would deny such assistance to these people, who plead with us to give their children an opportunity to succeed in life. I do not see how we can say "No" to them. There are 15,000 children on the Navajo Res-

ervation. The Papagos are in equally as poor condition, if not worse. The money would be used on both reservations.

The Indians will be watching for the appropriation of this money. I wish to say again that they do not want school buildings having frills. All they desire is usable schoolrooms, and, of course, they want to have a few roads by which they can get to the schools.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I agree with the able and distinguished majority leader in his statement that what the Indians and Indian families are concerned with is that they have suitable school buildings. I believe we have failed very sadly in not equipping Indian schools for vocational education and manual training. The Indians should have an opportunity to work with their hands and to do the things which through the ages they have been trained to do.

Last fall I visited an Indian reservation in Minnesota. When I went through the general classrooms in the school, I did not find the interest among the pupils that I found when I stepped into the vocational education or manual training classrooms. There I found keener interest.

If we are ever to aid Indians to take care of themselves and to take their place among the citizens of this land, it will be through the educational system of our vocational classrooms. We shall have to begin preparing Indian youths to go into the various communities of the Nation and to live as citizens of the land, as do other youths.

I thank the Senator from Arizona for yielding.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not true that Congress has approved a 10-year program for rehabilitation of the Navajo Indians?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Congress authorized \$88,000,000 to take care of rehabilitation, and a definite program was worked out at the time.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. The pending amendment is in line with that program, and is intended to put it into effect; is it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from Arizona is chairman of the Navajo watchdog committee, authorized by Congress, is he not?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator is now discharging one of his duties as chairman of that committee. I happen to be a member of the committee, as well.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to state another thing the watchdog committee has done. We have asked the universities and colleges of our States to help us observe the expenditure of the money, and they are doing so. They will make a report on the subject, and we can rest assured that we will get as much for the money we appropriate for the benefit of those Indian people as is possible.

I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON rose.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan whatever time he may require.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suppose it might be presumed that there were no Indians in the State of Michigan. It so happens that there are Indians in the State of Michigan; but the Senator from Michigan opposes the proposed increase.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] talks about frills. He said that the Indians did not want any frills in connection with school construction. He stated that he knew that if anyone had ever been on the Navajo Reservation he would favor these increases.

The Senator from Michigan has been on the Navajo Reservation. He was out there at about the time the school project at Shiprock was started. These things come along gradually. That project was started back in 1947. In this year's appropriation, known as the fifth increment, only \$1,990,000 is asked. That particular school is to have boarding facilities for 510, and facilities for 180 day students in addition. When completed—at least up to the fifth increment—the cost will be \$6,918,900. That is only a little short of \$10,000 per student for the cost of the facility. I notice one item for a gymnasium, auditorium, and office wing, \$870,000.

Mr. President, this is not all for schools. About a third of it is for roads and trails and irrigation. We who oppose this amendment have some ideas. The amendment was considered in the Senate Committee on Appropriations and was rejected. It had been considered by the House, and the House allowed about \$5,000,000 for this item. The Senate committee increased it \$19,500,000. The sponsors of the pending amendment would increase it about \$6,000,000 more.

This item has in it at the present time \$1,800,000 unobligated. It has in it about \$9,000,000 unexpended carry-over at the end of the year. So we who oppose this increase believe that not only have we allowed too much in the item of \$19,500,000—and some of us are sponsoring an amendment to decrease that amount—but certainly the pending amendment should not prevail.

During the past 10 years this item has cost \$76,240,454, indicating that we have not held down the support for Indian reservations and for the Indians individually.

The difficulty I found with respect to the Navajos, as I have discovered from a survey of the other cases, is that we have been spending great sums of money on them and we have not been accomplishing what we should have accomplished. I have felt at times that the difficulty is that there is too much time spent, by those who administer the Indian Bureau, in the spending of money itself, instead of educating and taking care of the Indians, so that they may go out into the world, into white men's communities, and take care of themselves.

The greatest need in this country today is for a program which would free the Indians. Those in charge of the Bureau, while taking care of the Indians should work to free them.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is the Senator from Michigan in favor of carrying out the long-range program which was adopted by Congress?

Mr. FERGUSON. The trouble is that we have been carrying it out for 60 years.

Mr. McFARLAND. No, no, Mr. President; that is not correct. Is the Senator in favor of the long-range program which was adopted and which was supposed to rehabilitate the Indians? Is the Senator in favor of carrying out the program for which \$88,000,000 was authorized, or is he opposed to it?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think that an authorization is no mandate upon either the members of the Appropriations Committee or on Congress as a whole to make appropriations. We did not say that the \$88,000,000 would be used to carry out the program in one year or 10 years.

Mr. McFARLAND. It was to be done over a 10-year period. It is supposed to be completed in 10 years. Does not the Senator think if it is a good step forward that it should be taken now? Is the Senator in favor of spending money to carry out that program, or is he opposed to it?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels that some things have happened since the program was adopted. Things have happened in the United States which make it necessary to cut the expenditure of money. We must determine whether we want to spend this additional amount of money by way of deficit spending. That is the question which confronts us. Naturally the Bureau will spend any amount of money Congress gives them. The House knew what it was doing. It allowed \$5,000,000. We must make cuts somewhere.

Mr. President, this morning we had an appropriation bill before the subcommittee with respect to the military. The military are asking for approximately \$52,000,000,000 to defend the United States. Here we have construction items. Are we going into 1953 fiscal year with an appropriation for roads and trails and certain other construction to be provided by deficit spending? The question is not whether we should or should not educate the Indians. That is the whole question before the Senate.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is the Senator in favor of allowing to continue to exist a situation in which 15,000 Indians, wards of the Government, have no opportunity for education?

Mr. FERGUSON. We have been appropriating money every year to take care of the education of the Indians. Spending \$88,000,000 over a 10-year period would only amount to \$8,800,000 a year. We are being asked to appropriate \$31,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is for construction work for all Indians throughout the United States, not merely for the Navajos. The Senator knows that to be the fact.

Mr. FERGUSON. How much will the Navajos get this year?

Mr. McFARLAND. They will not get enough.

Mr. FERGUSON. Naturally.

Mr. McFARLAND. They will not get enough. They will not get the amount which was budgeted and they will not get sufficient money to send their 15,000 children to school. That is the situation, Mr. President.

Mr. FERGUSON. Even if we appropriate the money this year they will not be sent to school.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not correct to say that the United States Government has neglected the Indian children? The prime objective of our educational program is to assimilate Indian children with our white school children. In my State an Indian school was closed down and the school district in the adjoining territory has been required to absorb the Indian children. While we appropriated vast sums of money annually for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indians are becoming poorer and poorer as wards of the Government, and at the same time illogical claims are made that the Government is not doing enough for them. Somewhere there must be an inconsistency.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. That will help ward off some of the criticism we who are asking for cuts have been receiving.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Arizona desired to know how much the Navajos and Hopis get. Last year they wanted \$10,500,000. Of this year's allotment, they want \$16,731,500 for the Navajo-Hopi program.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on September 22, 1951, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] made a very outstanding and able address on the Indian situation. I have it before me. Persons who feel that the Indians are abused and that the United States has not done its part for them should read the speech of the Senator from Nevada. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 9, page 1912, appears a table, which was printed in connection with the speech made by the Senator from Nevada. The table shows that in the fiscal year 1903 Congress appropriated \$9,941,299.29 for the Indian Service. In 1951 Congress appropriated \$80,635,055. It represents an increase of approximately 800 or 900 percent. Yet we are told that the condition of the Indians is getting worse year by year. The whole program has been mismanaged and mishandled.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Apparently the more money we give to the Indian Bureau the less the Indians get out of it.

Mr. BRIDGES. The moment the Indian Bureau gets its hand on an Indian, no matter how little Indian blood the "Indian" may have, it never relinquishes its hold on him. The distinguished Senator from Nevada, during the course of his address on September 22, 1951, pointed out that in the case of former Vice President Curtis, who had only a very small amount of Indian blood, the Indian Bureau held on to his estate and insisted on settling it even though he had a very small amount of Indian blood in his veins. That is how the Indian Bureau performs its functions.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the Indian Bureau at that time was under the direction of the Republican Party.

Mr. BRIDGES. It does not make any difference.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it is even worse if it was done under a Republican administration, because they should have known better.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to say that, so far as the Indian Bureau is concerned, and the statement that its history shows failure, I think a very fundamental fact is overlooked. I know something of the Indian Bureau people. I have lived near an Indian reservation, and I have lived on an Indian reservation itself. I have moved among those employed by the Indian Bureau people. I think they are very decent citizens. I have found for many years that the Indians themselves have not been willing to accept education. They have not been willing to improve themselves. For instance, I should like to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that on the Ute Reservation in Utah the white overseers who are in charge built little homes for the Indians to live in. They were fine little frame buildings. They asked the Indians to move into them. The Indians moved into the buildings and stayed there for perhaps a month. Then it was found that the Indians had put their saddles, harness, dogs, and general paraphernalia into the frame buildings, and they were living in the tepees which were standing to one side of the houses. But that condition no longer exists; there has been a big change in the Indians.

Mr. FERGUSON. When I was recently on the Navajo Reservation, I found that approximately 40 automobiles were being operated at the headquarters of the reservation. Those automobiles were being operated by the whites who were in charge of the headquarters. The Indians do not drive those automobiles. They are used by the white men who are supervising the Indians.

The taxpayers of the United States are paying for the operation of those automobiles.

If a few of the white supervisors rode horses to supervise the Indians, perhaps there would not be so many supervisors. But the present situation is that the supervisor rides in an automobile, and the Indian and his wife ride on a horse.

I am objecting to all these extravagant expenditures.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me? Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. There may have been a time when there was extravagance, and perhaps there is extravagance now. However, let us remember that the 10-year rehabilitation program for the Navajos, for instance, is a definite program to improve the land and provide education for the Indians.

I realize that it is difficult to have perfect administration. On the other hand, the Senator from Arizona and I are saying that there is a different feeling among the Indians today. Congress has adopted a program for the Indians, but the work in connection with the program is far behind schedule. Certainly we are under obligation to carry out the program.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the argument of the bureaucrat; namely, "Just give me more money and I will do better things."

Mr. WATKINS. But how can the Indian children be educated unless money is provided for the purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator from Utah say that \$10,000 per student must be spent for the Indian schools?

Mr. WATKINS. No; it would not be necessary to spend that much money if it were not for the inflation which has occurred.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there is one item for \$150,000 for a sprinkling system for a school in the desert. Is it necessary for quarters of that size to be provided?

I know, and the Senator from Utah knows, that the supervisors of these Indians not only drive automobiles, but in some cases fly in airplanes— all at the expense of the American taxpayers. On the other hand, the Indians have to ride horses.

Mr. WATKINS. If more airplanes and a landing field or two were available, there would not have to be so many supervisors or so many automobiles for the supervisors. It is not possible to drive an automobile over much of the reservation.

Mr. FERGUSON. But such a change would not result in decreasing the supervisory personnel. The only result would be to provide more airplanes, and then it would be necessary to provide more pilots and more ground forces.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me? Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to state that at the meeting on Saturday the Indian agent who is in charge of that reservation came to an agreement with the tribal council, to the effect that no

building will be constructed unless the chairman of the tribal council approves it.

The Indians do not care anything about frills, but they want education for their children.

Let me say to the Senator from Michigan that if we made reductions in all the other items of the budget in proportion to the reductions proposed in these items for the Indians, no doubt the budget would be balanced.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are trying to balance it.

Mr. McFARLAND. But the Senator from Michigan wishes all the cuts to be made in the items for the Indians, whose children now are not able to go to school.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I want to make the reductions in the funds proposed to be appropriated for the supervisors.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, under my amendment a cut of 12 percent below the budget figure would be made. But the Senator from Michigan would pick on the poor Indian who cannot read or write or come to Washington to tell the Senate about his difficulties.

The poor Indian cannot go to school. Yet he is called on to fight for his country.

Does not the Senator from Michigan think it is just as important for the defense of the Nation to educate these Indians as it is to build the plant in which the Senator from Michigan is interested?

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, yes; I realize how the Senator from Arizona feels.

Mr. McFARLAND. I did not see the Senator from Michigan asking that a cut be made in the case of the St. Lawrence seaway. I supported him on that measure.

Mr. FERGUSON. We did not even get it to a vote. If the distinguished Senator from Arizona had brought up that measure much earlier in the session, instead of so late, perhaps we could have had enough Senators here to keep it on the floor, and it would have gone through, and at least we would have gotten the St. Lawrence seaway started; and then the taxpayers would have purchased the bonds, and we would have had the seaway.

Mr. McFARLAND. That measure was brought up in good time, after it was reported. It was on the calendar for a month.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not think so.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Michigan for bringing the entire Indian problem into focus.

Since 1947, I have introduced two bills calling for abolishment of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau of Indian Affairs should be abolished, because that Bureau absorbs most of the appropriations which are made for the Indians.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

#### PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. MALONE. It is my opinion that the Indians have been virtual prisoners of war for 100 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. They have really been in concentration camps since they were placed in the first camp in the West.

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

A great commotion was made when the Japanese were placed in concentration camps during World War II.

Mr. FERGUSON. However, the Japanese were released from those camps, and now we are paying them damages for having put them in the camps.

Mr. MALONE. At that time I was not a Member of the Senate; I was a special consultant to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. I was sent to the Japanese camps, to make a report to the subcommittee. The conditions in those Japanese camps were no worse than the conditions which have existed for 100 years on the Indian reservations. Mr. President, we simply forgot the Indians.

Early this month it was my good fortune to make a commencement address at the high school at Fernley, Nev. That high school is within 15 or 20 miles of the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation. The Indian boys and girls attend the Fernley High School. Some of them graduated from that high school this year, and they are some of the finest boys and girls I have ever seen. Certainly they are on a par with the white boys and girls. At that high school the Indian boys and girls receive a good education.

#### TREATED IN SAME WAY

The purpose of the bill which I have introduced twice since 1947 is to have Indians treated in the same way that everyone else is treated, and to permit Indians to have all the rights that all the rest of us have.

Today the Indian is told that he cannot do this or that, and that he cannot leave the reservation except under certain conditions, and that if he does leave the reservation, he loses whatever mythical rights he may have.

My proposal is simply to give the reservations to the Indians, and have the reservations divided among the Indians, and then have Congress hold hearings to determine whether anything more is owed the Indians. In other words, let us pay the Indians whatever we owe them, and then let them go on their own way.

If that were done, it might still be necessary to care for Indians who are 35 or 40 years of age or older, and who have passed the best age for obtaining an education and for learning to support themselves. It might be that such Indians would have to be given some sort of pension. In any event, after 15 or 20 years that problem would disappear. Certainly the cost of putting every Indian in the United States on a pension would be much less than the present cost of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

#### DOING GREAT SERVICE

So I say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that he is doing a great service to the Congress and to the Indians by bringing this question into focus.

On the other hand, until the system is changed, until the Indian Bureau is directed to wind up its affairs, and until the proper committees determine what should be done in this matter, I believe we probably shall have to continue the present wasteful system.

Mr. FERGUSON. But not at the rate of expenditure provided by means of this amendment.

BIGGER INDIAN BUREAU

Mr. MALONE. I admit that there may be some additional waste in this amendment.

Nevertheless, how are we going to check on the Indian Bureau? Any witnesses from that Bureau simply give us a big story about some mythical thing the Indian Bureau proposes to do for the Indians. That has been the situation for 100 years, but nothing ever is done for the Indians. The only result of all these programs is to build a bigger and better Indian Bureau.

So I shall go all the way with the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

I hope that by next January or February we can begin to hold hearings on a bill to rearrange the Indians' affairs, to make citizens of the Indians, to treat the Indians in the same way that all the rest of us are treated, and to permit the Indians to have all the rights that all the rest of us have. At that time we should pay the Indians whatever we owe them, and we should arrange to have the Indian children go to school, where they belong.

Mr. President, Indian blood is good blood.

I never have been able to understand the philosophy of those—particularly Senators on the other side of the aisle—who favor the importation of great numbers of foreigners into the United States, but who permit the Indians, the original settlers of this county, to remain virtual prisoners of war.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I favor making a reduction in the appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and making it possible for the Indians to become free American citizens, with all the rights of American citizens.

At this point I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator to the number of automobiles the Indian Bureau has, as indicated in the budget figures. The total is 1,675.

This year they want 425 new ones. One thousand two hundred and fifty will be carried over. That shows what the white man is doing so far as the automobiles are concerned. He builds up his power, he builds up the amount of money he wants for each one of the projects. No wonder he wants these good roads. The Indian is not worrying about roads over which he may ride on his horse, but it is the white man, who will have one of the 1,675 automobiles, who is worried about the roads. That accounts for the demand for these roads.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I merely want to add that, if there is any race of people with-

XCVIII—502

in the entire United States of America who have a kick coming, it is the Indian.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PATTON in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the further proceedings under the call will be vacated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on the pending amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in the President's budget there was an item of \$325,000 for the reconstruction of what is known as Picacho Reservoir. With the percentage cut in the committee amendment, the funds needed would be short approximately \$100,000 for the rehabilitation of this reservoir. For that reason, \$100,000 is added in this amendment to provide for this important rehabilitation work.

The San Carlos project located in my home county in central Arizona is different from most large western reclamation projects in that it is not managed and administered by the Bureau of Reclamation but by the Indian Service. The area improved under project works is 100,000 acres. Half of this area is Indian land—the property of the Pima Indians on the Gila River Indian Reservation. The remaining half, or 50,000 acres, is operated by white farmers and is in their private ownership.

Because of the large and important Indian interests included therein, the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Indian Affairs retains control and management of the main improvements which constitute the project's so-called works and which serve the common interests of the Indian lands and white-owned lands alike.

It is true that a portion of the works—distribution canals and laterals on Indian lands and those on white-owned lands—have been turned over to the two respective local units, and each of these runs its own business to that extent.

But the Secretary has the responsibility of operating and caring for the large joint features of the projects—Coolidge Dam, Picacho Dam and Reservoir, the main canal, the power system, and plants connected therewith. Related to that responsibility is the occasional need for funds wherewith the works under his direction must be kept in shape and added to and enlarged when necessary.

Picacho Reservoir is an important unit in the works of the project. It is a relatively small reservoir located down on the project area adjacent to the irri-

gated lands. The early settlers built the original dam and reservoir some 60 years ago. In it they caught and stored transient storm waters, releasing the same later in regulated amounts for the irrigation of their lands. When the San Carlos project was constructed, subsequent to the passage of the authorizing legislation in 1924, the Government took over the reservoir as a part of the project works.

Throughout the many years of its existence and service to the project, Picacho Reservoir has received and saved intermittent flood flows which follow desert storms. This silt-laden water has gradually dropped its burden, and the bed of the reservoir has slowly raised so that presently there remains but small storage space. The ability of the reservoir to capture and store these floodwaters must be restored or these valuable waters will run to waste unavailable for irrigation use. Not only will such waters be lost but, without the regulation and control furnished by the reservoir, they will run wild into and upon the adjacent improved lands to cause damage to lands and improvements.

As you know, water is the most important resource in our southwestern country. In our particular area, naturally arid, and during recent years visited by prolonged drought, no water must be wasted. The laws of our State and the customs of our irrigated areas demand that water must be conserved and put to beneficial use where possible.

These are some of the reasons why Picacho Reservoir must be reconstructed and enlarged. The Indian Office and the Secretary are aware of the need for this construction and of their responsibility to provide for it. Unless they have the support for appropriation of funds for necessary work, the Department cannot carry out its contractual obligations to the landowners on the project. These landowners look to the Department for that protection. If it were not for existing contracts and agreements made with the Government, the farmers on the project could provide funds for doing this vitally necessary work themselves. But, because of the direct interest of the United States, principally because of the extensive Indian interests involved, the Government has elected to keep this project feature under control of the Secretary, and therefore the farmers cannot find legal background for borrowing or otherwise raising the funds required.

Let me emphasize that the funds requested are not a gratuity. They are planned and requested as a capital investment in the project facilities and are repayable by the landowners as a part of project-construction costs in accordance with the repayment contract in vogue between the Department of the Interior and project farmers within the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district.

I am close to the interests of the people involved in this matter and thoroughly convinced of the urgent need for favorable action in connection with this item.

I wish to use merely a minute or two in discussing the amendment. The item

affected is a small one, and even with the increase suggested the figure represents a cut of more than 12 percent in the President's budget.

Why pick on the poor, downtrodden Indians? Fifteen thousand of their children without school facilities; there are no schools for them to attend. All we are trying to do, Mr. President, is to give them a chance in life to establish themselves as American citizens, if you please. They fought in World War I and in World War II, and they made good soldiers. When they returned home, after associating with white people, the boys told their parents, "We must see that the children go to school." They are begging us, on bended knee, to give them an opportunity in life. We are sending money all over the world to help other people. Are we going to deny the poor Indians the opportunity of an education?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness. I announce further that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent because of illness in her family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is detained on official business.

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

On this vote the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 29, as follows:

## YEAS—49

Alken	Hennings	Moody
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Murray
Capehart	Humphrey	Neely
Case	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Johnson, S. C.	Smathers
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Knowland	Sparkman
Eaton	Lehman	Stennis
Flanders	Long	Taft
Frear	Malone	Tobey
George	McFarland	Underwood
Gillette	McKellar	Watkins
Green	Millikin	
Hayden	Monroney	

## NAYS—29

Benton	Ferguson	Nixon
Brewster	Hendrickson	O'Connor
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bridges	Holland	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Ives	Smith, N. C.
Cain	Jenner	Thye
Cordon	Kem	Weiker
Douglas	Martin	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarran	Williams
Ellender	McClellan	

## NOT VOTING—18

Anderson	Kerr	McMahon
Byrd	Langer	Morse
Carlson	Lodge	Russell
Chavez	Magnuson	Seaton
Fulbright	Maybank	Smith, Maine
Kefauver	McCarthy	Young

So Mr. MCFARLAND's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. BRIDGES. It was the intention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself to offer an amendment to the committee amendment to strike out \$10,000,000, but obviously it is useless to do that. Last year \$10,575,000 was appropriated for this item. This year the House allowed \$5,310,000. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate allowed \$24,812,000. The Senate has now raised the figure to \$31,000,000 plus. So it is very obvious that there would be no object in attempting to reduce the figure below the committee figure, since the Senate by its vote has jumped the amount some \$25,000,000 over the House figure, some \$7,000,000 over the Senate Appropriations Committee figure, and is approving a figure more than three times as high as the figure for last year.

So the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New Hampshire will not offer an amendment to reduce the amount further, because if the Senate triples the amount allowed last year, and makes a substantial increase over what the Senate Appropriations Committee has allowed, there is no use attempting to make a cut.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with respect to a construction item.

Included in the construction program, in a portion of the Interior Department appropriation hearings, there is an item for the building of a school for the Oglala community on the Pine Ridge Reservation. There are few projects that would make a greater appeal than that.

About a year and a half ago, when I visited the reservation, I saw a conglomeration of sheds that had been put together and called a school. I went into the basement, or cellar, under one of those sheds in which there was a class of 50 Indian boys. They were expected to go to that school. The walls were not plastered. There was a dirt floor, and only a little rickety stairway by which the boys could go to the cellar. If a fire ever started in that building, there would be a holocaust. The tragedy would be unspeakable. The type of construction program provided in the bill is expected to eliminate such buildings as that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD at this point an exchange of correspondence I have had with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, reciting the situation at that school, and the proposal for its improvement as now proposed by the appropriation bill before the Senate.

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

## UNITED STATES

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,  
Washington, D. C. April 24, 1952.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,

United States Senate,

MY DEAR SENATOR CASE: This is in reference to your letter of April 8, 1952, inquiring if funds were included in our 1953 budget for new school facilities for the Oglala community on the Pine Ridge Reservation to replace the present inadequate Lone Man Day School, No. 5.

There were included in our 1953 estimates presented to the House Appropriations Committee two projects for the Oglala community, Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak.:

1. New school facilities, Oglala Community, \$325,000.
2. New milking barn, Oglala High School, \$23,000.

When the Bureau of the Budget allowed funds for these urgently needed facilities in our 1953 budget estimate, it appeared reasonable to assume that the Congress would appropriate the funds. However, due to the small amount allowed by the House Appropriations Committee for Indian Bureau construction projects and appropriated by the House in the 1953 Interior Department appropriation bill, it will not be possible to undertake these construction projects, as well as many other urgently needed construction projects which were approved by the Bureau of the Budget, unless additional funds are appropriated.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has been requested to restore the reduction made by the House in our construction budget estimates. If these funds are restored, we plan to proceed with the construction projects for Oglala community as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

D. S. MYER,  
Commissioner.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,  
Washington, D. C., November 26, 1951.  
HON. FRANCIS CASE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CASE: Further reference is made to my letter of September 5, 1951, in reply to yours of August 28, 1951, pertaining to the condition of Day School No. 5 (Lone Man) at Oglala, on the Pine Ridge Reservation.

We are now in receipt of the report from the area director which includes the following recommendations:

1. That a new four-classroom school be constructed, with provision for the addition of two classrooms in the future plus the necessary quarters and other auxiliary facilities, including new water and sewage system.

2. That the new school be located approximately 1 mile south of the existing school which would be at the intersection of the present road and U. S. Highway No. 18 which we understand is to be relocated. This would make the new school readily accessible.

While no final estimates of cost have been prepared on the basis of a new school plant, it is tentatively estimated at today's prices that it would be between \$400,000 and \$500,000. We are exploring the matter further to see whether it might be possible to have it included in the 1953 budget.

Sincerely yours,

D. S. MYER,  
Commissioner.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,  
Washington, D. C., September 5, 1951.  
HON. FRANCIS CASE,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: I have your letter of August 28 relating to the school problem at the Pine Ridge Reservation and discussing in particular the condition of the school building there. You have suggested that Ben Reifel be asked to look into the matter.

This letter is to let you know that that will not be possible because Ben Reifel is already on his way back to Harvard where he is planning to continue his work during this coming school year. He was on our staff in connection with the Missouri Basin Studies staff during the summer and did help with some of the work at Crow Creek.

I am glad to tell you that Mr. Spaulding, area director at Aberdeen, has already initiated action in this matter. He is having a thorough check made of present facilities and equipment. His report is expected soon and I will advise you more fully later. Be assured I appreciate your interest.

Sincerely yours,

D. S. MYER,  
Commissioner.

AUGUST 28, 1951.

The Honorable D. S. MYER,  
Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs,  
United States Department of the Interior,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MYER: You will recall a conference in my office of some weeks ago when Area Director G. Warren Spaulding was here, I mentioned the need for a better school building and community center at Oglala on the Pine Ridge Reservation.

I have also mentioned it to others in the Indian Bureau and I believe that all who have ever seen what passes for the school building at Oglala will agree that it is one of the most inadequate in the entire Indian service.

The building is an old frame shell and it is so crowded that some of the classes are

crowded into a dark cellar that is a bad fire-trap.

If my recollection is correct, the walls of the cellar are unfinished and the roof studding and supports and absence of daylight are a disgrace to the country.

I have not been in the building for more than a year, but, unless there has been a tremendous improvement, I am sure that you can scarcely believe that a school with the enrollment that there is at Oglala should be so inadequately and improperly used.

This letter is occasioned by the fact that I noted recently that Ben Reifel had been assigned to make a study of some problems for Crow Creek. If he is in the area and available for other studies and reports, could you not direct him to Oglala and ask for an on-the-ground and spot check?

Ben was at one time stationed at Pine Ridge Reservation and knows the people there well and can give a practical appraisal of needs, present and future.

His report should cover the number of pupils dependent upon the Oglala school, a summary of chairs, desks, and other furniture available and needed—either for use in the existing facility or its replacement.

My own feeling is that you were personally to inspect what has been used there for a school, you would want to place its replacement as No. 1 on your replacement needs.

May we have a report or it when you find out what the facts are?

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE  
INTERIOR, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,  
Aberdeen, S. Dak., July 16, 1951.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR CASE: The maintenance engineer from this office plans to visit the Pine Ridge jurisdiction in the near future. During his visit he will check into the Lone Man School situation (No. 5) at Oglala, S. Dak.

The construction of a new plant at the above school has been under consideration for a number of years. From all indications it will be necessary to operate a school in the Oglala area for a long time. In view of this fact every effort should be made to replace the present conglomeration of buildings with a modern school building.

Sincerely yours,

G. WARREN SPAULDING,  
Area Director.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

MR. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will not the Chair restate the question?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, line 1, as amended.

MR. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was on page 10, in line 3, after the word "granted", to insert the following proviso: "Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of

the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 17, after the word "completed", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That the amount of \$24,000 heretofore appropriated and now available under this heading for school facilities at Squaw Point Unorganized Territory, Minn., may be expended for school facilities for the Prairie Island Indian Community or for cooperation with Burnside Consolidated School District No. 3, Goodhue County, Minn., in the construction, extension, equipment, or improvement of public-school facilities as may be agreed upon by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the State Department of Education of Minnesota, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 11, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "260" and insert "300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Tribal funds," on page 12, line 3, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "\$2,335,000" and insert "\$2,920,000", and on page 13, line 4, after the word "Secretary", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation or other tribal funds shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation—general investigations," on page 14, line 4, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000", and in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "\$2,200,000" and insert "\$4,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction and rehabilitation," on page 14, line 20, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$153,355,400" and insert "\$183,406,531."

MR. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-24-52-B" which I offer on behalf of myself and the Senator from Connecticut [MR. BENTON].

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (MR. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment to the committee amendment.

THE CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "\$183,406,531" and insert "\$152,406,531."

MR. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment I am now submitting proposes a reduction of \$31,000,000 in the construction funds of the Bureau of

Reclamation; in other words, dollar-wise; it proposes to reduce the total from \$183,400,000 to approximately \$152,400,000. This is the most important amendment which is likely to be offered today, and I should like to give a brief history of the situation.

The Bureau of the Budget did not recommend any new starts on reclamation projects this year. In view of the very serious budget situation and the impending deficit, it believed that we should not start any more new projects.

The House, when it passed the bill, did not provide for any new starts. The Senate Committee on Appropriations has included 10 new starts which call for initial appropriations of \$15,000,000 for the coming year. But these initial appropriations are merely the "come-on." The ultimate cost of the 10 new projects will be \$335,000,000, according to the figures in the House and Senate committee hearings which I have compiled.

So we are now about to decide by our vote on this amendment whether or not there is any justification for the ultimate total expenditure of \$335,000,000, at a minimum, and we can be quite certain, based on the experience of the past, that if the present estimate is that the total cost will be \$335,000,000, by the time the projects are completed the actual cost will be greatly in excess of that amount.

Furthermore, the committee accelerated the program of construction as it had been recommended by the House. My proposal is that we should somewhat slow down the rate of construction on existing irrigation projects already under way—slow them down from an annual volume of \$167,000,000 to a volume of a little more than \$150,000,000.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator realizes, of course, that if the 10 new projects are started and completed as set forth in the committee report the average amount of money to be expended each year will be about the same as has been expended in past years. Is the Senator urging that that was too much?

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I am saying is that in this period we should not commit ourselves to capital expenditures of \$335,000,000 additional.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is repeating what he said with respect to the rivers and harbors and flood-control commitments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I certainly am not repeating what I said. I may say that the reasoning of the Senate committee is extraordinary. The Senate committee says:

The committee has been advised that the projects now under construction will soon be completed, and that if construction is not initiated on additional projects the appropriation requirements in the fiscal year 1958 for those projects under construction will be less than \$14,000,000.

So, in order to keep up the expenditures additional projects are started. In other words, if the appropriations should fall to \$14,000,000, that would be a catas-

trophe which the country could not stand. So projects are added which will ultimately cost \$335,000,000, in order to maintain the volume of construction.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator says he is not repeating the arguments he made with respect to the rivers and harbors and flood-control commitments. In the bill which we passed the other day \$5,897,000 was appropriated with which to commence new river and harbor projects, and \$28,750,000 for new flood-control projects, the total cost of which will be \$474,000,000. But in that case the testimony was, as it is here, that the average level of expenditure, so far as the Federal Treasury is concerned, would not be materially increased, because the Corps of Engineers is running out of work.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, we must spend enormous sums of money in order to keep the Corps of Engineers busy spending money.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not enormous sums; but the normal amount which we have been spending in the average year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is one difference, at least in the case of the river and harbor projects of the Army Engineers, in that those projects had been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The proposals now before us were not approved by the Bureau of the Budget. They have not been certified as being necessary to the defense effort. They emerge, like Minerva from the brow of Jove, out of the Senate Appropriations Committee, all in one burst of spontaneous combustion, so to speak.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is aware that among the projects in the river and harbor bill which passed the other day were items not budgeted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There were very few such items involving smaller amounts of money. I opposed them. However, the committee is now proposing to add projects the ultimate capital cost of which will be \$335,000,000 projects which have not been recommended by any group except the Senate committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Every one of them is authorized by law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Congress authorized itself to appropriate for them. They are also recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation, of course, which naturally is interested in building as many projects as possible.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. In the case of the one project for Utah in this list—

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the Weber Basin project.

Mr. BENNETT. The Weber Basin project—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Utah going to oppose that project?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah is obviously not going to oppose that project.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am disappointed.

Mr. BENNETT. Using that as an example, and being fascinated by the Senator's statement that it has emerged, like Minerva from the brow of Jove, out of the Senate Appropriations Committee, does the Senator realize that for years the Bureau of Reclamation has been preparing that project for the beginning of construction? It did not emerge from the Senate Appropriations Committee. It has been under contemplation for years. The engineering work has been completed, and the project is ready to start.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think Minerva was probably under contemplation for some time before she emerged.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Senator realize that the Federal Government itself has created a situation in the area in which the Weber project lies which will practically either force the construction of such a project—

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator refers to the addition of facilities such as the Clearfield Naval Depot, the air bases, and other facilities.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Facilities which former Senator Thomas of Utah was successful in obtaining for that region.

Mr. BENNETT. Therefore, the men employed there must be provided with water to drink, and water for culinary purposes and for the maintenance of their homes and their jobs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I point out to my good friend that in the beautiful Wasatch Valley, which has been developing with Government installations paid for by those of us from other sections of the country, there is the beautiful and flourishing city of Ogden, and that a part of this project is designed to provide water for the city of Ogden. The taxable capacity of the city of Ogden has been increased by the coming of the new facilities. Why should not Ogden pay for a large portion of its water supply, instead of passing the burden on to the Federal Government? Does not the Senator from Utah oppose the Federal Government coming in to usurp the functions of localities? Is not that undermining local government? Is it not a blow at the foundations of the American system to have the Federal Government reach in with its tentacles and take over control of facilities which should be local in nature? I heard the Senator from Utah speak at great length and very eloquently on that thesis. I am surprised now that he is not a vigorous protagonist of it.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that the citizens of the city of Ogden will pay back a large part of the cost of erecting the Weber Basin project?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let them pay for it directly through a bond issue.

Mr. BENNETT. Unfortunately the project involves an area far outside the city limits of the city of Ogden.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now we come to one of the real skeletons in the closet in connection with irrigation and reclamation,

namely, that when the money is paid back for the so-called irrigation projects, it does not go into the Treasury of the United States. It does not go to pay back the taxpayers who advanced the money. It is used for additional reclamation projects. So when we appropriate this \$335,000,000 we can kiss it goodbye. It will be gone forever, gone with the wind. It will be used, as it is paid back, to build more irrigation projects. When the cost of such new irrigation projects is paid back, the money will be used to build still more irrigation projects. My good friends from the Southwest saw to that about 12 years ago.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is, of course, perfectly justified in taking whatever position he wishes to take; but now he is apparently attacking the entire theory of reclamation in the West. I say most respectfully to the distinguished Senator that the money which has gone into the West to build reclamation projects has developed the economy of the West.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It has done so at the expense of the rest of the country. But I should like to point out that I am not opposing reclamation. I want to reduce it moderately during a period of severe financial strain.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a result the people have been able to pay more taxes into the Federal Treasury. They have built up our country, thus enabling the Nation to be in a better position to defend itself. Under the theory of the distinguished Senator from Illinois in attacking the entire theory of reclamation, which I am proud to say was started under a Republican administration, he apparently believes that there is no benefit to the Nation growing out of such projects.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I repeat that I am not opposed to reclamation; only to spending more money than we can afford for it right now. I may say that I have a special amendment, which I submitted yesterday, my amendment C, which will come up later. The old-timers around the Capitol know perfectly well, but the citizens generally do not know, that the money which we spend for reclamation, in the first place, is interest free. No interest is paid upon it.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to finish my statement. Am I in error in my statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is partially right and partially wrong.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I not 99.44 percent right?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. With regard to the irrigation feature, if the Senator defines irrigation as putting water on land, the Senator is correct. But if we consider the multiple-purpose projects, dealing with power features, both principal and interest are paid back.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I was referring to reclamation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Take the situation with respect to the Hoover Dam. In connection with the construction of the Hoover Dam, not only will the principal be paid back, but the interest will be paid back. That is a great development which is bringing water to the thirsty lands of the West and bringing power to the metropolitan centers. It was required that the contracts be signed before a bit of concrete was poured in that dam, and that the contracts should provide for the repayment of principal and interest to the Federal Government. I think we will get far more out of the Hoover Dam in the West than we will get from the appropriations we have made to various foreign nations, because from some of them the American people will not get one penny back, and they will not add to our economic development.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from California that if he will compare his voting record with my voting record he will find that I have voted for practically every justifiable public-power project in the United States. I voted for public-power projects in the Northwest and in other sections of the country, because they conform to a set rule that on Government money not only the principal is repaid but interest is paid also.

But when we deal with irrigation only the principal is repaid, and no interest is paid. There is also an increasing tendency to load up on power some of the cost that should be borne by irrigation. Suppose we authorize a project at a total cost of \$500,000,000, with \$400,000,000 for irrigation and \$100,000,000 for power. The interest is paid only on the \$100,000,000. Power rates are charged sufficient to carry a portion of the \$400,000,000 set aside for irrigation, but with no interest. In other words, power bears not only its own load but a part of the irrigation load.

When the principal is paid back to the Government for so-called irrigation purposes, what happens to it? It does not go into the General Treasury, as is the case with power projects. It is used for additional irrigation projects. It is money which the Government will never get back. It will roll on forever. It is one of the greatest injustices that could be perpetrated on the general taxpayers of the United States.

Years ago I used to look with approval on John Baer's cow which he drew representing the United States being milked by the bankers of Wall Street. I believe that a more appropriate cow representing the United States would be a cow with its hind quarters facing westward and being milked by the semi-arid regions of the country for irrigation projects. The eight States in that region have small populations, but they are powerful States. They have 16 votes in the United States Senate. They constitute a powerful political force. I love them as individuals. But we must not forget the fact that we are being committed to spend hundreds of millions of dollars, and perhaps billions of dollars, for projects from which the taxpayer will never recover a penny, on which no interest will be paid, on which the

principal will be donated, and on which the unit cost per acre is extremely high. Reclamation can be a valuable investment, especially in normal times when we do not face such enormous deficits. But we should protect the taxpayer's investment, too.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the Senator wants to have all the facts. California last year paid in Federal taxes into the Federal Treasury three and a half billion dollars. That is more money paid into the Treasury by the people of California alone than was paid into the Federal Treasury by all the people of the 48 States as late as 1934. As the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said, in the development of power projects—and in connection with such projects I am willing to make a comparison of my voting record with the voting record of the Senator from Illinois, and I think my record will compare very favorably—the principal and interest must be paid back; but it is also true that in the development of irrigation throughout the West, which adds to and increases the standard of living of the American people, there is required—and properly so—the repayment of the principal by the people who go onto the lands, whereas in the case of many projects in other sections of the country no such requirement is applied.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to finish my presentation first. As I remember, the great Central Valley project was originally started by the State of California. The State of California found the burden too heavy, and called on the Federal Government for aid. The project went forward, and ultimately called for the expenditure by the Federal Government of over \$600,000,000. A large proportion of that amount will be charged to irrigation, and of the amount charged to irrigation not one cent of the money contributed by the taxpayers will be returned to the Treasury.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall yield in a moment. My time is limited. I should like to have at least an opportunity to present my views. Later I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. President, when the principal is returned to the United States Treasury, it does not go back to the taxpayers of the country who financed the Central Valley project. It will go for further irrigation projects. This is a continuing operation under existing statutes, world without end. By the legislation which we have passed Congress has surrendered control over the disposition of those funds. When once appropriated, they are gone. The Federal Treasury does not get the interest and does not get the principal.

Mr. President, I should like to point out also that the costs per acre are extremely high. I do not have the information with respect to all acreage costs.

But I have been able to get the figures for the Marias division, which, being in the northerly part of the country, presumably is a wheat area. Under the pending bill, we are committing ourselves to projects for the Marias division of the Missouri Basin project. The Marias division will ultimately cost \$60,000,000. It will irrigate 120,000 acres. According to my figures, that is at a cost of over \$500 per acre.

The most fertile farming land anywhere in the country lies in the belt which in Illinois centers around Bloomington. I was in Bloomington about a month ago, and I talked to the editor of the Bloomington newspaper and to real-estate agents there. They told me that very fertile farm land there was selling for \$550 an acre. Here we are confronted with land for which it will cost \$500 an acre merely to irrigate, on which the taxpayer will not get back one penny.

Mr. President, I think we have plunged too far on irrigation so far as returns are concerned, and certainly so far as the taxpayers of the country at large are concerned.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to have the Senator yield to me, because I must attend an Appropriation Committee meeting. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that when by flood-control projects and by the building of dikes water is prevented from overflowing lands none of the money expended for such projects is repaid, whereas in the case of reclamation projects every dollar of principal has to be repaid. Nevertheless, I think flood-control projects are a great investment in the future of our country, because if the topsoil is washed into the ocean there is destroyed an asset of the American people, the loss of which might cause our own civilization to fall into the condition of civilizations of the past which have lost their topsoil. Yet in the case of flood control in the great areas of our country not a penny, either of principal or interest, is repaid. I am not complaining about it, because I think the Federal Government has an obligation to see to it that this great resource is not lost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I reply to the Senator from California?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator had been in the Chamber when the Senate was discussing the rivers and harbors bill he would have known that I offered an amendment to provide that half of the cost of a levee should be borne by assessment on the land which was thus protected. I am sorry the Senator was not in the Chamber, because from his present remarks I would judge that he would have supported my amendment. Unfortunately I did not have his support, but I hope that I have gained a new recruit on this point at least.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Why should it be only half?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was not able to get even half. I often reflect on Cardinal Newman's hymn *Lead Kindly Light*;

I do not ask to see  
The distant scene—one step  
Enough for me.

I am glad to note that the Senator is supporting me in one step at least.

The semiarid States are powerful. They are politically powerful in the United States Senate. But they have asked for excessive amounts of money. I love them as individuals. Oh how we love them. But they are getting enormous sums of money. Where are they getting them from? From the State which pay most of the income taxes. From my State of Illinois, from New York, from New Jersey, and from Connecticut and other States. We are glad to grubstake them, but sometimes the grubstaker likes to see his money come back. They take the money and use it for something else, and they always get more and more money. I submit, Mr. President, that at a time when we are faced with an impending \$15,000,000,000 deficit we should not at this time make new starts in the case of reclamation projects.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall take 3 minutes to summarize my position, and then I shall yield the remainder of my time.

I should like to point out that vast irrigation projects already have been built. The new projects are not so well justified as the old ones were, and therefore we should look with especial care upon the new ones.

In the second place, the new projects are not certified, either by the Department of Defense or by the Bureau of the Budget, as necessary to the national defense.

In the third place, why is it such a crime, as the committee claims it is, to defer the construction of irrigation projects and to slow down the program a little during this period of emergency, so that the taxpayers may have some relief?

Fourth and finally, I wish to emphasize that the present budgetary situation is bad, with a \$15,000,000,000 deficit facing us. Here is a chance to save \$31,000,000.

Mr. President, that completes my argument.

Now, I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, first let me say that, although I do not know about all the projects, at least I know that a small South Dakota project is included. To that project the Air Force will contribute at least \$1,000,000—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator referring to the Souris diversion?

Mr. CASE. I am referring to the Rapid Valley project in the Missouri Basin.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is in Wyoming, is it not?

Mr. CASE. No; it happens to be in South Dakota?

At least \$1,000,000 of the cost of that project will be paid by the Air Force. Without the construction of that project, the Air Force will be confronted with the necessity of drilling additional wells—which will cost more than this project will cost—for unsatisfactory water—water that is heavily mineralized, so-called hot water—which is destroying their plumbing systems.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This project is primarily one to provide a water supply for Rapid City, is it not?

Mr. CASE. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what the description says.

Mr. CASE. Some water will be for Rapid City, but Rapid City will, in turn, sell the water to the air base.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it is for Rapid City, is it not? Does not the Senator from South Dakota believe that local government should take care of its own burdens, without coming to the Federal Government for relief?

Mr. CASE. Rapid City will pay back the cost of the water it receives and will pay it back with interest. The provision for interest payments is one which the Senator from Illinois has been overlooking. He has been talking about the lack of interest payments, but Rapid City will pay back all its part of the cost, with interest. In addition, the Air Force will pay for the water it uses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that is a white blackbird, I must say.

What does the Senator from South Dakota say about the Souris project, which ultimately will cost \$102,000,000?

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Illinois knows that the Souris project is not in South Dakota; it is in North Dakota.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Illinois repeatedly has referred to these projects as ones which are being initiated; he has referred to them as projects "initiating new construction." I wish to call attention to the fact that the north side pumping division of the Minidoka project, in Idaho, has been in process of construction for many years. It is erroneous for the committee or for the Senator from Illinois or for anyone else to refer to that project as one "initiating new construction."

Mr. DOUGLAS. The committee listed it as such.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That was an erroneous statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All I can do is take the opinion of the committee.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I wish to point out that about \$1,000,000 has been spent on that project since the end of World War II. The chairman of the subcommittee has called my attention to the foot note, as follows:

The amount recommended is to continue construction which has been under way for a number of years and for which approximately \$1,000,000 has already been expended.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was the project approved by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes, it has been approved. How would \$1,000,000 have been spent on the project if it had not been approved?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was it approved and certified by the Department of Defense for expenditures in the year 1952-53, the period for which we are now appropriating?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I cannot say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the answer is "no."

Mr. DWORSHAK. I say to the Senator from Illinois that in the Columbia River Basin project, which is comparable to this one, approximately 60,000 acres are being brought into cultivation annually. Of course this project is comparable to it only on a limited scale, because the plan for this project contemplates bringing in 4,000 or 5,000 acres annually—on a project where wells are used and water is pumped from the river. As a matter of fact, the funds carried in this bill would cover only approximately half of the plan, and would bring in only 2,250 acres.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How much of that amount is for planning?

Mr. DWORSHAK. This amount is for construction—to sink wells. The project is in no sense a new one. I am sure the Senator from Illinois wants the RECORD to be accurate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to have the RECORD accurate, but I trust the committee.

Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon; the footnote to which he has referred is in fine type, and I must be nearsighted. Excuse me, please. It was listed as a new project, however, and has not been approved by the Budget or certified as necessary for defense for the year 1952-53.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the fact that in the Senate we have been voting indirectly for power and reclamation projects for a number of years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I know what the Senator from Utah is going to say.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me say that before the Senator from Illinois was converted to the idea of not voting for such large expenditures for foreign countries, he generally voted for large expenditures for foreign countries, but voted against corresponding expenditures here in the United States.

Certainly the Senator from Illinois should consider these projects.

Let me point out that under the mutual security program the United States has either paid out or is to pay \$1,893,-695,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that in the bill which we are about to consider?

Mr. WATKINS. No; it is the loan program for which the Senator from Illinois has voted year after year, since he has been in the Senate.

The Senate has voted for that program, and has not even asked whether

the people of the other countries could pay for the construction of those projects. Regardless of such considerations, Congress has voted for expenditures for such projects all over the globe—in Europe, in Africa, in Asia; we have been going right down the line.

On the other hand, when a small beginning is made, for instance, on a small project in Utah, at a location where there are defense installations, and when the burden is so heavy that the people of the community cannot do the work themselves, strong objection is made in the Senate.

Mr. President, Utah pioneered in irrigation work; but when it comes to having any Federal appropriations made to help in that work, we in Utah find that we are at the tail end of the procession.

Now we have a project calling for several million dollars—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield one more minute to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield two more minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes more.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at this moment I happen to be standing beside the desk of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], an eminent Senator who is beloved by all of us. Again and again he has reminded us that the money spent on the foreign projects to which the Senator from Utah has referred is money from counterpart funds, and therefore those projects do not cost us anything.

I do not know that the Senator from Texas, at whose desk I am temporarily standing would approve of the particular application in the present case, but I am quoting him as he has replied to me on similar points on similar occasions in the past—that is to say, that the funds for projects in foreign countries come from counterpart funds, and therefore the projects are in a different category.

Furthermore, Mr. President, that bill is not before the Senate at this time, anyway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I promised the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] that I would yield 5 minutes to him, to permit him to speak on another matter. I now yield that much time to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### THE SITUATION IN KOREA

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the American press has recently carried stories of the declaration of martial law by President Syngman Rhee, of Korea, and the arrest, by him, of members of the Korean Legislature.

What is the truth? Are the Communists plotting a political revolution behind our lines in Korea?

Why do American Government agencies take sides against anti-Communist President Rhee?

On June 2, President Rhee said two underground Communist leaders have confessed that members of the assembly were drawn into a Communist plot to unify North and South Korea, through "peaceful negotiations."

Some of the assemblymen have confessed they received money from the Communists to finance the plan to unify North and South Korea, by electing a neutralist president, according to Communist orders.

It has long been part of the Communist plan to outflank us politically by setting up a "third force" in Korea. This would put Syngman Rhee out of power and then unite North and South Korea under a "government of national unity," like Poland. This "third force" would look neutral, sound neutral, and act neutral—until the American forces left Korea. Then it would be merely another puppet government in Asia.

Here is Owen Lattimore's formula again—to let Korea fall without letting it look as though we pushed her.

It is very curious that the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea—UNCURK—immediately ordered President Rhee to lift martial law and to free the assemblymen without reference to their being Communist plotters.

Of course, a United Nations agency could not criticize Communists, because the Soviet Union is on the Security Council of U. N.

The Voice of America broadcast the UNCURK criticisms of President Rhee before he had a chance to reply to UNCURK, but apparently did not broadcast Rhee's reply.

Dr. Paul Douglas, former president of American University and now adviser to President Rhee, said in an interview that intervention by the United Nations in the Korean domestic issue could cause open warfare behind our lines and bring about the collapse of the war against communism. With this threat to our soldiers and to our avowed political aims, did our Government help block any Communist fifth column in South Korea?

Oh, no. That would not be in character.

Instead, the Voice of America broadcast to the Korean people over stations of the Republic of Korea, all the criticisms of the Korean President which they could cull from the press of the world.

The administration told us that Syngman Rhee had censored the Voice of America, whereas he had, in fact, merely withdrawn the use of his own Government facilities because of one-sided criticisms of his regime.

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

Mr. JENNER. I have but 5 minutes, and I should like to complete my statement for the RECORD. Moreover, the Senate is operating under an order limiting debate.

The administration told us Rhee had established martial law. Did they tell us martial law was established because the Communist guerrillas had killed five American soldiers and injured hundreds of South Koreans?

No; they did not.

Did they tell us the civil police are maintaining civil law and order in Korea? That martial law applies to guerrilla rebels only?

No; they did not.

Is this another Koje incident in which the truth will come out by inches?

We know the Communists hate Syngman Rhee as they hate Chiang Kai-shek.

They hate both men for the same reasons—because both understand communism; because they have the fighting spirit; because they are friends of ours.

In 1928, the Soviet Communist leaders gave orders to all branches of world communism to fight any Korean leaders who favored christianity.

But who gave orders to the Voice of America to fight Syngman Rhee?

The United States Information Service, in a press release from the United States Embassy in Korea, justifies its policies by citing the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. It claims the right to send one-sided information about a sovereign nation over that nation's broadcasting facilities, because the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights says information must pass freely across frontiers.

What goes on here?

How long will it be before the United Nations decides that the Voice of America must broadcast information derogatory to us because the United Nations Declaration says so?

UNCURK, in its letter to President Rhee, says that it has the right to intervene within a nation and take action without delay, when the constitutional freedom of a member state is involved.

Freedom under what constitution?

The United Nations Charter?

UNCURK disclaims any intention of intervening in internal affairs, but redefines internal to suit its own purposes.

Any attempt by the United Nations to decide that constitutional rights are being violated would be a precedent for applying such intervention to the United States.

Is Congress ready to accept the right of the United Nations to enforce U. N. constitutional rights in member states?

If not, what is Congress going to do about the strange behavior of the American Embassy, the United States Information Service, and the Voice of America, which operate under American law, and UNCURK, which is operating in large part with American money?

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain excerpts from the UNCURK statement, President Rhee's reply to UNCURK, and the United States Information Service statement of policy on its criticisms of other nations' internal affairs.

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

#### POLICIES OF THE U. N. COMMISSION FOR KOREA

The following statement, from UNCURK to President Rhee, urged the President to lift martial law and free the assemblymen, without any reference to the danger from Communist plots. UNCURK apparently assumes the right to decide when the constitutional freedom of citizens of a member nation is threatened and to "take action without delay."

"The United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK) has sent the statement below to Dr. Syngman Rhee, president of the Republic of Korea. The statement was delivered at the presidential residence on May 28, at 9:30 p. m.

"The Commission had this morning an interview with the president. This interview lasted over 1 hour and was held in the presence of the ministers of national defense, home affairs and justice, and of the martial law commander.

"President Rhee announced his intention to answer the Commission's statement in writing.

"The Commission's statement follows:

"Having taken cognizance of recent political events within the Republic of Korea, the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea wishes to make the following statement:

"The Commission is the principal representative body of the United Nations in Korea. One of its purposes is to cooperate as closely as possible with the Government of the Republic of Korea in order to ensure and maintain conditions of political stability within the country. The sovereignty of the Republic of Korea is fully acknowledged by the United Nations. However, the United Nations cannot but take an active interest in the political development of the country, in view of the fact that the free people of the world have made, and continue to make, enormous sacrifices in men and resources in order to endure the independence, freedom and welfare of the people of Korea.

"The observance of the democratic guaranties and form of government given to the people of Korea in the Constitution of the Republic remain therefore a matter of continuous concern to the United Nations. The Government of the Republic of Korea itself has repeatedly recognized that the maintenance of a truly independent, democratic and prosperous State in Korea is, under prevailing circumstances, a task of such magnitude that international cooperation was welcomed by the Republic.

"It goes without saying that the Commission, representing the United Nations in Korea, does not take sides in any internal political conflict or controversy nor does it want to impair the recognized freedom of the Government to act within constitutional limits, however, if in the performance of its duties, both to the Government of the Republic of Korea and to the United Nations, the Commission becomes aware of any danger of violation of the Constitution and fundamental laws of the country, it is incumbent upon it to take action without delay.

"Martial law in several rural districts around Pusan and in the city itself has been enforced since Sunday, May 25. The Commission has learned that the National Assembly today voted by a great majority for lifting martial law. It has further come to the knowledge of the Commission that article 49 of the Constitution and article 17 of the law governing the enforcement of martial law have not been observed. A number of assemblymen have been arrested under

martial law and are still under arrest, while others live in fear of arrest or detention and are thereby prevented from attending meetings of the Assembly. The Commission has been unable to ascertain from official sources the exact number of those who have been arrested or detained, or whom it is intended to arrest or detain.

"In view of the above, the Commission urges that the following measures should be taken without delay:

"1. Lifting of martial law in Pusan City.

"2. Release of any assemblyman still under arrest or otherwise detained so as to enable the Assembly to function normally and freely, with the attendance of all members without impediment or threat. This is without prejudice to the right to prosecute assemblymen in accordance with the constitution for infringement of laws committed by them.

"In conclusion, the Commission wishes to reiterate that its good offices are available at all times to the authorities of the Republic of Korea in furthering the progress of the Republic along democratic lines."

(After the delivery of the UNCURK statement, on May 28, various officials of the Commission called on President Rhee the next day, when he promised the Commission a written reply. On that same evening—May 29—the Voice of America broadcast the statement to the Korean people without giving the President time to answer.

#### PRESIDENT RHEE'S REPLY TO UNCURK

JUNE 2, 1952.

THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE UNIFICATION AND REHABILITATION OF KOREA,

Pusan, Korea.

GENTLEMEN: When some of you gentlemen of the UNCURK came to see me on May 26, Monday, I made it clear, among other things, that the arrests of some assemblymen involved in a serious Communist plot were under investigation and everything would be made public through a legal trial conducted openly in full view of the public.

Your note of May 28, 1952, reached me after 9 p. m. of the same day. As you remember, we met again the morning of May 29, when I promised to send you a written reply to the note, never thinking that your note would be publicized before you received my answer. Some even heard it broadcast that evening by the Voice of America.

Naturally unaware of the true facts involved in this brewing political upheaval, some of our friends seem to have more confidence in what the group of assemblymen say, unknowingly, of course. Two of the well-known Communist underground leaders have been recently caught and confessed that some of the assemblymen are in league with the Communists in a scheme to unify north and south Korea through peaceful negotiations. Those who know what this means will understand why we feel deeply concerned.

The investigation of this case has been conducted by the police, and I get their reports. But I could not make them public then and have to wait until the police have completed the investigation. Knowing all this as I do, I have repeatedly assured you and other friends that everything will be made known within a short time, when the court is ready for an open trial of the case.

Meanwhile, some of our friends publicly accused me of being engaged in a struggle for power; this is entirely untrue. The real struggle for power is between the entire Nation bent upon electing the President by direct ballot and a group of assemblymen who are determined to elect the President by themselves, ignoring the expressed will of the people. Meanwhile, some of this group of

the Assemblymen have confessed that they had received money from the Communists to finance a plan to unify north and south after the Communist pattern. If we had ever wanted to settle our problem in this fashion, we could have halted the war and made peace with the Communists long ago, or even could have declined to resist communism in June 1950. I do not know how other nations may feel about this matter, but what I do know is that my people, each and every one of them, have been and are still deadly opposed to this kind of face-saving surrender. It is my duty as the chief executive of this Republic to stand by the declared mandate of the Nation. If I should fail in this, no one knows how to avoid the disastrous consequences that will follow.

From the very serious nature of the conspiracy case cursorily divulged above, I believe you will agree that a proper prosecution of the case itself demands keeping the involved assemblymen under detention for the time being.

There is no one more anxious than I am to see this country firmly established as a truly independent and democratic state. This has been the sole objective of my life-long struggle. I am now devoting my last days to set on a broader democratic basis this republic which has been established and is now being defended with your assistance and cooperation. This is exactly where I am now involved in a clash of opinion with certain sections of the national assembly. When I get through with this political conflict, you will see, I am sure, that it is I, not my opponents, who will help achieve the main purpose of your mission here in Korea.

As a matter of fact, it was generally understood at the time of enacting the present constitution—rather done hastily to suit the urgent demands of the then prevailing situation—that it was to be further democratized as soon as circumstances permitted. As I already have explained to you in person when you were good enough to come and discuss this matter with me, it is not the President but the assembly that ignores and suffocates the true spirit of the constitution and fundamental law of the country. The fundamental law of a democratic state is the expressed will of the people. The power of the government, including the legislative organ, is, of course, derived from the people themselves; there is no individual or group of individuals who can supersede the will of the people in a democratic state. All this is clearly stated in the Korean Constitution itself.

Completely ignoring the intrinsic and fundamental basis of the constitution, my political opponents in the assembly insist on adhering only to letters apt to be dead when severed from the underlying spirit that vitalizes them—of what has been openly admitted to be a temporary arrangement permitting the more expedient method of electing the president by the assembly and providing a unicameral legislature. This is what the entire nation is opposed to. This has been sufficiently demonstrated by the existence of a widespread demand for the dissolution of the assembly that stubbornly refuses to democratize the constitution, a process which has been long overdue. Piles of documents from all election districts, signed by their qualified electors, have been accumulating for the last 3 months. Furthermore, all of the seven provincial legislatures recently elected have sent in their resolutions demanding the dissolution of the assembly.

As I have offered to you personally, if you care to name any town or city where you want to attend a mass meeting at any time at your own convenience, I invite your attendance; you may go and tell them any-

thing and ask any questions you may like to put to them. Then you will know without any doubt what the people want.

No political stability (so stressed in your statement) can be achieved by bypassing the decision of the people. Loopholes of the constitution are being taken advantage of by groups conspiring to grab power, on one hand, while, on the other, the evidence of where the will of the people lies is daily mounting. There could not be a clearer call for the executive branch of the government than to side with the people.

In regard to the martial law, it was proclaimed solely to counteract the guerrilla activities, which took the lives of five American soldiers in one single case not far removed from this city, besides numerous other cases where innocent human lives were involved. I need not repeat all that which I have already directly told you to convince you of the need of such a martial law in this city as well as elsewhere. Incidentally, the martial law has been salutary in stopping demonstrations which have recently caused hundreds of people to be injured. I should like to have it clearly understood that in its origin the martial law had no connection whatsoever with the arrest or detention of any assemblymen, or any men, for that matter. It is purported to be lifted as soon as the emergency conditions cease or mitigate to the point where martial law can be dispensed with.

As a matter of fact, the martial law is only for public security, and the policemen are maintaining the peace and law. The army is responsible for checking the Communist guerrilla activities only.

Sincerely yours,

SYNGMAN RHEE.

—  
POLICIES OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE

This statement apparently derives the policies of the United States Information Service, in the American Embassy, from the U. N. Declaration of Human Rights, and claims the right to send information critical of one of our allies into that country over the radio facilities of that country.

THE AMERICAN EMBASSY,  
UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE,  
Pusan, Korea, May 31, 1952.

Memorandum to all concerned.  
Subject: Policies of the United States Information Service (USIS).

The fundamental policy of the United States Information Service, in keeping with its "Campaign of Truth" in promoting and disseminating all news and information concerning world events and in accordance with United Nations and United States policy, is the same for USIS in Korea.

Due to the present political situation in Korea, it has become increasingly necessary to reiterate our position and policy. The United States Information Service will continue to give the widest circulation possible to all United States Government UNCURK (United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea), United Nations and the United States Army official news release concerning the present situation. In addition, the USIS will present all official news releases of all recognized governments and organizations, including those which are in violation of the U. N. and U. S. policy or which have no basis in truthful facts.

The United States Information Service in Korea will continue to use the various channels or media for the dissemination of its news: radio, press, publications, bulletin boards and posters, and motion pictures, and would consider any infringement upon its right to use freely these media of information as unwarranted and illegal. Any purposeful withholding of truthful informa-

tion to the people of the world, providing it does not violate public security or safety and welfare, would be in violation of Article 19, United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, which states:

"Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontier."

The STAFF, USIS.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, first of all, I should like to say to the Senator from Indiana that I have also been concerned over the activity of our own State Department and the Government of the United States in regard to the political crisis in Korea. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1952, the Senator will find the statement made by me on the floor of the Senate relative to this situation, in which I suggested that the American Government and the American people withhold judgment until we could get the full facts. I thought a one-sided diet was being given, by information or propaganda, as the case might be, to the American people, regarding this situation.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that I was so concerned about it that I sent to the State Department to ask for the transcript of what had been going out over the Voice of America. I have read the full transcript. I find that it is loaded with statements which are primarily derogatory and detrimental to the Republic of Korea. I also find that, while mention was made of the debate in the Indian Parliament, in which members of that Parliament were critical of President Rhee, there was no mention of the statement made on the floor of the United States Senate on June 9, which might be interpreted as at least asking that judgment be withheld. I think it is a matter which the appropriate Senate committee should inquire into.

Mr. JENNER. We had better wake up.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think I have the floor. I was yielded 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the Senator also ask for the evidence regarding the broadcasts which were made in Korea during that period?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have that, too, and I shall be glad to turn it over to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. JENNER. I have that, also.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the

Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Returning to the debate on the Interior Department bill, I desire to place certain tables before the Senate. I hope the Senator from Illinois is somewhere close by; if not, he can read the information I am about to place in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my

Annual appropriations, summary by funds and total expenditures, 1902-51

Fiscal year	Reclamation fund	General fund <sup>1</sup>	Revenue available	Emergency funds	Permanent appropriation expenditures	Total funds available for expenditure	Total expenditures
1906	\$17,363,800					\$17,363,800	\$12,658,163
1907	18,051,161					18,051,161	12,533,916
1908	9,562,038					9,562,038	11,799,956
1909	9,180,700					9,180,700	10,390,395
1910	8,183,300					8,183,300	10,050,733
1911	26,896,790					26,896,790	9,556,325
1912	8,262,367					8,262,367	11,663,193
1913	8,300,508					8,300,508	8,791,905
1914	15,931,922					15,931,922	10,437,941
1915	1,204,411					1,204,411	14,213,173
1916	13,530,000	(9)				13,530,000	8,805,940
1917	8,887,557		15,000			8,902,557	8,023,130
1918	8,227,000	310,213				8,537,213	8,982,355
1919	9,397,081	443,196				9,840,277	8,645,625
1920	7,300,000	548,927				7,848,927	6,399,871
1921	8,463,000	661,177				9,124,177	10,034,149
1922	20,266,000	335,871				20,601,871	8,760,134
1923	14,800,000	559,530				15,359,530	10,045,703
1924	13,800,000	314,067				14,114,067	11,573,766
1925	11,890,809					11,890,809	10,169,452
1926	12,563,240	50,000				12,613,240	8,906,138
1927	7,436,320	75,000				7,511,320	7,449,552
1928	12,148,800	50,000				12,198,800	8,636,988
1929	14,138,400	115,000	190,000			14,443,400	10,254,937
1930	8,253,000	10,760,000	390,000			19,403,000	10,995,304
1931	9,087,000	100,000	395,000			9,582,000	13,942,762
1932	6,971,000	25,100,000	300,000			32,371,000	26,345,915
1933	2,442,288	13,050,000	375,000			15,867,288	25,204,914
1934	3,033,000	8,048,000	405,000	\$103,835,000		114,991,000	24,751,833
1935	890,750		316,900	34,076,000		35,252,750	40,882,912
1936	1,022,100	20,950,000	366,000	25,438,000		47,776,100	49,849,120
1937	12,028,600	36,850,000	666,000	4,573,000		44,071,600	52,379,804
1938	11,991,600	30,670,000	831,000	39,547,500	\$1,100,000	84,140,100	65,405,810
1939	10,574,600	32,995,000	866,000	5,002,488	4,600,000	44,033,112	79,329,428
1940	13,269,600	63,715,000	1,181,000	23,334	5,700,000	83,888,934	96,965,934
1941	9,429,600	63,765,000	1,339,000	119,287	6,600,000	81,014,313	85,596,484
1942	7,446,600	93,915,031	1,414,400	19,965	2,600,000	105,356,066	91,438,941
1943	2,651,060	87,076,210	1,936,400	1,127	2,600,000	94,262,543	69,287,440
1944	2,422,500	35,853,000	3,335,075	72,709	5,669,468	47,207,343	54,887,242
1945	5,321,000	19,824,200	3,278,800	22,332	5,282,501	33,184,169	50,376,076
1946	34,089,290	84,970,500	3,578,600		4,491,718	127,130,108	64,362,688
1947	36,315,968	77,846,135	3,284,245	30,396	4,806,879	122,222,831	129,142,887
1948	20,127,250	117,808,288	5,549,500		5,545,400	148,730,438	176,153,466
1949	29,952,663	229,251,403	6,999,601		5,293,475	271,497,242	243,794,856
1950	35,447,705	313,457,275	9,327,097		8,034,825	366,366,902	298,373,537
1951	(7)	271,543,800	(7)		3,327,177	277,045,886	296,448,244

<sup>1</sup> Including allotments from the reclamation fund through 1915; authorizations for increased compensation from general fund, 1918 through 1924, power and other revenues made available; and allocations from emergency funds 1934-44.

<sup>2</sup> General fund includes appropriations for operation and maintenance of the Colorado River front work and levee system and for the Colorado River Dam fund.

<sup>3</sup> Allotments prior to 1906 were canceled on July 27, 1907, at Fallon, Nev., and summary allotments issued in lieu thereof.

<sup>4</sup> Total expenditures for 1903-06, as follows: 1903, \$269,094; 1904, \$1,513,431; 1905, \$3,767,922; 1906, \$7,107,716.

<sup>5</sup> Excludes appropriation of \$100,000 to Secretary of the Interior for Imperial Valley protection.

<sup>6</sup> Includes appropriation of \$100,000 to Bureau of Reclamation for Bonneville.

<sup>7</sup> All funds merged into the general fund appropriation in fiscal year 1951.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks a table showing that for the 15-year period, 1938 through 1952, the expenditures for rivers and harbors amounted to \$927,952,554, set forth on a year-by-year basis.

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

Army Corps of Engineers  
RIVERS AND HARBORS

	Construction	Planning	Total
1938			\$90,822,101
1939			71,720,000
1940			52,500,000
1941			29,047,000

Army Corps of Engineers—Continued

	Construction	Planning	Total
1942			\$52,953,600
1943			29,979,000
1944			7,265,000
1945			11,359,000
1946	\$38,805,600	0	38,805,600
1947	41,720,650	\$1,533,100	42,253,750
1948	38,776,900	3,500,000	42,276,900
1949	99,288,000	1,924,000	101,212,000
1950	114,149,690	2,000,000	116,149,690
1951	114,620,500	1,500,000	116,120,500
1952	125,192,613	500,000	125,692,613
Total			927,952,554

Mr. KNOWLAND. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks, a table showing that, during the

15-year period, 1938 to 1952, there were total appropriations of \$2,430,438,975 for flood control. If my addition is correct, these tables show that for reclamation, rivers and harbors, and flood control, for the period from 1906 to 1952, the appropriations totaled \$5,683,535,362, which is \$1,000,000,000 less than we are appropriating for foreign aid in 1 year alone.

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

Army Corps of Engineers  
FLOOD CONTROL

	Construction	Planning	Total
1938			\$47,553,000
1939			82,000,000
1940			131,742,000
1941			71,695,000
1942			98,780,000
1943			139,111,700
1944			12,100,000
1945			8,230,100
1946	\$103,384,000	\$12,435,000	118,799,000
1947	132,391,000	6,510,000	138,901,000
1948	231,300,825	4,500,000	235,800,825
1949	339,593,100	3,133,000	342,726,100
1950	348,811,400	3,210,000	352,021,400
1951	340,894,750	2,900,000	343,794,750
1952	306,184,100	1,039,000	307,184,100
Total			2,430,438,975

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I do not care to take much time, but I ask unanimous consent that there may be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks two paragraphs which appear at page 644 of the hearings, headed "Missouri River Basin Project, Cheyenne Division, Rapid Valley Unit, South Dakota," and a one-page statement which I submitted to the Appropriations Committee with reference to the supplemental water supply for Rapid City, S. Dak.

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

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT, CHEYENNE DIVISION, RAPID CITY UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA

The Rapid City Air Force Base has not had, since its establishment in 1942, an adequate water supply. Anticipated peak demand during the coming year is more than double the available supply. Water is essential not only for domestic use at the base but for photographic laboratory, the aqua system of storing high-octane gasoline, maintenance of giant B-36's and B-36D's, etc. At the present time the Air Force base is required to rely on a very unsatisfactory source from wells of an average depth of over 4,000 feet which yield highly mineralized water at excessive temperatures of from 92° to 121° Fahrenheit. The necessary cooling, the corrosion of pipes, and treatment required present an expensive and continuing problem such as to make wells an entirely unsatisfactory source of supply. Furthermore, Rapid City's municipal use taxed existing facilities in the comparatively cool 1950 season. Even with some newly constructed equipment, the city's supply is expected to be far short of the peak demands in the coming year.

The only satisfactory source of additional water which can be economically developed

is through the Rapid Creek storage to be provided by Pactola Dam. Thus the Rapid Valley project would make a substantial contribution to the defense effort by providing an adequate water supply for the Air Force base and Rapid City and by increasing the food and fiber necessary to support such an effort through providing irrigation water for over 14,000 acres of land.

MEMO FOR APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INTERIOR

(By Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota)

SUBJECT

Construction Pactola Dam, second unit in Rapid Valley project, authorized Missouri Basin program.

URGENCY

1. To save Air Force from spending \$1,000,000 for unsatisfactory wells at Rapid City Air Force base—a B-36 base of the Strategic Air Command.

2. Flood control—so important that project has feasibility ratio of 1.7 to 1.

ORIGINAL PURPOSES

1. To supply supplemental water for irrigators in Rapid Valley: District so interested that it has voted to waive rights in Deerfield Reservoir (first unit (15,000 acre-feet) to meet Rapid City and air-base demands during Pactola construction).

2. Supplemental municipal water for Rapid City: Present rights to 6,000 acre-feet in Deerfield Reservoir (constructed 1941-43). Designed for city of 30,000—Rapid City is over 28,000 now and is being asked to help supply air base which has 6,000 military personnel, plus families in housing projects adjacent to base.

3. Flood control: Rapid Creek flows through industrial section Rapid City. Greatest urgency, however, is in narrow canyon above old city where rapid expansion has built hundreds of valuable homes. Engineers rate situation critical.

STATISTICS

Capacity:	Acre-feet
Flood control.....	43,000
Water storage.....	55,000
Dead.....	3,000
Total.....	101,000
Current cost estimate.....	\$10,992,000
Already expended, plans and surveys, approximately.....	350,000

The committee provided and earmarked funds to complete planning studies last year. If the committee contemplates providing funds for any "new starts" this year, this project should rate as high as any could in priority, since the Air Force simply must get additional water. It is believed that Bureau of Reclamation officials conversant with situation would confirm Pactola as among top three in urgency.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I promised to yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as a member of the committee, and having studied the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which proposes to reduce the over-all appropriation by \$31,000,000, let me say that it will reduce the amount provided in the House bill. The House passed this appropriation bill earlier in the session. After the House had acted on the bill, some floods occurred and

some other items in the bill were developed in general.

Members of the House have called on me in person and suggested that I support an increase in the House appropriation bill in the amount the Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended as now appears in the bill.

Mr. President, I have voted against any increases in the appropriation bill, and shall continue so to do, but, likewise, I shall oppose any decrease proposed by amendments offered from the floor, because the committee, after lengthy public hearings and very thorough study, made its recommendations, and I believe the committee exercised good judgment when it recommended to the Senate the amount contained in the appropriation bill.

I would say, Mr. President, that if the amendment offered by the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois should prevail, there are certain projects in the bill which would have to be stricken entirely. One of them relates to a transmission line in Minnesota.

Mr. President, my best judgment is that that transmission line should be constructed, because it will not only make possible of utilization the electric current generated in the installations at Garrison Dam, but also at Randall and Gavin Point, and it would permit the hooking up of the steam plants owned by private interests. These plants would act as a firm-up of the hydroelectric current generated at the flood-control dams in both North Dakota and South Dakota.

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

Mr. THYE. I am speaking on very limited time. If the Senator will inter-rogate me on his own time I shall be happy.

Nothing could be more unwise, Mr. President, than the elimination of this transmission line and the projects included in the appropriation bill as written by the Senate Appropriations Committee and which is before us this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thought I made it clear that my objections were entered against irrigation projects. I think the parliamentary record will show that to be a fact.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I can only say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that he proposed a large reduction. If a reduction of \$31,000,000 is made it will strike out the transmission lines, in my humble opinion. If I am incorrect in that statement, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will look at the RECORD of yesterday, pages 7892-7893 he will find my objection did not go to power projects, but entirely to irrigation projects.

REPRESENTATION—CONTRACTS WITH VARIOUS INDIAN TRIBES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the leaders of both sides, I should like to ask unani-

mous consent that I may make a statement of 3 minutes, not to be taken from the time of either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nevada may proceed for 3 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I make this statement because in the pending bill there is involved the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and I think the Commissioner of Indian Affairs should have his attention very seriously drawn to the matter which I shall discuss for a moment.

One James E. Curry is an attorney who represents various Indian tribes and tribal councils in claims against the Government. He has at least 32 separate accounts involving land-claim contracts. He also has a large number of general representation contracts, some of which have been canceled and some of which have not yet been approved by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but many of which are still valid and in force.

Mr. Curry had a general representation contract with the Pyramid Lake Tribal Council, which by its terms ran for 2 years. This contract has now expired. At the time this contract still had about a year to run, Mr. Curry tendered to the tribal council a new contract to run for a term of 10 years. The Bureau of Indian Affairs refused to approve this contract. Mr. Curry induced three members of the tribal council of the Pyramid Lake Tribe to come back to Washington in an effort to bring pressure to bear on the Indian Bureau to approve this contract. They got back here in November of last year. These three members were Avery Winnemucca, Albert Alec, and Albert Mauwee. After their efforts to secure approval of Curry's contract proved unsuccessful, two of these three men, Alec and Mauwee, left Washington to return to Nevada. Avery Winnemucca stayed on in Washington for some months, in fact, until about the first of May. While Winnemucca was here, Curry sent out from his own office letters purporting to be signed by Winnemucca as chairman of the tribal council, asking for voluntary contributions to assist the Indians in fighting their cause. This letter stated that Winnemucca had been designated as treasurer of a special fund to be raised by such voluntary contributions. The letter promised a strict accounting of all contributions and promised that if any of the funds were not used to aid the Indians in fighting their cause, amounts not used would be returned to the contributors. These letters were sent to tribes all over the United States and even in Alaska.

These letters were not in fact prepared by or sent out by Avery Winnemucca. They were prepared by Mr. Curry. They were written in his office on stationery which he supplied. His office help prepared them and folded them and stuffed them in the envelopes for mailing and put postage on them and mailed them. Mr. Curry paid for the postage. Furthermore, the post-office

box which was given as a return address—that is, the address to which contributors were to send their contributions—was Mr. Curry's post-office box, rented by him.

Recently, affidavits have been secured from members of the Pyramid Lake Tribal Council showing that Avery Win-nemucca never was designated treasurer of the so-called special fund, as stated in these letters soliciting contributions. These affidavits show that there has been no accounting of collections or contributions, and that the tribal council of the Pyramid Lake Tribe does not know how much has been contributed nor who may have made contributions.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, following the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, I may say that this is the first time during my service of 5½ years in the Senate that I recall hearing an attack on the reclamation policy.

It appears that the Senator from Illinois has gone completely over to the opponents of reclamation, who were quite numerous some 25 or 30 years ago, but have been dwindling in numbers until there are very few in the United States today.

The reclamation policy was established 50 years ago. We recently celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of the Reclamation Act. Reclamation has been a great boon to the United States. It is one program that is self-liquidating. There may have been frills added in various directions, but reclamation tends toward the solid development of the United States.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I have only 3 minutes, but I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Thirty seconds is all I need. Is it not correct that reclamation projects were first instigated and pushed through to completion by a Republican administration, that of the lamented President Theodore Roosevelt?

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator is absolutely correct, and it has been a solid program.

I wish to say a few words about the Weber Basin project. There were heavy floods in Utah during the past spring, due to heavy winter snows. The mountains and canyons are steep, and the water from them runs off into the Great Salt Lake, where it is unusable. Everyone who has been to the Great Salt Lake knows that it is about 25 percent salt.

If we had established the Weber Basin project many hundreds of thousands of dollars would have been saved. All we are asking for this year is funds for the first phase, to furnish water to numerous cities and towns in an area where we have four defense installations and an increasing population.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I have only a few moments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator made a statement about me during my absence.

Mr. WATKINS. The only reason why the people are asking the Federal Gov-

ernment to undertake this reclamation project is that it is too big for them to handle themselves. It would require financing beyond their ability, so far as a private loan is concerned, but it falls squarely within the reclamation policy which has been established.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah made a statement about me during my absence. Will he yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand the Senator from Utah said that the Senator from Illinois was opposed to reclamation.

Mr. WATKINS. I understood the Senator to indicate that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not opposed to reclamation, nor am I opposed to home, mother, or the American flag. I am in favor of all those things. However, I believe we should provide certain limitations in appropriating for irrigation; that is all.

Mr. WATKINS. That is all very well and good. I placed my interpretation on what the Senator said. It was the first real attack made on reclamation in this body, from my point of view, in many, many years.

The question of interest on the money was raised by the Senator from Illinois. In the case of the Weber project, the cities that get the water will pay the interest. About 40 percent of the water which is now lost will go to the cities to take care of the increasing population. They will pay interest and pay back every dollar that is spent on this project for the purpose of getting the water.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks two statements concerning the Weber Basin project, Utah.

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

WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH—AUTHORIZED BY PUBLIC LAW 273, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The project is to be built in an area contiguous to Ogden, Utah, the second largest city in the State. It is in the center of a farming, manufacturing, mining, smelting, and defense area. It will ultimately provide supplemental irrigation for approximately 27,000 acres and bring 51,000 acres under new cultivation.

The population of Ogden and 22 cities and towns in the area are vitally concerned with the completion of this project.

An important element in the project relates to flood control. Utah has just recently been designated a disaster area. Much of the damage resulting from these floods could have been alleviated by the completion of the first phase of the project.

In addition to the civilian water needs to be supplied by the project, four vital defense establishments, located in the area will be dependent on the project's completion. These installations are: Hill Field; the Ogden Arsenal; the Clearfield Naval Depot; and the Ogden General Depot, located within the city limits of Ogden and depending entirely on the city water supply.

The civilian employees at these four bases exceed 20,000, the majority of whom live within the area to be served by the project.

The fire problem at the Ogden General Depot alone should merit the initial construction of the project. In excess of \$1,000,-

000,000 in buildings, supplies, and materials is invested in this one depot, with over five billion in plants and supplies invested in the four major defense installations. These supplies include airplanes and airplane parts, naval supplies for the entire Pacific fleet, supplies for the western army area, and vital ammunition supplies.

The initial appropriation of \$1,350,000 would provide funds for general investigation, drawing plans, and some initial construction on the following:

Enlargement of Pine View Dam and Reservoir.....	\$100,000
Warship Dam and Reservoir.....	500,000
The Gateway canal.....	500,000
The Davis aqueduct.....	100,000
Miscellaneous drainage, etc.....	50,000
Total.....	1,350,000

The entire first phase of the project is scheduled for completion within 5 years and includes the following items:

The enlargement of the Pine View Dam and Reservoir.

Completion of the Wanship Dam and Reservoir.

Completion of the Stoddard diversion works.

Completion of the Gateway canal.

Completion of the Weber and Davis aqueducts.

The total cost of the initial phase is estimated at \$35,887,000.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

In these times of huge Government deficit spending and inflation I almost hesitate to appear before this committee urging the appropriation of additional funds. In fact, I would not do so were I not convinced that the appropriations I am about to recommend are absolutely necessary.

I want to emphasize this point. Reductions must be made in the President's budget if our fiscal policies are to remain economically sound. I am confident that the President's budget can be cut without jeopardizing essential defense or essential civilian activities.

Most of the items for which I am urging consideration generally provide for the ultimate repayment of the amounts expended. On the other hand, our foreign-aid expenditures do not provide for the repayment of the United States of any amount. These foreign-aid programs relate to all ramifications in connection with foreign nations' economies.

We are only now considering a 1 year's program of approximately \$7,000,000,000 for foreign aid. According to the Library of Congress, since the end of World War II, there have been 16 major aid programs for foreign nations, with a total expenditure of \$55,061,000,000.

I have had a tabulation prepared which shows that we are now spending more United States taxpayers' dollars in foreign countries on water and power programs than we are spending on like projects in the United States. It is all very well for us to play Santa Claus to all the other peoples of the world, provided we can continue to maintain and develop our own defense and economy at the same time. Our domestic programs (especially as essential as reclamation projects) should not be stymied as a result of a foreign give-away program.

This tabulation shows that since the end of World War II through June 30, 1951, American taxpayers' dollars have been used to further reclamation and allied programs in foreign nations in the amount of approximately \$2,000,000,000, and even this tabulation does not include the total cost since legislative reference informs me that some figures pertaining to these items are not available.

I call the committee's attention to the Weber Basin project. Public Law 273 of the Eighty-first Congress authorized the construction of this project. The President, when he signed this law, directed that detailed information on allocation and repayment be secured, and that certain Government agencies be consulted in this connection.

I am informed that this detailed information is now compiled. The Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and the State of Utah has completed the necessary studies and this report should now be available for this committee. I urge that this committee request from the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of Reclamation a copy of this report to substantiate the request for construction funds.

The project will be built in the center of a farming, manufacturing, mining, smelting, and refining area. It will provide supplemental irrigation for approximately 27,000 acres and bring 51,000 acres of new ground under cultivation. Ogden, Utah, is the intermountain railroad hub of the transcontinental railroad systems, and several of the most important intermountain industrial activities such as canning, meat packing, milling, and manufacturing are located in and near Ogden.

The completion of the project is of supreme importance to the activities of this city, the second largest in Utah. Weber Basin project will develop the area's last remaining surplus water supply for irrigation and municipal needs.

An important element in the project relates to flood control. Utah has been having its share of floods this year. It is important that these waters, which now go to waste, and do inestimable damage during the spring runoffs, be harnessed for later beneficial use.

As important as these needs are, however, of even more direct concern are the water requirements of four vital defense establishments located in the Ogden area. These are Hill Field Airforce Base, Ogden Arsenal, Ogden General Depot located within the city limits of Ogden, and dependent entirely on the city water supply, and the Clearfield Naval Supply Depot.

This committee should be advised that when the Ogden General Depot was first constructed, a well was drilled in an endeavor to secure an independent water supply. When it came in, it developed in excess of 2,000 parts of chloride per 1,000,000, and was therefore unusable and abandoned. This same chloride situation has been found in other wells which have been drilled in an endeavor to augment the water supply of the area.

Not only are the defense establishments directly concerned with the water supply which will be made available by this project, but the majority of the employees, as well as the military personnel, live within Ogden and are dependent upon that municipality's water supply for culinary purposes.

It is interesting to note the effect these defense establishments have had on the population of the area. From 1920 to 1940, the area's population increased about 17 percent per decade. Since 1940, however, the population increase has been in excess of 50 percent. The latest available civilian employment figures at the four bases are as follows:

Utah General Depot.....	3,908
Hill Field.....	10,437
Ogden Arsenal.....	2,650
Clearfield Naval Supply Depot.....	3,281

The Weber Basin Water Conservancy District formed to sign the contract for operation, maintenance, and repayment recently

received the following letter from Ogden Air Material Area, Hill Air Force Base:

"GENTLEMEN: The proposed Weber Basin development, under the jurisdiction of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, has been discussed with representatives of this command with particular reference to the desirability and necessity of supplementing domestic water supplies for communities in this area. It appears that this project, to provide both supplemental irrigation and domestic water for the Ogden Valley, is both economically feasible and a necessary adjunct to the water supply of the area. The economic well-being of the Ogden Valley is vital to the national defense effort in that the living conditions of employees of this command must necessarily be such as to maintain a highly efficient working force and one which is desirous of remaining domiciled in the immediate area.

"In addition to the city of Ogden, there are some 25 small communities in the valley in which reside a large number of the personnel employed at Hill Air Force Base. All of these communities, including the city of Ogden, are faced with a situation in which the locally available water supplies are progressively deteriorating in quality and rapidly diminishing in quantity per capita. The Weber Basin project will provide ample domestic water supplies of good quality for these communities. While it is anticipated that such supplemental water will not, even under an accelerated construction program, become available until about 1953, it is believed that, if the situation is not alleviated by that date, there will then exist difficult problems in connection with the maintenance of the status of the working force at this base.

"It is obvious that, from the standpoint of the economic and physical well-being of the approximately 8,200 employees at this base, the construction of the Weber Basin project is of importance to this command, as further delay in the implementation of this project will have an extremely adverse effect from the standpoint of employee morale, upon the accomplishment of the mission of the Ogden Air Material Area.

"Yours very truly,  
"C. B. Root,  
"Colonel, USAF, Commanding."

Culinary water and irrigation water are not the only needs of these people and these bases. Fire protection, sewage disposal, and all other functions essential to health and welfare should be considered.

For example, General Depot, which as I have said, is within the city of Ogden, has its own firefighting equipment, but is totally dependent upon the pressure from the city water supply. I am informed that there is an investment in excess of \$1,000,000,000 in material and buildings in this one depot alone with over \$5,000,000,000 invested in the buildings and supplies at these four major defense installations. I am sure the committee can imagine what would happen to that investment should a fire break out while the pressure in the water mains was down.

I cannot urge too strongly the necessity of beginning construction on this project. If we wait until a dry cycle comes (and I am informed that one is overdue) it will be too late. The construction contemplated will not conflict with any manpower needs for defense activities and no material considered critical or necessary for the war effort will be needed for this phase of the construction program.

I urge this committee to make available \$1,350,000 for the initiation of construction on this project. This is less than two one hundred-thousandths of the amount the American taxpayers will be expected to give to foreign nations under the Mutual Security Act for this 1 year alone. It is sixty-seven

ten-thousandths of the amount American taxpayers have donated since the end of the war to further foreign reclamation projects.

It should be kept in mind that the reclamation expenditures on Weber Basin and other domestic reclamation projects are repaid by those who receive the benefits.

Only last August the President is reported to have said that if the international situation gets no worse, it should be possible to make room for Weber in the budget. The President has indicated that the international situation is no worse. There is therefore no further excuse to hold up the initiating of construction on this project.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few minutes ago my colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], addressed the Senate in regard to this item in the appropriation bill. During the colloquy between the senior Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], there was a discussion about the relationship of the Douglas amendment cut. I wish to make the RECORD expressly clear that, as was pointed out by the Senator from Illinois on June 24, yesterday, the projects to which the Douglas amendment would relate, in the amount, roughly, of \$31,000,000, have been listed on page 7892 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, June 24. It is expressly clear that under the interpretation of the Senator from Illinois in his listing, the power facilities and transmission lines were excluded. I make this statement as a matter of legislative record.

Mr. HAYDEN. Just a moment. The difficulty is that the House did not provide any money for the Minnesota transmission lines. The Senate committee has made provision for the lines.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that. Mr. HAYDEN. So the question will be considered in conference, but the statement submitted by the Senator from Illinois, and printed in the RECORD, will not be considered in conference, unfortunately.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that. I was about to come to that. I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear what the intent was in case the Douglas amendment should be agreed to. I do not desire that the Senate conferees shall go to the conference feeling, during warm weather, that we were going to be left out in the cold, because we have been left out in the cold a long time with respect to the transmission lines.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sorry about that, but if the Douglas amendment should be agreed to, there would be no money to warm the Senator up; he would still be in the cold.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is just getting warmed up to that subject.

If the amendment carries, the appropriation will be reduced from \$183,406,531 to \$152,406,531, which will be below the House figure. So the Senate figure will be lower than the House figure. I am sure that the Senator from Arizona will agree that in that event certain of the projects, in one of which the Senator from Minnesota is vitally interested, would be lost in the shuffle. In other

words, we would still be frozen out in this particular appropriation bill in our quest for funds for the construction of vitally needed transmission lines.

I want the Senate to know that provision for these transmission lines is the result of testimony before the Appropriations Committee on the part of REA, private utilities, and municipalities. I think there has seldom been a time when the combined utility groups—private, public, and cooperative—have come before the Appropriations Committee with such a splendid program of cooperation. This will mean wonderful things in terms of transmission lines and hydroelectric power.

I wish to make my position perfectly clear. I believe this program is needed. It is a program which is worthy in terms of production of the area, in terms of national defense, and in terms of the security of that section of the country. It is surely one which will bear results in terms of increased revenues for producers, as well as in lower costs for consumers.

I hope the Senate will support the project. We have waited a long time for it. It appears to me that it affords a golden opportunity, and it is for that reason that I must candidly say that the program which has been outlined by the committee is one which I shall feel compelled to support, although my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has made it perfectly clear, from his point of view, that his amendment does not include transmission lines. After hearing the chairman of the subcommittee, I am somewhat aware of the fact that in conference there may be a lack of enthusiasm to do what can be done unless we support this program all the way down the line.

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe all the time has been used, so I suggest that a vote be taken.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 14, line 21. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from

Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent because of illness in her family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

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

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 60, as follows:

#### YEAS—17

Benton	Gillette	Moody
Bricke	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bridges	Hoe	Saltonstall
Douglas	Holland	Smith, N. C.
Ferguson	Ives	Williams
Frear	Jenner	

#### NAYS—60

Alken	Hennings	Monroney
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Murray
Cain	Hunt	Neely
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Nixon
Case	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kem	Pastore
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Knowland	Smathers
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Long	Sparkman
Eaton	Magnuson	Stennis
Ellender	Martin	Taft
Flanders	McCarran	Thye
Fulbright	McClellan	Tobey
George	McFarland	Underwood
Green	McKellar	Watkins
Hayden	Millikin	Welker

#### NOT VOTING—19

Anderson	Kerr	Russell
Brewster	Langer	Seaton
Byrd	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Malone	Wiley
Chavez	Maybank	Young
Duff	McCarthy	
Kefauver	McMahon	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment, offered for himself and Mr. BENTON, to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 14, line 21.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the figure "\$183,406,531" and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$168,406,531."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, while Members of the Senate are in the Chamber I should like briefly to explain the amendment. The Senate has voted down a cut of \$31,000,000. The pending amendment would reduce the appropriation \$15,000,000. It would eliminate all new starts with the exception of the Savage Rapids Dam in Oregon, which is probably the most defensible of the various new projects. It would save \$15,000,000 and would eliminate new starts, the ultimate cost of which, if we made the initial beginning would be \$335,000,000.

I hope the Senate will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 14, line 21.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 22, after the word "fund", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to carry on field engineering, survey work, design, or initiate the construction of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District system to deliver industrial water to the vicinity of Richmond, Calif."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 1, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for other than the completion of field engineering, survey work, and preliminary designs of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District System and no repayment contract shall be executed or construction begun until plans have been submitted to and approved by the Congress through its legislative and appropriation procedures."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 9, after the word "Congress", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$1,419,000 of the appropriation herein made for 'Construction and rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation' shall be expended for completion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal System, Boulder Can-

yon project in accordance with the terms and conditions of the appropriation for the same purpose contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$700,000 shall be available toward emergency rehabilitation of the Savage Rapids Dam to be repaid in full under conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 20, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the initiation of construction under the terms of reclamation law of any dam or reservoir or water supply, or any tunnel, canal or conduit for water, or water distribution system related to such dam or reservoir until the Secretary shall certify to the Congress that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance," on page 17, line 11, after the word "fund", to insert "including operation and maintenance of Palo Verde weir."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General administrative expenses," on page 17, line 24, after the word "Reclamation", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$5,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 20, after line 24, to strike out: "Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be reimbursable or returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Geological Survey—Surveys, investigations, and research," on page 22, line 23, after the word "activities", to strike out "\$25,362,685" and insert "\$25,301,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Mines—Conservation and development of mineral resources," on page 24, line 15, after the word "owner", to strike out "\$18,000,000" and insert "\$18,657,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 26, line 20, after the word "Mines", to strike out "on July 1, of said fiscal year" and insert "and said sums, together with all other payments to the Bureau of Mines for helium, shall be credited to the special helium production fund, established pursuant to the act of

March 3, 1925, as amended (50 U. S. C. 164 (c))."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Park Service—Construction," on page 28, line 4, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$11,770,000" and insert "\$19,670,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I offer the amendment which I ask be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "\$19,670,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$12,750,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this amendment would reduce the committee recommendation by \$6,920,000. It would provide the full budget estimate for construction work in our national parkways. Last year for the same item there was an appropriation of \$11,370,000. The amendment provides a modest increase over the appropriation of last year.

I invite attention to the fact that the committee report states that the funds so provided are to be allocated by the Park Service as it sees fit.

The amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and myself is in my judgment a sound amendment.

Many times we have stood on the floor of the Senate when a reduction was proposed, in which the allocation of the reduction would be left to the department or agency concerned. At such times Senators have protested and voted against proposed cuts because they were unwilling to delegate such authority to the department or agency concerned.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. This allocation is based upon the designation by the committee that the money should be spent nowhere else except upon roads and trails and parkways. Congress has stated that it wants the roads to be improved. The decision as to the particular roads on which the money would be spent would be left to the best judgment of the Park Service. It is a different matter from appropriating a lump sum to a particular service. This is road money, and nothing but road money. It is based upon the fact that in the past 10 years the number of visitors to our national parks has increased from 21,000,000 to 40,000,000. The roads are in terrible condition.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The budget estimate was \$12,750,000, as I understand.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The House allowed \$11,770,000. The Senate committee proposes to go beyond the budget estimate, as I understand.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no dispute about that, but the money is allocated for one particular purpose. I do not agree with the Senator that the committee said it would allow the Park Service to spend the money where it pleased. The committee stated that this money was for roads, and for nothing but roads. The only judgment it allowed to the Park Service was as to which particular roads would be improved.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, at page 17 of the committee report I find the following statement:

The remaining \$6,920,000 of this increase will be allocated by the National Park Service for roads, trails, and parkway projects.

Mr. HAYDEN. A parkway is a road.

Mr. BRIDGES. It says "roads, trails, and parkway projects."

Mr. HAYDEN. It is for nothing else but roads. A parkway is nothing but a road with a strip of land on each side which is controlled by the Government. Examples of parkways are the Natchez Trace, the Blue Ridge Parkway, and the parkway between Washington and Baltimore. They are nothing but parkways.

Mr. BRIDGES. On this item the committee has moved above the budget estimate. I am aware of the desirability of these projects. I am aware of the desirability of improving our national parks. I am aware of the fact that many projects in this country are desirable, but when we are faced with a budget of \$85,600,000,000, and when we find that a committee has increased a budget figure, and that the Senate is willing to increase it even more, it is time to start to make some reductions.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we have already voted large appropriations for foreign nations in Europe, Asia, Africa—nations all over the world—to enable them to build such parkways as they wish and to plan for whatever parkways they would like to have. It is proposed that we give those countries \$7,000,000,000 or \$8,000,000,000. I hope the amount finally voted will be less than that, but it is likely to be that large.

It seems to me that if we wish to make savings, we should make some reduction in the appropriations we vote for those purposes, for that money is simply given away, and will never be returned to us. We should make reductions in those appropriations, rather than engage in cheese paring in connection with the appropriations for our own roads and trails.

I wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire, whom I love very much, that I first became an advocate of good roads in the year 1911, when I traveled through New England, and found there a few good roads, principally in the parks. At that time there were no good roads elsewhere in the United States. For instance, at that time there were no good roads in Maryland or in Pennsylvania. In those days it was very difficult to reach Baltimore by road.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to say a word in reply to the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He has referred to a matter which I believe to be most important to the people of the United States and, in particular, to the Senate. It appears that whenever an attempt is made in the Senate to reduce the amount of an appropriation recommended by the committee or by the Bureau of the Budget for a project in the United States, the argument is made that we are giving large sums of money to foreign countries, and therefore we cannot refuse to make appropriations for the people of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that parkways in the United States are important.

On the other hand, when Senators argue that because we are making large gifts to foreign countries, we cannot afford to reduce the appropriations for projects at home, and thus work toward balancing the budget, I should like to see those Senators help us to make reductions in the appropriations we make for foreign nations, and in that way balance the budget.

However, what is done? The Congress votes to send Americans all over the world, to virtually all the other nations of the world, to tell those nations how to balance their budgets. We even send American dollars to get counterpart funds to be used by foreign countries to balance their own budgets.

Then Senators state on the floor of the Senate that cuts cannot be made in the appropriations requested for American projects because we are giving large sums of money to foreign nations.

I think we had better have a revamping of the entire matter. We had better look at our own budget, as well as the budgets of foreign nations. We should try to balance our own budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield to me, let me say that I agree that we should look at both. I agree entirely with the Senator from Michigan that we should have a balanced budget.

On the other hand, we are just dealing in chinquapins when we make a reduction of a few thousand dollars in this or that domestic item, while we are simply throwing down the drain billions of dollars which never will come back to us.

Today Russia is probably our chief enemy in all the world. Yet do Senators recall that at this time Russia owes us \$12,000,000,000 which undoubtedly she will never repay?

Certainly we cannot buy the friendship of other peoples by giving them money.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am not arguing for appropriations for

foreign aid; but I do not want the appropriations Congress makes for foreign aid to be used as the basis of an argument for increasing every one of the appropriations for domestic projects.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am opposed to that, too.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I am opposed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am opposed to increasing any appropriation unless it is necessary. But this work is necessary. These park roads are necessary for our own comfort and enjoyment. Our people have a right to expect that we shall provide for these projects.

Mr. FERGUSON. Here is what I want, Mr. President, insofar as my own conscience is concerned: I want to be able to say to the people of Michigan and to all the people of the United States that the fact that the Congress votes large sums of money for foreign aid does not mean that I should vote for an increase in appropriations for projects in the United States, and thus, in effect, vote to continue an unbalanced budget at home.

I would not vote for an appropriation which I did not believe was for the common defense. I have voted to make cuts in the appropriations for foreign aid because I have believed that those appropriations were not for the common defense of America. I believe that under the Constitution I have no right to vote for such appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield further to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say that the Senator from Michigan is a very able, splendid man, and I have the highest esteem for him. He serves very well on my committee, and he is really everything a Senator should be. I wish to say to him that park roads of the very type of those we are now discussing are being built in Europe today, and housing projects are being built at various places in Europe today—all at our expense; we are paying for those projects. Yet at this time the House of Representatives has refused to allow appropriations for planning for the future of our own country.

So, Mr. President, I think we should not interfere in such a cheese-paring manner. This fund is necessary for the good of our own people. For heaven's sake, let us get together and help our own people a little.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the trouble is that the amount now requested is 50 percent more than the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. How can such an amount be called "cheese-paring"?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we are not bound by the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. This body is above the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget is our servant, not our master.

Mr. FERGUSON. But we should balance our own budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the projected appropriations are vastly in excess of the amounts to be appropriated during the current year?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. That happens very frequently.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator should know that there was no road improvement in the parkways during the war, and there has been very little since the war. Actually, the Park Service asked the Bureau of the Budget for \$30,000,000, this year. The Bureau of the Budget refused to recommend that amount; but there is a justification for \$30,000,000, instead of the amount the Appropriations Committee included in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me, and then I shall conclude.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it is time for us to look after our own affairs a little and to build up our own country and our own strength, because when it comes to a showdown, we must depend upon our own strength.

We thought Russia was our friend, when we gave her \$12,000,000,000; but today Russia is our chief enemy. Russia never has thanked us for giving her the \$12,000,000,000 and never has paid any interest on it.

Everything we appropriate for our own people will not amount to as much as we are giving away to foreign countries.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. In the subcommittee I found it necessary to vote against the proposed increase, and I voted against it in the full committee. I believe we can get along without it this year.

I recognize that there is need for improvement in the national park road system. I should like to think that we could make that improvement without having to borrow the money, by means of an unbalanced budget, to do it, but I know that cannot be done, and therefore I believe we should let this item go for another year.

I voted against the proposed increase, and I shall support the pending amendment to the committee amendment, which will make a reduction in the amount carried at this point in the bill.

Mr. President, I realize that there is a very telling argument in the comparison between our spending of money overseas and a failure to spend money at home. I believe the argument would be more telling, however, and would come with better grace if those who make it would at least vote against overseas spending before they criticize these programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself, the

Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to the committee amendment on page 28, in line 4.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the vote taken at this time, for I understand that a number of Senators desire to attend the funeral of the late former Senator Wadsworth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 15 minutes available to him.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I shall not use the time available to me. Let us vote now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], on behalf of himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment on page 28, in line 4.

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

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

I announce also that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent because of illness in her family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—26

Alken	Ferguson	Morse
Benton	Flanders	Robertson
Bricker	Frear	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hendrickson	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Hickenlooper	Thye
Dirksen	Jenner	Tobey
Douglas	Kem	Welker
Duff	Martin	Williams
Dworshak	Moody	

NAYS—47

Bennett	Hoey	Millikin
Butler, Md.	Holland	Mundt
Cain	Humphrey	Murray
Capehart	Hunt	Neely
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Nixon
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kilgore	Pasfere
Eaton	Knowland	Schoeppel
Ellender	Lehman	Smathers
Fulbright	Long	Smith, N. C.
George	Magnuson	Sparkman
Green	McCarran	Stennis
Hayden	McClellan	Underwood
Hennings	McFarland	Watkins
Hill	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—23

Anderson	Kefauver	Monrone
Brewster	Kerr	Russell
Butler, Nebr.	Langer	Seaton
Byrd	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Malone	Taft
Chavez	Maybank	Wiley
Gillette	McCarthy	Young
Ives	McMahon	

So the amendment of Mr. FERGUSON to the committee amendment, offered for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. DOUGLAS, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as a mark of respect to the memory of Hon. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., former Senator and Representative from the State of New York, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 10 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "General administrative expenses," on page 28, line 8, after the word "offices," to strike out "\$1,262,000" and insert "\$1,342,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 23, line 11, after the word "exceed" to strike out "nineteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only" and insert "twenty-four passenger motor vehicles of which twenty-two shall be for replacement only."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fish and Wildlife Service—Management of resources," on page 29, line 7, after the word "Service," to strike out "\$7,292,000" and insert "\$7,325,375."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 7, immediately after "\$7,325,375," it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "of which \$181,000 shall be made available to the Federal Security Administrator to defray the cost of studies of problems affecting the education of children of migratory workers".

SIX MILLION DOLLARS FOR MIGRATORY BIRDS—  
NOTHING FOR MIGRATORY CHILDREN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this amendment will not cost the Government anything. It is a proposal to divert \$181,000 from the care of migratory birds to the educational needs of migratory children. We spend approximately \$6,000,000 a year for the care of migratory birds. About \$3,700,000 comes from the sale of stamps, about \$2,000,000 from general appropriations.

By these expenditures, we take care of migratory birds in a very good fashion. We establish refuges for them so that they will not have to fly too far and so that they will not become exhausted and tired at the end of their day's flight. We provide food for them so that they will be amply fed. We provide sanctuaries where they will not be shot. In other words, we spend money and take a great deal of time, care, and effort to provide for migratory birds.

I am all for it, Mr. President, but let us not forget migratory children.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not have very much time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wondered where the Senator got his figures. The migratory bird program is financed by sportsmen, through a tax which I helped to put through the Congress. There is

no appropriation of \$3,000,000 for migratory birds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter from M. E. Corbin, acting director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, addressed to Mr. Sol Markoff, Brooklyn, N. Y. The letter reads as follows:

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,  
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1952.

Mr. SOL MARKOFF,  
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MARKOFF: Your letter dated March 28 addressed to the United States Department of the Interior inquiring as to the services the Department of the Interior provides in connection with migratory birds has been referred to this Service for reply.

This Service has a permanent indefinite appropriation which is made up of receipts from the sale of Federal hunting stamps. These receipts are set aside in the migratory bird conservation fund. Fifteen percent of the fund is used for enforcing the Migratory Waterfowl Hunting Stamp and Migratory Bird Treaty Acts and 85 percent is used for the acquisition and administration of migratory waterfowl. It is anticipated that the expenditures from this fund in the current fiscal year for the benefit of migratory waterfowl will approximate \$3,722,000, of which \$2,342,000 represent anticipated expenditures for the development and maintenance of migratory bird refuges. Other major expenditures under this fund which are anticipated are \$500,000 for the acquisition of refuge lands for migratory waterfowl; \$305,700 for enforcement activities; \$201,500 for migratory waterfowl management investigations.

The Service also has other appropriations which are expended in part for the benefit of migratory waterfowl. The Service expects to spend in the current fiscal year from its appropriation for management of resources approximately \$2,065,000 for the benefit of migratory waterfowl. Of this amount, \$1,316,000 is earmarked for expenditure for management of wildlife refuges maintained for the benefit of migratory waterfowl; \$320,000 for administration of Migratory Bird Acts; \$250,000 for acquisition of migratory waterfowl management areas in the State of California, and the balance for other miscellaneous services.

From other appropriations available the Service expects to spend during the current fiscal year approximately \$761,000 for the benefit of migratory waterfowl. Major items included in this total are \$367,000 for construction of refuge facilities; \$150,000 for refuge maintenance activities; \$50,000 for population studies of migratory waterfowl; and \$50,000 for studies to improve migratory wildlife management methods.

I trust that the foregoing information will satisfactorily answer your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

M. E. CORBIN,  
Acting Director.

The third paragraph of the letter shows that more than \$2,000,000 of the appropriation for management of resources is spent for the benefit of migratory waterfowl. That is the item we are now considering. The letter is signed by the Acting Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did the Senator say \$50,000,000 for migratory waterfowl?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; \$2,000,000. The birds are partially taken care of under the item for the management of re-

sources. The writer of the letter says that the Service expects to spend in the current fiscal year from its appropriation for management of resources approximately \$2,065,000, for the benefit of migratory waterfowl. That is in addition to the \$3,722,000 from the sale of stamps and \$761,000 from other appropriations, including \$367,000 for the construction of refuge facilities, \$150,000 for the maintenance of refuge facilities, \$50,000 for population studies of migratory waterfowl—

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator let me enlighten him a little further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Please let me finish my remarks.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Some of the money comes from the 11 percent tax on guns and ammunition which I helped put through the Ways and Means Committee years ago. It does not come out of the General Treasury. The management fund is the 10 percent the Fish and Wildlife Service gets out of the funds to which I have just referred. The Senator from Illinois does not interpret the figures correctly. He should read what Solomon asked when the angel appeared to him in a vision and said to Solomon, "What would you have?" Solomon said, "Give me understanding to judge between good and bad."

The Senator from Illinois does not have the understanding when he reads the figures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall let the letter speak for itself. What I am trying to say is that we spend more than \$6,000,000 for the care of migratory birds, and I am in favor of it. I think they should be taken care of. But the other day the committee turned down a request for \$181,000 to care for the educational needs of migratory children. There are well more than a million migratory children in this country, who move along with their parents with the crops. Since they do not remain long in any one place, they do not have the privilege of education, nor are they exempt from dangers or provided food and sanctuaries. We do not take care of the children of migratory farm workers, but we do take care of migratory birds.

About two and a half centuries ago a minister in Ireland made a proposal for dealing with famine in Ireland. He proposed that the English, who were the controlling government of Ireland, deal with the famine by killing the children and roasting them, and that would eliminate the famine. That was Dean Swift's modest proposal.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I want to discuss this Dean Swift proposal a little further.

We adopt a similar attitude with reference to children. We spend millions of dollars for wildlife and the birds, but not a cent for migratory children. I am proposing that \$181,000 of the money which we now spend on birds shall go to such children. It is about time we made the beginning. There are more than a million children moving around, illiter-

ate, disease-ridden, with no attention being paid to them. It is difficult for the localities to deal with them. I think we should establish refuges for them.

So, Mr. President, I hope the chairman of the committee will take this amendment to conference.

I was accused of being against reclamation, home and mother, apple pie, and the American flag. I hope the Senator from Arizona will not put himself in the position of being opposed to children and placing birds in a higher priority than children. It is my earnest hope that the Senator from Arizona will accept the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I regret that I cannot do so, because we cannot in this bill permit appropriations to be made for the Federal Security Agency.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am happy the Senator from Illinois has had a change of heart, because only a few minutes ago he voted against an appropriation for Indian children.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I voted against an appropriation for the Indian Bureau. There is a big difference between Indian children and the Indian Bureau. Furthermore, it was for a proposal to stop an increase of a \$43,000,000 item.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator cannot get out of it that way. He voted against Indian children.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All I am asking for is that 3 percent of the money now spent on caring for migratory birds be spent in caring for migratory children. Are we going to say that we spend \$6,000,000 for birds and spend nothing for children?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that material demonstrating the need for a modest program for children of migratory workers be inserted at this point in my remarks. I think it shows that there is at least as great a justification for caring for the needs of migratory children as there is for caring for migratory birds. And my proposal is to divert a mere 3 percent of what we spend for the birds to the needs of these children—only \$181,000.

There being no objection, the material was ordered printed as follows:

EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF MIGRATORY FARM WORKERS

(Appearing as a part of ch. 11 of the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor)

The Executive order directed the Commission to inquire into the " \* \* \* educational conditions among migratory workers."

"Speaking broadly," said a Michigan educator, "about the only group in the United States that we do not consistently educate is the migrant child." Migrant children are among those with lowest educational attainments found in the United States. Nor are they likely to get educational opportunities so long as they work during school hours and move from place to place with their parents in search of employment. They suffer also from the discrimination and social stigma which excludes them from full participation in the community.

There have been many recommendations for bringing migrant children into the

schools and for bringing the schools to migrant children, but very little has been accomplished. Migratory life involving 4 to 6 months away from home is bound to cut into children's schooling, but their itinerant status is not the only obstacle to their education. School opportunities for migratory children are limited. Inadequate school facilities, community opposition to the admission of migratory children to the schools, discrimination because of color or economic status, family incomes too low to supply necessary clothing and food are among the handicaps under which they suffer. Moreover, poverty compels them to work when other children are in school. Retardation, irregular attendance in school, and emotional disturbance are logical results of their status as migrants. Moreover, nonenforcement of child-labor and compulsory school-attendance laws, crowded schools, lack of teachers, and school facilities are all characteristic of the migrant child's educational environment.

The testimony before this Commission was but an echo of the findings of earlier commissions and investigations, yet little or nothing has been done to find an adequate solution to the educational problem of migrant children.

#### LOCAL SCHOOLS DO NOT SERVE NONLOCAL CHILDREN

The fundamental problem in the education of migratory children is that our educational system is based on the principle of local responsibility and control—a sound principle for resident children. The migratory child, because he is itinerant and lacks equal community status, does not fit into the structure of our educational system. The local school district, hard pressed to provide for its own permanent resident children, finds it difficult to make adequate provision for migratory children.

State school funds supplied to local school districts are most frequently allocated on the basis of either a school census or average daily attendance. Migrant children are more likely to be counted in the school census than they are to attend the schools. If allocations of school funds are based on the census, migratory children may be counted even though they do not attend school. By thus increasing the census basis for the allocation of funds, but without attending school, migrant children help to increase the educational benefits available to those who do attend. If, on the other hand, the allocation of funds is based on average daily attendance, in those districts in which attendance and enrollment fluctuate widely because of migrants, school funds are usually too low to provide for peak enrollment needs. So, likewise, are they, if the school census is taken at a time when the migrant children are not on hand to be counted.

Most State school-attendance laws do not apply to migratory children, although in 7 States they specifically do apply and in 18 other States the laws are broad enough to include them. In 23 States laws apply specifically to resident children and whether or not these laws are extended to migrants depends upon local interpretation. Under such local interpretation, children without the necessary residence requirements are often excluded. However, in such States nonattendance by migrants is more likely to be due to nonenforcement of the school-attendance laws than to specify exclusion.

While most States have compulsory school-attendance laws, nonenforcement for migrant children is characteristic. Some States—New York, New Jersey, and California for example—have attempted enforcement of the attendance laws by State officers. Generally, however, this is left to the local community which, in the face of inade-

quate finances and physical facilities as well as social pressures against migrants, finds nonenforcement easier than enforcement.

No Federal agency and very few State agencies have been specifically charged with responsibility for investigating the educational problems of migratory children. There is great need for a comprehensive study of ways and means to deal with this problem.

Educational deficiencies of the children of migratory workers as they move from job to job are similar to those encountered at their home base. For example, in the Texas-North Central States migration, which is primarily Mexican-American, we find that the migrants have little chance to get an education while they are at home in south Texas. Being an area of concentrated wetback traffic, its school problem is aggravated by the presence of children in large numbers who are regarded as not belonging to the community and hence for whom little is done.

The States of Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, into which these Texas-Mexicans annually migrate, have endeavored to bring migratory children into their school systems but even with the best of will, they are confronted with a most difficult problem in meeting the educational needs of these young nomads. Not only do they spend but a short time within the State, but they move frequently from one local community to another. Since the bulk of migrant labor comes to these States during the summer months when schools are not in session, this further reduces what they can do.

In the predominantly Negro migratory stream of the Atlantic coast, there are many families with children. These migrants spend the winters at their home base in Florida where families work in various crops. Those who go to school in Florida enter late in the fall and drop out early in the spring. As a group, they are retarded from 2 to 5 years as compared with resident children. Thus, because the children work and the school-attendance laws are poorly enforced, their education while at home is irregular at best. Very few schools districts in Florida have made serious attempts to get migrant children into school for the 6 or 7 months they are at home. Some children do not go to school at all during the winter and the summer schools provided are wholly inadequate even if the children were there and could be persuaded to attend.

The northward trek begins in the spring, the families working in from two to six States before returning home in the fall. A majority of them work in New York and New Jersey. These States have made attempts to get migrant children into regular school sessions while they are there and also to provide child-care facilities and summer schools. They are able to reach some of the children, but encounter the same obstacles as do the North Central States in attempting supplementary education for Texas-Mexican children. New Jersey is distinctive in providing additional funds for schools which have migrant children enrolled.

In States where many of the migratory workers have their home base, as many as 40 percent of all the children of school age do not attend school. The percentage of children of migratory workers not in school in these localities is much larger and may be as high as 60 percent. This situation cannot be explained on a basis of the inability of such States to afford schooling for their resident children, for they are not lacking in economic resources and taxable wealth.

#### EXPERIMENTAL EFFORTS

We have said that no comprehensive program for the education of children has been

devised; nonetheless, there have been a few experiments that may help to point the way.

For 3 years (1947-49, inclusive), the State of New Jersey operated a 6 weeks' demonstration summer school for migrant children at Freehold. It was successful in providing supplementary school experience for 50 to 70 children each year at a cost of less than \$5,000 per year. Although State appropriations for its operation ceased in 1950, the school was continued under the auspices of the New Jersey Council of Churches.

Since the early 1920's California has made funds available for temporary elementary schools for migrant children. Such a school was built in the 1930's at the Arvin Farm Labor Supply Center. This school was integrated into the community so that both resident and migrant children attended. A number of similar schools were provided in California in areas of migrant concentration. At one time, California experimented also with mobile schools designed to follow the children as they moved from crop to crop. These schools were abandoned when it was found that as they moved, groups of migratory families scattered, thus breaking up the instructional unit. Moreover, this type of school provided no opportunity for community integration, attendance fluctuated widely, and it was found difficult to get qualified teachers.

During the 1940's, Michigan operated a number of summer schools in order to reach a few of the 8,000 migrant children in the State from April to November. None of these schools has been continued. They depended upon local interest and only one used the State aid available to school districts for this purpose. Nevertheless, these schools provided the first schooling some of the migrant children had ever had.

Religious and charitable organizations have worked with migratory children and have carried on programs which include religion, child care, and education. Limited funds and personnel, however, have meant that relatively few migrant children have been reached through this means.

Although these various experiments have not taken root, they have demonstrated that something can be done.

#### EDUCATION FOR MIGRANTS—A MUST

Hundreds of thousands of the children of migrant workers are today getting little or no education, and they face the prospect of being slightly, if any, better able to improve their earning power and to raise their level of living than have their parents before them. This is no fault of theirs, but is the inevitable result of present public policies in many parts of our Nation. These policies are creating a new generation of persons, inherently as competent as other Americans, but who will be compelled to spend their lives in poverty because the communities in which they spend their childhood do not provide them with even the rudiments of an education.

This Commission wishes to reiterate its conviction that the education of the children of migratory farm workers is one of the most urgent and most essential of the many steps which the Nation can and should take to improve the lot of migrants who have for so long been deprived of what the rest of us take for granted.

#### RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that:

1. The Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor, through the cooperation of public and private agencies, including the United States Office of Education, State educational agencies, the National Education Association, universities, and the American Council on Education, develop a plan which will provide an adequate program of education for migratory workers and their children. This

may include Federal grants-in-aid to the States.

PROGRAM FOR PROVIDING EDUCATION FOR  
CHILDREN OF MIGRATORY WORKERS  
(Prepared by the Office of Education, FSA)  
1953 budget estimate

	Amount
Personal services.....	\$28,314
Travel.....	6,465
Communication services.....	300
Printing and reproduction.....	900
Cooperative agreements with non-	
Federal agencies.....	143,100
Supplies and materials.....	271
Equipment.....	1,500
Taxes and assessments.....	150
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>181,000</b>

INTRODUCTION

In fiscal year 1953, funds are needed to meet the problem of providing education for the children of migrant farm workers. The need for extension of school opportunities to the children of migrants has recently come into clear focus, with the report of the President's Commission on Migrant Labor. That need has taken on an additional urgency because of the 1950 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act requiring that children be free from work during school hours, and therefore exposing the inadequacy of the school opportunities available to many children of migrant agricultural laborers. The problem of educating such children is of long standing, yet demands an immediate beginning of corrective action.

The problem is uniquely difficult. It is inter-State and intersectional in character. Individual States acting alone cannot achieve results commensurate with the urgency and breadth of the need. Indeed, sometimes State and local school officials are tempted to turn away from the problem because of its difficulty, giving as an excuse that the children "are from another State." Actually, they are "from" no State, but live in several. This unique characteristic of the problem makes it particularly a Federal responsibility.

This Federal responsibility is not necessarily one of providing or operating schools for the children of migrant farm workers. That responsibility is properly to be lodged with the States and local communities, in accordance with the established and accepted pattern of American education. The Federal responsibility lies in giving the necessary coordination of effort and influence, the furnishing of consultative help, the guiding of cooperative activities, the carrying on of research, bringing together and analyzing and publishing basic facts, statistics and descriptions of best practices. Such Federal initiative is to be exercised, however, in such manner as most effectively to stimulate and coordinate and encourage State and local school leaders in moving quickly and effectively to meet the educational needs of migrants, by this process leaving a growing influence of continuing effort in the States and local districts as the Federal effort tapers off.

WORK PROGRAM AND OBJECTIVES

The Office of Education will initiate a research and action program in cooperation with Federal and non-Federal agencies and institutions directed toward identifying, defining, and beginning to meet the educational needs of the children of migrant agricultural workers. This program will involve close collaboration with other Federal agencies such as the Departments of Labor and Agriculture and the Children's Bureau, whose cooperation is being established through in-

formal discussion leading toward more formal participation. The cooperative relationship with non-Federal agencies and institutions is to be achieved both through committee and conference work and through cooperative agreements (which are discussed below).

Research and action program: The program of research and action involves planning and working with national, regional, State and local school personnel, as well as with interested voluntary and public agencies and groups (1) to develop the facts about the children of migrant agricultural workers and their education or lack thereof; (2) to provide more nearly adequate educational services; (3) to provide better qualified teaching personnel, specially selected and trained to understand migrant rural children and to work effectively with them; (4) to identify best instructional methods and to encourage their wider use; (5) to provide such pupil personnel services as will tend to keep these children in school, both with and without the cooperative help of agencies enforcing the Fair Labor Standards Act; (6) to develop more nearly adequate learning materials, adapted to the needs of the child and to his migratory situation; (7) to provide more nearly adequate building and instructional facilities—possibly some that might travel with migrant families and groups of families; (8) to communicate knowledge about successful practices, improvements and progress to all those involved and interested; and (9) to secure a greater degree of social acceptance of the migrant child and his family by local communities, and of acceptance of citizenship responsibilities and rights by migrant parents and their children.

Cooperative agreements: While the Office of Education will assume a leadership role in this project, effective results will be realized only to the degree that State Departments of Education, local school people, and many nonschool agencies and groups become directly involved in planning, action and follow-through. To this end, it is not contemplated that the professional staff of the Office will be greatly augmented. Instead only certain minimal and inescapably essential additions to the Office staff will be made, with the bulk of expenditures being used to support the cooperative aspects of the project. Initiating conferences in each of the four principal "streams" of migrant labor will help to identify and enlist the active participation of the agencies, institutions, groups and organizations which in each area, give greatest promise of effective cooperation. Federal funds, matched by the participating agencies and institutions, will be doubled in effectiveness and multiplied many times in total impact. Such a cooperative device for putting a program into effect will make possible a concerted attack on problems which otherwise evade the efforts of educators in the States or of a single Federal agency working alone. Moreover, as the Federal dollar is multiplied in effectiveness, the foundation is also laid for continuance of the work after the ultimate withdrawal of the Federal agency. The first year of the project should serve to suggest the possible time schedule under which goals may reasonably be reached, but it is not expected that a single year will see anything more than a hopeful beginning. The children of migrant farm workers (estimated to comprise about five of six percent of the Nation's children) are the principal source of illiteracy, the least advantaged and most neglected of all groups in the country, the children least rooted in community life and having the most limited opportunity of personal development and growth into constructive citizenship. To make a significant beginning on the hither-

to baffling and evasive problems of educating these children will be a minor triumph.

Explanation of budget requirements

Personal services..... \$28,314

While some leadership for the project is being provided by persons now on the office professional staff, a few additional persons are required who have certain essential competencies in rural sociology and life and to provide the necessary full-time central direction and administration of the project. The real impact on the problem is dependent both upon securing this key small staff and upon tapping, through cooperative agreements, the fuller resources of non-Federal institutions and agencies.

An amount of \$28,314 is requested for 6 new positions to assist in the development of educational services for migratory farm workers. (1 GS-14, chief; 1 GS-12, assistant specialist; 1 GS-9, research assistant; 1 GS-5, secretary; 2 GS-4 clerks.) This small staff will be responsible for determining centers which are strategically located, and which have an active interest in the education of children of migratory workers, for negotiating with State departments of education and educational institutions and arranging for cooperative agreements between the office and such institutions.

Other objects

Travel..... \$6,465

Man-days of travel, 294.

Number of travelers, 3.

Travel funds will be required for the staff in order to permit them to work with State departments of education and educational institutions in arranging for cooperative agreements, in stimulating interest of school officials, in conducting regional conferences for planning purposes, for attending meetings of educational agencies and organizations and to render advisory and consultative services as required.

Communication services..... \$300

Funds are requested to provide for telegraph and toll services and for postage for urgent official business, as follows: Telegraph service, \$100; toll service, \$150; postage, \$50. Printing and reproduction..... \$900

An amount of \$900 is requested to provide for printing forms, questionnaires, instructional and other materials which will be required in initiating this program.

Other contractual services..... 143,000

An amount of \$143,000 is requested to enable the office to enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with educational institutions and organizations to conduct research which will include experimental work in curricular activities for migrant children; on teaching methods and practices suited to the learning needs of migrant children; development and adaptation of teaching materials; development of teacher materials; and the gathering of basic statistical and informational data.

The amount of \$100 is requested for miscellaneous expenses such as labor services, installations and repairs to office equipment. Supplies and materials..... \$271

An amount of \$271 is requested for office supplies and materials for the staff, an average of \$45 per person.

Equipment..... \$1,500

An amount of \$1,500 is requested to provide office furniture and equipment for the staff of six persons requested.

Taxes and assessments..... \$150

An amount of \$150 is requested for compliance with the provisions of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

NATIONAL CONSUMERS' LEAGUE REPORT FROM  
WASHINGTON  
HOUSE REFUSES AID TO EDUCATION FOR MIGRANT  
CHILDREN

WASHINGTON.—The children of migrant agricultural workers have practically no opportunity to obtain an education. Education, as a matter of fact, is a pretty big word. Most of these children have no opportunity to learn to read or write or get acquainted with the simple elements that constitute citizenship.

"It is literally scandalous, the treatment that some of these children, the future citizens of the United States, are getting with regard to education," said Commissioner Earl J. McGrath of the United States Office of Education, testifying before Senator HUMPHREY's Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations. "They constitute our biggest reservoir of illiterates."

PARENTS WERE BETTER EDUCATED

Dr. Howard A. Dawson, executive secretary of the National Conference of County and Rural Area Superintendents of Schools of the National Education Association, also before the committee, said that according to the latest information his organization has been able to obtain, "there are somewhere in the neighborhood of 600,000 families among these [migrant] agricultural workers, and \* \* \* there are at least a million children of school age involved in these families. \* \* \* It is also fairly well established that the children of these families in this generation are receiving less education than their parents did and the average for those parents is little less than the fourth year of education."

"This is progress in reverse," said Senator HUMPHREY.

In a Texas study, in the migrants' home base where enrollment of children of migrant agricultural workers is largest, Dr. Dawson declared that "only slightly more than half the children between the ages of 6 and 15 were enrolled. Some had never attended any school at all and the chances are they never would enter a school. Of those enrolled many missed the first 2 or 3 months, and so on. Only 16 percent of the migrant children who enrolled attended as much as 120 days, and that is the minimum law for attendance in Texas. In other words, 84 percent of them did not even comply with the law, and there was nothing done to enforce the law. There is no expertly supervised attendance for children in rural areas, especially where these migrants are congregated to the largest extent."

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS TO STUDY PROBLEM REQUESTED

In Florida Dr. Dawson told of one school where the enrollment increased from 280 to 503 from Friday to Monday morning. For several weeks the school ran a double shift. Then the beans came and the total school enrollment dropped overnight to 20.

While on the trek, the children of the migratory families did not often attend school, he said. In Michigan one study disclosed that of 2,570 migratory children only 710 were enrolled in school, "even in the State of Michigan, which in many respects had a superior school system."

"Let us not forget that the real strength of a nation is measured by the education of its citizens," said Senator CHAVEZ, Democrat, New Mexico, during the congressional debate, April 2, 1952, on tidelands oil leases.

The President, in his budget message to Congress this year, requested \$181,000 to begin a survey and study of education among migrant children. He said:

"Children of migratory workers constitute a special group whose present educational opportunities are inadequate. As has been pointed out by the Commission on Migratory

Labor, because these children move with their families, they start school later, attend fewer days, make less progress, and drop out earlier than others. As a first step toward meeting this problem we need to work out special teaching materials and methods suited to their education."

Miss Mary Dyckman, of the Consumers League of New Jersey, in a statement to the House Appropriations Committee in support of the President's request, pointed out that the summer school and cultural center for children and adults in Freehold, Monmouth County, "could be much more valuable to those who do attend if there were similar schools in other States to which they could transfer when they leave here, and if there were some conformity of teaching and curriculum for them in the various States."

"No State can cope effectively with an interstate educational problem of this kind," she said, declaring that the sum recommended for the Office of Education may be able to bring about this coordination.

PRESENT EXPERIMENTAL PROJECTS WOULD BE  
BENEFITED

Mrs. Rebecca Barton, director of the Wisconsin Governor's Commission on Human Rights, testifying before the Humphrey subcommittee, also told of a summer school experiment in Waupun, Wis., where "their eagerness for education was amazing. The mothers said to us that what they wanted most was not better housing, nor higher wages. It was a chance for the education of their children."

But the request was refused in the House. The House Report on the 1953 Appropriations Bill for Labor and Federal Security said:

"The request for \$181,000 to make a special study of the educational needs of the children of migrant workers is also disallowed. While the need to better educational opportunities of this group of children is obvious, and has been for many years, the committee does not think there is an emergency need to set up a new program at this time."

This item is now up for consideration by a Senate Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, Senator CHAVEZ, Democrat, New Mexico, Chairman.

CONSIDERS IT AN INVESTMENT IN NATION'S  
FUTURE

Dr. McGrath, in explaining the plans proposed by the Office of Education, said:

"We want only six persons to act as coordinating agents in the Office. The rest of the money is to be used for what we have called cooperative agreements with the State departments of education, to buck up their staffs, to stimulate interest there, to make agreements with the colleges and universities \* \* \* and with private organizations. They are all ready to go in fiscal 1953 to help us in making a national broadside attack on this problem. And I feel certain, Mr. Chairman, that the Federal Government will never have invested \$181,000 any better if they provide these funds, than in this project."

From this study Dr. McGrath said he would expect:

1. The development of cooperative working agreements with States and private organizations and institutions.
2. A comprehensive census of migrant children and where they travel to, their conditions, health services, and so on.
3. A program, in cooperation with the States, of tests and records which could be sent with each child as he moves so that each succeeding school system would know the educational status of the child at the particular moment.
4. Specialized training for teachers of migrant children.
5. Teachers who, like the records, can go with the child.

6. Publicity campaigns with regard to the education of migrant children in communities in order that, in psychological terms, the children will be accepted as members of the community and not rejected as they are at present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WELKER. I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Investigations of resources," on page 29, line 22, after the word "law", to strike out "\$4,056,000" and insert "\$4,062,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 30, line 8, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$450,000" and insert "\$628,000."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "\$628,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$673,800."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the committee amendment provides \$20,000 for rip-rapping of the dike at Lake Andes, S. Dak. The Lake Andes Refuge, administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service, is one of South Dakota's great recreational areas, serving also a part of northern Nebraska.

In the original estimate of flood damage from the recent Missouri River floods submitted by the Fish and Wildlife Service several weeks ago, the item of \$20,000 was included to repair the south dike. This amount was to provide for the replacement of lost fill and for rip-rap material. Subsequent to this, additional information was received from the field personnel indicating that, with present water levels in the lake, the dike should be raised an additional 2 feet to prevent extensive damage. The present freeboard on this dike is slightly over 1 foot, which means that any appreciable rise in lake level would result in water topping the dike.

It has been estimated that \$45,800, in addition to the \$20,000 already requested, will be required to raise this two-thirds mile long dike 2 feet. This would provide for 13,000 cubic yards of fill and 8,100 cubic yards of gravel and rip-rap protection for the new fill. The dike of which I am speaking is not only important for management of lake-water levels, but also provides a public road across the lake.

The chairman of the subcommittee has advised me that he is willing to accept the amendment as part of the bill,

and I would be truly gratified if the Senate would accept the amendment, since it will provide funds sufficient to retain the recreational facilities so much enjoyed by the people of South Dakota and Nebraska.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I shall be glad to accept the amendment, because the floods which damaged the dikes on Lake Andes occurred since the estimates were made, and, as I understand, the matter was not considered by the House. We will take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Territories—Administration of Territories," on page 31, line 24, after "(48 U. S. C. 1405)", to insert "and expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands appointed pursuant to the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress"; on page 32, line 5, after "(c)" to insert "and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress"; in line 11, after the word "Islands", to strike out "and American Samoa" and insert "American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Island"; in line 16, after the word "houses", to strike out "\$8,703,037" and insert "\$3,320,287"; in line 20, after the word "Territories", to insert "including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands"; in line 25, after the word "necessary" to insert "in carrying out the provisions of article 6 (2) of the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress"; on page 33, line 2, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the following additional provisos: "Provided further, That on and after July 1, 1952, all receipts from operation of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, including receipts of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust Territory or by other agencies or instrumentalities of the United States in administering such Trust Territory, shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and all financial transactions of such Trust Territory and of such agencies and instrumentalities shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 34). Receipts and expenditures of such Trust Territory and of such agencies and instrumentalities shall, except as otherwise expressly provided by law, be subject to all laws relating generally to the

budgeting, receipt, custody, and application of public moneys: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation in this act shall be used in the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for any purpose not authorized by law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 21, to insert:

Until Congress shall further provide, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums not to exceed \$5,500,000, to supplement local revenues as may be required to enable civilian authorities to continue to carry out the civilian activities which have heretofore been carried out by the Navy: *Provided, however*, That no new activity requiring expenditures of Federal funds shall be initiated without specific prior approval of Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Alaska public works," on page 34, line 10, after the numerals "1955", to strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert "\$13,208,200"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed" to strike out "\$486,000" and insert "\$654,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Alaska Railroad revolving fund," on page 36, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$13,000" and insert "\$14,000"; and in line 6, after the word "than", to strike out "\$11,000" and insert "\$12,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Administration, Department of the Interior," on page 39, after line 19, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 110. The Secretary hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of Director, Division of the Budget and Finance, in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Virgin Islands Corporation—Revolving Fund," on page 40, line 6, after the word "law", to strike out "\$975,000" and insert "\$1,515,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 41, to insert:

#### TITLE III—EMERGENCY FLOOD AND STORM REPAIRS

##### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

##### *Emergency flood and storm repairs*

To enable the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse applicable appropriations for the cost of personnel, supplies, and facilities, diverted for the repair, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of structures, buildings, or other facilities, including equipment, damaged or destroyed by flood or storm, \$1,350,000, to remain available until June 30, 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 12, to change the title number from "III" to "IV."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 13, to change the section number from "301" to "401."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not heretofore authorized by the Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 402. (a) No part of the money appropriated by this act to any department, agency, or corporation or made available for expenditure by any department, agency, or corporation which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953 contemplated would be employed by such department, agency, or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) function performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating or disseminating public information, publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion picture and similar material, shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2).

(b) This section shall not apply to the preparation for publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys, to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports, or publications of the National Park Service, or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 10, to strike out:

SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

(b) to positions filled from within the department;

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(d) to positions the personnel of which are engaged in health and safety, law enforcement, soil and moisture, activities in the field, exclusive of administrative personnel;

(e) to seasonal and casual workers;

(f) to employees of the Bureau of Mines;

(g) to employees of the Geological Survey;

(h) to employees in grades CPC 1, 2, and 3: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 percent of the total pro-

vided for in this act, such limitation may cease to apply and said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953, and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1953 this provision shall again become operative.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 13, to insert:

Sec. 403. (a) No part of any appropriation made by this act for any purpose shall be used for the payment of personal services in excess of an amount equal to 90 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purposes in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for the payment of personal services for any purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for personal services for such purposes less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for personal services in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

(b) This section shall not apply to appropriations for health, safety, law enforcement, or operation and maintenance activities in the field.

Sec. 404. (a) No appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be available to pay—

(1) for personal services of civilian personnel above basic rates, or

(2) for transportation of things (other than mail), or

(3) for travel of civilian personnel more than 90 percent of the amount which the budget estimates heretofore submitted in connection with such appropriation or authorization contemplated would be expended therefrom for such purposes, respectively; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for such purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for such purpose less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for personal services in budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

(b) This section shall not apply to appropriations for construction of law enforcement.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and myself, I call up amendment designated "6-24-52-C," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 3, immediately after the word "irrigation", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure for or in connection with any reclamation project unless effective provision has been made pursuant to this proviso to cover into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts all revenues hereafter derived by the United States from such project."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I make a point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand that objection has been made in the way of a point of order?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have made a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained. The Chair understands that the Senator from Illinois desires to move to suspend the rule.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do. Yesterday, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 7892, I gave notice of a motion to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI and I now move to suspend the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to deal with a situation which has already been referred to earlier in the debates this afternoon on the irrigation appropriation. In the debate on my amendment to reduce construction funds of the Bureau of Reclamation by \$31,000,000, I discussed the matter fairly extensively.

It is at present the custom that a very large proportion of appropriations for irrigation purposes are never returned to the general Treasury. Instead, the revenues derived from repayment of loans on irrigation projects, must be used only for additional irrigation projects. This means that the taxpayers never get their money back. The money goes for more and more irrigation projects. It also means that Congress, in large part, loses its power over appropriations.

So far as I know, this provision is unique for irrigation projects. I think it is a very bad procedure, from a governmental standpoint, and the situation is going to get worse and worse with the years as the repayments accumulate. Some are carrying irrigation to a point which is not economical.

I shall not make an extended argument upon this point, but there is a grave abuse, which Congress, and particularly the Senate, needs to be aware of. I hope very much that the Senate will accept the amendment, although I must admit that in the light of the votes this afternoon, my hopes are not too high.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the policy of using the receipts or proceeds from public lands as the private purse of the Nation has been long established. It was on that basis, and upon the recommendation of Senator Oscar Underwood, of Alabama, that the original Reclamation Act provided that the receipts from the sale of public lands or other revenues from public lands should be placed in the reclamation fund. Such receipts have been handled in that way ever since. That is all there is to it. The money which is applied to this fund does not come from the taxpayers, and obviously it should not be interfered with; and yet this amendment would kill the whole fund.

What the Senator from Illinois is complaining about is that a later statute provided that money received in repayment, when the original money came out of the General Treasury, should go into

the reclamation fund. I am not particularly concerned whether that policy is maintained forever; but we should not kill the whole reclamation idea to get at what might be an objection with respect to a part of it.

For that reason I think the motion of the Senator from Illinois should be voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI in order that he may offer a certain amendment. [Putting the question.]

In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I congratulate the Presiding Officer for the accuracy of his hearing in deciding that two-thirds of the Senators present did not vote for the motion. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. HAYDEN], one question before the bill is passed. It will require only half a minute.

On page 6 of the Committee report occurs the following language:

The committee concurs with the House in the elimination of the proposed transfer of the facilities at Fort Logan, Colo., and has disallowed all funds for the purpose of operating such facilities.

The Senator from Arizona will recall that my colleague [Mr. MILLIKIN] and I submitted an amendment providing that no part of any appropriation contained in this bill should be available for the purpose of transferring to the Bureau of Indian Affairs the Veterans' Administration hospital facility located at Fort Logan, Colo.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, since there is no part of the bill containing money for any such purpose, it is not necessary for the Senator to offer his amendment. Such necessity has been completely eliminated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In the opinion of the Senator from Arizona, no money in this bill could be transferred for that purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is entirely satisfactory to the Colorado Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 7176) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments,

request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. O'MAHOONEY, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CORDON, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KNOWLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 2214. An act to amend section 709 of title 18 of the United States Code;

H. R. 2813. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Collbran reclamation project, Colorado;

H. R. 7405. An act to provide for an economical, efficient, and effective supply management organization with 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; and

H. R. 7714. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

#### STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1737, House bill 7289, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, this is the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary. It has not been before the Senate for the required period of time. I have no objection to making it the unfinished business if it is understood that the bill will not be taken up until tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. It is my understanding that the bill will not be taken up until the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. CASE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

#### SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN "POLICE ACTION"

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. On June 25, 1950, North Korean Communist forces attacked South Korean positions south of the thirty-eighth parallel, thereby beginning the bloody and savage military action which Democratic leaders of our country have chosen to designate as the Korean "police action."

It is a matter of historical record that President Truman, without the consent of the Congress, saw fit to order General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to use the American Armed Forces available to resist that aggression.

June 25, 1952, marks the second anniversary of this conflict. It is fitting that we in the Senate of the United States pause briefly in our deliberations and, without rancor, consider the situation in which our country has been placed.

For two long years the gallant sons of American mothers have been struggling against a brutal and ruthless enemy.

For two long years we have been engaged in a war, the like of which is unprecedented in American history.

Let us not deceive ourselves with political deceptions. This so-called "police action" is war. We have been at war for 2 years. Despite the platitudes which we hear from our so-called allies, let every American realize that this is not a United Nations war, but has been tailored into a full-fledged American war under the United Nations flag.

We have contributed 98 percent of all the air force in Korea; 83 percent of all the naval forces are furnished by the United States; 88 percent of all the ground forces, with the exception of the South Koreans, are furnished by the United States; 93 percent of all the casualties have been suffered by the United States; and more than 90 percent of those killed are American boys; 100 percent of the cost of the war is borne by the American taxpayer. To place a United Nations label on this Korean war is a shabby and disgraceful farce which can only be designed to deceive the American people.

This is a bizarre conflict. From the very beginning our gallant fighting men have been denied the right to punish the enemy with all the resources at our disposal. Tactically, we have been hamstrung by political and diplomatic limitations, novel and unnatural in the conduct of warfare, until this week.

We have allowed a vicious foe to crouch beyond the Yalu River, to amass men and materials, and to attack us at will from his protected sanctuary.

After our initial set-back, due to the overwhelming mass and power of our enemy, our forces were able to counter-attack and to push the aggressors back to their boundary. On November 27, 1950, a more formidable adversary entered the conflict. Gen. Douglas MacArthur announced that our forces in Korea faced an entirely new war because of the intervention of Red Chinese troops. The American people were told on December 1, 1950, by Gen. MacArthur

that the orders forbidding him to attack Chinese Communists north of the Korean border were putting his forces to "an enormous handicap without precedent in military history."

On March 7, 1951, the general further warned the American people that the battle line would remain in a theoretical military stalemate as long as there was a "continuation of the existing limitation upon our freedom of counteroffensive action."

On March 24, 1951, he added that, "I stand ready at any time to confer in the field with the commander in chief of the enemy force in an earnest attempt to find any military means whereby the realization of the political objectives of the United Nations in Korea might be accomplished without further bloodshed."

On April 10, 1951, the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, saw fit to relieve Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his position as Commander in Chief of the United Nations Command, Commander in Chief of the Far East, and commanding general of the United States Army in the Far East.

Although relieved from his command, General MacArthur still believed that it was possible for the United States, since it had been embroiled in this war, to carry it forward to victory in the traditional American manner.

In his speech before the Congress of the United States on April 19, 1951, he spoke these prophetic words: "Once war is forced upon us, there is no other alternative than to apply every available means to bring it to a swift end. War's very object is victory—not prolonged indecision. In war, indeed, there can be no substitute for victory."

He recommended four steps in 1951 which he felt were dictated by military necessity in the conduct of the war:

First. The intensification of our economic blockade against China.

Second. The imposition of a naval blockade against the China coast.

Third. Removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's coastal areas and of Manchuria.

Fourth. Removal of restrictions on the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa with logistical support to contribute to their effective operation against the Chinese mainland.

For reasons known only to the administration's political strategists, General MacArthur's recommendations were not followed. Instead, after our Armed Forces had punished the enemy and had him reeling back to the point of defeat, the State Department, at the suggestion of the Russians, allowed the enemy in July of 1951 to commence interminable armistice talks.

At that time our Armed Forces were in a position of strength in Korea. We had clear and undisputed control of the air; our planes roamed at will over Communist-held positions; we outnumbered the enemy in quality and quantity of the artillery and tanks.

But the lessons of the Communist conquest of China were ignored by Field Marshal Acheson. Month after month

our negotiators sit in the tents at Panmunjom, listening to Communist bickering and double talk; and by their very presence supply the Communists with a vehicle to broadcast vicious lies and diatribes against the United States.

In the meantime, this formidable foe reorganizes his army, brings in a Russian air force, prepares entrenched positions, and assembles artillery and self-propelled guns and tanks in vast quantities.

My fellow Americans and my colleagues in the Senate, the situation which faces us in Korea today is grim, as it is also in other areas of the world. In the opinion of Vice Adm. C. Turner Joy, former chief negotiator at Panmunjom, "We must accept a delayed armistice or a bloodletting."

He stated as early as February 29, 1952, that the military advantage which the Allies held in July 1951, had been lost during the armistice talks. He warned the American people that:

We must realize that we are not negotiating from the same position of military strength as we were at the beginning, when the enemy was badly pressed, but from a position of mass stalemate.

Mr. President, at this point I refer to exhibit No. 1.

I ask unanimous consent to have certain printed exhibits inserted at the end of my remarks. During the course of my remarks I shall refer to the exhibits by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. On June 20, 1952, Admiral Joy warned:

The Reds will stop at nothing to gain their ends. The greatest lesson we have learned is that the only thing the Reds respect is unmistakable firmness and applied military strength.

I refer to exhibit No. 2.

The admiral went on to say that the truce talks began on the assumption that the Reds would bargain in good faith, but the Communists used that assumption and the prolonged negotiations as a tactical maneuver to build up their forces in North Korea.

As time passed, it has been revealed gradually to the American people that our aircraft losses in the Korean combat have been staggering, due to increased Communist air power which has become supreme in the Korean theater. Week after week the American people have listened to reports of no progress in the truce negotiations.

I refer to exhibit 2a.

Rear Adm. Ruthven Libby, on March 11, 1952, wearily told the Communists that he has been getting fed up with what Gen. Matthew Ridgway called known falsehoods by Red truce negotiators.

I refer to exhibit 3.

General Ridgway himself, on March 11, 1952, stated that the truce talks had now reached a point where it would be impossible for him to guess what would happen next.

I again refer to exhibit 3.

On March 8, 1952, General Van Fleet disclosed that the Chinese and Korean Reds had built up a force of over 900,000 men in Korea, and admitted that the Chinese and North Koreans had twice as many artillery pieces as the United Nations. "They are throwing a lot more artillery shells than they ever have. There are points on the front where they think nothing of throwing in concentrations of 1,000 rounds and more. In other words, they are being pretty liberal with their shells, so they must have plenty of them."

I refer to exhibit 4.

On June 1, 1952, General Van Fleet issued another ominous statement to the American people, in which he made no attempt to minimize the manpower, firepower, and latent airpower of the Communists.

They have, he calculated, two and one-half times the combat strength of the United Nations, and about twice the artillery power of the Eighth Army.

I refer to exhibit 5.

It is no wonder the American people have become confused and angered. If the public has been trying to keep informed with the assorted estimates, predictions, boasts, and analyses on the state of the United Nations forces in Korea, it must be confused.

Consider the statement of Maj. Gen. Daniel Hudelson, just arriving home from long combat experience as an infantry commander in Korea, to the effect that if the Communists launch a major offensive, we could not hold them. "We simply don't have the manpower," he said.

On this same day, in June 1952, General Van Fleet, despite his previous admissions of the Communist power and massed strength, practically dared the Reds to start a fight and announced that "if they do, they will be soundly defeated."

I refer to exhibit 6.

In the first week of June, President Truman, in a speech, claimed that we still have air superiority over most of North Korea, and can bomb the enemy at will almost anywhere in his territory.

I refer to exhibit 7.

The President also claimed that our planes have knocked out eight times as many enemy craft as we have lost, and yet only a few days earlier official Air Force and Navy reports placed our plane loss at 1,400 since the Korean war began, compared with an estimated loss of only 400 planes for the enemy.

Within the past few months we have had testimony from the highest civilian and military officials in our Government. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Lovett, has stated:

The Russians are outbuilding us—we are falling behind them, relatively speaking, in the arms race.

Secretary of the Army, Mr. Pace, has said that the Korean war was eating into reserves of armament faster than they could be replaced.

The Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Finletter, has bluntly stated:

We have lost time—time that cannot be recouped.

At home we are facing more and more strikes.

General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has informed the American people that Russia "could overrun Europe today."

General Twining, Acting Chief of Staff of the Air Force, has admitted that Russia in the last 5 or 6 years has outstripped this country in aircraft production, and that, furthermore, the Russian air force would equal or surpass ours in the year 1954.

Is it any wonder that we are confused?

I refer to exhibits 8 and 9.

Mr. President, I could spend considerable time commenting upon the preposterous conduct of the Kojé Island episode. Here were prisoners taken in battle who were allowed to organize, arm, and to forcibly resist their captors. They were allowed to hold court, try, condemn, and inflict punishment, including torture and even death to those who would not submit to their doctrine and authority. The culmination of this sordid affair was their seizure of the commandant and the resultant agreement between the Reds and our Army officials which gave the Communists tremendous propaganda material.

Mr. President, I make no pretense of being a military expert. I sincerely wish this world could live in peace and prosperity, yet, as a peace-loving American, it is impossible for me to fathom the devious thinking behind the present conduct of Mr. Truman's Korean fiasco, or police action, as he terms it.

In the great Midwest, from which I have the honor to come, the people are realistic, and they possess a lot of common sense which seems to be very uncommon in Washington today. We cannot understand why our sons are being sent to a far-off land to sacrifice their lives in a struggle which this administration apparently does not desire to win.

I do not know whether there is a connection between the Democratic Party's much-publicized prosperity, which is based on a war economy, and the urge to keep the Korean war simmering on the back burner. I do not know why we withdrew from Korea in the first place, and made that unhappy nation an inviting target for Communist aggression. With all the billions of dollars we have spent for armaments, I do not know why we were incapable of arming the South Koreans so that they could protect their own country from aggression.

I do not know why we reversed our position and ordered that brave handful of American soldiers back into Korea to stem the tide of the Red hordes—and, I may add, without the help of the United Nations. I do not know why General of the Army Douglas MacArthur was relieved from his command.

I do not know whether the program which Gen. Douglas MacArthur advised would ever end this conflict; neither do I know whether his suggestions can be used at this late date.

It is impossible for me to understand why we allowed the Red Chinese to enter this conflict without directing reprisals against them.

I cannot tell you, Mr. President, why we have squandered the victories gained by our men on the battlefield, and why, for 11 long months, we have allowed our badly mauled enemy to recoup his strength and to become a more formidable and dangerous foe. In my serious contemplation and study of the Korean debacle, I have been unalterably convinced that it is sheer folly for the United States to engage in an endless war of attrition which bleeds us of our most precious asset—the manhood of this Nation.

I cannot understand a war which the administration tries to fight with a philosophy of guns and butter. I am aware that even today we put more money into refrigerators, washing machines, and TV sets than we do into ordnance.

This fact has been cited as proof of Democratic prosperity. I, for one, want no part of a prosperity which stockpiles household appliances for some and caskets for others.

I have heard my Democratic colleagues stand on the floor of this Senate and orate at length about the fantastic superweapons which we have developed in the atomic and hydrogen fields. Being a mere Member of the Senate, I am not allowed to possess the information upon which they base their grandiose claims; but I do know that sons of the American mothers and fathers are fighting in Korea with bayonets and with guns, just as American boys did in the other two wars which have occurred under Democratic leadership.

I wish I could stand before you today, Mr. President, and offer some clear-cut solution to the Korean war.

Perhaps it would be possible if the Government of these United States operated in the open. Perhaps it would be possible for me to make some concrete suggestions if the administration saw fit to tell the representatives of the people the truth concerning the situation, the truth concerning the contributions of our allies, the truth concerning our military potential, the truth concerning our present rate of production of weapons, the truth concerning the State Department's plans for the "bold" new world, which they have been so long endeavoring to create.

It has been impossible for me and for other Members of the Senate, I am sure, to gain access to information concerning the trade which our allies are at present carrying on with Red Russia. So, I frankly confess that I do not know the entire story, Mr. President. I am disturbed when I see reports as late as June 4, 1952, in the New York newspapers, which quote London sources as saying that the British Empire sold Russia more raw rubber during the first 4 months in 1952, than she did in all of 1951. I cover that point in my exhibit No. 10.

It is incredible to me that while Britain shipped 51,000 tons of rubber to Russia in 1951, already in January, February, March, and April of 1952 she has sent 58,000 tons into the maw of the Kremlin. Mr. President, I am concerned when I read reports from Bonn, Germany, which disclose that the Mutual Security Agency has taken action

against 87 West German concerns because of "improper trade with companies in the Soviet orbit."

My mind is not at ease when I read the opinions of the "experts" who say that the temptation for Japan to increase its trade with Communist countries of Asia will increase as time goes on. It would seem to me, Mr. President, that if we are allied with nations who are determined to resist Communist aggression, all of us must recognize the fact that we cannot be greedy and be free.

Mr. President, it is interesting to those who have noted the press reports today to observe what happens in Britain, when representatives of the former labor government of Britain question our representatives about what those who are directing the war in Korea have elected to do in order to save American lives there.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield on that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I am very much impressed by the very interesting and informative address which is being made by the Senator from Kansas.

I am glad he has called attention to the rather surprising news releases which crowd the news ticker—releases coming today from Britain, where it appears that the former Labor Government of Britain, and more especially one Mr. Bevan, along with Clement Attlee, have been attacking the United States with all kinds of criticism, indicating that they believe we had no right or authority to bomb the power plants on the Yalu River, and indicating that instead of applauding that very constructive, courageous, and successful raid by American fliers, those Britons have joined the Communists in criticizing that type of attack.

I wonder whether the Senator from Kansas believes that with that type of "support" from an ally which should be in the thick of the fight with us, in the attempt to protect the free world, there is much hope for success in Korea.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that I fail to see that there is much hope, especially when members of a former government of one of our chief allies—the United Kingdom—take such a position, and also in view of the fact that representatives of that government tried to convince our diplomatic forces and the American people that we should soften our attitude and should permit Britain or the United Nations to recognize Red China and the other satellites of Red Russia.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kansas will yield further to me, let me ask whether it is also a fact that the same British Government induced a somewhat timid State Department in the United States to insist that our Seventh Fleet, now operating in Asian waters, instead of aiding in every way it could the land forces the

United States has there so as to bring to a victorious close the war in Korea, follow orders—as it now is doing—whereby it prevents the Chinese Navy from stopping shipments of supplies to our Communist enemy?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. It is the same Government. That, I am sure, is one thing among many others, that is most alarming to every American. I know it is alarming to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. It is indeed alarming.

I believe it should be said, to the credit of Winston Churchill, that that highly destructive policy which the former British Government sold to our State Department and eventually sold to our military and to our President, namely, the policy of using our fleet to protect the Communists by giving them an opportunity to ship supplies of war to their fighters in Korea, was initiated by the Labor government of Britain, although it seems to me that Winston Churchill cannot escape some cause for criticism by virtue of the fact that since he has ascended to power in Britain he has not changed that policy.

Would the Senator from Kansas, therefore, agree with me that we are fortunate—indeed, we know we are fortunate—that today the control of Britain is not in the hands of men like Bevan, who openly criticizes the recent raid against the Communists and openly indicates that Britain should withdraw the small modicum of support she now is giving the United Nations in support of the United States in the war in Korea?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that we should be truly grateful and thankful for the position taken by the great Prime Minister of England in the present situation. I desire to say further that it is to the credit of Anthony Eden, who apparently backed Winston Churchill in the face of criticism from the representatives of the Labor government.

Mr. MUNDT. I quite agree. It seems to me we must recognize that Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden operate in a very difficult situation when they have to contend with a man like Aneurin Bevan, who becomes an open apologist for the Communist cause by criticizing every effort we make to bring the war in Korea to a victorious close, to defeat the Communist troops, and to compel Red China to stop her aggressive activities on that peninsula.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, what alarms the Senator from Kansas is that, if the position presently brought to our attention by the representatives of the Labor government in England should prevail, it would make the American position in Korea very, very questionable, if we were expected to go it alone and were expected to complete the Korean war—and I call it a war—along the present lines. I think the American people and the Congress of the United States have every right and every reason to wonder what our next move will be and what our policies are to be. That is one of my reasons

for thinking that the situation with which we are confronted is most serious.

Mr. MUNDT. In that very connection, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Kansas would care to comment as to what he considers to be the future of NATO and the future of the mutual-security program in Europe, to which American taxpayers have contributed many, many billion dollars, if at the very entrance to Europe we should find Britain controlled by a Labor government which indicates that it wants to have no part in the resistance to communism and that it wants to be a neutral, thereby giving equally friendly attention both to the side of aggressive communism and to the side of Anglo-Saxon freedom.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I may say to the able Senator from South Dakota it cannot but have a depressing and a very questionable effect upon many sober, somber-thinking Americans, who probably thought that we had overreached ourselves in going the complete route, as we did, though we were willing to do it. But, when they see an attitude of this kind, supported probably by only a bare margin, as we know the present Government in England is supported at this time, and the likelihood that the present Government might fall, it certainly throws into bold relief America's position, and where we might be if we were to keep our guaranties and our positions, once we have given them, as we have always tried to do, in the face of the situation which exists in Korea. It makes the Senator from Kansas doubly apprehensive.

Mr. MUNDT. It would seem to me that unless the people of Britain generally, including their great and powerful newspapers, now repudiate, and repudiate in no uncertain terms, the Communist-appeasing words of Mr. Bevan and his associate, Mr. Clement Attlee, it indicates that this whole joint enterprise which we have been financing at such great cost to ourselves, in which we have been sending the flower of American youth to help build a European army under NATO, this whole effort toward collective security, of which the British are presumably a great part, is not only built upon shifting sands, but is indeed built upon shifting sands around a very wobbly island.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I appreciate the observation of the able Senator from South Dakota. He never spoke a truer word.

Mr. MUNDT. And, because the Senator from South Dakota believes, as I know the Senator from Kansas does, that the threat of aggressive communism is genuine and realistic, and because he and I believe that the one great effective way to defeat it is to have a genuine, collective security, it is indeed sickening and nauseating to find this strong minority, representing apparently a substantial group in Great Britain, engaged in the kind of castigation reported in the American press today. It is high time we heard from those British journalists, those British leaders of public opinion, those British statesmen, who will stand square-toed and courageously

in the common defense against communism, and who will repudiate the kind of Communist-appeasing language attributed to Mr. Bevan and Mr. Attlee in the press today.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Does not the able Senator from South Dakota agree with the Senator from Kansas that it is all the more important, now, in the face of what is happening, for our own State Department, our own Government officialdom, to re-evaluate and to lay frankly and candidly before the Congress of the United States and the American people what our future policy shall be, when it seems to be shifting and on such shaky foundations as apparently the press reports indicate?

Mr. MUNDT. I most assuredly do, because the very basis of all the claims of success we have heard, as American leaders, from General Eisenhower on down, have come back to tell about the progress being made in Europe, is the assumption that the British are going to be a part, and a big part, in that defense line. Instead, we find the leaders of a great party in Britain, which is close to being a majority party, which is a large minority party, and which has recently been in power, not only failing to take a stand in their oratory and in their parliamentary procedures against communism, but going to the extent of criticizing the United States for exercising our rightful authority in Korea. We did attack the Communists, and we destroyed some of their sources of power on the Yalu River. Instead of patting us on the back, applauding us, and saying, "We wish we could be there to help you," they criticize us because of the devastating blows which have been dealt to the Communist strongholds in Korea and Manchuria.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I appreciate the able Senator from South Dakota bringing his enlightening viewpoints into the discussion this afternoon.

Mr. President, it is because of the situation, the things we are reading about, and the fearful prospect of what may happen in the future, if the adverse positions we are now finding are becoming popular in England and in some other parts of the world should prevail that I, for one, cannot and will not tolerate sending American boys abroad to fight Communist aggressors, while at the same time some nations are allowing trade to be carried on with the enemy.

I wish to further invite attention to some statistics concerning the three wars for which the Democratic administration must accept the responsibility. I ask unanimous consent at this time that a chart, which was prepared by the Legislative Reference Department of the Library of Congress, entitled "Casualties of United States Major Wars" be inserted in the Record at the close of my remarks, as exhibit 11.

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

(See exhibit 11.)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, were it not for the fact that the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing prevent such a typographical situation, I would sug-

gest that the Senator from Kansas follow the printing of his chart in the Record with a unanimous-consent request to have printed in the Record a companion chart showing the number of casualties which have occurred in wars precipitated under Republican Presidents since the turn of the century, because there have been no wars and no casualties, under Republican Presidents, since the turn of the century.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should be glad to accede to that request, if under the rules of the Senate it could be done.

Mr. President, I call particular attention to the fact that, according to the official information released by the Department of Defense, on June 11, 1952, the American people have suffered 109,712 casualties in the Korean police action.

We have had 19,317 boys killed in this savage conflict. We considered World War I to be a bloody war, and yet we have already had 40 percent as many killed in Korea as we did in that struggle.

We have lost more than twice as many of our sons as we did during the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War.

Already 1,000,000 American families have had sons in Korea; \$25,000,000,000 have been spent; and the end is not in sight.

The news of June 19, 1952, is ominous. We read that in one skirmish Communist artillery and mortar fire was 7,174 rounds. We read of probing attacks on the allied lines by Red tanks and self-propelled guns, and the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Pace, has notified the American people that: "If we are called on to continue the war in Korea into fiscal year 1953—which, by the way, starts July 1—as now appears virtually certain, the support requirements placed on our forces here at home will be greater and their state of readiness correspondingly even less favorable." Exhibit 12 covers that point. He further states:

If the war continues in Korea, it will be imperative under these facts to ask Congress for more men.

Almost a year ago, Mr. President, an investigation was conducted on the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and the military situation in the Far East. At the conclusion of those hearings, eight of my Republican colleagues had the courage to tell the American people the truth.

I remind you, Mr. President, that no one dared to challenge their views. Were they right, Mr. President? They said:

(1) The victory won by our Armed Force in the Pacific has been squandered by our diplomats.

That is found on page 34 of the report.

(2) The Korean conflict is improperly labeled the police action.

That is found on page 41 of the report.

(3) Political considerations have prevented the full exploitation of American air and naval superiority in the Korean war.

That is found on page 42 of the report.

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

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sorry the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has apparently temporarily left the Chamber, but apropos of the present discussion, I thought the distinguished Senator from Kansas would like to hear this information which has just come in over the ticker:

Eden said he would not like to estimate whether the action had lessened the chances of an armistice, adding, "If this bombing is intolerable to the Communists they really have the remedy in their own hands. An armistice can be concluded tomorrow on terms which satisfy the honor and interests of both sides if the Communists want it."

This is what I particularly wanted to bring to the attention of the Senator from Kansas:

While labor leaders criticized American leadership in Korea, French officials took an opposite view.

"The plants [that were bombed] are in North Korean territory, and they are a legitimate military objective," said a spokesman for the French Foreign Minister in France. "After all, we all know there is a war going on there."

The spokesman made the statement after the French Cabinet had discussed the bombings.

A Moscow dispatch said the House of Commons debate over Korean affairs was almost sure to be interpreted by the Russians as a serious division of British-American relations. The debate was said to have strengthened the opinion of a number of western diplomats in Moscow that Russia is sending Andrei Gromyko, Deputy Foreign Minister, as Ambassador to London to take advantage of the situation.

That is the end of the press dispatch. I think it is significant from two points of view. One is that the French recognize the realities of the situation in Korea; second, Mr. Bevan and the former members of the Labor Government, and now members of the Labor Party in Britain, are merely giving aid and comfort to the Soviet Union by the position they are taking in trying to undermine the position of the Government of the United States and also, incidentally, the position of the Prime Minister of Britain, Mr. Churchill, who has apparently taken a more realistic view of the situation than have the British Labor Party officials.

I merely wish to say, in conclusion, if the Senator from Kansas will permit, that it seems to me the British press and the responsible government officials of Britain will make clear to the British people that the Government of the United States and the American people have borne more than 90 percent of the burden of the action against aggression in Korea, and they must recognize the fact that international communism is global in character. If communism is successful in Asia, it will ultimately, in my judgment at least, be successful in Europe, because the great apostle of communism, Lenin, succinctly put it many years ago when he said that the road to Paris is through Peking. What he meant, of course, was that if international com-

munistism could dominate all Asia, with her vast strategic resources, she would then be prepared to turn against the west with an overwhelming amount of manpower and resources, and it is highly dubious that any defense set up in Western Europe could withstand that great aggregation of power. When the members of the Labor government of England attempt to give aid and comfort to Communists in the Far East, they may be actually cutting their own throats.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I appreciate the statement the able Senator from California has made and what he has brought to our attention, because as he well knows, the Senator from Kansas regards the Senator from California as one of the most diligent, courageous, honest, and forward-looking Senators, who has given much time and thought to the Asiatic situation. As the Senator has so ably put it, he has been concerned about the attitude of the British as contrasted to the present attitude of the French. The French attitude is most wholesome, because, apparently, without waiting for time to expire, they have indicated their approval. They realize the war is going on and they well know that the United States is bearing the brunt of it.

I thank the Senator from California for his statement.

Mr. President, finding No. 4 was as follows:

(4) The advice and information of our ablest and most experienced officials has been ignored.

That is covered by page 45 of the report.

(5) The Secretary of State has assumed military functions.

That is covered by page 23 of the report.

(6) Successful completion of the Korean war was essential since the United States cannot afford the attrition of manpower.

That is covered by page 31 of the report.

(7) The administration has no positive plan for achieving decisive victory.

That is found on page 31 of the report.

They warned the American people to beware of "Munich-like respites which are only surrenders in disguise, and which make the ultimate reckoning infinitely more costly."

In retrospect I can see how far-reaching and how compellingly important were those findings which the committee made; at least, those on the committee who subscribed to them.

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

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Kansas the date on which the report to which he is making reference was published?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I think it was published between May 3 and June 27, 1951, and it is covered by Senate Document No. 69 of the Eighty-second Congress, first session.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Kansas has pointed out that in this report it is stated that the administration has no positive program or plan for victory in Korea. The report in question was published many months ago. No exception, so far as I know, was ever taken, and no challenge has ever been made to that report. Does the Senator from Kansas think that the administration today, on the second anniversary of the tragedy of Korea, is any closer to achievement or designing a program for victory in that bloody conflict in the Far East?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I am compelled to say to the able Senator from Washington that we are no closer to victory.

Mr. President, I sincerely recommend on this second anniversary of the Korean war, that every Senator of the United States take the time to read the report which their colleagues issued many months ago.

I am aware that the weather is warm in Washington, D. C., and that there are in the offing political conventions which are attracting the attention of Members on both sides of the aisle. I know that there is pressing legislation which the majority would like to get through as quickly as possible. Many Members of Congress would like to go home and attend to their personal affairs.

I suggest, however, that it is warm in Korea, too; warm with the blood of thousands of American boys who have been denied their opportunity to enjoy a full and happy life. There are pressing matters in Korea which those boys would like to see solved, and I have no doubt but that all of them would like to come home and attend to their personal affairs. I refer to exhibit 14.

I cannot face the people of the State of Kansas in the coming months ahead unless I have done everything within my power to try to find a solution to this conflict which is daily substituting in many an American home, black letters from the Defense Department for the hopes and aspirations of a loving mother or wife.

I call upon the Senate as representatives of the people this very day to begin immediate consideration of the difficult problem which we face in Korea. Let us put aside our partisan feelings for the moment, and let us consider the welfare of our youth.

Collectively, let us devise, as soon as possible, a solution to this problem, and utilizing the sovereign power of this august body let us carry our solution through with fortitude and resolution. Let us get the facts, and insist upon a clear-cut statement of our principles and objectives in Korea. Let us demand a program for victory, and return to some of the fundamental American concepts which have made this Nation great.

Mr. President, in the early part of my remarks, I asked unanimous consent to have appear at the end of my statement a series of exhibits which I have labeled and referred to. I ask again that they be made a part of my remarks, to appear at the conclusion of my statement.

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

## EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 29, 1952]

## JOY WARNS UNITED STATES MUST FACE PEACE DELAY OR BLOODLETING

MUNSAN, February 28.—Vice Adm. C. Turner Joy declared tonight that America has the choice between a delayed armistice or a possibly unacceptable casualty toll in Korea.

He made it clear he believes a quick truce is unlikely without a high cost in blood.

"The speed with which an armistice is achieved," he said, "is in direct proportion to the military pressure applied."

In an exclusive interview inside the tent which is his home and office in Korea, the chief Allied armistice negotiator said the military advantage the Allies held last July has been lost during the armistice talks.

The lull in ground fighting, he said, has enabled the Communists to build a massive defense line across the Korean peninsula.

"I am informed," he said, "that the Communists now are dug-in in bunkers and tunnels extending back as far as 20 miles.

## POINTS TO STALEMATE

"We must realize that we are not negotiating from the same position of military strength as we were at the beginning, when the enemy was badly pressed, but from a position of military stalemate."

Then, taking cognizance of expressions of impatience from home, the soft-spoken admiral from St. Louis, said:

"Some people get my goat. They don't want any casualties but they want an armistice quickly. And they want an armistice without any concessions to the enemy."

But Joy quickly qualified that statement to make his position completely clear.

## NOT HURTING REDS ENOUGH

"What the Communists hate is to lose territory, to be pushed farther north, and we are not pushing them. I'm not criticizing our tactics. God knows I don't want to see a lot of casualties, and it would take a lot of casualties to push them back now.

"But I think that those people who complain that we are 'haggling' must realize that to expedite this armistice requires renewed military pressure, and that means casualties. They can't have their cake and eat it too."

"Navy bombardment and air power is exerting pressure," he said. "It is hurting them badly economically. But it is not hurting them badly enough. We have not isolated the battlefield.

"In spite of the fine work of the Air and Navy, the enemy is as strong or stronger now than he has ever been.

"We are causing him a lot of trouble. But, as a simple illustration, if he wants to get 100 bullets down to the line he simply starts out with 200."

## EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Daily News of June 20, 1952]

## JOY SAYS REDS STOP AT NOTHING

SAN FRANCISCO, June 20.—Vice Adm. C. Turner Joy, who argued with the Communist truce negotiators for 10 months in Panmunjom, said today the long talks convinced him the Reds will stop at nothing to gain their ends.

They are "ruthless \* \* \* a very shrewd crowd," Admiral Joy said.

"The greatest lesson we have learned," he said, "is that the only thing the Reds respect is unmistakable firmness and applied military strength."

Admiral Joy will have 30 days before reporting as superintendent of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis. He arrived here yesterday aboard the U. S. S. *Gen. H. W. Butler*.

Admiral Joy said the U. N. began the truce talks originally on the assumption that the Reds would bargain in good faith.

## TACTICAL MANEUVER

"The Communists," he said, "used that assumption and the talks as a tactical maneuver to build up their forces in North Korea."

He was pessimistic about the changes in the over-all picture in Korea.

"When the truce talks began last July," he said, "the Red armies were on the ropes. They were pretty badly beaten."

"As a result," the admiral said, "we are negotiating from stalemate instead of from a position of strength."

"However," he said, "we have made progress in the negotiations—we have learned what the Communists are; we have learned a lesson that will serve us in the future."

## NO PREDICTIONS

Admiral Joy declined to go out on a limb in predicting the ultimate outcome of the truce talks.

He said his long experience seated at the green baize-covered table in the little hut in Panmunjom convinced him further that the Red truce was closely controlled by a firm hand from above.

He arrived accompanied by his wife, Martha, and his son, Army Lieut. David D. Joy, a veteran of 13 months in Korea.

## EXHIBIT 2A

[From the Washington Daily News of June 23, 1952]

## LEMAI SAYS REDS HAVE 40,000 PLANES

NEW YORK, June 23.—Gen. Curtis E. Lemay says Russia now has four times as many planes as the United States plans to build in three to five years.

General Lemay, commander of the United States Air Force Strategic Air Command, told aviation officials at a dinner given in his honor last night that the Soviet air force surpasses the air forces of the free nations in numbers and approaches them in quality.

"It is the consensus of our own and Allied intelligence that the Soviet Union now has about 20,000 aircraft in organized air units," Lemay said. "They have almost that same number in reserve, and there are several thousand aircraft in the possession of their satellites."

## EXHIBIT 3

[From the Washington Daily News of March 11, 1952]

## COMMUNISTS SOFTEN THEIR TONES—ADMIRAL LIBBY TELLS REDS HE'S 'FED UP' WITH FALSEHOODS

PANMUNJOM, KOREA, March 11.—Rear Adm. Ruthven E. Libby wearily told the Communists today he was "getting fed up" with what Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway earlier called "known falsehoods" by Red truce negotiators in prisoner discussions.

The Communists, still blaming the armistice deadlock on the United Nations, dropped their threats and insults in prisoner of war discussions under Admiral Libby's warning yesterday that the Allies will walk out if the Reds kept it up.

## ACCUSATIONS MILD

All in all, Admiral Libby said later, the 45-minute meeting was "quite mild" and minus the vicious Communist invective of the past 2 days.

North Korean Maj. Gen. Lee Sang Cho again accused the U. N. of fabrications to

cover up conditions in prisoner compounds, but his words were phrased more softly, Admiral Libby reported.

Admiral Libby, irritated by General Lee's insistence the U. N. command was stalling negotiations, said:

"We are getting fed up with your attempt to make things appear as facts when they are not facts."

General Ridgway, in a surprise visit to truce camp headquarters at Munsan, denounced Communist armistice negotiators for their known falsehoods and said the talks have now reached a state where it is impossible for him to guess what would happen next.

The Supreme U. N. Commander said the armistice conference was "a fight—a spiritual and ideological contest with communism" that has become increasingly trying in recent weeks.

## EVIDENCE OF PLAGUE

General Ridgway assailed the Communist assertions charging Allied planes and artillery with loosing diseased insects in North Korea and China to spread epidemics.

"There is not a scintilla of truth in the Communist assertions," he said. "I repeat—not a scintilla of truth. The Communist statements of bacteriological warfare are completely and categorically false."

The Supreme Commander said he had seen evidence that bubonic plague exists in North Korea and that the Reds might have disseminated germ warfare propaganda in "covering up their own epidemics."

U. N. and Communist staff officers adjourned a discussion of armistice terms after only 5 minutes with no progress. It was the third straight day the session—deadlocked on Communist nomination of Russia as a truce inspector—lasted less than 10 minutes.

## EXHIBIT 4

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 8, 1952]

## NINE HUNDRED THOUSAND REDS READY IN KOREA, VAN FLEET SAYS—STRENGTHENED FORCE STILL GIVES NO SIGN OF SPRING OFFENSIVE

SEOUL, KOREA, March 8.—Gen. James A. Van Fleet disclosed today the Chinese and Korean Reds have built up a force of about 900,000 men in Korea, but there is no indication of a spring offensive.

The United States Eighth Army commander said in an interview the Reds had more men, weapons and planes, but that the Allies have enough to stop any attack. He said about 450,000 Reds are in the front lines.

General Van Fleet added that he would be surprised if the Communists attempted an offensive similar to their costly but unsuccessful major drives in April and May of last year.

"I am confident we could stop any attack the Communists might throw at us," he said. "It would be a good thing if we could get those people out of their fox holes and dugouts to mow them down the way we did last April and May."

## HAS MEN AND AMMUNITION

"We still have an intense desire to do it. We have enough equipment, men, and ammunition available. We could do it just as effectively as we did last year."

It has been a difficult task for this general of action to become accustomed to the change of pace the Korean conflict took last November when action across the front slowed down to a snail's pace. If General Van Fleet had the decision to make, it seems certain he would have preferred to continue offensive maneuvers which cost the Communists heavily in men and equipment.

But with the armistice talks, political considerations weighed as heavily as Allied military operations.

"It was thought we could arrange an armistice if we slowed down in accordance with the wishes of the people back home who did not want heavy casualties when there was a chance for peace," he said.

"The future operations of the Eighth Army are still on the conference table at Panmunjom."

#### FOE HAS MORE ARTILLERY

General Van Fleet said the Chinese and North Koreans have twice as many artillery pieces as the United Nations strung along the 155-mile battle front and in reserve.

"They are throwing a lot more artillery shells than they ever have. There are points on the front where they think nothing of throwing in concentrations of 1,000 rounds and more. In other words, they are being pretty liberal with their shells so they must have plenty of them."

General Van Fleet said Allied artillery is better, however, "and that is where we feel we have the advantage."

He reported the enemy is using Chinese, American and Japanese field pieces and has some new Chinese and Russian guns.

A disconcerting fact for the Allies has been that the Chinese and North Korean units are now at near full strength.

#### NOT WORRIED OVER ROTATION

"It wasn't that way before when we were inflicting heavy casualties on the Reds that cut deeply into their combat strength," General Van Fleet observed, recalling the crushing blows his army delivered the Communists last year.

Communist tank strength along the front and in reserve totals about three brigades—roughly 500 tanks—General Van Fleet said.

Concern has been expressed in some quarters that rotation of troops and replacement of combat-hardened divisions with new units has weakened the fighting quality of Allied troops.

General Van Fleet said morale still is high among his doughboys. He said intensive training has been going on in each unit while present static conditions exist along the front.

#### EXHIBIT 5

[From the New York Times of June 1, 1952]  
VAN FLEET DOUBTS ATTACK BY FOE NOW 2½ TIMES SIZE OF U. N. ARMY  
(By Murray Schumach)

HEADQUARTERS, EIGHTH ARMY, IN KOREA, May 31.—Gen. James A. Van Fleet, Commander of United Nations Ground Forces in Korea, declared today he did not think the Communists would open an offensive. He pointed out that although the enemy's strength had been increased considerably during recent months so had that of the United Nations.

(In the Korean truce negotiations, the Communists charged the Allies Saturday with trying to extend the war through mistreatment of prisoners.)

In the press conference the general made no attempt to minimize the manpower, fire power, and latent air power of the Communists. They have, he calculated, two and one-half times the combat strength of the United Nations and about twice the artillery power of the Eighth Army. He said he was convinced that should the enemy open a large-scale attack he would undoubtedly throw in the air power he now has based in Manchuria. "Personally, I do not believe he is foolish enough to stage a major offensive," he said. "If he did the Eighth Army would meet it and defeat it decisively."

The general was equally optimistic about the prisoner of war situation on Koje Island where about 80,000 Communists are held. He said conditions on the island off the south coast of Korea were very favorable and that the worst is over.

General Van Fleet does not foresee any trouble in moving the prisoners from their present enclosures into compounds holding not more than 500 prisoners each. He declared that tension on the island already had decreased considerably and was fast disappearing.

"When the time comes to move the prisoners from one compound to another, we'll move them," he asserted. "Unfortunately, the great mass of the prisoners there are poor victims of fanatical leaders and it is the masses that get hurt rather than those leaders. I do believe that with firm and just measures, all within the Geneva Convention, we can soon have uncontested control over the prisoners and move them quickly."

Although the general had conferred with the President of Korea, Syngman Rhee, during the past week, he declined to discuss political matters today. The subject of political problems fall within the jurisdiction of the American Embassy, he indicated.

While the general seemed slightly uncomfortable in discussing the prisoners of war and politics, he was completely at ease and obviously pleased to talk without any notes on military matters.

#### U. N. HAS TANK ADVANTAGE

General Van Fleet said the Eighth Army had an advantage in tanks and would have the edge if fighting broke out during the rainy weather.

The Communists, he said, fared well during the winter and "are really suffering for nothing for combat." They had good winter clothes and received their summer issue before the United Nations troops did. They had ample supplies of food and of good quality among Communist outfits, he said, and other rations now included such items as candy, cigarettes, "and even liquor at times."

The general said the enemy forces obviously had "ample quantities of ammunition," because "they do not hesitate to fire any quantity in concentration whenever we stir them up, and concentrations up to 2,000 rounds are not uncommon."

There is no doubt, he went on, that despite the attempt of the United Nations Air Forces to cut down the forward movement of enemy supplies, the Communists now have enough at hand to "stage a limited major offensive."

Among the United Nations advantages should there be an enemy offensive, he said, was that the non-Korean forces have remained as good or better than during last year, and "the Korean Army is many times better." During an offensive, too, he pointed out, the enemy would not be able to replace supplies with sufficient speed to maintain the drive. It was unlikely the enemy could gather many more North Korean combat replacement units because "he must be getting down to the bottom of the barrel," the general said.

"If I were the enemy I would be extremely reluctant and would recommend against an offensive," the general concluded. "He must know the Eighth Army, with its trained divisions, fire power, and air and naval support, will make him pay a disastrous price for any attempt on his part for a major offensive. In my opinion, he is still smarting over the defeats of last summer and has no appetite for more of it."

#### EXHIBIT 6

[From the Washington Daily News June 9, 1952]

UNITED STATES GENERAL SAYS: "REDS CAN DRIVE US OUT OF KOREA ANY TIME THEY ATTACK"

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 9.—May. Gen. Daniel H. Hudelson, commander of the Fortieth Infantry Division, said here that Communist troops can drive United Nations armies out of Korea any time they decided to attack.

General Hudelson, who led the California National Guard Division into combat in Korea, returned here from the Orient last night and stated flatly the Reds have too much manpower for the U. N. forces.

Asked if he believed the U. N. troops could hold back the Communists, General Hudelson replied: "I certainly do not."

"They have too much manpower there. We do not have the manpower to compete with them," he said, emphasizing that the statement was his personal opinion.

"The enemy has the capability of shoving down right now," he said.

General Hudelson's statements were in direct contrast to those of Gen. James A. Van Fleet Eighth Army commander in Korea, who said that if Communist forces attacked United Nations men the Communists would be "soundly defeated."

General Van Fleet virtually challenged the Communists to launch an offensive.

#### VAN FLEET VIRTUALLY DARES REDS TO ATTACK

SEOUL, KOREA, June 9.—Gen. James A. Van Fleet virtually challenged the Communist armies today to attack United Nations forces in Korea and said if they did they would be "soundly defeated."

While his troops were knocking back strong probing attacks along the 155-mile front, the Eighth Army commander reiterated his faith in his army's ability to repel any major offensive mounted by the 1,000,000-man Red Force.

Van Fleet has conceded that the Reds outnumber the Allies 2½ to 1 but he said the U. N. forces morale continues high, almost to the point of wishing the enemy would attack.

Night raiding B-26 bombers destroyed a locomotive and a number of boxcars south of Wonsan on the east coast.

#### EXHIBIT 7

[From the Washington Daily News of June 10, 1952]

#### WE'RE WEAK, WE'RE STRONG (?)

If the public has been trying to keep up with the assorted estimates, predictions, boasts, and analyses on the state of United Nations readiness in Korea, it must be mighty confused.

Here comes Maj. Gen. Daniel H. Hudelson home from long combat infantry experience in Korea to say that if the Communists launch a major offensive, the U. N. forces couldn't hold them.

"We simply don't have the manpower," he said.

On the same day, the top commander in Korea, Gen. James A. Van Fleet, practically dares the Reds to start a fight and announces that if they do they will be soundly defeated.

Yet all official estimates of Communist strength indicate the U. N. forces are outnumbered in manpower, guns, and jets.

President Truman, in a speech last week end, claimed the U. N. still has air superiority over most of North Korea and can bomb the enemy at will, almost anywhere in his territory.

Mr. Truman also claimed that our planes have knocked out eight times as many enemy

craft as we have lost—in air combat. Which would seem to take no account of planes lost to enemy antiaircraft fire.

Only a few days earlier, official Air Force and Navy reports placed our plane losses at 1,400 since the Korean war began, compared with an estimated loss of only 400 planes for the enemy.

That hardly jells with the impression the President was trying to create.

If the public can't seem to understand what is going on in Korea, here are some of the reasons.

#### EXHIBIT 8

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 21, 1952]

#### ENDS AND MEANS

Secretary Lovett and other spokesmen of the Defense Department, resisting the ceiling of \$46,000,000,000 imposed by the House on military spending, presented an alarming account of the state of the Nation's preparedness in testimony before a Senate Appropriations subcommittee.

Mr. Lovett said that "the Russians are outbuilding us—we are falling behind, relatively speaking, in the arms race."

Secretary of the Army Pace said that the Korean war was eating into reserves of armament faster than they could be replaced.

Secretary of the Air Force Finletter said, "We have lost time—time that cannot be recouped."

General Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said that Russia "could overrun Europe today," and that only Soviet recognition that American atomic retaliation would exact a high price has deterred Stalin.

General Twining, Acting Chief of Staff of the Air Force, said that Russia in the last 5 or 6 years has outstripped this country in aircraft production, particularly in jet fighters. The general said that qualitatively the Russian air force would equal or surpass ours by 1954.

There are two things to be said about these doleful estimates of American preparedness. The first is that in the 7 years through the end of this month the Truman administration has had more than \$110,000,000,000 in appropriations to use in building up a secure defense for the United States. The testimony of the President's service chieftains shows how little has been achieved through this vast outlay.

The second pertinent point is that the administration has taken on an unsupportable burden of foreign policy commitments, so that no matter how much is spent it will never be enough to cover them all. It is fighting a war in Korea at a cost reckoned by Lovett at \$9,000,000,000 to date and \$400,000,000 every additional month. It is pledged to arm, in whole or in part, 13 allies under the North Atlantic Pact, and West Germany, which may cost us as much as \$4,500,000,000 over the next 3 years.

We are staking the French in Indochina to arms, the Nationalist Chinese in Formosa, the Filipinos, the Japanese, and, presumptively, the Australians and New Zealanders. Although our Air Force in Korea is inferior to that of the Communists, the first multi-jet bomber wing organized for combat has been sent to a base in England rather than to Korea, where the war is on.

But Mr. Truman wasn't talking about his administration's project of underwriting the status quo everywhere in the world and making every war an American war. There is no bargain-counter way to do that. In truth, the entire resources of the American Treasury, now and in the future, can hardly make an impression in fulfilling such a project.

We are overcommitted in our pledges to the world. The foolhardy attempt to fulfill

them has stripped us virtually bare of the means of defending ourselves.

#### EXHIBIT 9

[From the Washington Daily News of May 26, 1952]

#### MAY HAVE GUNS—POW'S ARM FOR BATTLE

KOJO ISLAND, KOREA, May 26.—An American officer said today Communist war prisoners inside Red-controlled compounds on Koje are arming themselves for battle.

First Lt. Robert L. Stock, of the 187th Airborne Regiment, on guard duty here, said a Communist arsenal was operating in one compound and was "presumed" to be making small guns to resist any effort to enter the enclosures.

The officer's report made it appear virtually certain that any U. N. attempt to regain control inside the compounds would result in a bloody fight.

It was disclosed that the rebellious captives also have built battlefield-type defenses inside the compounds and stocked a supply of home-made weapons including gasoline bombs.

#### CRUDE FORGE

Army engineers plugged an escape tunnel to the outside from notorious Compound 76, where Col. Francis T. Dodd was kidnapped May 7 and held hostage for 78 hours.

It was in this compound, Lieutenant Stock said, that the Communists are turning out knives, tomahawks, steel-tipped spears and gasoline "Molotov cocktails." He said they also had crude but serviceable wire cutters.

Lieutenant Stock said the prisoners used a crude forge to make weapons from wood, barbed wire, and steel gasoline drums.

Prisoners also were building supply piles of rocks, placing them on the thin roofs of barracks in Compound 76. In Compound 96, they broke large rocks into smaller ones that could be thrown easily.

The prisoners also defiantly raised forbidden flags and propaganda banners within all but 3 of the 17 compounds although they had hauled them down in 8 compounds Saturday on orders from Brig. Gen. Haydon L. Boatner, the Koje commandant.

General Boatner brought in flame-throwing jeeps to patrol the compound areas. Flame-throwing tanks already were on the scene.

#### TUNNELS

One officer reported that the prisoners were believed to have assembled a jeep of their own within one compound from parts smuggled in over a period of months.

Additional weapons—possibly even guns and ammunition—could have been smuggled into the compounds through a tunnel from the outside into Compound 66, and distributed to other compounds through connecting tunnels.

The tunnel from compound 66 to the outside was collapsed and filled in. Two other tunnels connecting compounds 66 and 76 were to be destroyed immediately. Whether other tunnels connected the various compounds was not known.

Lieutenant Stock said light observation planes were flying over the compounds to make photographs which could be studied for additional evidence. They already have spotted defense trenches and what appear to be deeply dug bunkers.

#### AVOID INCIDENTS

He said the captives got their metal for weapons from 55-gallon gasoline drums. The gasoline was sent into the compounds to furnish heating fuel. It was cut off several days ago when it was discovered they were storing gasoline and making clay fire bombs with it.

Allied troops still were on the outside of the compounds.

General Boatner told newsmen the Communists could have broken out of their compounds during recent disorders "if they had wanted to," but would have taken "hundreds of casualties."

He warned newly arrived British guard reinforcements not to start any fights with the prisoners. He said they must avoid any incidents that would hurt the U. N. position.

He said it would require considerable construction for the next few weeks to set up smaller compounds so the prisoners can be separated into smaller, more easily controlled groups.

An officer said they expected some trouble when the Reds are herded into 500-man enclosures. At present the 80,000 prisoners on the island are held in 17 compounds. Some, such as the infamous 76, hold as many as 6,000.

"We don't want to kill prisoners," General Boatner told the British Commonwealth troops—Canadians and the King's Shropshire Light Infantry. "We don't want to kill one prisoner."

#### CLARK CRACKED DOWN ON DODD AND COLSON

Mild punishments were originally recommended for the two generals who were finally demoted in connection with the Koje Island prison camp revolt, a reliable source revealed today.

The military board which first investigated the prison camp fiasco proposed that the Army deal leniently with Brig. Gen. Francis T. Dodd, captured by his Communist prisoners, and Brig. Gen. Charles F. Colson, who made concessions to the Reds to secure General Dodd's release.

The board's findings, however, were reviewed by a board of inquiry convened by Supreme Allied Commander Mark W. Clark.

General Clark then recommended that Generals Dodd and Colson be broken to colonel, their permanent rank, and Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, concurred.

#### EXHIBIT 10

[From the American Mercury of July]

#### TRADING WITH THE ENEMY?

LONDON, June 4, 1952.—The British Empire sold Russia more raw rubber the first 4 months of this year than she did during all of 1951.

Britain and Malaya sold 63,900 tons of rubber to Russia in 1949, 77,900 tons in 1950, 56,000 tons in 1951.

Figures for reexports from Britain and direct exports from Malaya combined for the first 4 months of this year: January, 13,325; February, 18,914; March, 16,607; April, 9,579. Total for 4 months: 58,425. (New York World-Telegram and Sun.)

BONN, GERMANY, June 3, 1952.—The Mutual Security Agency's special mission here disclosed today that it had taken provisional action against 87 West German concerns because of "improper trade with companies in the Soviet orbit."

The disclosure indicated the seriousness United States officials attached to the apparent predilection of West German businessmen to trade with the Communist-dominated East. (The New York Times.)

WASHINGTON, May 31, 1952.—Experts are inclined to agree that the temptation for Japan to increase its trade with the Communist countries of Asia will mount as time goes on, for the simple reason that Moscow favors such trade and because it is considered cheaper for Japan to obtain raw materials from Asian sources than from such far-away places as America. (New York World-Telegram and Sun.)

## EXHIBIT 11

## Casualties of United States major wars

War	Branch of service	Numbers engaged	Battle deaths	Other deaths	Total deaths	Wounds not mortal	Total casualties <sup>1</sup>
Revolutionary War, 1775 to 1783.	Army.....		4,044			6,004	
	Navy.....		342			114	
	Marines.....		49			70	
	Total.....		4,435			6,188	
War of 1812, 1812 to 1815.....	Army.....		1,950			4,000	
	Navy.....		265			439	
	Marines.....		45			66	
	Total.....		2,260			4,505	
Mexican War, 1846 to 1848.....	Army.....		1,721	11,550	13,271	4,102	17,373
	Navy.....		1			3	
	Marines.....		11			47	
	Total.....		1,733			4,152	
Civil War, <sup>2</sup> 1861 to 1865.....	Army.....		110,238	249,290	359,528	280,040	639,568
	Navy.....		2,112	2,411	4,523	1,710	6,233
	Marines.....		64	312	376	144	520
	Total.....		112,414	252,013	384,427	281,894	646,321
Spanish-American War, 1898.....	Army.....	280,564	345	2,565	2,910	1,512	4,422
	Navy.....	22,875	10	0	10	47	57
	Marines.....	3,321	6	0	6	21	27
	Total.....	306,760	361	2,565	2,926	1,580	4,506
World War I, 1917 to 1918.....	Army.....	4,057,101	50,510	69,446	119,956	193,663	313,619
	Navy.....	473,262	436	7,285	7,721	884	8,605
	Marines.....	78,827	2,457	787	3,244	7,714	10,958
	Total.....	4,609,190	53,403	77,815	130,921	202,261	333,182
World War II, 1941 to 1945.....	Army <sup>3</sup> .....	10,420,000	237,049	68,957	306,006	571,822	877,828
	Navy.....	4,424,557	36,488	23,618	60,106	32,754	92,890
	Marines.....	669,100	19,508	4,089	23,657	55,396	79,053
	Total.....	15,513,657	293,105	96,664	389,769	659,972	1,049,741

<sup>1</sup> Excludes captured or interned and missing in action who were subsequently returned to military control.

<sup>2</sup> Union forces only. Totals should probably be somewhat larger as data on disposition of prisoners are far from complete.

<sup>3</sup> Army data include Air Force. Note: All data are subject to revision. For wars before World War I, information represents best data from available records. However, due to incomplete records and possible differences in usage of terminology, reporting systems, etc., figures should be considered estimates. Leaders (.....) indicate that information is not available.

Source: Information Please Almanac, 1952. Edited by John Kieran. New York, Macmillan, 1951. p. 232.

## Report on United States casualties, summary No. 94

The Department of Defense announced the following report of battle casualties in the Korean area, based on notification to next of kin cumulated for the period through midnight, Friday, June 6, 1952:

	Total Department of Defense	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
1. Total casualties (sum of items 3, 4, and 5).....	109,712	88,832	1,375	18,318	1,187
2. Total deaths (sum of items 3, 4a, and 5a).....	19,317	16,131	301	2,445	440
3. Killed in action, total.....	17,316	14,591	233	2,061	431
4. Wounded in action.....	79,918	62,920	1,031	15,919	48
a. Died of wounds.....	1,802	1,397	12	384	9
b. Other (current wounded, returned to duty, evacuated to the United States, etc.).....	78,116	61,523	1,019	15,535	39
5. Missing in action, total.....	12,478	11,321	111	338	708
a. Died.....	199	143	56	0	0
b. Returned to military control.....	1,381	1,319	2	20	40
c. Current captured.....	1,223	1,219	0	0	4
d. Current missing.....	9,675	8,640	53	318	664

NOTE.—These figures represent cumulative casualties for which notification to next of kin was effected through midnight Friday, June 6, 1952. They do not reflect all casualties which have occurred up to that time because of the time lapse required to receive notifications of individual casualties from the Far East and to verify and process these notifications in the headquarters of each service. The data indicate the cumulative number of permanent and temporary losses from effective military strength as the result of enemy action.

<sup>1</sup> Reflects revisions of previously reported figures.

## EXHIBIT 12

[From the Evening Star of June 19, 1952]  
PACE TO ASK CONGRESS FOR MORE FORCES IF KOREA WAR CONTINUES

Secretary of the Army Pace said last night "it will be imperative \* \* \* to ask Congress for more men" if the war in Korea continues.

He did not say how many more would be required. The United States now has nearly 3,500,000 men under arms in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The Secretary gave his appraisal to a Senate Appropriations subcommittee in a prepared statement made public by Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming. Senator

O'MAHONEY is chairman of the group, which met in closed session.

## SEEKS MORE FREEDOM ON FUNDS

Mr. Pace appealed to Congress for more money and more freedom to spend it for arming than the House has voted.

He said the Army has only 20 of the 21 divisions it needs, and could not afford to expand under the \$46,000,000,000 ceiling the House has voted on military spending.

"Of the 20-division army now in being, we have 8 divisions in the Far East and 5 in Europe," he said. "Of the remaining 7 in the United States, we have been able to maintain only 1 as a strategic reserve, ready and capable of immediate deployment overseas."

## EXPLAINS BASIS FOR VIEWS

"If we are called on to continue the war in Korea into fiscal year 1953 [starting July 1], as now appears virtually certain, the support requirements placed on our forces here at home will be greater and their state of readiness correspondingly even less favorable."

## EXHIBIT 13

(Exhibit 13 is "individual views of certain members of the Joint Committee on Armed Services and Foreign Relations of the United States Senate relating to hearings held on the dismissal of General MacArthur and the military situation in the Far East, May 3-June 27, 1951.")

## EXHIBIT 14

[From U. S. News & World Report of February 1, 1952]

## DEATH DESERVES A REASON—A LETTER FROM KOREA

(This letter, written by an enlisted man serving in a medical battalion, is a soldier's cry for justification of the sacrifice that he and others make in Korea. Expressing approval of certain principles outlined from time to time on this page with reference to the spirit of America, he reminds us again that there must be an alternative to armed warfare—another way to freedom and peace than militarism and death. His letter speaks for itself.—David Lawrence, Editor.)

My war experiences in Korea have awakened me to the sad condition of the world today. I am desirous of submitting, for your respectful consideration the impressions and views of an American serviceman who has both witnessed and contributed to the many outrages of costly war. My 8 months in Korea have revealed much to me.

For quite some time now I've been of the opinion that our leaders are selling their constituents short. Whether or not this is the intended or inevitable result of their selfish applications, the unfortunate outcome cannot be ignored.

Why cannot sober, intelligent people be easily awakened? Are we such sound sleepers that we are impervious to the loud cries of the warnings about us? Or if we recognize these signals, why don't we act? Are we afraid? Or weak? Or disinterested?

It is too little to say that I am saddened by the tragedy of armed rule; so strongly have the black features of blood-fed war been engraved upon my sensibilities; I am now a resolute reformer who plans to stoutly oppose the threat that both militarism and the current wave of political corruption are massing against the very thing we believe we are defending—freedom.

My long service experience has exposed much that is dangerous to our democratic way: waste, extravagance, inefficiency, the caste system, inconsistencies of administrative policies, gross injustices and unfairness, mass classification and control, poor planning and execution—all peculiar to the

armed services. In my mind, regimentation can never become a healthy ally of a free, objective thinking peoples. It stands as a serious threat and must be checked and overhauled. It is inconceivable how any military group can become popular in America. The doctrines of regimentation are in sharp conflict with the honorable principles of freedom. Any move toward military control will meet violent resistance and crushing defeat by the heroic firebrands of liberty—the American citizenry.

Despite my many complaints and rebellions against the numerous faults of our Government and Armed Forces, I wish to emphasize: (1) I am proud of my American heritage and will defend, with even my life, the inherent freedoms in man, and (2) my resentments do not prevent me in the least from playing a competent role as an American serviceman. This is a very real war at times and many men painfully die. This consideration alone is sufficient to make any other motives obscure and so directs my wholehearted efforts to spare American lives. Often the only way to do this is by destroying the enemy. This we have done at times.

Clearly, I am not an advocate of war and its attendant devices. Nor do I propose an overthrow of our agencies but suggest, rather, a purge that would cleanse and provide substantial foundation for the old, but neglected, precepts of liberty as conceived by America's inspired and resolute founding fathers.

My pains are real. I've been wet with the warm, fresh blood of a dying boy. I've watched it make thick pools on the ground and seen the color fade from once smiling and hopeful faces. I wished to God I could have given answers to the imploring questions I read on the silent lips. It is tragic that such a supreme sacrifice cannot gain consolation, if not merit, from the recognition of clearly defined issues for which it is made. To me death deserves, at least, a reason. I see none in the beclouded and warped diplomatic volleys of contemporary and widespread popularity. These young men—is this our secret weapon? Our productive know-how? Our power punch? I think not. \* \* \*

My war lessons have been costly but not without important gains. For I see more clearly than ever before that the defense and preservation of freedom and its popular tenant, democracy, lies not in armed warfare, but in the constructive example of righteous living. Unnatural war has equipped me with the very implements with which I seek to destroy it. It is paradoxical that we decide to promote peace by all-out subscription to its worst enemy, war. More than this, the destruction and tragedy in its wake are contrary to the patterns of man's natural evolution.

There is much to be done. I love my America. I've fought for her, and will at any time she is endangered. I am driven not by any blind heritage—not by a brightly waving flag—but by America's people who in themselves are freedom's own army: democracy, kindness, honor, and courage. It is as you say: "There is no strength comparable to the strength of a nation whose people know the meaning of sacrifice."

#### EXHIBIT 15

[From U. S. News & World Report of June 27, 1952]

ARE COMMUNISTS WINNING IN KOREA?—THEY HAVE MORE MEN, TANKS, PLANES—U. N. AT STANDSTILL

TOKYO.—Communists in Korea are pushing far ahead of U. N. forces in the build-up for any future renewal of full-scale war. Communists at this point are winning in the race for dominant strength.

XCVIII—504

A year ago, at the start of the second year of war, Communist armies were defeated—a ragtag, bobtail outfit, badly mauled. Losses in battle had been staggering. U. N. forces, largely American and South Korean, had smashed their armies, destroyed most of their equipment, put them on the ropes.

It was then that Jacob Malik, acting for Russia's Stalin, proposed a truce.

Now, at the start of the second year of the truce talks and the third year of war, Communist armies are vastly stronger than ever before, in manpower, in equipment, in training. At the same time, U. N. forces are little stronger in numbers, about the same in equipment, weaker in experience, battle-tested personnel.

A year from now, if present trends are continued, Communist strength in Korea may be overwhelming. The war at that time will be entering its fourth year and the truce talks their third year. All signs are that the Communists are determined to push ahead as rapidly as possible in their continuing build-up.

Three new Chinese armies, totaling 75,000 to 100,000 men, are reported both by the British and by the Chinese Nationalists to have moved into Korea in recent weeks. Aircraft from protected airfields across the Yalu River are more daring. Use of artillery by the Communists is in a rising trend. A big and steady increase in available armor is reported by U. N. intelligence sources.

The Communists, military commanders discover, are using the truce talks as a cover for a rapid build-up of their own forces and as a device for discouraging a build-up of U. N. forces.

In a single year of talks, the Communists have worked a revolution in relative military strength between their forces and those of the U. N. In a second year of talks, the Communists will strive to make ever greater gains.

Manpower in Communist armies in Korea has about doubled in size in this year. Where the Communist armies a year ago were defeated and demoralized, now they are fresh and trained. Then they were short of food, had little clothing. Now they are well fed, well clothed, ready to fight. Many of them are veterans with battle experience.

U. N. forces are little larger now than before the truce year started. Their principal gain in effective strength has come through the renovation of South Korean divisions. A year ago, only two of these divisions could be counted upon for real fighting. Today, American commanders say that the 10 South Korean divisions compare favorably with other U. N. units. American divisions, meanwhile, have been brought up to full strength. But rotation has sent home the veterans. The Americans now in Korea are not the battle-tested fighters who had the Communists on the run a year ago.

Much of the U. N. Army in Korea, thus, lacks experience in large-scale combat. Numerically, the Communists are far stronger. They still are short of the 3 to 1 superiority needed for an offensive with chances of success, but they are increasing in strength steadily.

In equipment, Communists gains in the truce year have been sensational.

Tank forces of the Communists had been destroyed just before the truce talks started. The Russian T-34s, which a year earlier had led the original push of the Communists into South Korea, had been knocked out by U. N. planes and guns or had been captured.

With artillery it was the same story. When the truce talks started, the Communist armies had been reduced to a feeble rabble. They had some small arms, a few mortars and hand grenades, but no heavy weapons.

Today, after a year's respite, the Communists have three tank brigades in Korea. They are believed to have 500 to 1,000 tanks and self-propelled guns. Estimates are that the Communists are about equal to U. N. forces in armor strength and soon will be stronger.

The Communists today have more artillery in Korea than the U. N. Their guns are well placed and capably manned. Supplies of ammunition are large enough so that Communist commanders think nothing of firing 5,000 rounds in support of some minor, local action.

In antiaircraft artillery, the build-up is especially impressive. The Communists are well supplied with Russian-made antiaircraft guns, radar-equipped. These guns are concentrated around vital targets in North Korea. Communist guns, during the year of truce talks, have knocked down more than 500 U. N. planes.

In the air, Communist gains are even more sensational. When the truce talks started, the Communists had no effective air power. U. N. air forces, with overwhelming superiority, blasted targets all over North Korea, virtually at will. Today, with an estimated 1,700 military planes, the Communists strongly challenge U. N. air supremacy.

In numbers, Communist and U. N. planes are about equal. However, more than half of the Communist planes are jet interceptors. Russian-made, they can outperform most U. N. planes under some conditions. Because of their short range, they do not venture far from their Manchurian bases. But they are very fast, and they are making it hard for U. N. bombers to get at targets in North Korea.

Because of them, the big American B-29's have stopped making attacks by daylight. Smaller bombers now have to take jet-fighter escorts when they go on daylight missions.

Handicap to the Communist air force is its lack of airfields in North Korea. With fields closer to the front lines, their planes would be able to intercept U. N. planes more effectively and to attack ground troops. The Communists, thus, have been trying for many months to build airfields in North Korea.

So far, U. N. planes have been able to knock out these fields before they were ready for use. The Communists are persistent, however, and they have an unlimited supply of laborers. Airfields in North Korea, once in operation, can spell trouble for U. N. forces.

A new air threat now is beginning to appear in the form of an improved jet plane. U. N. observers say this new Russian plane seems to be heavier and to have a longer range than the jet now the backbone of the Communist air force. With large numbers of longer-range planes, the Communists could carry the air war back of U. N. lines.

Behind this build-up is the armament industry of Russia. Where the United States quickly converted her war plants to civilian production at the end of World War II, Russia has kept right on producing munitions. The end of that war made no change in Russia's policy of military priority on all goods—civilian existence on what is left, if anything. Now the munitions industries of Czechoslovakia and other satellites also are producing arms of Russian types.

Aircraft production in Russia, small at the end of World War II, has been extended so rapidly that today Russian factories are turning out military planes faster than the United States.

The Communists have these industrial resources, along with China's vast manpower, to draw upon in building their forces. They have in North Korea a well-trained, well-armed ground force in place of the poorly armed troops that were on the run when truce talks started. They have built their

air force to the point where it challenges U. N. supremacy.

An all-out offensive is not expected yet from the Communists, in spite of their increased strength. Their ground forces have not reached the point where they can knock U. N. troops out of their strong positions, and their air force still is not able to operate back of U. N. lines.

One year of truce talks, however, has enabled the Communists to build up to formidable strength. Truce talks, if they go on long enough, can be expected to see this build-up reach the point where the Communists can try to push the U. N. out of North Korea.

#### EXHIBIT 16

[From the New York Times of June 4, 1952]  
**PROSPECT OF TRUCE DIM, U. N. AIDE HOLDS—  
 KOREA RELIEF CHIEF WILL BASE HELP PROGRAM ON PREMISE OF NO HALT IN WAR NOW**  
 (By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, June 3.—After a 6-week on-the-spot survey of the situation in Korea, J. Donald Kingsley, United Nations Agent General for Korean Reconstruction, has decided to base all his planning on the assumption that there would be no armistice in the Korean war in the foreseeable future.

This abandonment of hope for an armistice, which drastically alters the United Nations programs for reconstruction, stems from the view that the Communists' demands for forcible repatriation of all war prisoners are deliberately intended to make settlement impossible. However, Mr. Kingsley believes, and is acting on the assumption, that a fairly stable front will be maintained and that the Eighth Army is fully capable of holding a line of its choice more or less indefinitely in the face of anything the Communists can throw against it.

In line with this reasoning, Mr. Kingsley and his top staff have begun framing an entirely new kind of venture in United Nations operations. They want to mobilize all the United Nations resources and those of its specialized agencies for a concentrated and coordinated drive in the area behind the arms front to reconstruct a workable civilian economy despite continuing hostilities in the center of the stricken peninsula.

#### BATTLE BEHIND FRONT

It is Mr. Kingsley's view, as expressed to officials of the specialized agencies with whom he is consulting here, that while the battle for Korea will not be lost by the Eighth Army it may be lost behind the front. His recent survey of the area has convinced him that local administration is so bad, health, communications, and agricultural conditions so poor and the fear of guerrilla activity so great that if the situation continues unchanged there will be nothing much left worth fighting for in South Korea.

In the past, a serious attack on all these problems has been postponed in the hope of an armistice. While this has been a normal and reasonable reaction to events, Mr. Kingsley believes that an attack on the economic and social front must be made without waiting any longer for an armistice that may never come.

Mr. Kingsley already has reached a preliminary agreement with the directors of the Food and Agriculture Organization in Rome and of the International Labor Office and World Health Organization in Geneva on the part these agencies can play in the program. He will consult with the Director General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization in Paris later this week before returning to New York. All the agencies reached thus far have promised full cooperation.

#### MUCH AID ALREADY GIVEN

The United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, which Mr. Kingsley heads as

Secretary General Trygve Lie's representative, is already providing a great deal of assistance to South Korea in a variety of fields, from central banking to public health. No effort has as yet been made, however, to develop a comprehensive program for putting the whole economy in working order.

As the first step in his new project Mr. Kingsley has asked each agency to prepare a 5-year program to make the Korean economy viable. All these programs will be drawn up in Korea with constant contact among the agencies to keep them related to one another.

No one concerned is underestimating the difficulties involved in trying to do the reconstruction job. There is a profound conviction, however, among United Nations civilian authorities and, Mr. Kingsley believes, a rapidly growing conviction among the United States military authorities who act for the United Nations in Korea, that the western position throughout Asia and the Middle East hangs more on the future handling of the Korean areas under western control than on any other single factor.

#### EXHIBIT 17

[From the New York Times of May 21, 1952]  
**JOY ACCUSES REDS OF VICIOUS TACTICS—SAYS  
 FOE SEEKS TO PERPETUATE STALEMATE IN  
 KOREAN WAR—CALLS ABUSE A NEW LOW**

TOKYO, Wednesday, May 21.—Vice Adm. Charles Turner Joy, senior United Nations delegate at the truce discussions in Panmunjom, accused the Communists yesterday of "seeking by every vicious means at your disposal" to block an armistice in the Korean war. "If you seek to perpetuate a stalemate you will continue with your present pointless action," he said. "The responsibility is yours."

Admiral Joy was replying to another lengthy speech by Lt. Gen. Nam Il, in which the North Korean again accused the United Nations command of murderous violence against war prisoners in South Korean stockades where new rioting broke out yesterday.

The meeting was the longest in a fortnight and after adjournment Admiral Joy told correspondents the Communists had reached a new low in abuse.

#### TO TAKE NEW POSITION

Admiral Joy, who has conducted the negotiations since their start last summer and who shortly is to become superintendent of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, said: "I have been here nearly 10½ months but I have not heard such vicious, degrading propaganda as that thrown at us today. You have to read it to believe it. They accused us of forcibly retaining prisoners of war and of almost every other crime possible."

For more than 2 weeks the Communists have called for daily sessions of the plenary delegations, admittedly not to discuss armistice terms but to "tell the truth to the world" regarding alleged American atrocities.

General Nam reiterated the well-worn argument that the series of prison riots, which the United Nations Command said were carried out by a hard core of Communists in South Korean stockades and presumably were directed from the outside, "proved" that the prisoners had repudiated the United Nations' principle of voluntary repatriation of captives after an armistice.

#### COLSON LETTER CITED

General Nam cited the letter written to the prisoners by Brig. Gen. Charles F. Colson in an attempt to obtain the freedom of his kidnaped predecessor, Brig. Gen. Francis T. Dodd. The communication was repudiated by the headquarters of the United Nations

Commander, Gen. Mark W. Clark, as extorted under duress.

"Your commandant admitted to the world your inhumane treatment and murderous violence against our captured personnel," the North Korean general said. The riots, he added, "killed and buried the myth that our captured personnel refused to be repatriated."

"No matter what despicable means you use you cannot quiet the righteous voice of our captured personnel," General Nam said, "and no amount of distortion and slander can twist our stand."

General Nam's long statement apparently was made in answer to the point Admiral Joy scored the previous day—that the Communists earlier in the proceedings had agreed openly to screening of prisoners to determine how many wished to return north of the thirty-eighth parallel after a truce. Admiral Joy had pointed out that the Communist charges of illegality of the poll began only after it was determined fewer than half of the captives would elect to return to their former command.

The admiral yesterday informed the Communists their stand was "fraudulent and hypocritical."

United Nations headquarters announced the appointment of Brig. Gen. Frank C. McConnell, assistant division commander of the United States Twenty-fifth Division, as a new member of the armistice delegation. Admiral Joy will be succeeded as chief delegate by Maj. Gen. William K. Harrison Jr., and General McConnell will take General Harrison's place.

#### EXHIBIT 18

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 25, 1952]

**ATTEMPT TO HIDE "LAST GIVE-AWAY"?—  
 GENERAL RIDGWAY MADE TWO PUZZLING  
 STATEMENTS IN 72 HOURS; CALLED PEACE  
 SHAKY, THEN ASKED UNITED STATES PEOPLE'S  
 PATIENCE**

(By Constantine Brown)

Gen. Matthew Ridgway made two puzzling statements within 72 hours. Last Thursday, he warned a group of Japanese editors about the dangers to Japan from a concentration of a massive Soviet ground, air, and naval force in Siberia and the Sea of Japan and intimated that that force could be set in motion in a short time against Japan. This was interpreted to mean that peace is even more shaky in the Far East than most superficially informed people believed.

Then Sunday the general urged the American people to have patience with the slow-moving Korean cease-fire parley because on its outcome depends the peace of the world. This statement was followed by the announcement of a partial news blackout regarding the last and most important part of the negotiations—the question of the exchange of prisoners of war. It was explained from Tokyo that "confidential sessions" might give staff officers more leeway in working out a compromise on this deadlocked issue.

The cease-fire talks have not been conducted completely in the open. The representatives of the belligerents met in tents at Panmunjom where they talked for an interminable time. Then the American public-relations officer, Brig. Gen. William P. Nichols, gave the reporters a briefing related to the day's developments. Only the highlights of the negotiations were presented. And when it was inadvisable to present more than a sketchy picture, General Nichols confined himself to stating that no or little progress had been made. The one thing the American people back home actually learned was the reason why the negotiations were difficult. The American public-relations officer succeeded in obtaining the American

people's backing by informing them correctly about the preposterous demands of the enemy, thus preparing public opinion for the step-by-step concessions we were making. Although these concessions were not always palatable, they were only mildly opposed at home. For all intents and purposes, however, General Nuchols had a free hand to withhold information from the American reporters.

General Ridgway's decision to pull the curtain of total secrecy on the remainder of the talks dealing with the vital exchange-of-prisoners problems appear strange since it was he who last summer protested most vigorously the attempts of the Red delegates to prohibit newspaper correspondents from entering the armistice discussion area. He actually ordered all negotiations stopped until the enemy agreed to permit the press to cover the meetings. The present news blackout imposed by him will be interpreted, rightly or wrongly, as an attempt to hide a "last give away" and facilitate the signature of a "package" armistice which may be opportune for the administration's domestic political purposes but will not give us the security advantages in Korea, which he set out to obtain.

For this reason some political quarters in Washington believe that the new move announced Sunday by General Ridgway was not his own idea but was imposed on him by higher quarters in Washington. General Ridgway cannot forget that the Chinese Communists employed similar tactics during their negotiations with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in 1946. They then agreed to an armistice to be supervised by United States truce teams, and after they regrouped their forces and received more military supplies from Moscow, they did not hesitate to break it and took Manchuria from the Nationalists. This was followed by their complete victory over the American-friendly Nanking government.

As for the effect the signature of a truce in Korea would have on world peace, the expectations of General Ridgway seem to be contradicted not only by the statements in Washington of Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett who spoke last week about the arrival of Chinese Red troops in Indochina, where a shooting war is expected to grow in intensity, but also by his own statements that the Russians are concentrating large forces with Japan as their final aim.

The Chinese and Korean negotiators at Panmunjom have given no reason to induce the most optimistic individual in the world—and General Ridgway is a realist—that they look favorably toward a peace in Asia. Their truculent, deceitful and scornful attitude throughout these 9 months of negotiations has never changed. And if anybody has any doubts about the Kremlin's dictation of armistice terms he has only to draw a parallel between the accusations of the Reds that we are using germ warfare and the murder of the 14,000 Polish officers during the last war in the Katyn Forest.

In both cases the strictly neutral International Red Cross at Geneva was invited to investigate by the West, and in both cases such investigation was scornfully rejected by Moscow.

#### EXHIBIT 19

[From the Washington Daily News of March 11, 1952]

#### JOY SAYS REDS WILL STALL UNTIL WE FORCE A DECISION

Vice Adm. C. Turner Joy, senior United Nations truce delegate, believes the Communists will continue to stall on a Korean armistice until we force them to come to terms.

Admiral Joy's statement, made in reply to a question cabled him by United Press, was the strongest he has made since the truce

talks opened July 10, 1951. The question: "Why are the Reds stalling?"

#### THE ONLY LOGIC

"While no good purpose is served in speculating on specific Communist reasons or on immediate Communist objectives, one fact is fixed and clear," he said in reply.

"The Communists are motivated simply and exclusively by self interest. They will stall as long as they believe it is to their advantage to stall. They will quit stalling when they are convinced that it is no longer to their advantage.

"While patience and cold logic constantly repeated are indispensable in negotiating with the Communists, they can never be decisive. The only real logic to the Communists is the imperative logic of military pressure.

"Until such time as we force them to come to terms, we can look forward to endless debate over their senseless side issues and their arrogant and ludicrous proposals."

#### NO TIME FOR TRIPE

Meanwhile, at Panmunjom, an allied truce delegate warned the Communists today that he will walk out of Korean armistice meetings if they continue to insult the U. N.

"There is a limit beyond which we are not going to go," he told newsmen after a 57-minute meeting on exchanging prisoners. "I am not going to sit and listen to that tripe. I'll just get up and walk out."

The Communists on Sunday had accused the U. N. command of "inhuman and barbarous" acts against Red prisoners, including forged tattooing and threatening them with bayonets and hand grenades to join anti-Communist societies.

Admiral Libby called Red accusations completely groundless.

"Unless and until you decide to negotiate," he told the Reds, "we can see no hope for any actual progress in resolving the issues confronting us."

#### PLAGUE IN THE NORTH

Allied intelligence has reports that cholera, typhus and bubonic plague are ravaging North Korea. While our serums and vaccines protect South Koreans and U. N. troops, the Reds apparently have no such controls. Recent Red charges we're waging germ warfare are probably made in an attempt to shift blame to keep from their own people their inability to provide preventive measures, our experts say.

#### WAR IN THE AIR

While the ground front was quiet, U. N. aircraft raided the Yalu, striking rail lines and shooting up the Red capital, Pyongyang. Sabres jumped MIGs near the Manchurian border shot down seven.

#### MADE IN RUSSIA

In Tokyo, Gen. Matthew Ridgway's headquarters disclosed that North Korean and Chinese troops are being supplied with everything from pistols to tanks by Russia and Red satellites.

#### EXHIBIT 20

[From the Washington Star of June 22, 1952]

It was hard to realize, this calm summer week end, that the Korean war this coming Wednesday would enter its third year.

There were, of course, nearly 20,000 United States grave markers to testify to the fact. There were almost 13,000 missing American troops—most of them, it is presumed, in the hands of the Communists. There were 78,000 Americans wearing Purple Hearts in witness to the hazards of war.

Yet—even 2 years after—it was not officially war. The Supreme Court had made this clear in the epoch-making steel decision earlier this month.

And it did not feel like war—except to the men who were fighting it. True, there

was the draft, and there were economic controls of a sort at home. The normal amount of grousing about both was heard in the land. But the general feeling was one of business as usual.

#### NOT EVEN POLITICS

Even politicians, with their eye on the main chance in even-numbered years, were not making the indicated amount of capital over the war. The Republicans were vociferous in their criticism of the way Korea had been handled. The Democrats generally hailed Korea as the only thing possible under the circumstances. But there was little convincing talk about "don't change horses" in one camp, or about "we can run it better" in the other.

In that sense, at least, it was probably the only war since the Black Hawk Rebellion that the public so successfully managed to overlook. Unlike the Black Hawk Rebellion, it was no little war. Already it had lasted longer than World War I; already it had cost more in life and blood than the Revolutionary, 1812, Mexican and Spanish-American Wars put together.

As the dawn of the third year of war approached, the end still was not even in sight.

#### THE FIRST YEAR

It was the dawn of a Sunday just 2 years ago. Korea was—at that instant—still the "Land of the Morning Calm," which had been its rather fanciful name for thousands of strife-torn years.

As the sun came up over the mountains of Korea, few American thoughts were on that far peninsula. The Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, and Gen. Omar Bradley—just back from a trip to the Far East—seemed convinced that continued peace in Asia was a good bet.

Then the traffic signal that is controlled in Moscow switched from red to green. Like a rush-hour crowd in a New York subway, the armies of the puppet North Korean Government surged forward against the ineffectively manner border posts of the South Korean Army. The war was on.

#### PICTURE IN FOCUS

By D-day plus 3—June 28—the picture was in focus. Unchecked by outside forces, the North Koreans would easily overrun the entire peninsula. The United Nations gave clearance for a police action against the aggressors. But there was no real police force under the U. N. Boldly, President Truman stepped in.

At first, the United States sought to give only air support. After three more days, ground troops—a single battalion—moved in. It was like trying to stop a tank with a barricade of eggshells. The Reds raced south, seemingly invincible.

Reinforcements came in; at first a regiment, then a division, then more substantial formations. Finally, the United Nations had enough power in the field to start fighting.

The mushrooming war effort in Korea posed a difficult problem for the United States. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, commanding the U. N. forces, also had the job of occupying Japan. He took a gamble. He stripped Japan of occupational forces and sent them to the front.

As the summer wore on, it began to look as though General MacArthur might get his troops back from Korea—or at least the remnants of them. The battlefield no longer was a line drawn ever farther southward across the peninsula. The advancing Reds turned the corner in southwest Korea. What had been a line became the boundary of a pocket, centered on the vital port of Pusan.

Lt. Gen. Walton H. Walker, the ground commander in Korea, told his men to stand or die. He had said it before, and always the Reds had pushed on. But this time the troops responded. Some died, but more

stood. The Reds were stopped only about 30 miles from the U. N.'s last toehold.

That turned the tide. In ill-great secrecy, on the west coast of the peninsula, new forces waded ashore to cut the North Korean supply lines. It was a risky thing—riskier, even, than emasculating the occupation of Japan. But like the first gamble, the second one worked. Now it was the Reds' turn to run.

Perhaps, in a sense, the success at Inchon and later was too great. The inertia of the initial push took the Allied troops all the way to the Manchurian border.

There had been rumbles from inside China meanwhile—rumbles that no one in authority paid much attention to. Three times the Chinese warned that if North Korea were invaded, China would retaliate. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, seemed to think it was a bluff. At Wake Island in October, General MacArthur seemed to support Mr. Acheson's view. In sending troops far to the north, General MacArthur was taking his third calculated risk.

#### THE HUMAN WAVE

This time the gamble did not pay off. Two hundred thousand Chinese—glibly styled "volunteers" in true Communist black-is-white language—swept down on the United Nations forces. The Allies had seen some dreadful fighting when only Koreans were opposing them. But when the Chinese came in, they got their first real taste of the human wave—an earnest of the absolute disregard Communists hold for human life.

It was a winter of suffering and strife, not only because of the type of war being fought but because of the weather as well.

As the impetus of the Allied drive the summer before had carried the U. N. far to the north, so their winter push took the Reds far south. It was not until January 15, 1951, that the Communist offensive, now mostly Chinese, was halted. The slow return push of the Allies began in February.

#### SECOND TEAM

A new cast of characters, meanwhile, was entering the drama. General Walker, the ground commander, had been killed in a jeep accident. He was replaced by a relatively unknown lieutenant general named Matthew B. Ridgway.

The big news of the spring had less to do with the fighting on the ground than with a battle on a higher plane. This struggle culminated in April with the relief of General MacArthur from all his commands, and his replacement by General Ridgway. Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet went to Korea to take over the battlefield.

General MacArthur had wanted to carry the war to the enemy on its own home ground. His superiors had felt the effect of such an effort would be too small to balance the risk of unleashing a full world war. The battle continued in Korea, quite overshadowed by the battle at home. Again the tide of war rolled northward across the thirty-eighth parallel.

Then, on June 23, Russia—the silent partner in the Red combination—broke silence.

#### THE SECOND YEAR

It was too pat for mere coincidence that Jacob Malik should agree to go before a United Nations microphone on the Saturday night before the first anniversary of the war. The series of broadcasts, in which Mr. Malik had agreed to take part, was called The Price of Peace. It was not a top-Hooper rating program, and those who tuned to it that Saturday evening expected to hear either pious mouthings or Communist gobble-dygook. The "Price of Peace," quoted in rubles, was too high, most people felt.

But Mr. Malik, that night, put a bargain-basement price tag on the universally desired commodity, peace. After uttering the usual calumnies and citing as well-known

truths the usual lies, Russia's U. N. delegate came to the point.

"The Soviet peoples further believe that the most acute problem of the present day—the problem of armed conflict in Korea—could also be settled.

"This would require the readiness of parties to enter on the path of a peaceful settlement of the Korean question. The Soviet peoples believe that as a first step, discussions should be started between the belligerents for a cease-fire and an armistice providing for the mutual withdrawal of forces from the thirty-eighth parallel.

"Can such a step be taken? I think it can, provided there is a sincere desire to put an end to the bloody fighting in Korea."

#### NEGOTIATIONS START

The Western world mulled this offer over. Six days later, General Ridgway offered the Reds an opportunity for meetings aboard a Danish hospital ship. They turned this down, suggesting the ancient, battered town of Kaesong instead. Kaesong had significance for the Communists. It was just inside North Korean-held territory, and just south of the thirty-eighth parallel. General Ridgway acceded.

Almost at the moment Mr. Malik spoke the fighting died down. And, except for relatively minor jockeying here and there along the line, the battle front has been in a stalemate ever since.

At the Kaesong conference table the two sides were like a large cat and a small dog, watching each other warily, now one giving way an inch, now the other, neither quite ready to make either peace or war. That was the way the situation stayed for 2 months. There was ill will aplenty. But on each side there also was a disinclination to call a halt to what amounted to a truce.

#### PANMUNJOM

The atmosphere at Kaesong eventually proved intolerable. There were charges and countercharges of violations of the neutral zone. Finally, when the talks seemed on the verge of collapse, they were moved to a crossroads not far away—a spot so little known that few Koreans even had heard of it. Its name, Panmunjom, is known today to people everywhere.

The issues on which the peace conference worked brought troubles one by one. The negotiators could not agree on a buffer zone. When they did, a cease-fire line gave them trouble. When this stumbling block was overcome, the matter of prisoners became an issue.

In December the Communists yielded to insistent Allied demands and produced a list of prisoners of war held by them. According to United Nations calculations, it should have had about 82,000 names on it, including about 12,000 Americans. The list brought joy to some families at home, but woe to many others. It contained 3,198 American names among a total of 11,559. To date the fate of the other 70,000 has never been explained.

#### PRISONERS OF WAR

If 1950 was the year of the galloping war, if 1951 was the year of the sluggish peace, 1952 has been the year of the prisoner of war.

The prisoner-of-war question now provides the only issue separating the negotiators at Panmunjom. But it holds them far apart. Our side has taken many prisoners under an implied promise of amnesty. We do not think we can properly force these people to go back to the Communists. The Reds, on the other hand, insist that we must return all prisoners, although a plebiscite in the camps has indicated a majority does not want to be repatriated.

There the issue rests. The Reds show no signs of budging. And "forcible repatriation" has been denounced so unequivocally

by President Truman and other officials on our side that compromise on the point no longer seems possible.

The pressures created by the POW debate finally reached the overload point. They exploded last month on the U. N. prison-island of Koje, off the Korean coast.

The story of Koje is too fresh for detailed retelling: How an American brigadier general was captured by his captives; how another brigadier ransomed him with concessions; how the Reds made propaganda capital of the incident; how the two generals were broken to colonels and a third was sent in to clean up the prison island; how, only now, peace is being restored to Koje-do.

Midway in the Koje trouble, General Ridgway left to take over General Eisenhower's post in Europe. He turned over his job—and woes—to Gen. Mark W. Clark, former head of the Army field forces, on May 12.

So much has happened away from the battle front in the last 12 months that many persons have almost forgotten that there is a front. Yet the war in Korea in the last year has not been bloodless. 33,000 Americans have become casualties since Mr. Malik cried peace—almost half as many as in the first year of the war. The toll today stands at 110,000 American dead, wounded or captured, with hundreds of thousands more among our Korean and other United Nations Allies. No one knows the losses suffered by the Communists, but it is certain they are several times our own.

The third year in Korea begins this week. What lies ahead?

#### A THIRD YEAR?

Before trying to sort out the possibilities, let us face up to a couple of important questions: (1) What are we doing in Korea? (2) How has our purpose been affected by the battle lull in the past year?

We went into Korea to show the Reds that the free world could not be taken over piecemeal by armed aggression. We have shown them that. Communism's armies started marching 2 years ago at the thirty-eighth parallel. Today they are back where they started. We are still in Korea because having thrown the enemy back across his borders, we have not yet been able to negotiate a way of keeping them there. Our finger is in the dike, and we do not know when we can take it out.

The fact that we are having a hard time finding a way out of the Korean war does not, of course, mean that we made a mistake in getting into it. The merit of our original Korean decision cannot be judged by the results alone. It must also be judged against the alternative results which might have been expected if the Communists had been allowed to get away with this first blatant aggression. So judged, even today, it looks like a decision which had to be made.

#### BUILD-UP AND LETDOWN

The answer to our second question is somewhat more complex. In the year since the truce talks began, the Reds have had more than a chance to rest. They have had a chance to build their power. They now are estimated to have about 1,000,000 combat-ready troops in Korea, or waiting in reserve on the Manchurian border. They have tanks and heavy guns they did not have. They have new air strength—something like 1,800 planes, of which perhaps 1,000 are jets.

The U. N. forces meanwhile have put fresh (which means green) troops in the line. But the number of our troops committed has remained fairly constant. We had about 350,000 in Korea a year ago. We have about that number now.

And the year of hopeful waiting has had other, subtler effects. Undoubtedly, it has somewhat cooled our blood. With each passing month of the unwritten "truce," it has become harder to face the prospect of all out renewal of the war.

## THE POSSIBILITIES

Anything can happen in Korea, of course. But it seems likely that one of five things will happen. Here they are:

1. There still may be a settlement—an agreement, at least, on a formal truce. Even if there is an agreement, it will not signal the end of our involvement in Korea. We might eventually be able to bring most of our troops back home. But we could do this only if, at the same time, we were able to make it unmistakably plain that we were both determined and prepared to punish any renewed aggression at the source. Of all the possible Korean solutions, this probably is the one that most appeals to our top strategists. Whether it ever materializes depends on whether it also appeals to the Kremlin.

2. The Panmunjom talks may continue indefinitely, with fighting confined to the relatively light skirmishing that now is taking place. This is a sort of war of nerves to which western man is ill-adapted. As we have seen, it poses a difficult problem of home-front morale, to say nothing of that of troops in the field. There is a question how long we could hold our resolve to stick it out under these circumstances.

3. The truce talks may collapse, yet the present "sitzkrieg" on the thirty-eighth parallel may continue indefinitely. This situation would present us with the same difficulties as arise in connection with possibility No. 2. The difficulties, indeed, would be heightened in this case. For there would be no apparent purpose nor end to our passive involvement, once we had stopped seeking a peaceful solution.

4. We may decide, if the talks break down, to go all out in an effort to carry the war to the home territory of our Korean enemy. Taking a leaf from MacArthur's book, General Clark indicated recently that if the fighting were renewed and the Reds hit us hard from the air, we would retaliate by bombing their airfields in the privileged sanctuaries of Manchuria and China. There is some question as to whether General Clark sees eye-to-eye with his Pentagon superiors on this point. In any event, there have been reports that we are preparing to carry out this threat with tactical atomic weapons. There are two great questions about such a course of action. One is whether it would be effective. The other is whether it would lead to an unleashing of the world war we have been trying all along to avoid. Both are serious questions.

5. We may, if the talks break down, be in for a renewal of the kind of war we fought during the first year in Korea—a bloody see-saw of maneuver and attrition, giving both sides a chance to test men and equipment in a limited theater of action and to kill each other's soldiers a long way from home. The trouble is that the Reds can afford to lose more young men than we can—particularly when few, if any, are Russians.

In threatening a new sort of Korean war if the Communists get rough in the air, General Clark implied that this old sort of Korean war was what could otherwise be expected. The experts seem to agree that the Red buildup of power would prevent us from running them out of Korea, as we did once before. They are unanimously hopeful, on the other hand, that we have too much power in Korea to be run out ourselves.

These, then, are the major possibilities ahead, on this grim anniversary. None of them is wholly pleasant. Americans do not like to think in these terms. The fact is, however, that there is nothing pleasant about our situation these days—in Korea, or anywhere else. These are not pleasant times. They are not going to be pleasant for a long time to come.

It boils down to this: There is no reasonable prospect of our extricating ourselves from Korea in the foreseeable future.

## A DAY TO REMEMBER

Mr. CAIN. On the second anniversary of the war in Korea, we are reminded that beginning in 1945 the free nations within the United Nations, including the United States as a member, sought by political means to restore freedom, unity, and independence to Korea. I think it proper for just a few minutes to wonder how well we have carried out that mission. Of course, we remember that on this day 2 years ago aggressive forces from North Korea crossed the thirty-eighth parallel in their attempt to destroy freedom forever from the southern end of that peninsula. It was on this day 2 years ago that the United States and, but a few short days later, a number of free nations within the United Nations, sought by military means, because every peaceful effort had failed in previous years, to be successful in carry-

ing out a mission to restore freedom, unity, and independence to Korea.

After 2 years of bloodshed and death, how close are we now to the accomplishment of that mission? I have on my desk on this second anniversary of the war in Korea letter dated June 25, 1952, addressed to me, and simply saying:

Pursuant to your request, attached is a report of United States battle casualties in Korea, based on notifications to next of kin, as of June 20, 1952.

If I can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please advise.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. HOUSER,  
Rear Admiral, USN, Director, Office  
of Legislative Liaison.

The figures indicate the number of losses in the categories of those killed, those wounded, and those missing in action. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

United States battle casualties, Korea (based on notifications to next of kin)

	June 25, 1950, to Mar. 30, 1951	Mar. 31, to Sept. 28, 1951	Sept. 29, 1951, to Mar. 28, 1952	Mar. 29, to June 20, 1952	Total increase	
					Mar. 31, 1951, to June 20, 1952	June 25, 1950, to June 20, 1952
Total casualties.....	58,550	29,100	19,306	3,655	52,061	110,611
Total deaths.....	9,865	4,869	3,946	789	9,604	19,469
Killed in action, total.....	8,753	4,392	3,594	706	8,692	17,445
Wounded in action, total.....	39,023	23,143	15,485	3,009	41,637	80,660
Died of wounds.....	1,025	416	306	76	798	1,823
Other (current wounded, returned to duty, evacuated to the United States, etc.).....	37,998	22,727	15,179	2,933	40,839	78,837
Missing in action, total.....	10,774	1,565	227	(60)	1,732	12,506
Died.....	87	61	46	7	114	201
Returned to military control.....	1,094	274	13	4	291	1,385
Current captured.....	112	58	905	214	1,177	1,289
Current missing.....	9,481	1,172	(737)	(285)	150	9,631

Figures in parentheses represent decreases, the result of adjustments to records.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have only this to say about those figures. They indicate that up until the time General of the Army Douglas MacArthur was relieved of his commands, the United States had suffered total casualties in the number of 58,550. It was said in April 1951, when General MacArthur was recalled to this country, that his removal from his commands would be an answer to the needs and requirements of the campaigns in Korea, and that with other management the war would more rapidly, more easily, and with less suffering, be brought to a successful conclusion.

The figures indicate that since Gen. Douglas MacArthur was relieved of his commands, 52,061 casualties have been suffered by the United States. How many more are yet to die?

As was earlier mentioned by the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP], in what I thought was a most constructive statement, the news ticker today has been filled with items of interest to every American. I wish to make brief reference to some comments offered by this source.

## From London:

Jittery Labor Party forces House of Commons debate on American bombing of Yalu River power plants on Korean-Manchurian border.

## From Pusan, Korea:

South Korean President Rhee narrowly escapes death at hands of would-be assassin.

## From Washington:

New diplomatic donnybrook brewing between United States and Britain over Korean war strategy.

## From London:

LONDON.—U. N.'s Secretary General Trygve Lie called on the Soviets today to help bring about a Korean truce as a first step toward global settlements in Europe and Asia.

He did not name the Soviet Union in his appeal during a speech before the U. N. and foreign press associations at a luncheon here, but it was clear he was speaking to the Russians.

"There are certainly causes for unhappiness, but the prolongation of the war is not the fault of the United Nations," Lie said.

"It should be apparent to those governments which have it within their power to

influence the course of the armistice negotiations that no real progress can be made on these larger problems, and indeed on the issues which divide the world in Europe as well as Asia, until the present hostilities are brought to an end.

"Let that war be brought to an end and a strife-torn world will have a real chance for a fresh start," he said.

But Lie admitted no definite end to the Korean war was in sight.

I think we should pay attention to what various world leaders say these days, especially on the second anniversary of the beginning of the war in Korea, which has already claimed well over 100,000 American casualties, and concerning which the Secretary General of the United Nations says there is no end in sight.

Another ticker reference from London is as follows:

Labor Leader Attlee charged in Commons that the United States deliberately kept Britain in ignorance of plans to bomb the Yalu River power plants in Korea.

Attlee said bitterly that the Yalu attacks will lessen the chances of a truce and may touch off a third world war.

The Labor leader, who as Prime Minister, took Britain into the Korean war, made his statement in opening a full-dress debate on Korea before a crowded house.

The Laborites threatened a vote of censure against Prime Minister Churchill because of the Korean situation.

Defeat for Churchill would force his government's resignation.

If Mr. Churchill's government should fail, what would the consequences be to the United States and to the free world in general? Would the ascendancy to power of the present day Labor Party in Great Britain mean a repudiation by that Government of its obligations and commitments made with respect to the war in Korea, as a member of the United Nations, through a resolution solemnly agreed to in July of 1950?

I continue to read from the ticker. This is an item from the United Nations, New York:

A top U. N. official said American forces bombed Yalu River power plants without consulting other allies in Korea because it was purely a military matter.

The spokesman said on the second anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean conflict that he believed the paralyzing attack on the big enemy installations was a justifiable military step.

How in heaven's name could this official of the United Nations, or any official of any free government, or any responsible human being and citizen anywhere, say other than that military necessity required the recent bombing of the power installations on the Yalu River? In heaven's name, what did Mr. Attlee mean when he bitterly assailed the attacking of those installations without his having been notified by the United States? Has he forgotten that the United States was selected by the United Nations to assume the command responsibility in the name of all the free members of the United Nations? It has been America's responsibility and burden to fight the war in Korea as the command agent, for what that agent thought was the best interests of all the United Nations members who were parties to the war in Korea.

The next item from the ticker is from London:

"I have been very favorably impressed by what I have seen in Korea," Alexander said at the airport. "I think that General [Mark W.] Clark and the American command are doing a fine job of work. They have got in Korea a real United Nations team doing a fine job of resisting aggression."

Though Alexander did not mention the Yalu River attacks, his statement was certain to anger the Laborites, who regard the raids as not merely resisting aggression but asking for Red retaliation.

I take it from what Field Marshal Alexander said that he understood the military necessity for destroying the power installations, which have too long been available for use by the enemy.

Going one logical step further, Field Marshal Alexander did not think it necessary that he be advised when his Government had been among other governments to delegate to the United States of America their authority for command operations, and only in part because it had been recognized by Great Britain and all other free nations that the United States has contributed much more in personnel, blood, and material to the war in Korea than all of our allies put together.

The next item on the news ticker is from London:

Attlee said Field Marshal Earl Alexander, Churchill's Defense Minister, who arrived here today, after a visit to Korea, apparently was kept in the dark about plans for the Yalu attacks.

There was no criticism by Field Marshal Alexander that he was kept in the dark.

"It is quite obvious that a raid of these dimensions could not have been mounted on short notice," Attlee said.

"It must have been decided before Lord Alexander left Korea—and yet he knew nothing about it."

Attlee called the Yalu attack "the biggest single raid of the war."

"I think it will lessen the chances of an armistice and may lead us dangerously near to a general conflagration in the Far East, and no one knows where that will stop," Attlee said.

Across the House from Attlee as he spoke were Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden.

Immediately on his arrival, after an overnight flight from New York, Alexander had conferred with Churchill and Eden in the Parliament Building.

The next item is from London:

Attlee emphasized that Alexander, "the British Minister of Defense, holding a very high office," and, at the same time, "a very distinguished soldier visiting a command in which British land, naval, and air forces are engaged," apparently was told nothing of the bombing plans.

Eden followed, opening debate for the Government, and expressed regret that Britain was not consulted or informed beforehand about the raids.

Mr. President, I have a great respect for the British Empire and Commonwealth. I saw much of her soldiers during the last war. They were as gallant, effective, and brave as any soldiers I have ever known anywhere. But one sometimes wonders about political leadership, and particularly about what might have happened had Mr. Attlee and

others been advised beforehand that military necessity required the demolition of the power installations on the Yalu River.

My memory may be incorrect, but it is not far wrong. I recall that during the month of January 1951, about 18 months ago, the Secretary of State was directed by the President of the United States and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to advise the allies with whom we were joined in Korea of our intention to begin destroying at its source every enemy aircraft that crossed the Yalu River going south to destroy American military personnel and the personnel of our allies. Never in the course of the ensuing 18 months since the Secretary was directed to advise, among others, Great Britain, of what America thought was proper in saving the blood of young Americans, Britishers, Turks, Greeks, South Koreans, French, Belgians, and the others who are with us in Korea, has an enemy aircraft been chased back to its Manchurian lair and destroyed.

The answer is clear, if not understandable. When Mr. Attlee, then the Prime Minister of Great Britain, was advised of America's intention as the command agent for the free nations of the United Nations, Mr. Attlee said, "This is a bad intention. We frown on it conclusively."

Our Secretary of State and those who make high decisions with him were persuaded by Prime Minister Attlee's thought, and the reluctance of certain other allies, that we ought to engage in a war, while always giving to the enemy advantages to which that enemy, in terms of history and in terms of the future, never has been entitled to, and never should be entitled to, because, Mr. President, death deserves a reason. No American and no young Britisher should be permitted to die in combat without his Government having given to him every possible opportunity to survive. When enemy planes are unmolested, men die needlessly and without reason.

Mr. President, I have been very much disturbed by the ticker comments. Even though the hour is late, permit me to continue to reflect on them for just a short period.

Eden then described the attacks.

"Five targets were attacked—four of them nowhere near the Manchurian border," he said.

"The fifth station, on the Yalu River, provides no less than 40 percent of all the hydroelectric power in North Korea.

"As I understand it, the United Nations commander in Korea referred the question of bombing this station—not the other four—to Washington and the operation was approved.

"Her Majesty's Government was not informed or consulted."

"I regret this," Eden said.

With no desire to criticize Mr. Eden, this American believes he has a right to again point out to Mr. Eden, to make it even that much more clear, that the United States was selected by Great Britain and by other free nations within the United Nations to do what the United States thought properly must be done in protecting the best interests, in terms of military necessity, of all of the nations

with whom the United States is joined in Korea.

There were cries of "Oh, oh!" from the Laborites when Eden said Britain was not consulted and some cheers when he said he regretted it.

But Eden continued to defend the attacks themselves on the ground that they are perfectly legitimate military targets.

It is an important consideration to remember, that, though Mr. Eden regretted he had not been informed, he made it very clear today in the House of Commons that military necessity required or made legitimate the power plants as military targets.

The Laborites threatened to try to overthrow the government with a motion to reduce Eden's salary—a technical move to force a straight confidence vote. As the vote would involve money—Eden's salary—under British parliamentary procedure a defeat would force Churchill's resignation.

The present voting strength gives Churchill a majority of 24 over the Laborites and 19 over the combined Laborites and Liberals.

Mr. President, I should like to make one more reference to the ticker of today. It comes from London:

Plainly showing the anxiety of the Conservatives, as well as the Laborites, that American "get-tough" action might extend the war, Eden refused to say that the Yalu attacks did not hurt truce chances.

"It is said that this action is going to prejudice the conclusion of an armistice," Eden said. "I would not care myself to try to estimate that at all. I think it is a pretty difficult calculation to make."

He said the problem of consultation between the United States and its allies in Korea gives the government great concern. That problem, he added, is to a certain extent insoluble.

Eden said allied bombing was essential because of the enormous build-up of Communist strength in Korea about which the United Nations Command has frequently warned.

"If this bombing \* \* \* is intolerable to the Communists, they have the remedy in their own hands," Eden said. "An armistice could be concluded tomorrow which would satisfy the honor and the interests of both sides if the Communists want it."

Left-wing Labor Leader Aneurin Bevan said an armistice could be reached quite easily if the United States, while resisting aggression in Korea, recognized the Chinese Communists, repudiated the Chiang Kai-shek Nationalist Government and agreed to let the Reds represent China on the U. N. Security Council.

It is said that Mr. Bevan is a man of considerable influence and prestige in Great Britain. It is thought to be by no means impossible that he may in time become the British Prime Minister, or assume any of a number of important Government portfolios.

Should his elevation to these portfolios come about, I think we ought to bear in mind his comments, made in London on the second anniversary of the beginning of a war in Korea concerning which the Secretary-General of the United Nations says there is no end in sight. On this day, after 2 years of war, Mr. President, we are impressed with one thing after reading the ticker comments all day, and that is that we allies have much yet to learn about each other. We must find a way in which to get closer together. Certainly this close-

ness which does not now exist has to become an imperative necessity if ever again in the future the United Nations selects the United States to lead a war for the restoration of freedom, independence, and unity to any place other than Korea, anywhere else on the face of the earth.

Mr. President, in the Sunday Star of June 22 there was published a provocative article on Korea. In it the Star has suggested, through an unnamed but I think very competent writer, that any one of five things may happen in and as a consequence of Korea.

It will not take very long to read this portion of the article. I am constrained to do so because this is not an average, ordinary day. This is the second anniversary of a war which may, according to the disagreements seemingly existing presently between ourselves and some of our allies, go on indefinitely.

I read from the article:

1. There still may be a settlement—an agreement, at least, on a formal truce. Even if there is an agreement, it will not signal the end of our involvement in Korea. We might eventually be able to bring most of our troops back home. But we could do this only if, at the same time, we were able to make it unmistakably plain that we were both determined and prepared to punish any renewed aggression at the source. Of all the possible Korean solutions, this probably is the one that most appeals to our top strategists. Whether it ever materializes depends on whether it also appeals to the Kremlin.

2. The Panmunjom talks may continue indefinitely, with fighting confined to the relatively light skirmishing that now is taking place. This is a sort of war of nerves to which western man is ill adapted. As we have seen, it poses a difficult problem of home-front morale, to say nothing of that of troops in the field. There is a question how long we could hold our resolve to stick it out under these circumstances.

3. The truce talks may collapse, yet the present *sitzkrieg* on the thirty-eighth parallel may continue indefinitely. This situation would present us with the same difficulties as arise in connection with possibility No. 2. The difficulties, indeed, would be heightened in this case. For there would be no apparent purpose nor end to our passive involvement, once we had stopped seeking a peaceful solution.

4. We may decide, if the talks break down, to go all out in an effort to carry the war to the home territory of our Korean enemy. Taking a leaf from MacArthur's book, General Clark indicated recently that if the fighting were renewed and the Reds hit us hard from the air, we would retaliate by bombing their airfields in the privileged sanctuaries of Manchuria and China. There is some question as to whether General Clark sees eye-to-eye with his Pentagon superiors on this point. In any event, there have been reports that we are preparing to carry out this threat with tactical atomic weapons. There are two great questions about such a course of action. One is whether it would be effective. The other is whether it would lead to an unleashing of the world war we have been trying all along to avoid. Both are serious questions.

5. We may, if the talks break down, be in for a renewal of the kind of war we fought during the first year in Korea—a bloody seesaw of maneuver and attrition, giving both sides a chance to test men and equipment in a limited theater of action and to kill each other's soldiers a long way from home. The trouble is that the Reds can afford to

lose more young men than we can—particularly when few, if any, are Russians.

Mr. President, on this second anniversary of the war in Korea, it seems to me that we Americans should begin to decide as a nation what we wish to do in Korea in the future. There are other things, in addition to those mentioned in the article in the Sunday Star, that we could do.

It seems to me that our problem is that as a nation and as a government we have failed to select for ourselves a goal and to do everything within our power, both nationally and as citizens, to achieve it.

Mr. President, in connection with the war anniversary reflections, let me say that I picked up the United States News and World Report for this week, and in it found its first article to carry the following title: "Are Communists Winning in Korea?"

I believe the article is designed to cause all Americans to think. It seems to me that the substance of the article should be called to the attention of those who find it convenient to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or who are certain to do so. I now read the article:

Tokyo.—Communists in Korea are pushing far ahead of U. N. forces in the build-up for any future renewal of full-scale war. Communists at this point are winning in the race for dominant strength.

A year ago, at the start of the second year of war, Communist armies were defeated—a ragtag, bobtail outfit, badly mauled. Losses in battle had been staggering. U. N. forces, largely American and South Korean, had smashed their armies, destroyed most of their equipment, put them on the ropes.

It was then that Jacob Malik, acting for Russia's Stalin, proposed a truce.

Now, at the start of the second year of the truce talks and the third year of war, Communist armies are vastly stronger than ever before, in manpower, in equipment, in training. At the same time, U. N. forces are little stronger in numbers, about the same in equipment, weaker in experienced battle-tested personnel.

A year from now, if present trends are continued, Communist strength in Korea may be overwhelming. The war at that time will be entering its fourth year and the truce talks their third year. All signs are that the Communists are determined to push ahead as rapidly as possible in their continuing build-up.

Three new Chinese armies, totaling 75,000 to 100,000 men, are reported both by the British and by the Chinese Nationalists to have moved into Korea in recent weeks. Aircraft from protected airfields across the Yalu River are more daring. Use of artillery by the Communists is in a rising trend. A big and steady increase in available armor is reported by U. N. intelligence sources.

The Communists, military commanders discover, are using the truce talks as a cover for a rapid build-up of their own forces and as a device for discouraging a build-up of U. N. forces.

In a single year of talks, the Communists have worked a revolution in relative military strength between their forces and those of the U. N. In a second year of talks, the Communists will strive to make even greater gains.

Manpower in Communist armies in Korea has about doubled in size in this year. Where the Communist armies a year ago were defeated and demoralized, now they are fresh and trained. Then they were short of food, had little clothing. Now they are well fed,

well clothed, ready to fight. Many of them are veterans with battle experience.

Mr. President, how much of this information are Americans thinking about? I believe Americans should get ready for larger operations in Korea. Such operations should not come as a surprise to the people of the United States. The present build-up cannot go on indefinitely without having an effort made by those who have built up these forces to employ them against their enemies, who happen to be the United States and our allies.

I read further from the article:

U. N. forces are little larger now than before the "truce" year started. Their principal gain in effective strength has come through the renovation of South Korean divisions. A year ago, only two of these divisions could be counted upon for real fighting. Today, American commanders say that the 10 South Korean divisions compare favorably with other U. N. units. American divisions, meanwhile, have been brought up to full strength. But rotation has sent home the veterans. The Americans now in Korea are not the battle-tested fighters who had the Communists on the run a year ago.

Much of the U. N. Army in Korea, thus, lacks experience in large-scale combat. Numerically, the Communists are far stronger. They still are short of the 3-to-1 superiority needed for an offensive with chances of success, but they are increasing in strength steadily.

In equipment, Communist gains in the "truce" year have been sensational.

Tank forces of the Communists had been destroyed just before the truce talks started. The Russian T-34's, which a year earlier had led the original push of the Communists into South Korea, had been knocked out by U. N. planes and guns or had been captured.

With artillery it was the same story. When the truce talks started, the Communist armies had been reduced to a fleeing rabble. They had some small arms, a few mortars and hand grenades, but no heavy weapons.

Mr. President, do you remember the day—it was June 23, 1951—when Mr. Malik announced, at a banquet in New York, I believe, that if only the parties to the dispute in Korea would get together and talk things over they could soon reconcile their differences and then sweetness, light, and peace would prevail throughout all of Korea? How smart are we Americans really, Mr. President? We should examine into that question, for what I am reading at this time only reflects on what has happened to the advantage of the enemy since we accepted Mr. Malik's proposal as one made in good faith.

I read further from the article:

Today, after a year's respite, the Communists have three tank brigades in Korea. They are believed to have 500 to 1,000 tanks and self-propelled guns. Estimates are that the Communists are about equal to U. N. forces in armor strength, and soon will be stronger.

The Communists today have more artillery in Korea than the U. N.

Mr. President, let me read that sentence again. It is difficult to believe; or do not you share my concern, Mr. President? I know how deeply you share it, sir; and that concern is shared by many Members of both parties in the Senate and by many other Americans throughout the Nation.

This is the sentence:

The Communists today have more artillery in Korea than the U. N.

Certainly they did not have any artillery to speak of a year ago, before the truce talks began. On the assumption that the author of this article knows precisely what he is talking about, every American should be conscious of the likelihood of future greater trouble, which obviously will come when an enemy has more big guns than we have.

I read further from the article:

Their guns are well placed and capably manned. Supplies of ammunition are large enough so that Communist commanders think nothing of firing 5,000 rounds in support of some minor, local action.

Mr. President, some persons say we have not done much fighting during the last year. Many Americans are lulled to sleep, and do not worry very much; but when any guns fire 5,000 rounds in so-called minor local action, Americans within the range of those guns will die needlessly, even though the battle lines are just about frozen or static.

I read further from the article:

In anti-aircraft artillery, the build-up is especially impressive. The Communists are well supplied with Russian-made anti-aircraft, guns, radar-equipped. These guns are concentrated around vital targets in North Korea. Communist guns during the year of truce talks have knocked down more than 500 U. N. planes.

In the air, Communist gains are even more sensational.

Mr. President, that is the second time the author of the article has used the word "sensational" with reference to the gains made by our enemy during a period in which we were seeking at a truce table to find an end to the hostilities.

When the truce talks started, the Communists had no effective air power. U. N. air forces, with overwhelming superiority, blasted targets all over North Korea, virtually at will. Today, with an estimated 1,700 military planes, the Communists strongly challenge U. N. air supremacy.

In numbers, Communist and U. N. planes are about equal. However, more than half of the Communist planes are jet interceptors. Russian-made, they can outperform most U. N. planes under some conditions. Because of their short range, they do not venture far from their Manchurian bases. But they are very fast, and they are making it hard for U. N. bombers to get at targets in North Korea. Because of them, the big American B-29s have stopped making attacks by daylight. Smaller bombers now have to take jet-fighter escorts when they go on daylight missions.

Handicap to the Communist air force is its lack of airfields in North Korea. With fields closer to the front lines, their planes would be able to intercept U. N. planes more effectively and to attack ground troops. The Communists, thus, have been trying for many months to build airfields in North Korea.

At the rate of the build-up of the enemy, again assuming that the author knows whereof he speaks, what does the future hold for our free people in Korea? If the prevailing truce talks continue for another year, accompanied by a proportionate build-up which has been accomplished during the past year, does it seem likely that the free forces will be able to do anything other than build

cement cellars in an effort to hold the enemy at bay?

So far U. N. planes have been able to knock out these fields before they were ready for use. The Communists are persistent, however, and they have an unlimited supply of laborers. Airfields in North Korea, once in operation, can spell trouble for U. N. forces.

We ought not to forget in passing, on this second war anniversary, that in years gone by every qualified military authority that I have ever heard address himself to the subject has said that Korea was the last place in which American forces ought to be committed and employed on the ground.

A new air threat now is beginning to appear in the form of an improved jet plane. U. N. observers say this new Russian plane seems to be heavier and to have a longer range than the jet now the backbone of the Communist Air Force. With large numbers of longer-range planes, the Communists could carry the air war back of U. N. lines.

Behind this build-up is the armament industry of Russia. Where the United States quickly converted her war plants to civilian production at the end of World War II, Russia has kept right on producing munitions. The end of that war made no change in Russia's policy of military priority on all goods—civilian existence on what is left, if anything. Now the munitions industries of Czechoslovakia and other satellites also are producing arms of Russian types.

Aircraft production in Russia, small at the end of World War II, has been expanded so rapidly that today Russian factories are turning out military planes faster than the United States.

The Communists have these industrial resources, along with China's vast man power, to draw upon in building their forces. They have in North Korea a well-trained, well-armed ground force in place of the poorly armed troops that were on the run when truce talks started. They have built their air force to the point where it challenges U. N. air supremacy.

An all-out offensive is not expected yet from the Communists in spite of their increased strength. Their ground forces have not reached the point where they can knock U. N. troops out of their strong positions, and their air force still is not able to operate back of U. N. lines.

One year of truce talks, however, has enabled the Communists to build up formidable strength. Truce talks, if they go on long enough, can be expected to see this build-up reach the point where the Communists can try to push the U. N. out of North Korea.

The Senator from Washington believes that he will have reason on too many occasions in the future to come back to read what he has here offered for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. President, again, this is the second anniversary of the beginning of a war perhaps without end, at least for a very long time, in Korea. We know how we feel about the war. Some of us Americans are more frustrated than others. Some of us believe that our Government has lacked the courage and the imagination and the determination to carry out its military mission, once enemy action had attempted to impose the evil of tyranny upon the free peoples in Korea.

But, Mr. President, whatever our thoughts, regardless of the loved ones we may have lost, how lucky can we be? As a nation, we have not suffered as Korea has suffered. We have not been ex-

posed to gunfire, devastation, and destruction. On this second anniversary, my heart is completely filled with sympathy for the South Koreans and for many North Koreans, also, and with admiration and respect for the courage and stamina with which South Korea has done its best to withhold and withstand destruction and the Communist forces from North Korea.

I hold in my hand a recent statement made in New Hampshire by Dr. Lou Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States, I shall conclude my reflections on this second anniversary of the war in Korea by letting Dr. Yang speak for himself, as in this statement he does so feelingly, so realistically, so forcefully, and so beautifully, too. We Americans ought to join hands with the South Koreans whenever we have an opportunity to do so. Ambassador Yang says:

If I were to try to paint a brief word picture of Korea today, I should have to tell it to you just about like this:

Our past is sad;  
Our present is terrible;  
Our future is grim.

It is very difficult, under these circumstances, to make what might be termed an encouraging report on Korea. But I can tell you that the spirit of the Korean people, despite the misery and the horror of modern warfare which has been visited upon them, remains unconquerable. We shall never, never submit to communism. If the worst should come to the worst, I can assure you that we might be exterminated, but we would prefer death as a nation to the dishonor and degradation of being slaves of communism.

In my view—and it is only the view of one man, Mr. President—if my nation and its governmental leadership had been so motivated, with courage and determination, as those have been who have been under the heel of the tyrant in Korea for two long, bloody years, the war would have been over and done with long since. The Ambassador to the United States from the Republic of Korea went on to say:

What has happened to Korea since the fighting began is something you could hardly believe even if you saw it with your own eyes. General MacArthur said he had seen a great deal of war, but never anywhere, anything so utterly horrible as what happened to the Korean people in the terrible winter of 1950-51.

That was a very moderate winter in the United States, as I recall. We were all well housed, well fed, and well clothed. But not so with our friends and allies, the South Koreans. Dr. Yang continues:

General Ridgway has declared that in all the long and sometimes painful history of Asia there has never been another tragedy to equal it. Mr. J. Donald Kingsley, who has worked among all the refugees of Europe, in his capacity as Director of the International Relief Organization, has stated that the destruction he saw in Korea has never been equaled on a nation-wide scale, since the annihilation of Carthage by ancient Rome.

As I myself have visited and flown over the sites of our 55 cities which have been destroyed, and of our 1,200 villages that have been wiped off the face of the earth, the most tragic consideration of all has been the pitiful

condition of the 60,000 and more lost children who wandered over the highways without parents, without homes, without food, and without any clear understanding of what is happening to them, or why.

Mr. President, I do not like to read such comments as this on the second anniversary of the war in Korea. But it is not so much a case of Americans reading such comments and thinking about them as it is a matter of getting rid of the war before it overwhelms the forces of freedom.

The Korean Ambassador tells us something about the losses in Korea. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] earlier today, in his splendid speech, mentioned the American casualties. They now run well over 100,000. Let us see what the Korean Ambassador says about Korean casualties:

Out of our South Korean population of 22,000,000, over 8,000,000 persons have lost their homes. More than 1,000,000 civilians have been killed and another million are missing, wounded, or invalided. In addition to these, some 300,000 of our Korean soldiers have been wounded, captured, or killed. Next to our own military casualties are your own, for the American list now has passed the 100,000 mark. All of this has happened in an area less than two-thirds the size of New England, and in the northern part of our country, where 9,000,000 of our helpless and innocent people have been captives and pawns of their Communist masters, the physical destruction and loss of life have been even greater.

In 800 brief days, Mr. President, 8,000,000 Korean homes have been destroyed, or 8,000,000 persons have lost their homes, and a million human beings, citizens of South Korea, have been killed or are missing or wounded or invalided. In addition, some 300,000 Korean soldiers have been killed, captured, wounded, or missing. That means, distressing as it is, that the South Koreans, whom we seek to liberate, have lost about 3 soldiers, killed, wounded, and missing, to every American who has made a comparable sacrifice in the Korean conflict.

Korea continues to need relief and needs it desperately. For nearly 2 years now our people have been driven up and down the Korean peninsula ahead of attacking armies and shuddering under the fearful rain of napalm and explosive bombs from the air. Our factories have been destroyed and our means of livelihood have all but disappeared. To a considerable extent we have become a nation of refugees, living in refugee camps and our children housed in orphanages. Homes that have escaped devastation and which originally housed a single family, now give crowded shelter to sometimes as many as six families. Others live in barren and partly destroyed factories and public halls. Even those whose lives have been saved have suffered agonies of body and spirit which comfortable people 10,000 miles away cannot even conceive.

It is hard to conceive of such tragedy, Mr. President. The Senator from Washington has seen quite a lot of war, but that was quite some time ago, and I do not think I can conceive of such tragedy as the Korean Ambassador is telling us about.

As our people stand in the midst of their ruins today, they have two things that they would like to say to their friends and allies.

The first is—don't stop until the job of freeing and restoring our land is complete, and the second is, help us—for help we must have—to restore the broken ruins this war has spread across our entire nation. I realize that those two things might sound selfish—but we do not mean them to be so because we regard the war in Korea as not Korea's war alone. It is communism's war against the entire free world.

Mr. President, I think the Korean Ambassador believes it; I know he does. The United Nations and the United States have never acted as though they believed it, but the Ambassador says:

The first is: Don't stop until the job of freeing and restoring our land is complete.

It will be noticed, Mr. President, that this Korean does not distinguish between North Korea and South Korea. When he says "keep up your job until you have freed my country," that means the restoration of unity of the peninsula which is called Korea. Then he says:

The second is: Help us—for help we must have—to restore the broken ruins that war has spread across our entire nation.

Communism's actual attack in my country and communism's threatened attacks elsewhere in Asia are part and parcel of one war, and I will repeat what that war is—it is communism's war against the entire free world. We free peoples are interdependent. The fate of one portends the fate of all.

There are those who seemingly disagree with the Ambassador from Korea. I am reminded of the ticker tape from which I read earlier. Apparently Mr. Attlee, recently Prime Minister of Great Britain, does not recognize, as does the Korean Ambassador, that the Korean war is a Communist war against the free world and that all of the free world should participate in it and keep on going until that land had been restored to those to whom it belongs.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the Korean Ambassador has this to say:

It has been our conviction from the beginning that the Communists were not sincere when they proposed a truce talk.

I have offered for the RECORD those comments from the United States News which indicate what has happened to the enormous increased strength of the Communists during 12 months of negotiations. Maybe more persons in high authority should have listened with greater care to such observations as were being made in a public address in the sovereign State of New Hampshire by the Korean Ambassador. He said:

It has been our conviction from the beginning that the Communists were not sincere when they proposed for a truce talk. When the proposal was made by the enemy, the Communist invaders were suffering heavy casualties at the hands of the U. N. forces. The series of defeats had undermined the Communist power as a fighting force. They obviously desired an opportunity to recuperate, to regroup their forces, and to effect their build-up in order to increase their military strength.

I am sure that I am not alone in thinking that the Communists have been using the last 10 months to make the necessary preparations for an offensive with their ultimate objective to defeat the American and U. N. forces in Korea.

The Ambassador then concludes in positive fashion:

There is more, much more, that I would like to say. But I think you know what is in our hearts, and I think you know why.

Like every other nation on the border of Soviet power, we had our choice. We could have submitted, as so many other peoples have done, and our nation would remain whole today, but our spirits would be dead. We made our choice: to stand and fight, to stand if need be and die, to try to safeguard our liberty. We hope the United Nations will stand with us still. We hope our friends will strengthen their resolve. We hope the entire free world will not so far mistrust its own might as to step aside and give up the cause until the complete goal of liberation for our nation has been won.

Mr. President, the Senator from Washington makes but one guess. My guess is—and this is why I have imposed so long upon the indulgence of the Chair this afternoon, on this second anniversary of the war in Korea—that freedom will not again be restored to free men throughout the world, and then maintained, until the free forces decide to carry out, in fact, the resolve they made in the United Nations, at Lake Success, in early July of 1950, which was that the free nations, out of a free choice, and with their eyes open, were imposing upon themselves as a mission the restoration of freedom, unity, and independence to all of Korea.

Two years have gone by since we undertook that mission. There is no purpose in laboring the point that we are not within sight of the accomplishment of our mission. The challenge to free men everywhere on this second anniversary is to become much more successful in pursuance of that mission in the months which lie ahead, than we free people have been in the 24 months which have passed.

#### PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE PRIMARY BILL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Illinois on the reporting of the presidential preference primary bill by the Senate Rules and Administration Committee.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS ON THE REPORTING OF THE PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE PRIMARY BILL BY THE SENATE RULES AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

The Senate Rules Committee this morning favorably reported the presidential preference primary bill, which a group of us introduced 5 months ago. Senator HAYDEN and the committee deserve praise for the excellent work they have done.

The committee's action comes at a time when the needs and demands for electoral reform are at their highest. As the conventions draw near the temptations of the party bosses to make deals and use shenanigans are shockingly evident. While responsible party organizations will be quick to recognize and heed the voice of the people, the obvious attempts of some professionals to thwart the will of the people dramatizes the need for taking the selection of the candi-

dates for the Nation's highest office out of the hands of the party bosses and putting it into the hands of the people.

The 60,000,000 "voteless" citizens of our nonprimary States are demanding their rightful say in the nomination of their party's presidential nominee. The committee's action, if sustained by Congress, will make this possible.

The people are banging at the door of the smoke-filled rooms. The chorus of letters and editorials, the unusually high number of primary write-in votes, and just plain grass-roots discussions all sound the note that Congress should pass this legislation before we adjourn. That is why I hope the Senate will immediately consider S. 2570, as reported by the committee.

Now is the time for us to make certain that more States hold preference primaries in 1956 than did this year. The primaries this year have frightened the politicians in both parties. But they are trying to ride out the popular storm and they may succeed in doing so. Experience shows that the time to have passed preferential primary legislation for 1952 would have been in 1948.

We cannot wait until 1956 to enact primary legislation for 1956. If we want more preference primaries in 1956 we must strike while the iron is hot and the abuses of the present convention system are obvious.

I recognize that the primary bill, as reported, will not necessarily rid us of all the evils of our present system of nominating presidential candidates. It directs the Attorney General to negotiate agreements with States planning to hold presidential preference primaries between February 1 and May 31 of an election year. The States are encouraged to sign agreements with the Attorney General since if they sign they will receive financial assistance for their election expenses. These agreements would provide for a consideration which is limited to a ceiling of 20 cents for each vote cast in a State presidential preference primary. In return for this Federal assistance the States would promise to include on their primary ballot the names of presidential candidates on whose behalf nominating petitions have been signed by 500 voters in three-fourths of the States participating in these agreements. No State is compelled to adopt the presidential primary if it does not wish to do so. The aim of our bill is merely to make it easier for the States to let the voice of the people be heard.

Undoubtedly as we go along we shall find that the presidential preference primary bill can be improved. But we are headed in the right direction and I sincerely hope that the Senate will consider the bill as soon as possible.

As I have said, the people are banging at the doors of the smoke-filled rooms where the party bosses will meet to choose their hand-picked candidates for the Presidency. Let the voice of the people be heard.

#### CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF JAMES H. FLANAGAN

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on the Executive Calendar is the nomination of James H. Flanagan, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I ask the acting majority leader one question, please?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. Has the acting majority leader had occasion to confer with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the minority leader, as to his views on the question?

Mr. HILL. I conferred with the acting minority leader, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], who is a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. The Senator from Idaho was at the time the acting minority leader. I told him it was my purpose to ask that the nomination be confirmed.

Mr. CAIN. Then the acting minority leader, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], was in agreement with the intention of the acting majority leader?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be immediately notified.

#### RECESS AS A MARK OF RESPECT TO FORMER SENATOR AND REPRESENTATIVE JAMES W. WADSWORTH

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in compliance with the previous order of the Senate, and as a mark of respect to the memory of the former Member of the Senate and former Member of the House of Representatives, the late James W. Wadsworth, of New York, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 26, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 25 (legislative day of June 21), 1952:

##### TECHNICAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator for Technical Cooperation.

##### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Abe Murdock, of Utah, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term expiring December 16, 1957. (Reappointment.)

##### FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Walter L. Greene, of Alabama, to be Federal Housing Commissioner, vice Franklin D. Richards, resigned.

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

##### To be captain

##### MEDICAL

George Spangler Woodward, 23587A.

##### To be first lieutenants

##### AIR FORCE

John Dean Morgan, 23766A.

John Robert Ford, 23767A.

Armand Michael Carlomagno, 23769A.

Joseph William Allen, 23772A.

Eugene Lawrence Hudson, 23770A.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

## POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

## ALABAMA

John A. Alsbrooks, Sheffield, Ala., in place of J. H. Blake, deceased.

## ARKANSAS

Carl D. Lynch, Smackover, Ark., in place of J. W. Byrd, deceased.

## CALIFORNIA

Opal F. Hamilton, Leggett, Calif. Office established October 16, 1949.

## GEORGIA

Katherine C. Wimberley, Bainbridge, Ga., in place of R. G. Hartsfield, retired.

## ILLINOIS

George O. Downer, Downers Grove, Ill., in place of B. L. Kellogg, retired.  
Joseph R. Sester, Genoa, Ill., in place of C. B. Faber, resigned.

## MAINE

Lawrence M. Glidden, Palermo, Maine, in place of D. W. Worthing, deceased.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Edward J. McCaffrey, Concord, Mass., in place of J. R. McManus, removed.

John F. Murphy, Northampton, Mass., in place of E. E. Cooney, retired.

Willard W. Ellis, Yarmouth Port, Mass., in place of W. P. Cook, deceased.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Harriet R. Cowley, Ambrose, N. Dak., in place of R. L. Hanson, transferred.

Elmer W. Hoppa, Cayuga, N. Dak., in place of J. E. Murray, resigned.

Alvin O. Herberg, Wildrose, N. Dak., in place of R. W. McCoy, resigned.

## OKLAHOMA

Paul S. Badami, Ponca City, Okla., in place of E. P. Souigny, deceased.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Bernard T. Shilling, Conneautville, Pa., in place of C. G. Melcher, deceased.

Kenneth M. Bistline, Landisburg, Pa., in place of L. I. Wertz, transferred.

## TENNESSEE

Bernard F. Vandergriff, Clinton, Tenn., in place of E. C. Cross, retired.

Nedgel R. Leathers, Toone, Tenn., in place of M. R. Kelley, retired.

## UTAH

George E. Brown, American Fork, Utah, in place of D. G. Ingersoll, transferred.

## WYOMING

Hugh M. Currah, Shoshoni, Wyo., in place of C. W. Hornbeck, resigned.

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 25 (legislative day of June 21), 1952:

## PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

James H. Flanagan, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, from July 1, 1952.

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 25 (legislative day of June 21), 1952:

## POSTMASTER

Anthony J. Teti, to be postmaster at Toughkenamon, Pa.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1952

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.  
Rev. Ernest A. de Bordenave, rector of Old Christ Church in Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O God, behold the Members of this Congress.

They are called upon to make fateful decisions that affect the life of all mankind, while they themselves are prideful, self-centered sinners like everybody else. Theirs is a great opportunity but an awful responsibility. Surely, they need Thy help.

Keep them humble by the knowledge that Thou art the final ruler in human history. Guide them by the knowledge that Thy justice is the measure of Thy demand upon their decisions.

Give them fortitude to accept what they cannot change, courage to change what they ought to change, and wisdom to know the one from the other. Amen.

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7714. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3168. An act to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion.

## 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 joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 23, 1952:

H. R. 5633. An act to approve contracts negotiated with irrigation districts on the Owyhee, Riverton, Milk River, and Frenchtown Federal reclamation projects, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6336. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research;

H. R. 6787. An act to extend the Rubber Act of 1943 (Public Law 469, 80th Cong.), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6909. An act to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; and H. J. Res. 449. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Vannevar Bush as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

## APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS AND EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, 1953

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6854) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

## CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2284)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6854) "making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4 and 7; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,725,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,825,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,  
A. M. FERNANDEZ,  
OTTO E. PASSMAN,  
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
G. CANFIELD,  
BEN F. JAMES,  
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARLEY M. KILGORE,  
BURNET R. MAYBANK,  
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,  
KENNETH MCKELLAR,  
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,  
ZALES N. ECTON,  
STYLES BRIDGES,  
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

## STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6854) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following state-

ment in explanation of the conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$2,585,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary, as proposed by the House instead of \$2,625,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$51,000,000 for administering the Public Debt as proposed by the House instead of \$51,117,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$20,500,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Treasurer, as proposed by the House instead of \$21,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Relating to salaries and expenses, Bureau of Customs, permits the use of not to exceed \$1,220,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$2,725,000 for salaries and expenses, Secret Service Division, instead of \$2,695,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,770,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$4,825,000 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint, instead of \$4,775,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,275,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$19,250,000 for acquisition, construction, and improvements, United States Coast Guard, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Strikes out the Senate proposal to place a general limitation on amounts that may be used for personal services.

Amendment No. 9: Strikes out the Senate proposal to limit the amounts that may be used for travel, personal services and transportation of things.

Amendment No. 10: Strikes out the Senate proposal to provide an expenditure limitation of \$644,384,591 on the purposes provided in the Treasury Department title of the bill.

Amendment No. 11: Changes section number.

#### TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$2,150,000,000 for postal operations as proposed by the House instead of \$2,105,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 13: Strikes out the Senate proposal against use of funds in connection with the operation of seized plants, facilities, or other property.

Amendment No. 14: Changes section number.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,  
A. M. FERNANDEZ,  
OTTO E. PASSMAN,  
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
G. CANFIELD,  
BEN F. JAMES,  
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which we present today makes the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill the first of the regular 1953 appropriation bills to clear the Congress. The bill was reported to the House on February 29, 1952, and passed the House on March 3. The Senate Committee on Appropriations reported it to the Senate on April 22, and it passed that body on April 29. The conference was delayed pending a Supreme Court decision on seizure of the steel plants, inasmuch as the Senate had inserted an amendment

which prohibited use of funds in connection with seized property.

This conference report carries total appropriations of \$3,437,895,000 for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year 1953. This amount is \$77,250,000 less than the budget estimates of \$3,515,145,000, and \$670,000 less than the amount approved by the House. In addition, the bill provides authorization for the Export-Import Bank of Washington to use its funds for administrative expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,125,000, but this item was not in conference inasmuch as the House and Senate had both approved the same figure.

Of the total in the bill, the major part, or \$2,793,800,000, is for the Post Office Department, and \$644,095,000 is provided to carry on the functions of the Treasury Department.

The largest item in conference was involved in amendment No. 12 under which the Senate proposed a reduction of \$45,000,000 in the House figure for postal operations. The House had already slashed the Post Office request \$28,300,000, which was considered the maximum reduction that could be made without impairing the postal service.

When the Congress reduced postal appropriations several years ago, the Department curtailed certain postal services in order to operate within the limits of the amount appropriated. Notwithstanding a flood of protests from all parts of the United States the curtailed services are still in effect and the Department estimates that the savings resulting therefrom approximate \$100,000,000 annually. The additional cut of \$45,000,000 in postal expenditures for 1953 proposed by the Senate would have necessitated a further substantial curtailment of postal services which the House conferees do not believe is justified at this time. We therefore insisted upon the restoration of the full amount approved by the House. Suggestion had been made to allow the Senate figure and permit the Post Office Department to submit deficiency estimates at the next session of the Congress, but this proposal was not agreed to inasmuch as the conferees felt that the Post Office Department should be required to plan its year's operations on the amount made available in the House bill. The Senate finally receded on this amendment, so that the amount appropriated for the Post Office is the same as in the House bill.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the bill as recommended by the conferees is so nearly identical with the bill as it passed the House that I feel certain there will be no opposition to the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

#### GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL, N. Y.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7855) for improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, N. Y., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is a so-called emergency measure, that it applies to the port of New York, and will be very helpful in the defense effort.

Mr. LARCADE. That is correct; it is absolutely essential to clear the harbor. There is a bar that has to be taken out that is impeding navigation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it is a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. LARCADE. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the following improvement is hereby adopted and authorized in the interest of national security, to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans recommended in the report hereinafter designated:

Gowanus Creek Channel, N. Y., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 318, Eighty-second Congress, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

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 EXCESS PROFITS TAX LAW

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. It is.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Just what does it do?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The bill came out of the Ways and Means Committee unanimously. It corrects a provision in the excess profits tax law which was corrected in the Senate in 1950 when the act was passed. This was left over in conference for further study; this is the result of the further study.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That, effective with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1950, section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code, as added by section 101 of the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, is hereby amended by changing its heading to read "Corporations completing contracts or making deposits under Merchant Marine Act" and by adding to said section 457 the following new subsection:*

"(c) Base period earnings credit for deposits under Merchant Marine Act, 1936: The excess profits net income computed under section 433 (b) for any base period year shall be increased by the amount, if any, by which (1) the taxpayer's tax-deferred deposits of earnings, made in or accrued to reserve funds under section 607 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in respect of such base period year, exceeds (2) the amount of such deposits of earnings for the taxable year. The Secretary shall provide, by regulation, for proper adjustment of the deposits made in or accrued to the reserve funds for any taxable year so as to exclude therefrom any amount payable for such year as reimbursement of operating-differential subsidy."

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.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ROGERS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 40 minutes on Thursday, June 26, after the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday, June 26, following any special order heretofore entered.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 110]

Aandahl	Dempsey	Horan
Abbitt	Dingell	Jackson, Calif.
Abernethy	Doughton	Johnson
Addonizio	Eaton	Kean
Albert	Evins	Kearney
Allen, La.	Fenton	Kennedy
Bates, Ky.	Fisher	Kilday
Beckworth	Frazier	McDonough
Bennett, Mich.	Gamble	Mitchell
Burdick	Gore	Morris
Carlyle	Gregory	Morton
Carnahan	Hall	Moulder
Case	Edwin Arthur	Norblad
Coudert	Hand	O'Brien, N. Y.
Cox	Herlong	Patman
Dawson	Hollifield	Pickett

Powell	Sasscer	Tackett
Redden	Scott	Taylor
Reece, Tenn.	Hugh D., Jr.	Vinson
Richards	Steed	Vorys
Robeson	Stigler	Weich
Roosevelt	Stockman	Wickersham
Sabath	Sutton	Wood, Ga.

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-four Members are present, a quorum.

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

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any rule or rules of the House to the contrary, that it may be in order for the Committee on Appropriations to file a supplemental appropriations bill on Thursday and for the same to be considered in the House on Friday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8210) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8210, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Friday, June 20, there was pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 9, after line 10, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 111. Section 503 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'It is the sense of the Congress that by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled and the Congress therefore requests the President to invoke immediately the national emergency provisions of sections 206 to 210 inclusive of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage.'"

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of the expeditious consideration of this bill, which is essential, I shall insist on the rules of the House being followed and shall object to any extension of time under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, 2 weeks ago the President appeared

in this Chamber before a joint session of the Congress and at that time he asked the advice and assistance of the Congress in bringing about termination of the disastrous steel strike that now afflicts the country. At that time the President asked the Congress to make a difficult decision for him, namely, whether he should use the law of the land, the Taft-Hartley injunction provision, or whether the Congress would give him further authority for seizure which had been denied by Supreme Court decision.

The President was opposed to the use of the Taft-Hartley Act and the President very cogently in his message stated that from his standpoint he was against the use of that provision. At the conclusion of the President's argument on the subject he said:

Consequently, I feel that I should put the facts before the Congress, recommend the course of action I deem best, and call upon the Congress which has the power to do so to make the choice.

The choice lay between use of existing law and the enactment by the Congress of other laws. There have been a number of bills introduced. I know that bills are pending before three committees of the House of Representatives to enact other law. None of these committees have acted, the Congress is about to adjourn or to recess; so the question is plainly up to the House, what answer are you going to make to the President's request, or are you going to entirely ignore the responsibility of the Congress and do nothing?

That is the plain choice, that is all there is to it.

Some of us think that the President should use the law of the land, and all we are saying is that in response to your request for advice on this subject, we say to you: Just use the law of the land, we are not going to enact any other law. That is all there is to it.

I do not see why anybody should get excited about it, why anyone should get excited about suggesting to the President that he use the law of the land and that is all this does.

Some folks say, well, the law of the land will not be effective, the Taft-Hartley amendment is not any good. But what has been the experience? The Taft-Hartley feature of the law has been invoked on nine occasions. Of the nine times that the Taft-Hartley injunction was used only in one case has there been a work stoppage after the 80-day period. In three of those cases they did not even have to get the injunction. When the President appointed the board the thing was settled before injunction was applied for. In five cases there were injunctions and in all of those cases there was not an hour's work stoppage. The whole thing was settled before the injunction was over. In one case, that involving the maritime union, it did not work. I would say that when a law works in eight out of nine cases it is a pretty good law.

Some people say, well, the unions will not work under the law. Well, if there is any labor union, or if there are any other minority groups in this country,

that today say they are bigger than the law and refuse to observe the law, the quicker this Congress and the country knows about it, the better it is going to be both for the unions and for the country.

Now, my friends, I do not want to prolong this discussion. I do not want to get into any controversy about it. It is a simple thing. We ought to do something before we adjourn this Congress, and if we are not going to enact a law, then we ought to say to the President, "Go ahead and use the law that we have."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all agree that the proper settlement of the steel strike is essential to the stabilization of our economy and the defense production of our country. This is a very important matter, but it will never be settled unless it is settled right.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot approach this measure with hostility, either to management or to labor. The proper way to settle the strike is by mediation and conciliation or by collective bargaining, and it cannot be settled satisfactorily in any other way.

It has been said that under the Taft-Hartley Act there will be a cooling off period of 80 days. There has already been a cooling off period of 154 days. The men stayed at work, and then at the expiration of that time they proceeded to strike again. I think we all know that those men who are involved in this strike are hostile to the Taft-Hartley Act. Proceeding under that act rather than cooling off will throw additional fuel upon the flames. You cannot change the bent of men. I have no quarrel with labor because they organize. They have but one thing to sell, and that is their labor, the earnings of which support them and their families. It clothes them and houses them and they are dependent upon it for all they have. The industrial producer has many things to sell. He may have a loss on one article and make it up on another. Labor cannot do that. You cannot be hostile to labor because it attempts to assert its rights.

I think it is very unfortunate that this steel strike has occurred. I hope it can be settled amicably. When you send men back to work under injunction, they have not the same spirit that they would have if they went back voluntarily. I think that is a human characteristic. Of course, it is more pleasant for men to work under agreements, to have friendly association with employers, and that is the way it ought to be. Men who are working under those conditions will work better and produce more than working under the compulsory processes of the courts.

There is a practical question here. I think we all want this strike settled, but here by your request you are limiting the President on the methods he may use. Whether you like the President's views or not, I am sure we all know that he wants to see the strike settled. The President is the Chief Executive of this Government. He is just as supreme in that department as we are in ours. He

has a powerful position with great responsibilities, and why do you want to tie his hands as to the methods that shall be pursued? I do not know the status of the steel strike at the present time; I do not know how near they are to a settlement. I hope it can be settled soon. But, suppose they were just on the verge of settlement, the use of the Taft-Hartley Act might prevent the settlement and prolong the dispute.

This amendment is but a request. The Congress recognizes the fact that they can tell the President what methods he shall pursue in his discretion as the Executive head of the Government, but he can use them or not as he pleases. The amendment has no merit. We have not the information with reference to the condition of the strike that the President has. I do not know how near it is to settlement, but let us do nothing that will prevent its speedy settlement under proper circumstances, and with the good will of all.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, if this Congress does not act and act wisely and promptly, the old slogan that "Nero fiddles while Rome burns" will probably give place in history to a new one which might well be written, "The Communist juggernaut drives on while Congress plays games." We have been playing football and kicking this issue around too long.

All the amendment now before you seeks to do is substitute a new game for the old game. Instead of football you are now going to play post office. According to what I heard last Friday, all this amendment would do would be to send the President a letter. We were told last Friday that all that would be accomplished by this amendment would be to send the President a letter and ask him to use the Taft-Hartley law.

There is not a man or woman in this Congress who does not know that we must build up our defenses here and abroad if we would stop the Communist threat. No one denies it. But when the President stepped in and seized the steel mills to give us the wherewithal to continue to build our defenses, many of you mocked and jeered him. The Communists stood back and laughed at us. When the Supreme Court said that it is up to the Congress to give him a law by which to act, you cheered the Supreme Court. Yet you have not done anything about it, and this amendment will not do anything about it.

When the President came before us he said that it is up to us, the Congress, to give him a law by which he can act. He called your attention to the defects in the Taft-Hartley Act, which will not give you steel, the steel which we need to continue to build up the defenses of this

country and of free civilization throughout the world. He concluded by saying:

The choice is squarely up to the Congress. I hope the Congress will meet it by enacting fair and effective legislation.

The Congress is not enacting fair and effective legislation. It is not enacting any legislation if it adopts this amendment to the Defense Production Act by which you will send the President a letter telling him to use the law which you and I know is not going to produce steel and is not going to get the men back to work.

It is all right for you to say, as has been said and as you will say again, that no minority is going to stand up against the law. No minority is going to stand up against the law in this country, and unions and laboring men and working men in this country will not violate the law. But when you gave the President the authority to seize our boys and send them wherever they are needed to defend our liberties, these workmen who were producing the material to supply them with the arms for defense turned to with a will to do the job. Now, you want to tell the President to seize these men and tell them to produce so that the steel mills and the steel owners can make more money at the expense of the American taxpayer.

If you think you can force them to produce more profits for the steel barons at their expense and at the expense of the free world, you are mistaken. They will do the right thing if you will enact a fair law and an effective law. They have never refused to stand up and work side by side with all those who have the best interests of this free land at heart, and they will do it again, but they will not do it because of any injunction by which you say, "You work," and at the same time you say to the steel mills, "You take the profits." That is not the American way, that is not the democratic way. The workers of America will produce for defense; yes, they will produce for profit—but they will not produce for the profit of the few at the expense of the many.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it was very interesting to listen to the gentleman from New York draw a sharp line between management and labor. I am not so sure but that perhaps that is the purpose of the opposition to this amendment. Surely we are not going to get the production necessary for the defense effort, if we follow the tactics of the so-called Americans for Democratic Action, which by pitting management against labor and class against class, would create the same situation in America which existed until recently in Great Britain. This issue which we have before us in respect to this amendment is one of the most fundamental issues which has ever been presented to this House. We passed a law in respect to the settlement of these disputes, and the purpose of that law was to continue production not only in a period of emergency such as we are experiencing now, but even in peacetime so that they would not be such shocks to our economy as to necessitate drastic action on the part of the Con-

gress. The President of the United States took an oath to faithfully execute the laws passed by this Congress. He has no alternative under his oath of office than to execute the laws passed by the direct representatives of the people. All this amendment does is to reiterate in perhaps too mild terms the desire on the part of the Congress that the President under his oath of office execute the laws that we pass. That is all that it does.

Mr. Chairman, this action is short of impeachment because there is no time for impeachment. This is a serious situation. So we should take the responsibility which is ours, and tell the people that we have requested the President—at least requested the President—to, in keeping with his oath of office, execute the laws which the representatives have passed.

Mr. Arnall and Mr. Putnam should realize that the negotiations which are going on now in respect to the settlement of the steel-wage price dispute is a tripartite conference. Last month they said, "We will not give anyone any consideration in respect to price until they have settled the labor dispute." But, a short time before that they had said to steel, "Yes, you take the package and we will give you \$4.50 a ton." Steel came back and said, "We think we need \$5.50 a ton." So do we realize, Mr. Chairman, that at one time, a month or 6 weeks ago, and this situation can be brought up-to-date, if it were not for the stubbornness of the administrators of this act, they were only \$1 a ton apart, and if they probably struck the difference and called it \$5, then the steel strike would have been settled a month ago? The steel strike is being continued now because of the stubbornness of the administrators of this act who will not be realistic and see the facts of life in respect to it.

This amendment is the least we can do to further express the intent of the Congress in respect to this matter.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Smith amendment to put the Taft-Hartley Act in this bill. The controversy in the steel case was pending during the time the Committee on Banking and Currency were holding its hearings on this bill. Never did the sponsor of this amendment propose consideration of this amendment by the committee. It is rash and unconsidered action that is now proposed to be taken by the House of Representatives. I am sure the employees in the steel industry want no unnecessary prolongation of this strike. Their livelihood is involved.

Their sons, too, are in Korea. Their loyalty is more inflexible to the United States even than is that of capital which can find a congenial climate in which to operate under varied regimes and under almost any flag. Why then is there any logic in using this emergency control legislation as a vehicle by which the weight of congressional influence is thrown on capital's side of this dispute? If we can contribute constructively to

a just solution of the wage and other problems involved in the steel strike, let us do so and with all possible speed. But in the name of fairness and for the good of our country let us refrain from an ill-considered and unfair thrust at the cause of American labor. Let us defeat the amendment by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER to the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Insert "Provided, however, That the President shall first obtain from the leading employers in the steel industry assurances that any wage settlement reached during the period of any injunction obtained under the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, shall be retroactive to January 1, 1952, or to any other expiration date of the prior collective bargaining contracts."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill; and, at least by inference would amend the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WALTER. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] offers an amendment to the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

The Chair has had an opportunity to read the language of the amendment. It is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment is not germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], or to the pending bill.

The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are simply going through another one of the dramatic fights of the last 20 years. We have heard the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan. One thing about him, he is always consistent and always has been consistent in opposition to legislation that has represented progress, and legislation that has represented the best interests of the working man and the working woman. We now find him taking the floor today and in an emotional outburst talking about the President of the United States not acting or living up to his oath of office. As a matter of fact, the President of the United States, President Truman, obtained far more in the industrial dispute in the field of steel than the Taft-Hartley Act. Further, President Truman was able to obtain close to 100 days of continuance of work. In addition to that, there has been about 3 months more of continued production on the part of the steelworkers without re-

sort to the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

If the President had lived up to the Taft-Hartley Act, the 80-day waiting period, if the injunction had been issued, would have expired long ago and we would still be without steel. There is absolutely no law on the statute books to take over after the expiration of the 80 days provided for in the Taft-Hartley Act which will permit anything to be done or the mills to be taken over, or any other action taken.

The President of the United States has accomplished more by the action he took than he could have by invoking the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Yet they now come in and expect further restraint of the men who have voluntarily continued their work for close to 6 months without resorting to the Taft-Hartley Act, men who have effectively produced steel at the request of the President of the United States during this period.

The Taft-Hartley Act provides a breathing spell. If an injunction is issued the breathing spell is for 80 days. The President has done more than the Taft-Hartley Act could have done, yet we hear Members make arguments and give expression to emotional statements such as have been made by my friend from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] only a few minutes ago.

As a matter of fact, Phil Murray—I say this objectively—Phil Murray has shown himself to be a real statesman in this industrial dispute. It has been a year ago last December since the steelworkers received an increase, yet since that time there have been increases for the workers of General Electric; there have been increases for the workers of Chrysler, increased within the wage formula, yet steel wages have not increased since December 1950.

Had they adopted the increase recommended by the Wage Stabilization Board it would not have been 26 cents, but 12½ cents as of January 1 of this year, 2½ cents additional, or a total of 15 cents as of July 1 of this year, and 2½ cents more on December 1 of this year, or a total 17½ cents as of the end of this year.

As to the "fringe benefits," they are not wage increases although they do represent an obligation on the part of business; yet, if the steelworkers received everything in the way of wage increases and fringe obligations or benefits recommended by the Wage Stabilization Board and its panel, they would still be behind the wages and fringe benefits received by the employees of General Electric.

So, therefore, if there is to be criticism, there should be criticism elsewhere. I am not now entering into the field of criticizing and I do not think that criticism at this time is going to be conducive to a solution of the trying situation, but if progress is to be made it must be made by men sitting down around a table with understanding minds in an approach to the solution of the issues or points in difference and dispute. Criticism is not going to be conducive to an understanding mind.

However, if you look over the whole period of time leading up to this crisis, the ones who should be complimented are the leaders of labor under the leadership of Phil Murray, because they have been very tolerant and understanding under the conditions.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio to the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Strike out the word "requests" and insert in lieu thereof the word "directs."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. The language contained in the amendment is far beyond the power of the Congress to insert.

This Government is divided into three separate and coordinate branches, each independent and supreme in its own sphere—the executive, the legislative and the judicial.

We have no authority to direct the President to do anything within the scope of his authority. He has the right of free choice to take what measures he pleases in order to effectuate the objectives he desires to accomplish. This would put the House in a ridiculous position and I hope that there is some power in the Chairman to protect us from attempting to assume authority which we have no right to assume in invading the province of the Executive.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the Constitution of the United States—a document which is too often forgotten and overlooked in this House—in section 3 of article II, in stating the President's duties and responsibilities, contains this language:

He shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

The President in his message to the Congress asked for instructions as to what to do in the steel controversy. It is constitutional, it is entirely in line with our right and authority, in this particular instance at least, to give the President the instructions or directions that he has specifically requested.

In my opinion this amendment is entirely in order.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, this is new legislation. It is legislation, it seems to me, notwithstanding what the gentleman from Ohio says, that any court in the land that had jurisdiction would declare unconstitutional.

The President's powers are broad. The President could adjourn the House and Senate if they disagreed as to adjournment, he can convene the Congress when an emergency demands. I may say, too, that he is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and is vitally concerned with production. He is charged with increasing production and seeing that the steel plants of the country remain in operation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman from Kentucky has raised a new point of order, I

would like to be heard on the new point he has made.

The Smith amendment has been ruled in order and all my amendment to the Smith amendment does is to change one word, the word "requests" to the word "directs." If it is in order to request the President to do something by this amendment, it is certainly in order to direct him to do so inasmuch as the Constitution provides that he shall execute the laws.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Kentucky pursued the right course in making the point of order he did, although, personally, I would rather see the matter go to a vote so that the country would know how drunk with power the coalition is.

Coming back to the point of order, and referring specifically to the organic law, that organic law is not compulsory or mandatory. There is nothing mandatory on the President. This amendment has got to be germane.

The Smith amendment was ruled to be germane because of the organic law, the references in the National Production Act to the Taft-Hartley Act. As I stated, going back to the organic law, there is nothing mandatory there.

The gentleman from Ohio says his amendment involves the changing of only one word. You could change the word "may" to "shall" and that would change the whole meaning of a bill or amendment and would be subject to a point of order. So the mere changing of a word is not controlling in itself. It is what the effect is. The word "direct" brings about a completely different effect than the wording of the Smith amendment.

The Smith amendment was ruled to be germane because there is a reference in the NPA organic act to certain other acts which can become traceable to the Taft-Hartley law. Now we have to go back to the Taft-Hartley Act through the National Production Act that we are extending in order to have the Smith amendment held germane. Now you have to go back there again in connection with this amendment to ascertain whether it is germane. The original Taft-Hartley Act does not use the word "mandatory." It is discretionary, and it provides for machinery that the President can resort to, if he desires. It is not mandatory, and there is nothing in the National Production Act which changes that. So, on the question of germaneness, regardless of the constitutional aspect, if there is something in the same that the Chair can pass upon—without regard to that, it seems to me that the amendment is not germane for the reasons I have stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the point of order if he desires to be heard.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I was going to make the point that under the existing 1947 Labor-Management Act the word "may" is used, so it is discretionary alone. Making it mandatory does change and amplify existing legislation, which is the point of order that I might have made.

I was going to ask a parliamentary inquiry of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Would it not be possible, because this raises a basic issue, to have this point of order withdrawn and have a vote which I think the House is entitled to on this particular question, although I might disagree with it?

Mr. SPENCE. I shall not withdraw the point of order. I believe the language in the Constitution says that the President shall take care that the laws are faithfully executed. Let him take care.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] offers an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] makes the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the so-called Smith amendment.

The Chair has had an opportunity to read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. Permit the Chair to advise the committee that the Chair is not called upon to rule on the question of constitutionality of a matter submitted. The Chair is only required to rule on the question of germaneness.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is germane; that the amendment merely proposes to change one word in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. The question of whether or not the Congress shall direct or request is a matter not before the Chair to determine but for the membership of the committee.

Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, a little over 4 years ago the Congress of the United States passed a law called the Taft-Hartley Act to meet conditions such as those which exist in the present steel controversy. For some unknown reason, or at least unknown until yesterday or the day before, the President has seen fit to either fail or refuse to use the law given to him by the Congress to meet the emergency situation in the steel case. The President then seized the steel plants of the Nation under what he claimed to be an inherent constitutional right but which action the Supreme Court of the United States ruled was unconstitutional and was therefore null and void.

Then the President of the United States delivered a message to Congress in a hastily called joint session in which he insisted that the Congress give him instructions and directions as to what to do in the steel controversy.

He, also, asked for authority from the Congress to seize private property. This Congress on five different occasions by five different actions has refused to do so.

We have been called upon to answer the President's demand that we give him instructions and directions. In the Congress of the United States rests the inherent power that governs this country. This is a government of the people and we, as representatives of the people, are here assembled in the Congress of the United States, with an amendment before us to request the President to do that which section 3, article II, of the Constitution requires him to do—to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

What are we, in Congress, going to do? Just continue to be mice rather than men, and say to the President, "Now, if you do not want to faithfully execute the law we will just request you to do so. We will request you to enforce the law. We will request you to abide by the provisions of the Constitution. You have asked for our instructions and directions, but we are not going to give them to you. We will neither direct nor instruct the President, but will just request him to do this, the very thing we have already said should be done once before by the passing of the Taft-Hartley Act. So we are going to request him to faithfully administer the laws of this country.

Why should we not be strong enough to say to the President, "You have asked for our instructions and our directions. Here they are. Abide by the law. Use the law we have given you." He will have received an explicit, direct instruction from the Congress when we do that, rather than a simple request.

However, if we adopt this Smith amendment as offered, and make only a simple request, the President can easily say, "Congress did not tell me to do it. They did not instruct me and direct me to do it, as I asked them to do. Instead, they just requested me to use the Taft-Hartley law. Of course, I will not do anything I am requested to do if I do not want to do it."

After this steel situation gets a little worse I suppose we will have another resolution offered saying, "Mr. President, will you please, pretty please, follow the Constitution and faithfully execute the laws of the Nation which we have given you?"

I say to you, if you believe the President should use the Taft-Hartley Act, and abide by the law as enacted by Congress, then you should say so plainly and unequivocally, without any argument or discussion, by adopting this amendment I have offered.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment to the amendment will be adopted. In fact, I hope the gentleman from Virginia, the author of the original amendment, will accept my amendment to his amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is a rather peculiar argument the gentleman from Ohio made. He implores the Congress to be strong enough to direct the President of the United States as to what he shall do. This implies that you shall be strong enough to disregard the provisions of the Constitution, to disregard the duties and

the obligations of the different branches of this Government, and to invade the province of the executive branch of the Government.

Every Member here took the oath that he would support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and that he would bear true faith and allegiance to the same. That is an essential oath. To attempt to invade the authority of the executive branch is certainly a violation of the spirit of that oath.

I do not believe there is a lawyer in this House who would say this direction to the President is constitutional.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPENCE. Just for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Agreeing with the gentleman from a legal standpoint, should we not be courteous enough, after the President asked us, to tell him?

Mr. SPENCE. No; I think that is a very specious argument. Whether the President requested it or not, the Congress has no constitutional authority to direct him as to what he shall do to endeavor to settle the strike.

This is absolutely disregarding the province of the Chief Executive. He did not get his powers from the Congress. He got them from the founding fathers. It is the greatest Constitution any government in the world has ever operated under. For 163 years it has been the charter of our liberties. Yet we hear gentlemen say, "Disregard the Constitution. Be strong enough to ignore its provisions and send a message to the President of the United States." We have no authority to send such a message to the President. I do not care how you feel with regard to the President of the United States. I challenge any lawyer in this House to say that he thinks we have the right to direct the President under the circumstances that exist to take any particular action in this controversy. I do not hear any response, and you cannot make any response. If the constitutionality of this amendment was considered by the courts, I am sure it would be held unconstitutional. I hope the Congress of the United States will not put itself in the position of ruthlessly invading the executive department, for if we do so what argument will we have against other departments usurping the power of the legislative?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the so-called Smith amendment. At the very least, I want the people of the district I am privileged to represent to know exactly where I stand, and why, on the issues presented by this proposed amendment.

Let us make that issue crystal clear. It is really very simple, and yet very, very fundamental. Let us not attempt to becloud it with all this discussion of collateral matters extraneous to the actual issue before us.

The pending amendment has nothing to do with the merit, or lack of merit, of the Taft-Hartley Act. The inescapable

fact is that the Taft-Hartley Act is the law of the land. It was placed on the statute books and made the law of the land after the most painstaking consideration. We formally voted twice to make it the law, overriding the President's veto by more than the two-thirds majority necessary.

More than that, the Congress has even formally voted against a repeal of the law, notwithstanding the great pressure exerted for its repeal. We again considered various aspects of the law when we adopted certain perfecting amendments we found necessary from our experience with it in its practical applications. Those amendments had my support.

What's right or wrong about the Taft-Hartley Act is not the issue here. Nor is the issue whether the unions or the steel companies are right or wrong in the position they take. When we cast out vote on this amendment we will not be voting for or against the Taft-Hartley Act, nor will we be voting for or against either the unions or the steel companies.

The question, and the only question, presented by the Smith amendment is whether we, as Representatives of the people, purporting to represent all the people, believe that the law of the land should be invoked to meet a grave emergency situation confronting the entire country. It is just as simple as that. On a fundamental issue of this character I cannot see how any Member of Congress, however much he may dislike the Taft-Hartley Act, and however much he may be beholden to organized labor for its political support, can possibly vote against the pending amendment.

It has been argued that no useful purpose would be served by invoking the emergency provisions of the act, as the the union leaders will probably defy the injunction if one is granted. The President made that argument in his recent message to Congress. I was astounded. It amounted to a suggestion to the steelworkers to refuse to obey any injunction that may be issued by a court of the United States.

I am truly amazed that any Member of Congress, much less the President of the United States, should even suggest that a law should not be invoked because it will probably not be obeyed. That is as sound and as logical as saying that a policeman has no duty to arrest a law violator if the policeman has reason to believe that the man might resist arrest. To contend that the law should not be invoked, as it may not prove to be an effective remedy, is as nonsensical as saying that a doctor should not prescribe a well-known treatment for a well-known disease unless he is absolutely sure it will effectuate a 100-percent perfect cure.

Mr. Chairman, Philip Murray has said that the President promised him he would not invoke the Taft-Hartley Act. What Philip Murray promised the President, I do not know. I do know, however, that our whole country's security is at stake by virtue of the stoppage of vital steel production. I do know we are faced with an emergency situation. I also

know that the President sent a message to Congress asking us for our suggestions.

By voting for this amendment we will be saying in reply: "Mr. President, invoke the law of the land written by the people's representatives in Congress for just such an emergency situation and successfully used by you on several previous occasions." I deeply regret that it has become necessary for the Congress to ask the President of the United States to discharge his duty under the Constitution to execute faithfully the law of the land.

The Taft-Hartley Act emergency provisions having been invoked, we are then in a position to determine what, if any, additional emergency legislation may be desirable or necessary under the circumstances of the Steel case to insure the safety, security, and welfare of the country as a whole.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Brown amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 20 minutes.

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

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I want first to address myself to a statement made by the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], to the effect that in this controversy, the steel controversy, the President had already done more than could have been done under Taft-Hartley. He seeks to reduce the matter to just a simple question of days, like the 80-day provision in the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. It just is not that simple, and that is not a fair explanation or a fair comparison.

What I think a lot of people forget is that, under the provisions of the act, when the President finds that a national emergency strike occurs or threatens he appoints a board to inquire into the particular controversy. This board reports in a short time, something less than 5 days, on the facts. Then, if the President sees fit, he can request the Attorney General to apply for an injunction. If that injunction is granted, what happens then? It is not just that the parties sit down and wait for the 80 days to run, but the law provides for the Mediation Service to step in and to promote the processes of real, genuine collective bargaining; and that is what everybody wants, but apparently it is what everybody is afraid of for some reason or other, especially those who oppose this amendment and who speak so viciously of the Taft-Hartley Act.

At the end of the 80 days, if agreement has not been reached, the last offer of the employer is made public knowledge; then within 15 days a vote is taken at the employee level on whether or not to accept the last offer of the employer.

As distinguished from that action, which should have been taken under existing law, what have we seen?

We have seen seizure invoked, which is to me completely antagonistic to collective bargaining. In the case before

the Supreme Court do not forget that representatives of the railroad brotherhood were present, arguing against seizure.

There are many Members here, some of whom I am now looking in the eye, who drafted the Taft-Hartley Act. Do not forget that it was written here in the House of Representatives; it was written here in the Hartley Act, and one of the things that caused us the most concern was the question of how to deal with these national emergency strikes—and whether you believe in it or not, seizure was not incorporated, but this process set out in the law was the one adopted, and it is the law of the land.

I certainly have much sympathy with those who hold that it is a rather ridiculous thing for the Congress of the United States to find it necessary to ask the Chief Executive to enforce the law of the land. I trust that we are not here setting a precedent by which each time something like this arises we will have to ask the President to do the very thing that the Constitution obligates him to do.

Let me make a prediction: The Steel strike is going to be settled within a week.

Maybe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] thinks that is funny. I do not think it is funny. He should agree with me that the controversy ought to be settled within a week; and if they will get the Government taking less of a part in it perhaps they can sit down and get it worked out.

I also say that it is somewhat futile, possibly, to request the President or even direct him to enforce the law of the land, because he said in his press conference a few days ago that he was not bound to do what the Congress wanted him to do. He said that the Taft-Hartley Act was generally written for peacetime and hence it would not apply now. That is a complete reversal of thinking, but at least it lets us know that he has come to realize the present situation for what it is, that we are actually at war.

But to my mind a much more serious thing than that transpired when Mr. Murray—and I have the highest regard for him; nobody ever heard me castigate him; certainly I shall not—went out to my State of Indiana and said in so many words that he had a deal with Mr. Truman before Christmas, last December, that if the union would postpone its strike on January 1, the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, the injunction, would not be used against them. So I say advisedly, that when Mr. Truman came up here and asked us for advice he already had so compromised himself by bargaining away his duty and his responsibility that probably he could not enforce the law if we asked him to.

Finally, it should be understood that we are not attempting here to invade the prerogatives of the Chief Executive. Nor are we passing on the possible merits or demerits of the Taft-Hartley Act.

What we are doing is expressing a conviction that the President should follow the course he is supposed to follow which is simply to administer to the

best of his ability and in good faith the laws passed by the Congress.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the House will adjourn at 5 o'clock this afternoon to pay respect to the memory of a very distinguished former Member of the House, the late James Wadsworth. As we cannot remain in session any longer than that time, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 12:30.

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

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 12:40.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto conclude not later than 12:40.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAWFORD) there were—ayes 173, noes 39.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Under this limitation is the Chairman of the committee, who has already spoken once on this amendment, entitled to be heard again under the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the committee could rise in opposition to a pro forma amendment and be recognized again.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Under the limitation?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; under the limitation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Was not the time limited on both of the amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. And all amendments thereto.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Brown amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. On the Smith amendment and all amendments thereto, and a pro forma amendment is an amendment thereto.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MULTER. I have an amendment at the desk now to the Smith amendment which, of course, would not be in order until we disposed of the Brown amendment. Would it be in order to have my amendment read for the information of the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; if the gentleman asks unanimous consent.

Mr. MULTER. I ask such unanimous consent.

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time that has been allotted to me be given to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair earlier during the discussion on this bill under the 5-minute rule, in the light of objection that was made, said that the Chair would not entertain any such request in the future for allocation of time when time is fixed.

Mr. FULTON. May I make a further unanimous-consent request that my time be called immediately following the time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]?

The CHAIRMAN. That is within the control of the Chair. The Chair will try to accommodate the gentleman.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that his amendment be read for the information of the Committee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER to the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: After the last word in the Smith amendment insert "Except that in view of the fact that the workers in the steel industry have voluntarily withheld any work stoppage for a period in excess of the maximum time during which an injunction could have been in force, the President is requested to proceed as though such injunction had been granted without, however, applying for such an injunction."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has merely been read for the information of the Committee and has not been presented by the gentleman from New York for consideration.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In keeping with the procedure to reserve a point of order, would that not lie at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order can be raised when the gentleman from New York offers his amendment formally. It is merely offered for information on this occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, my sense of propriety is not offended by the Brown amendment, but I would like to make the observation that there is nothing in it that is any more compulsory than is to be found in existing law. The President in refusing to use Taft-Hartley law is already in defiance of established policy of Congress. If observance and obedience to law was a matter that was optional on the part of the President, then the argument of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] would be pertinent. The gentleman from Kentucky objects to the amendment because it impinges upon the constitutional rights of the President. I fail to get the force of that statement; in fact, I do not think it is pertinent to the question because the President is as much bound by the law as you or I, and he is at the present time, in my judgment, in defiance of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment. I do this with some reluctance because I think it most unfortunate that the Congress should find itself in the position of having to make any requests upon the President. The President has his constitutional duties to perform and we have ours. It is ordinarily beyond the province of the Congress to make requests of the President as to how he shall handle work stoppages imperiling the national interest, or as to how he shall handle any situation within his constitutional province. However, in the present instance, the President came before a joint session of Congress and said it was a question with him of using what he called the Taft-Hartley approach, which he did not wish to use, and the seizure approach, which he did wish to use. The Supreme Court had told the President that he could not use the seizure approach without new authorizing legislation from the Congress. Both branches of the Congress had told the President quite plainly that they are not in favor of his seizing the steel industry. There therefore remain only the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. It is unfortunate that the President seems to have taken pleasure in thwarting the will of Congress. More than that, he said quite significantly that the strikers might not obey a Taft-Hartley injunction. The implication, as I read it, was that if the strikers were in contempt of court, the President's sympathies would be with them. Indeed, his speech was almost an incitement to contempt. It is, of course, entirely true that we cannot force the President to act under the Taft-Hartley law; we cannot force him to take any particular step with respect to this work stoppage. If this amendment should be defeated, which I can scarcely imagine, the President would then be in a position to say that Congress refused to give him seizure legislation and, at least by implication, disapproved the use of the Taft-Hartley law. We certainly cannot allow a recalcitrant President to impute his recalcitrance to the Congress and get away with it. I therefore think it is our plain duty to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, ever since last December when the threat of a Nation-wide steel strike became imminent there have been loud cries that the President should use the Taft-Hartley Act to meet this crisis. There has been so much shouting about this solution to the steel crisis that we have lost sight of the basic facts involved.

We should remember that the Taft-Hartley Act merely provides an 80-day delay of a strike. Furthermore, the board of inquiry which is established under the act has no power to recommend a fair settlement. The act merely provides a delay of a settlement and it

does not provide the most important element of all—machinery for the recommendation of a fair settlement of the issues in dispute.

At the request of the President last December 650,000 steelworkers postponed a strike scheduled for December 31. They stayed on the job for 99 days while the Wage Stabilization Board listened to the issues in dispute and made its recommendations for a just settlement. Up until the evening of April 8 there was every hope that the parties would reach a settlement, but when the President was advised that an impasse in bargaining had been reached he had no alternative but to resort to Government operation of the steel mills in order to prevent a serious breakdown in vital defense production.

If the President had invoked the Taft-Hartley Act on the evening of April 8 there would have been an inevitable delay of a week to 10 days within which the board of inquiry made its initial report to the President. Then under a Taft-Hartley injunction the workers would have been forced to stay on the job for 80 days, although they had voluntarily stayed at work some 99 days already, while the Wage Stabilization Board conducted detailed hearings on the issues in dispute. In the face of these facts, the President acted with complete justification to maintain essential steel production and at the same time, in the American tradition of fair play, to enable the Government to accord the steelworkers just treatment during the period in which in the national interest they were forced to abandon their resort to a test of economic strength in their dispute with the steel companies.

The Supreme Court has ruled that the President under the circumstances existing on April 8 exceeded his constitutional authority. Accordingly, the President has relinquished control of the steel mills and we are faced with the very situation which the President sought to avoid—a crippling strike in the steel industry, the industry which is the very backbone of our defense mobilization program.

The President has turned to the Congress for help in this situation. It avails us little to turn a deaf ear to his presentation of the facts in this case. To tell the President to resort to Taft-Hartley now is to tell him to waste a week or 10 days in setting up a needless board of inquiry and to force 650,000 steelworkers who have cooperated fully with the Government's stabilization rules to return to their jobs at 1950 wages while the steel companies continue to make profits on a 1952 price basis. The steel companies, who have continually refused to bargain in good faith unless guaranteed a price increase, will be benefiting from their refusal to abide by our stabilization rules.

This is not equal justice under the law. This is not the American way of doing things. The Congress cannot escape its responsibility to enact seizure legislation which will restore essential steel production and at the same time enable

the Government to treat both management and workers fairly during the period when this vital industry must proceed under Government operation if we are to meet our defense production goals.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] can be described, and will be described as a "slave-labor" amendment. It seeks, as does the Taft-Hartley law, to swing the whole power of government and law enforcement machinery into the ranks of steel industry management and to force the workers in the steel industry to go back to work at the risk of heavy fines and other measures which a court might take to punish for contempt of its injunctive decrees. In itself, the procedure provided for in the Taft-Hartley Act, and which is sought to be effectuated by this amendment is unfair and un-American. But under the present circumstances, when the steel workers have voluntarily refrained from walking off the job, as they were entitled to do the moment their contract expired, and have stayed at work for 150 days, the tyranny of the Taft-Hartley procedure is even more offensive to one's sense of justice.

This amendment is nothing but a petty political attempt to force the President, by leaving him no alternative at a time when the national security is gravely threatened, to invoke a law that can accomplish, by force, nothing more than has already been accomplished by the voluntary agreement of the union. Supporters of such an amendment seem to forget that while these long-winded negotiations have been in progress, the steelworker has had to take home a wage that has lagged continuously behind the cost of living, a deficiency that is felt on his dinner table and seen in the clothes his wife and children wear. Nevertheless, this amendment is a direct slap in the face to that same steelworker, forcing him to go back to work for another 80 days without any better hope of the settlement of his wage demands.

A review of the Smith amendment, however, brings me to compliment my colleague from Ohio in one respect at least. The gentleman from Ohio has stood up on his hind legs and taken definite action in this important matter. He has responded to the clear choice which President Truman presented to this Congress when he told us there should be adequate seizure legislation enacted or that the Taft-Hartley Law should be used. The gentleman from Ohio repudiates any possibility of seizure legislation and in straightforward terms directs the use of Taft-Hartley.

Not so with the amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Virginia. This amendment makes a game of volleyball out of the national security and with its approval the problem will be batted back to the President without a single solitary change in the realities of the situation. Everyone knows that the application of the pertinent provisions of the Taft-

Hartley law is discretionary with the President. Under that law, section 206, the President may appoint a board of inquiry, and he may—section 208 (a)—direct the Attorney General to seek an injunction. The Smith Amendment changes none of that; it brings the country no nearer a solution of this grave problem.

The amendment is neither fish nor fowl. It does not take a positive stand like the suggestion offered by the gentleman from Ohio. It makes no provision for a solution after the 80-day Taft-Hartley injunction has expired. It is patty-cake, lollipop legislation that adds up to absolutely nothing—zero. Just a big fat goose egg, as far as getting steel into the tank and munition plants of the Nation is concerned.

It seeks only to put this Congress on record as favoring the use of a club on American labor. It seeks to replace collective bargaining with the injunction decree and the contempt citation. I ask that these unjust amendments be repudiated in the name of common decency.

And furthermore, Mr. Chairman, it is my fervent hope that when the House proceeds today and tomorrow to take final action on these 1952 amendments to the Defense Production Act, it will move to undo the crippling damage that has been done to the vital machinery on which we rely to keep our national economy on an even keel in this period of crisis.

It is my hope that we will see a great repentance for the sins that were committed against the best interests of the consuming public of this country. As usual, an unholy coalition has been running things here and, whatever may have been the motives of those who joined, it is certain that, as Economic Stabilizer Roger Putnam so aptly described it, a "to-h—with-the-consumer spirit" prevailed in this House. These special-interest, decontrol amendments seem diabolically designed to create more inflation rather than to hold the line and keep economic forces in balance at this time when we just cannot afford to let anyone rock the boat.

How can we shut our eyes to the meaning of this action for the millions of Americans who must fight the battle of inflation in the grocery store, the butcher shop, and the clothing store. I have observed with some wonder the almost uncanny genius of the Republican Party for picking out the precise issue where the average American consumer and the small-business man, who is also a consumer, have the most at stake and I have watched the members of that same party blast away at those interests with reckless, ripper amendments to this anti-inflation law. This is, perhaps, the political marvel of our generation and during the past week we saw the same routine acted out again with strict adherence to the usual script.

It is not my purpose, however, to impress upon my Republican colleagues the elementary fact that the housewife looks for someone to blame when the weekly grocery bill drains her pocketbook. I am here pleading to keep that grocery bill within reasonable limits. I am here

asking this House to back away from the brink of economic chaos to which it has brought the Nation by this sabotaging of our price-control machinery.

Specifically, let us beat down the Talle amendment which means the end of price control as the consumer knows it. The Consumer Price Index now stands within a point of the highest mark it has reached in modern history. The Talle amendment does nothing more nor less than to pull the safety valve off the boiler. To complete the metaphor, the escaping steam symbolizes the vanishing into thin air of the standard of living which the American people once enjoyed.

Let us knock out the amendment to emasculate the Wage Stabilization Board which, outside of the much publicized steel dispute, has had an excellent record of settling labor disputes within the framework of stabilization policy.

This bill as it now stands ravaged by the action of the House in the Committee of the Whole is bad enough, but let us at least resist any further attempts at strangulation of our efforts to keep living costs down and our economy producing the materials we must have to preserve the national security.

I earnestly request the Banking and Currency Committee to insist on roll-call votes on all crippling amendments so that the American people will know where each of their Representatives stand on this most crucial issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

(Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. ARMSTRONG.)

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Smith amendment and all amendments thereto. I do not have time to apologize or express my deep regret that I must oppose so many leaders of my own party and of the majority party as well, but I oppose this amendment for three reasons:

First, the amendment violates the principle of the separation of powers in the Federal Government as set forth in the Constitution. The executive power is vested in the President. Now he has asked us what he should do to settle the steel strike. The only responsibility the Congress of the United States has is to pass legislation for him to administer and to execute.

Secondly, I oppose this amendment because it would set a dangerous precedent. In effect, we ask the President to perform his duties under the Constitution. If we do that, then pretty soon all the Federal agencies will be sitting back and saying, "Well, we don't have to execute this law unless Congress gets angry enough to ask us to."

Thirdly, I oppose this legislation because of its utter futility. You cannot make Harry S. Truman a good President by congressional resolution. He is supposed faithfully to execute the Office of the Presidency, as the Constitution says, to the best of his ability. An able and a courageous President, one who observes his duty under the Constitution, would

not have run up here to the Hill to ask Congress what he should do. He would have done his duty under existing law, or he would have asked for new legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to let this matter go into the hands of the President to do what he thinks is wisest and best. If he does not do what is wisest and best, then, of course, we will have to go along with the same ineffectual and bungling leadership to which the country has become accustomed. But I repeat that it would set a dangerous precedent for Congress to tell the executive agencies and the executive leaders from the President down what they should do in regard to laws already on the books. We in Congress should let the Constitution operate as established.

May I close with this remark on the part of a new Member of this body: It seems to me we should face up to our responsibility, the responsibility of Congress to pass legislation that will prevent these crippling strikes. If new legislation is needed, to bring peace and cooperation between management and labor and at the same time to protect the rights of the public, then let us get busy and pass such legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that anything we do here by way of the Smith amendment or the Brown amendment will necessarily compel the President to seek a Taft-Hartley injunction. I think the most helpful thing that could happen now would be for all Government auspices to be withdrawn. Let them try to settle the steel strike by free collective bargaining. If that does not happen, the President may, of course, have to use the Taft-Hartley injunction, although he has given reasons why he believes some other approach would be more fair at the present time. I hope if he does use it the workers will respect the injunction.

I want to say a word about another matter that was up for debate during the consideration of the Lucas amendment. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL] placed in the RECORD some statements from the files of the Un-American Activities Committee dealing with certain public and labor members of the Wage Stabilization Board. I think it is only fair that replies of three of those members, Mr. Brophy, Mr. Childs, and Mr. Sigal, be presented to you for your consideration. I have here the statements of these gentlemen, and I am going to present them to you at this time. They are as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN BROPHY BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR IN ANSWER TO CONGRESSMAN VAIL, MAY 21, 1952

My name is John Brophy. I am an alternate member of the Wage Stabilization Board. Prior to this position I was consultant of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions to the United Nations for 1 year.

I was one of those who helped to found CIO in 1935 and for 4 years I was its national director under the chairmanship of John L. Lewis. Following this for 10 years under

the presidency of Philip Murray I was national director of Industrial Union Councils, CIO's State and community central labor bodies.

It is not my purpose to cover the ground already covered in the testimony of the labor members of the WSB, Messrs. Walker and Childs. That field has been adequately covered by them as to the position of the AFL and the CIO on the subject of wage stabilization.

Rather it is my purpose to deal with a phase of the record made on May 9, when Congressman VAIL propounded a series of questions as to the qualifications of certain unnamed individuals to sit as members of the WSB. These questions are based upon testimony of one Benjamin Gitlow submitted before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Even though I am unnamed, it is evident, that I am one of those the Congressman tried to smear since there is sufficient information for identification purposes.

I became a member of the United Mine Workers of America in 1899. I was elected president of District 2, United Mine Workers of America, in 1916 and served in that capacity for 10 years. In 1927 I ran against John L. Lewis for the national presidency of the United Mine Workers of America, and according to the published official count was defeated. Shortly thereafter I was expelled for protesting what I considered the officers' violation of the union constitution and sound trade union policy. This was an intraunion affair entirely, and no question of loyalty to the country was involved in any way.

The great body of my support in that election in the miners union came from democratic trade-unionists. If Communists at that time opposed Lewis and therefore supported me, they did so for their own reasons which were not mine. I deny flatly that I "consorted" with Communists.

If Lewis ever accused me of being a paid agent of the Soviet Government he was only indulging in florid campaign oratory. There isn't a word of truth in it and he knows it.

All the expenses I incurred in my campaign (several leaflets and one automobile trip outside my own district) amounted to less than \$250 and were paid out of my own money. I received no contributions from the Communist Party or from individual Communists. I might add that I was reinstated by Mr. Lewis in the UMW in 1933 and continued to be a member until after the UMW withdrew from the CIO and expelled all members who remained with the CIO.

As to what transpired in the inner circles of the Communist Party as referred to in the testimony, I would have no knowledge. But since they claim to have been in on the ground floor of everything since the invention of the wheel it would not surprise me if they had laid claim to having a hand in even my humble affairs. My trade union policies before, during, and since my campaign against Lewis were determined only by me, regardless of the claims of Communists or ex-Communists.

I was a member of a trade union delegation to Europe and the Soviet Union in 1927. It was sponsored, not by the Communists as claimed in the testimony, but by various American trade unionists and liberals, and was led by James H. Maurer, president of the American Federation of Labor's Pennsylvania State body.

I presume the Portland conference mentioned was the Federation of the Pacific, composed of west coast A. F. of L. and independent unions. On invitation of this group in 1937, I was assigned by John L. Lewis, then chairman of the CIO, to address this conference on the aims and purposes of CIO.

I repeat the statement in my letter to the House on Un-American Activities Committee when these false charges were originally made:

"I deny completely and emphatically that I ever received one penny, directly or indirectly, from the treasury of the Communist Party in my campaign for the presidency of the United Mine Workers of America. I enter this denial whether that statement was made by Ben Gitlow or anyone else, now or at any other time. I am not a Communist. Neither am I a Soviet agent, as claimed, and never have been. I am and always have been opposed to the philosophy of communism. No one knows this better than the Communists themselves. If at any time they have expressed approval and apparently supported views and policies for which I stood, they have done so without approval or consultation with me."

Those who indulge in the dissemination of baseless allegations and intimations against fellow citizens, public officials, or a great labor federation, such as the CIO and its responsible representatives, do an injury to social justice and truth. They weaken the fabric of a decent American society and endanger America in the great struggle between totalitarianism and the free world. Trade unions can be a powerful force in aiding the common cause to which all freemen are committed. Their full cooperation should be welcomed rather than restricted.

Naturally I am concerned in maintaining my good name, but even more I am interested in promoting the general welfare of America and its people. This I conceive to be possible only if democracy is strengthened. Free trade unionism is an extension of democracy in the field of labor-management relations.

I have had a long, active life in the trade-union movement. My work during all of these years has been in the open. I have operated according to the American democratic pattern with complete loyalty to and faith in the Constitution and its great Bill of Rights.

I am proud to stand on this record, confident in the knowledge that I have never committed a disloyal act to my country, from the day that I first went down into the mines in Indiana County, Pa., at the age of 12 to the present.

This is my answer to the insinuations which have been introduced into the records of this committee.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH W. CHILDS BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR IN ANSWER TO CONGRESSMAN VAIL, MAY 21, 1952

Before concluding, I should like to say a few words with regard to certain charges made by Congressman VAIL during Mr. Feinsinger's testimony before the committee on May 9.

Perhaps Mr. VAIL's remarks are better described as insinuations than as charges.

What Congressman VAIL did was this: He read to Mr. Feinsinger what he asserted to be excerpts from testimony given at public hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee and newspaper reports. Mr. VAIL did not give the date of these Un-American Activities Committee hearings, nor did he give the names of the witnesses he was quoting. Mr. VAIL did not name the individuals thus back-handedly accused. Instead he asserted that they were members of the present Wage Stabilization Board and indicated that they were CIO members.

Never having appeared before a congressional committee prior to this day, I cannot claim to be familiar with the procedure followed at committee hearings. Perhaps that is why I am shocked and surprised by Mr. VAIL's method of making these charges.

He said that he was quoting from public hearings before the Un-American Activities Committee (Tr. 639). Why then did he omit to state when these hearings were held, or to supply any information which would enable those against whom he made his dirty insinuations to locate the transcript?

I assume that the witnesses before the Un-American Activities Committee whom Mr. VAIL quotes were identified when they testified. So far as I know, it is not the practice of congressional committees to permit witnesses to wear masks or to refuse to give their names. Why then did Mr. VAIL omit to identify these witnesses, and even go to the length of striking out their names where they appeared?

The witnesses before the Un-American Activities Committee presumably gave that committee the names of the people they were making charges against. But Mr. VAIL also deleted those names, and leveled his insinuations only against unidentified CIO board members.

Now, since Mr. VAIL is exempt from the libel laws when he speaks here, it is difficult to understand the reason for this grotesque and unfair procedure. I can only conclude that Mr. VAIL has a preference for unidentified informants over named witnesses, and that he prefers vague insinuations to direct charges.

Further, Mr. VAIL chose to make his insinuations when Mr. Feinsinger, who could not possibly answer him, was on the stand, rather than any of the individuals he accused. Evidently, Mr. VAIL prefers to make his insinuations behind peoples' backs, rather than to their faces.

Mr. VAIL appears to be interested in smearing, not in getting at facts. This is a technique of the Communists and the Nazis. It is not the technique of Americans.

Some of Mr. VAIL's insinuations are so vague that it is not possible to say against whom they were directed. However, one of them is identifiable as being directed against me. On pages 648-649 of the transcript of May 9, 1952 the following statement by Mr. VAIL appears:

"Let us deal with another individual, also a member of the labor group.

"A statement of the Civil Rights Congress opposing Red-baiting and attacks on Communists was signed by this individual, identified as president of a local of the United Rubber Workers, from the Daily Worker of May 25, 1947. The Civil Rights Congress has been cited as an organization formed in April of 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations, International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. It was dedicated, not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party, and controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it. This is Report No. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated September 2, 1947.

"Attorney General Clark cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist, press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948."

Since I am the only member of the United Rubber Workers serving on the Wage Stabilization Board, it was quite evident to me when I read Mr. VAIL's statement that I was the individual to whom he referred.

I have secured a copy of the Daily Worker of May 25, 1947, and the Daily Worker does list Joe Childs, president of Local 9, United Rubber Workers, Akron, Ohio, as a signer of a petition opposing Red-baiting by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

I have searched my memory and I do not remember signing such a petition. I also cannot remember having any familiarity with or knowing anything about the Civil Rights Congress 5 years ago, in May 1947.

It is not and has never been my practice to associate or collaborate with Communist groups or organizations. To the contrary, I have always opposed and actively fought against Communist attempts to infiltrate the Rubber Workers Union and the CIO. If I signed this Civil Rights Congress petition, and I suppose that it is possible that I did, even though I do not remember it, I certainly did so without knowing that the organization had any tie-up with the Communists. The name "Civil Rights Congress" certainly sounds innocuous enough, and in 1947 I was opposed, as I am today, to the type of Red-baiting in which Mr. VAIL, for example, engages. I notice that, according to Mr. VAIL's statement, it was not until some time after May 1947 that Attorney General Clark cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive. It seems to me a little unreasonable for even Mr. VAIL to expect a local union officer to be more forehanded in these matters than the Attorney General.

I have never been a member of the Communist Party and never expect to be. I have never been sympathetic with communism and never expect to be.

I consider myself as good an American as anyone else, and a better American than anyone who uses a congressional committee and congressional immunity to smear other people through unproven insinuations.

At the conclusion of my testimony Mr. John Brophy, another CIO labor member, wishes to reply to thinly veiled references directed at him. CIO member Benjamin Sigal will also have a statement on this same subject. He was present on Friday, May 16, when CIO labor members were originally scheduled to appear. He is unable to be here today and requests an opportunity to be heard on Monday or Tuesday, May 26 or 27, or some other date in the immediate future.

STATEMENT OF BENJAMIN C. SIGAL, CIO MEMBER, WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, MAY 27, 1952

My name is Benjamin C. Sigal. I am a CIO member of the Wage Stabilization Board. I am here to respond to certain vague insinuations which were introduced into the record of this committee's hearings on May 9, 1952, as well as to answer any questions which the committee may have in regard to the Wage Stabilization Board and its policies.

According to the transcript of May 9, 1952, Mr. VAIL made the following statement:

"The New York Times of September 21, 1947, reported that this individual was attorney for the United Shoe Workers, cited as one of the unions in which the Communist leadership was strongly entrenched at that time. He appeared in behalf of the Washington Chapter, Americans for Democratic Action, to protest against passage of H. R. 7595, hearings on legislation to outlaw certain un-American and subversive activities. What would you say about him?"

I assume that this statement refers to me inasmuch as I am the only labor member of the Wage Stabilization Board who is an attorney. I also assume that the conclusion which Mr. VAIL sought to infer from this statement is that the conduct attributed to me was in some respect derogatory, although he made no statement to that effect. It is for this reason that I have characterized the statement as one of vague insinuation.

It is true that in September 1947 I was an attorney for the United Shoe Workers. This is an international which was then, and is now, affiliated with the CIO. I first began to represent that organization in June 1946 and terminated my relationship with them in the fall of 1947. I had no previous relationship with that union in any capacity whatever, and so cannot testify as to the

existence of Communist leadership in its ranks prior to 1946. However, I can assert, as my conviction, that at the time I was representing that organization its leadership was not communistic and that Communists were not strongly entrenched in the organization. It is possible that there were some Communists in the lower ranks of its leadership. I am confident, however, that the national officers of the organization were not influenced in their policies by any Communists or Communist sympathizers in their ranks.

Mr. VAIL's statement is presumably based on the pamphlet issued by the Un-American Activities Committee in 1944, in which it is stated that the United Shoe Workers is one of the unions in which Communist leadership was strongly entrenched. Since I had no connection with the organization at that time I cannot make any statement about Communist influence in 1944. I think it only fair to note, however, that even if that statement were true in 1944—and I am not prepared to admit the truth of that statement merely on the authority of that pamphlet—there is no reason to assume or assert that such was the case in 1947 when I was representing the union. To assume that I was a Communist sympathizer because I represented a union which may have harbored some Communists, is a conclusion utterly unjustified by logic or reason. I am not now, and have never been, a Communist or sympathetic with Communist ideology.

Mr. VAIL's statement then goes on to point out that I protested against the passage of H. R. 7595, which later became the McCarran Act. Our democratic processes have indeed sadly deteriorated if it can now be said that one is tainted with subversion merely because he testifies against a proposed law which deals with subversive activities. What I said about the McCarran Act is spread on the records of the committee which handled the law. I do not propose now to reiterate my statements concerning it. It should suffice to say that the arguments I used were substantially similar to the ones President Truman used in vetoing the bill. The arguments I used were substantially similar to the arguments used by such Senators as KILGORE, LANGER, LEHMAN, and others when they opposed it. The arguments I used are similar to those used by the Members of this House who opposed it. It should be noted furthermore that four present members of this committee voted against the bill. Is Mr. VAIL prepared to assert that President Truman, as well as the distinguished Members of Congress who opposed the bill, are also tainted somehow with Communist sympathy? If not, I submit it was highly unfair even to suggest that my conduct was in any degree questionable because I testified against that bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, all Members on the list in the possession of the Chair may revise and extend their remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not possible by unanimous consent to secure the same permission for other Members who may want to speak but are not on the list?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, all other Members may extend their remarks on the pending amendment at this point.

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am voting for the Smith amendment. I think the President should use Taft-

Hartley procedure in the steel strike. I think he should have used it long ago.

We have got to make it clear that neither the unions nor management nor the President are above the law or beyond the law in labor-management disputes, and Taft-Hartley is the law, and will continue to be until it is changed by Congress. I voted for it. I voted in 1949 for amendments that time and experience had demonstrated would improve the law, but these amendments were defeated by the Fair Deal. If the President will use the law now, instead of abusing it, instead of evading and avoiding it, I think this strike will be settled. In any event, by using the law we can find out whether further legislation is necessary. At present I am against any kind of seizure law. I believe in the collective-bargaining procedure, the democratic last offer and last chance to accept, provided by the Taft-Hartley Act. We need steel production, but we need also to protect the fundamental freedoms of workers and employers.

The President has requested the advice of Congress on this subject. Of course his request was political, to get him off the spot between the Supreme Court and Phil Murray. I do not believe, however, that we should play politics with his request, but should answer it in good faith. This is what Congress has done. We have denied seizure powers, and by this vote are advising the President to execute existing law.

It is argued that for Congress to ask the President to obey the law he is sworn to uphold creates a bad precedent. I suggest this precedent will apply only when we have a bad President, and I hope that condition will continue for only a few months more.

It is argued that the voluntary delay in striking in the steel case takes the place of the involuntary delay that may be required under a Taft-Hartley injunction. If this is true, then every delay in work stoppage during a labor dispute becomes an excuse to evade the law. The Taft-Hartley Act permits a court to enforce an involuntary delay in concerted action, while leaving every workman free to work or quit, as he desires.

In a time like this, when our men are fighting in Korea, we must protect the rights of individual workers here at home, but in disputes between unions and management organizations, the public interest, the safety of our Republic, must come first.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment which, in effect, directs the President of the United States to invoke the Taft-Hartley law is just in keeping with the many amendments that have been offered to destroy this bill. A continuation of price control is necessary to stop inflation. The passage of this measure without the amendment is the only sensible and logical way in which we can have real price control.

I am in receipt of the following three letters: One from Martin T. Lacey, president of the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York and Vicinity, A. F. of L., and a man who has done a great deal for organized labor

and who understands the needs of the people of our country. It is as follows:

CENTRAL TRADES AND,  
LABOR COUNCIL OF  
GREATER NEW YORK AND VICINITY,  
New York, N. Y., June 24, 1952.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We strongly urge the continuation of price controls where it affects food, fuel, everything relating to the farmer's needs and to the housewives' budget.

Do all you can to defeat the Talle amendment as it will place heavy burdens on the housewife's budget if controls are ended, causing living costs to zoom. Run-away inflation will follow placing in jeopardy the stabilization of the American economy.

Respectfully yours,  
MARTIN T. LACEY,  
President.

The following letter was received from Mr. Thomas A. Murray, the distinguished president of the New York State Federation of Labor, A. F. of L., representing hundreds of thousands of people in the Empire State which also urges the adoption of strong price control:

NEW YORK STATE  
FEDERATION OF LABOR,  
New York, N. Y., June 24, 1952.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Inflation can destroy American security just as readily as enemy bombs.

Vote and urge your brother Congressmen to support price controls where it affects the housewives' budgetary household needs and thus support the American economy and help continue the American way of life.

Respectfully yours,  
THOMAS A. MURRAY,  
President.

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, A. F. of L., has added its strong voice in a plea to Congress to pass the proposed bill without the amendments which would in effect destroy it. That letter is as follows:

JOINT COUNCIL No. 16,  
INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF  
TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSE-  
MEN AND HELPERS OF AMERICA,  
June 24, 1952.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Vote in favor of retaining price controls because the American economy can be most readily destroyed by a run-away inflation.

The backbone of our American way of life is the family, the home, the children. Do not destroy the budget upon which the American housewife depends to provide the daily needs of her family group.

Vote the continuation of controls.

Respectfully yours,  
LEONARD GEIGER,  
Recording Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore will cast my vote against the Brown amendment, the Smith amendment, the Talle amendment, the Lucas amendment, and the Harrison amendment, and I urge the House to pass the committee bill without these crippling amendments.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, the present amendment would not be before us had it not been for the fact that on June 10 the President addressed a joint session of Congress, asking the Congress for aid or direction in the steel crisis. A strong and courageous President would never have done this. For that matter, a strong and courageous President would have acted with greater propriety in the first instance by preventing a muddle instead of encouraging it.

Frankly, I am not sure that the present request, if passed by this House, will mean anything to a President who has already by improper remarks, openly issued an invitation to the steel workers to continue the strike in the event the Taft-Hartley law is invoked. This the President did on two occasions: First, on June 10 when he addressed the Congress; and, second, at a recent press conference on June 19, or thereabouts. For the President to doubt in advance that the law would be disobeyed if invoked by the Chief Executive, amounts to bad faith, not only to all of the American people generally, but it is bad faith to the very steelworkers whom the President pretends to befriend.

The American people, including the steelworkers, all expect the President of the United States to keep faith with his oath of office, and give due respect to the laws of the land.

Since the President has stultified himself in coming before the Congress on June 10, I feel that I have no alternative but to give him the courtesy of an honest reply by voting in favor of this amendment. But, I do so in good faith, not only for myself, but for those whom I represent. Those I represent expect similar good faith from the Chief Executive. We do not expect a statement from the President with an attitude—"I did not want to use the Taft-Hartley law, but Congress asked me to." Such an attitude on his part would be a full invitation seeking disrespect for the Taft-Hartley law, if he decides to use it. Of course, if we do not pass this legislation, we could expect to have the President say that Congress did not want me to use the Taft-Hartley law. This is all the more reason why we must, today, reply affirmatively and disregard any other considerations of impropriety, whether it be his or ours.

Certainly, if the President admits his weakness and his inability to deal with this crisis, the least we must do is to comply with his request. Common courtesy requires this. Our need for steel commands it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of this entire attack on labor with which I am concerned. And that is that for the past 2 or 3 months I have been trying to determine leading issues for campaigning in my district for reelection in November. I have been somewhat concerned because I have found a satisfied, full-time working program with a lot of our workers so it has been rather difficult to arouse them to any aggressive political activity. But, I am sure as a result of the wires and letters I have received from workers in the city of Minneapolis, that they are considerably alarmed at the position of this Congress in its attitude and its approach to the question of this steel dispute. I feel satisfied now that I will have the same issues again in 1952, the issue which brought me here in 1948 with a 17,000 majority as a result of my opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a vindictive attack against the President

of the United States and the workers in the steel industry.

That is all it is. It certainly provides no means whatsoever for settling the steel dispute, much less for bringing it to a conclusion in a manner that would be fair to all parties concerned—the steel companies, the steel workers, and the American people.

What is the real situation with which we are confronted? In the first place, and I stress this point, the demands of the steel workers are thoroughly reasonable. The representatives of the American Federation of Labor on the Wage Stabilization Board have prepared a detailed analysis of the Board's recommendation in the steel case. The conclusion of the A. F. of L. members is that not only do these recommendations fail to give the steel workers benefits which other workers have received, but on the contrary, even if the recommendations of the Board were put into effect the steel workers would still be far behind most of A. F. of L. unions. This analysis further emphasizes that the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board in the steel case were conservatively within the limits of its well-established policies. As a matter of fact, the steel case is simply the most publicized "catch-up" case the Wage Stabilization Board has processed.

Despite the fact that their demands were not at all excessive, the steel workers have already waited 120 days without taking any action to gain their demands. It was only after waiting all of that time and after there seemed to be no other avenue open to them, that they finally did cease work.

What is now proposed in the Smith amendment? In the first place there is no assurance that anything at all will result in the passage of this amendment. There is nothing in the amendment which requires the President to do anything. It simply asks the President to invoke the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. The President has already made it clear that nothing is to be gained by his taking such action, and it is very unlikely that he will do so simply on the basis of such a request.

Secondly, even if the President should invoke the emergency dispute provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, all that can be done under that act of any significance has already been done. The Taft-Hartley Act provides that the President shall say that there is a national emergency. Certainly no constructive purpose can be served by such a finding in the light of the accepted fact that if the steel dispute should continue for a prolonged period the Nation would undoubtedly be confronted with such an emergency.

The act then provides for a cooling-off period of 80 days, but the steelworkers have already gone through a cooling-off period of 120 days. What purpose can be served by attempting to force them to wait for another 80 days?

The third step is the appointment of a fact-finding board to make recommendations. The Wage Stabilization Board was just such a fact-finding board, and it has made recommendations which were thoroughly in harmony with ac-

cepted stabilization principles. What possible purpose can be served by the appointment of still another fact-finding board to plow over the same old ground and undoubtedly arrive at the same conclusions?

The only other step called for by the Taft-Hartley Act—and the only one which has not been utilized to date—is the holding of an election among the employees to vote on the last offer of management. The experience with such elections has shown that union members do not readily forsake their just demands when they vote in such elections. Moreover, in this case it would be very difficult to determine precisely what the last offer of management was, since it is quite clear that the companies involved in the Steel case are split among themselves and have not agreed on any offer to the steel workers.

Even if all of these apparently meaningless steps should be followed, the 80-day cooling-off period would elapse in September or October at a time when Congress would probably not be in session. The Nation would then be faced with exactly the same problem it faces today to which the Congress would have provided no solution whatsoever.

The proposed amendment can achieve no solution of the serious problem we face of securing resumption of steel production. If the Taft-Hartley Act is applied in this situation, it will simply deprive the workers in the steel industry of the wages and working conditions to which they are entitled, while the companies will be assured of continued high-level profits. Certainly this is the very opposite of the even-handed justice which all groups in this Nation have a right to expect from their Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the Smith amendment can achieve no constructive result. It will either be completely ineffective or it will do positive injustice to the steelworkers who have already been deprived of a fair disposition of their just demands.

I therefore urge my colleagues to vote down the Smith amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the Taft-Hartley law, which the gentleman by his amendment would invoke, was, at the time of its passage by the Congress, regarded as punitive legislation aimed at putting all organized labor in a strait-jacket.

It is clearly evident that the gentleman from Virginia and a group of labor haters still regard it as a club at their convenience with which they seek not social, economic, and political equality, but a means to gain their major objective—the destruction of all unions.

The sponsor of this amendment has been the author or supporter of most of the antilabor legislation offered in the Congress in the past decade. I refer to the Smith-Connally Act, the Taft-Hartley Act, and his more recent attempt to put the entire Nation into receivership.

President Truman appears to be the gentleman's pet peeve. If he feels that the President is not abiding by the Con-

stitution and the laws he has taken an oath to enforce, then he should consider impeachment of the offender.

I object to his venting his wrath on all organized labor, and particularly on 650,000 steelworkers, in order to get at one individual. I recall the great sage of Monticello and his ideas of the equality of man. I wonder how hymn of hate fits into his theory.

I also protest the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to any section of the pending legislation. The proposal is only a gesture. The Taft-Hartley law says the President may, after certain preliminaries are taken care of, seek a court order. It appears to me that the gentleman could better direct his energy in a move to amend the Taft-Hartley law making action mandatory.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman's proposal produce steel? Is it not a subterfuge for action the Congress should take now to meet the emergency? Even though I stand as one "crying in the wilderness," I want to register my objection to the recess or adjournment of the Eighty-second Congress until such time as the Congress has met this issue by concrete legislation that will insure equality under the law to all segments of our economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the Congress enacted the Taft-Hartley Act some years ago. It is on the books. The President has declined to use the emergency procedures contained in it, although he has used those procedures in nine other cases, and has asked for other legislation which would shorten the 80-day period and abolish the Board. He prior to that, had seized the mills, an action which was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. Now he wants to pass the political buck to the Congress by having us tell him all over again what to do. It seems to me it is rather like "painting the lily" for the Congress of the United States to take any such action as is here proposed. Furthermore, at this season of the year, it looks like a political buck-passing game, and I am against helping anybody pass a political buck. Congress has taken its share of the responsibility by passing the law. The President has not yet taken his by carrying out the provisions of the law. When he has done that, then the buck passing can begin. Mr. Chairman, I am against both amendments, as it is entirely unnecessary for the Congress to tell the President what to do when he already has law upon the statute books—and has taken an oath to administer the laws of the United States. This amendment requesting the President to invoke the law has all the earmarks of a political booby trap.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious period in the history of the United States, when the Congress finds it necessary to direct,

implore, or request the President to execute the laws which the Congress has passed and thereby uphold the Constitution. It raises the question as to whether the present occupant of the White House is President of the United States or a dictator.

It raises the question as to whether he is beyond the law because of what he thinks are his inherent powers, which the Supreme Court says he does not have, in defiance of the opinion of the public and the will of the Congress. It certainly raises the question as to whether this Congress should not give serious consideration to Mr. SHAFER's discharge petition, which is on the Clerk's desk, which would allow the House to proceed with impeachment of the President.

We have no assurance, we have no means of knowing whether the rank and file of labor is willing to accept the last best offer in the steel strike which the Taft-Hartley act would reveal by a vote of the strikers as provided in that act. We know that there is at least an understanding between the head of the Steel Workers' Union and the President of the United States not to use the Taft-Hartley law in this instance. But we know he found it necessary to use the Taft-Hartley law in several other instances, but not in this case. The question is why? I think that is one of the responsibilities and obligations of the Congress to find out in the best interests of the health and welfare, the national defense, and economy of this Nation. Perhaps the following news story from the June 23 edition of the Chicago Tribune reveals the reason why President Truman will not invoke the Taft-Hartley law in the steel strike:

**CIO HEAD TELLS PLEDGE NOT TO USE TAFT LAW—EIGHT THOUSAND IN GARY HEAR BLAST AT IKE**

Philip Murray, president of the CIO and its steelworkers, said yesterday in Gary that President Truman had given him a pledge not to use the Taft-Hartley law to end the steel strike.

He asserted he received the pledge last December 24, when Mr. Truman called him and asked that a strike then scheduled for January 1 be deferred.

Murray quoted the President as telling him, "If you will voluntarily agree to suspension of the strike, you need have no fear of the courts imposing the Taft-Hartley injunction on your union."

Since the courts could issue the injunction only on application of the Government, this assurance was equivalent to a pledge not to invoke the law.

**CALLS RANDALL A "LIAR"**

Murray spoke before 8,000 strikers who filled Memorial Auditorium and stood in the street outside, where his remarks were audible over loudspeakers. An estimated 90,000 strikers live in the Chicago area; 75,000 are members of the Gary local 1014, and 10,000 of the neighboring East Chicago local 1010.

Despite his reference to the Truman pledge, Murray criticized Clarence Randall, president of the Inland Steel Co., for saying that Murray and Mr. Truman had "made a deal." Murray said he had "more respect for the office of President than to try to do such a thing."

He accused Randall of "deliberately lying" and said the steel executive denied later in Washington that he had made the state-

ment. "I called him a liar again," Murray said.

Murray charged the steel companies with conspiring to prevent a strike settlement.

**CHARGES MISREPRESENTATION**

He accused the companies of carrying on a campaign of misrepresentation of the issues and charged that the companies are controlled by the banks.

"I am prepared to carry on this fight, struggling and sweating just like you are, right down to the bitter end until a wholesome and satisfactory solution of our differences has been reached," he said.

Murray also assailed General Eisenhower for returning to the United States from Europe "without even trying to comb the salt out of his hair, putting on civilian clothing, and, with complete ignorance of the facts, saying, 'I don't see why they don't use the Taft-Hartley law.'"

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, there has been more hooey, more baloney, more pure political poppycock purveyed in the debate on this question than any since I have been in Congress. The charge has been made that the President has violated his oath of office and has failed to enforce some provisions of the Taft-Hartley law that it was his duty to enforce. As a matter of fact, this is not true at all. It is true that the President has failed to use the power that was given him in the Taft-Hartley law to try to stop the steel strike. But this was a matter of discretion with him. Frankly, I think he should have used the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law before he ever seized the steel mills but I can quite well understand his hesitation to do so for he had by agreement gotten the workers to postpone their strike for more than the 80 days as provided by the Taft-Hartley law. Moreover, it seems to me that the President should not have been criticized for asking both the steel mills and the employees to submit their differences to the Wage Stabilization Board for investigation and a report and in the meantime, to continue the production of steel. Many of you are lawyers and what one of you has not, as a matter of policy, advised his clients to submit their differences to arbitration or to arrive at a settlement without recourse to the courts? Certainly that has been my policy in the years I have been engaged in the active practice.

Be that as it may, I am sure the President should have used the injunctive provisions of the Taft-Hartley law before attempting the drastic method of seizure of the steel mills. He would have been in a much stronger position before the court and in all probability had he exhausted his remedies under the Taft-Hartley Act without a successful settlement of the strike, might have been upheld by the Supreme Court in the seizure of the mills.

But we seem to have forgotten throughout the whole controversy that the thing most necessary for the public welfare is to get steel production. Many of the Members of this body have been more interested apparently in rebuking

the President and in making political capital out of the present steel strike than they have in the main purpose of getting steel, not only for the rearmament effort, but for the stabilization of our civilian economy as well.

One of my law professors used to tell this story to his classes. He was trying to emphasize the fact that a lawyer ought always to come to the very heart of his case when questioning witnesses. He said as a youth he found an old gun in his home—one of those old muzzle-loaders. He rammed it full of powder, then full of shot or slugs and took steady aim at a bird sitting in a nearby tree. He pulled the trigger. There was a tremendous flash and explosion. The boy was knocked down and temporarily out. As soon as he came to himself, he ran back to the house scared half to death. His dad met him and seeing that he was not too badly hurt, did not ask him about how badly he was hurt or show any solicitude for his welfare. He did put this question to the boy: "Son, did you hit the bird you aimed at?" We have lost sight of the bird in this case.

Because I am determined to keep my eye on the bird and to do everything possible to see that production of steel is resumed, and the present controversy settled between the operators of the mills and their employees, I am going to vote for the Smith amendment after voting against the proposal of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to direct the President to use the powers given him under the Taft-Hartley Act to enjoin a continuation of the strike. I do not believe we have the power to direct the President; but I am voting to suggest or request the President to use this power. I am doing this not because I think it is the best remedy or the best solution of the problem that faces us, but because I think it will get us back into the production of steel; for I am sure the members of the union are good Americans and will abide by the order of the Court.

I am voting for this amendment because it is perfectly apparent that neither the House nor the Senate is willing to face the issue and give the President the power that he should have in an emergency of this sort. It is possible that a vote on the last offer of the employers by the members of the union as provided for in the Taft-Hartley procedure may get a settlement of this strike. I am afraid, however, that it will not. But it is clear that until the President has exhausted this remedy, the Congress is not going to face the real issues in this case and enact legislation that will give the President more power than he has under the Taft-Hartley Act. At the end of the 80-day waiting period, he will have exhausted every power that he now has to control such crippling Nation-wide strikes. Then perhaps the Congress will face up to its duty and obligation and enact the necessary legislation. Personally, I am willing now to give the President the right to seize the mills temporarily and operate them until the employers and employees arrive at a settlement of their differences. So long as men may be drafted and sent to the battlefield and maybe to their

death, I am certainly willing to do what is necessary in the way of seizure of private property to provide them with the arms and equipment they must have. And yet I know that seizure is not the best and final solution of this problem of Nation-wide strikes. Many remedies have been suggested, among them the following:

First. Bar strikes in any industry affecting defense whenever an emergency is declared. This obviously would be unfair to the workers unless some means was at the same time provided for a decision on their complaints.

Second. To apply the antitrust laws to the monopoly power of unions. Even Senator TAFT agrees that the anti-monopoly laws cannot well be applied to the labor unions.

Third. Ban industry-wide collective bargaining and industry-wide contracts with unions. An effort was made to do this when the Taft-Hartley law was drafted. However, it was found almost impossible to define geographical or industrial areas in which collective bargaining could be conducted. Senator TAFT, while he opposed the attempt to define collective-bargaining areas in the Taft-Hartley Act, now seems to favor another effort in this direction.

Fourth. Keep the Taft-Hartley injunction as at present with the added power to place companies and unions in court receivership if a strike is threatened after the 80 days. This is, in my opinion, an entirely unjustified interference with both companies and unions.

Fifth. Compel arbitration of disputes in basic industries with Government enforcing arbitration awards. I will later discuss this proposal which, to me, makes more sense than any of the others suggested.

Sixth. Refuse to both management and labor the protection of the Taft-Hartley Act and other labor relations provisions of the law unless management and labor write into their contracts a provision for submitting their differences to arbitration.

Seventh. Seize industry by Presidential order under definite restrictions laid down by the Congress.

As I have suggested above, it seems to me that either plan 5 or plan 6 is to be preferred to any others. In the first place, the people have confidence in our courts and if labor courts were set up for determining issues submitted by the contending parties or if an appeal to the courts from the decision of boards of arbitration were provided, it seems to me that the rights of both parties would be amply protected and above all that the public would be protected from the disastrous results of the open warfare which a Nation-wide strike amounts to. Neither management nor labor is enthusiastic about this remedy which may indicate that it is the best and wisest after all. I know that there are objections to compulsory arbitration but it is my firm conviction that industrial disputes and eventually international disputes will be settled by courts set up for the purpose. I am convinced too that to date no better way has ever been de-

vised for settling disputes and maintaining order than our courts.

In this connection, Mr. Marquis Childs in his syndicated column for May 8 has this to say:

Compulsory arbitration of labor disputes in this country is coming as surely as night follows day if the present trend continues. It will come not because any group or an individual wants it. But the plain fact is that Nation-wide strikes in vital industries can no longer be tolerated.

Mr. Childs then goes on to say that in the Scandinavian countries, labor courts have functioned satisfactorily.

If the Congress does not establish labor courts or provide for compulsory arbitration in some other form, then it seems to me that plan 7, the seizure by Presidential order under strict regulation of such seizure by some such provisions as are suggested by Senator MORSE, should be adopted by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the chairman of the committee who opposed the Brown amendment and also to my friend from Georgia, Judge LANHAM, let me quote the President.

On June 10, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 6929, the President said to us:

I feel that I should put the facts before the Congress, recommending the course of action I deem best, and call upon the Congress, which has the power to do so, to make the choice.

Note that word "choice." That shows the President wanted us to act—to use our judgment—which he hoped would be the action he approved. Then he said:

A seizure law, if properly drafted, can achieve the objective of assuring steel—

And so on. Then he condemned the Taft-Hartley Act. He did not want any of that.

Then he said this:

If however, the judgment of the Congress, contrary to mine, is that an injunction of the Taft-Hartley type could be used, there is a quicker way.

He did not want the Taft-Hartley Act type of injunction. He wanted another kind of injunction.

Then he went on:

That would be for the Congress to enact legislation authorizing and directing the President to seek such an injunction.

Note the situation. The President finds a serious condition confronts the Nation. He finds the course he tried to follow to be illegal—he apparently will not use the Taft-Hartley Act—he asks the Congress to write a seizure or injunction law—which it will not do—as he well knows—and then leaves the issue to the Congress to solve. We should, as he requests write legislation authorizing and directing him to do what the Congress thinks should be done.

Inasmuch as the Congress apparently differs, from his views there is no reason at all why we should not comply with his very courteous request and give

him our advice authorizing and directing him to use the Taft-Hartley Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL].

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Chairman, I cannot see what would be accomplished by either of these amendments. I think the procedure represents the most unique, unprecedented, and possibly dangerous action on the part of the Congress. Under the separation-of-powers theory, certainly the Congress cannot tell the President what to do. On the other hand, it appears as a meaningless, idle, futile gesture for the Congress to suggest to the President that he administer the law. It appears ludicrous almost for the legislative branch to suggest that the Executive execute the law of the land.

I am therefore opposed to both amendments, and shall vote against them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to both of these amendments on constitutional grounds. I feel that they go beyond the province of Congress, and I do not believe the fact that the President himself requested this Congress to act unconstitutionally is sufficient ground for our doing so.

I think we ought to look at this from a long-time viewpoint. It is a question of the separation of powers.

I think that the President should use the Taft-Hartley Act of course, and enforce the laws of this land; but I do not think the Congress should ever get itself into the position of asking, demanding, or instructing a President to enforce the laws; the Constitution of the United States requires that he do so.

Our only recourse, I submit, if the President has not enforced the laws of the land, is impeachment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the majority leader is not on the floor, because I should like to ask him now a question I tried to get him to yield for me to ask during his discourse when he said that the President was able to do more to solve the steel dispute than the Taft-Hartley law could have done.

I think the question the people of the country and the Members of Congress want answered is: Did or did not President Truman make a deal with Phil Murray that if Murray would withhold calling a strike the President would not enforce the laws of this country? We ought to have that information on the table.

I see the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency sitting at his desk. I wonder if he has the information, if he is close enough to the administration?

I see the majority leader has just entered the Chamber. I call his attention to the fact that I wanted to know whether he was able to say that the President did more than the Taft-Hartley

Act could do because the President had made a deal with Phil Murray that if Phil Murray would postpone the strike, the President would not enforce the law?

I gladly yield to the gentleman to answer the question.

**Mr. McCORMACK.** The gentleman from Massachusetts can answer that question very simply. The President of the United States with his persuasive powers, and Phil Murray and those around him, great men that they are, responded and did what was done. The question of deals is something that was not involved at all.

**Mr. MEADER.** I am glad the gentleman has explained that the President did not give Mr. Murray any consideration for this postponement; it was simply his winning personality.

**Mr. McCORMACK.** No considerations or deals were made. Now, do not misquote me.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] is recognized.

**Mr. AYRES.** Mr. Chairman, last night I flew out to my district in Akron, Ohio, to attend a meeting I had called for labor, management, and the public to discuss the Defense Production Act and the various amendments thereto. In the Fourteenth Congressional District of Ohio there are 660,000 people, of whom 100,000 are union members—good, honest, God-fearing union members who do not always follow the dictates, right down the line, of union leadership. The meeting was most constructive. Mr. Leo Dugan, executive secretary of the CIO Council; Mr. G. L. Patterson, general counsel for the United Rubber Workers of America; Mr. Robert Shuff, of the American Federation of Labor; and Mr. William Fowler, of the United Auto Workers, CIO, were in attendance to express their views on the Defense Production Act, with particular emphasis being placed on the discussion of the Lucas amendment and the Smith amendment.

They also expressed concern over the manner in which the investigation of the Wage Stabilization Board was conducted. They also felt it grossly unfair that Joseph W. Childs, vice president of the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, should have been questioned as he was. For the sake of the record, I would like to add at this point that Mr. Childs enjoys an enviable reputation in his home community, and is a past member of the Akron City Council. According to his testimony before the Education and Labor Committee he apparently had been made an innocent victim of a Communist-front organization. It is regrettable that the Civil Rights Congress and the Daily Worker used Mr. Childs. Congressman VAIL used only information that was a matter of public record in the files of the Un-American Activities Committee. However, Mr. Childs was not the issue. Those interested in Mr. Childs' testimony can find the verbatim comment in the hearings now printed pursuant to House Resolution 532. This testimony is found on pages 599 to 660.

There was some difference of opinion between those representing the steel workers and those representing the rub-

ber workers. I was told by the steel workers that the union-shop controversy was not causing the steel strike. However, Mr. Patterson spent considerable time in an effort to prove that the Wage Stabilization Board should have the power to rule on the union-shop question. The gentleman speaking for the steelworkers' union stated that the union leadership did not fear a secret vote as, in his opinion, the workers would vote not to accept the latest offer of the steel companies. Contrary to this view steelworkers have told me that if a secret vote was taken they would vote overwhelmingly to accept the latest wage offer and forget about the union shop. I was interested in the comment from the steel people, "If it were not for industry-wide bargaining there would be no steel strike in Lorain, Ohio."

Fair play is the most important thing in handling the legislation at hand. Neither side should have an unfair advantage and both sides should be willing to cooperate. I think it very commendable for the labor leadership to have been willing to express their position. I can agree that under the Lucas amendment there would be a possibility of the Wage Stabilization Board being lopsided. I can also remember that labor walked out on the Board when a decision was made that did not meet with their approval. I cannot agree, however, that the President should not have used the Taft-Hartley law nor that he should not use its provisions in the steel strike now.

The statement made to me after the meeting that was of most interest was that although the Taft-Hartley Act was objected to by union leaders, it is not by the rank and file of the union members. One gentleman of Hungarian descent came up to me after the meeting and said in a broken voice, "Bill, I am a good American. I own my home and am helping my son through college and have been working here at Goodrich for 17 years. Do not be kidded by all the arguments you have heard here this evening. We men in the shop are beginning to realize that we were wrong in 1948—we did not understand the Taft-Hartley law. Now we know that the Taft-Hartley is a law that regulates the union leader but not the union member. Please vote your conscience, Bill." That is what Bill is going to do.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is recognized.

**Mr. ELLSWORTH.** Mr. Chairman, I desire to call to the attention of the Committee the fact that the Brown amendment to the Smith amendment is in fact equivalent to an amendment to section 206 of the Taft-Hartley law itself. The Taft-Hartley Act has been criticized mostly on one particular point and that point is that it is a permissive law. The law reads, "may appoint a board of inquiry," and so forth. That fact has been the greatest point of criticism by those who are now objecting to the application of the emergency sections of the Taft-Hartley law.

The fact that the law is permissive and not mandatory is not controlling.

We say now, if we enact the Brown amendment, that the President is "directed" to do these things called for in the emergency procedure sections of the Taft-Hartley law. It seems to me there is no possible conception here of a constitutional point, there is nothing involved in this discussion regarding the separation of powers, inherent powers or anything of that kind. The Congress of the United States wrote the Taft-Hartley law, it is the law of the land, and we now say that we did not say it quite right the first time, we now direct the President to use this procedure. The law could have been written in this way at the time it was enacted. There is therefore no reason why the suggested change cannot be voted now.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

**Mr. GREEN.** Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to both the Brown and the Smith amendments and may I say here that there is a lot of confusion on the part of certain Members because some people believe that it is mandatory upon the President to use the Taft-Hartley injunction procedure. Actually, the Taft-Hartley Act, as far as the President is concerned, is a permissive proposition. It says he may use it. As our majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] has stated, the President did a lot more than if he used the Taft-Hartley Act in connection with the matter of the steel strike.

It is also very interesting to hear many Republican Members get up on the floor and talk about a deal that the President was supposed to have made with Phil Murray. Certainly the steel company operators and the Republicans ought to know something about deals because previous to the turn of this present century there were plenty of deals made by the steel companies and steel management with Republican Presidents of the United States, when they used to be able to sell steel cheaper in Europe than they sold it in the State of Pennsylvania, when they used to bring immigrants over in order to work them at cheaper wages and keep the standard of living of the working people in this country down.

**Mr. Chairman,** I am sorry the Taft-Hartley Act ever passed the Congress. I was not here to vote against it, but I voted for the repeal of the act and I will vote for its repeal again.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

**Mr. BLATNIK.** Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition to both the Brown and Smith amendments and I want the Record to show it is my belief that these amendments are merely a flagrant attempt by many in Congress to pass the buck. Instead of Congress proposing a constructive procedure in order to arrive at a workable solution which would keep steel production flowing, and be fair to both management and labor, we pass the buck to the President of the United States, and tell him to do that which we originally said was permissive, if his own discretion and good

judgment deemed it wise and effective to use that law.

The President appeared before us and explained why he could not use the Taft-Hartley Act and why it would not work. Now the House wants to take away from the President his power of discretion by compelling him to use the Taft-Hartley Act, and we refuse to give him the necessary authority to work out a solution to this grave issue by a sound, constructive procedure. If these amendments are adopted, this House will be alining itself on the side of steel, and against the workers in the steel industry, and there will not be free and collective bargaining, as was referred to some moments ago by the leadership on the other side. I say this will be strike breaking by injunction, and Congress, if it adopts the pending amendments will be responsible.

If the House would take time to examine the facts of the matter, it would find that all the equities are on the side of the steelworkers. It is a fact that the steelworkers have not had a wage increase since December 1950, despite the fact that the cost of living has skyrocketed since that date.

Since 1946 the record shows that the net profits in steel have increased 140 percent; steel prices have increased by 80 percent, and steel dividends have been upped by 148 percent.

Months ago, the steel workers attempted to negotiate a new contract with steel management—but management refused to bargain collectively. Finally, at the request of the President, the whole controversy was referred to the Wage Stabilization Board which recommended about 17½ cents an hour wage increase plus certain fringe benefits. The steel management refused to accept the recommendations of this fact-finding agency.

These are facts which cannot be denied and they point to one conclusion—and that is that justice is on the side of the steelworkers and that it is the steel companies who are responsible for the present breakdown in steel production. Throughout this long-drawn-out affair, the workers have conducted themselves in a most exemplary manner—abiding by the spirit and letter of the law, cooperating with the Government in every way, refraining from any strikes while they made every attempt possible to bargain freely and collectively. Now comes this open and brazen proposal to drive the hard-working and patriotic men who labor in our mines and steel mills back to work by means of coercion and arbitrary power. I am strongly and absolutely opposed to these amendments and I call on the House to vote them down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, there is one phase of this argument that might be interesting to many lawyers in this distinguished body. This is an action in equity and in a proceeding in equity you appeal to the conscience of the chancellor, so we have been advised.

You now come into a court of equity, and one of the basic maxims of a court of equity is that it should never be asked to do a futile thing. If the gentleman from Indiana knows about what he speaks, and this strike is to be over in a week, then by what reason can this House ask or direct anybody to appeal to a court of equity to do a futile thing? Furthermore, when you go into a court of equity, and the chancellor is considering the petition for an injunction, it will be pointed out to him that the union has already acceded to the requirements of the act by many, many days. What chancellor in equity will not say to the petitioner, "You have been complied with now. Why should an injunction be granted in a case where the purpose has been met?" I certainly feel that if this is looked at flatly and narrowly as a proceeding in a court of equity, this petition will fail. Why do a futile thing? Both the Brown and the Smith amendments should be defeated.

Beware the Greeks bearing gifts—look at the list of names speaking for the Taft-Hartley Act today. Look at whose hearts are bleeding for labor today. Beware these false friends. These men have fought and spoken and voted against labor for many years. Are they to be believed today?

The gentleman from Ohio tells us what a rubber worker in Akron told him, that the Taft-Hartley Act is good for the worker—well, if there is any doubt in anyone's mind let me assure you that the mine workers and the steelworkers are united in their opposition to this bad law—and will vote so if necessary in open or secret ballot.

I do not intend to prolong this debate. My most eloquent effort today will be to vote against the Brown and Smith amendments, and I say in conclusion that my only regret is that I am not able to cast this vote for repeal of the nefarious slave-labor Taft-Hartley Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, just in order that the record may be perfectly clear, I want to state at the outset that I do not see how the President has any other choice but to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act, which is the law of the land. Now, having said that, and having made it publicly known as to how I feel about it, I think I have gone as far as duty requires any Member of Congress to go in a case of this kind. As to the remaining duty that is incumbent on me and on you in the present problem, if we adopt the amendments that are now before us, we then set a precedent that we will have to live with for the balance of time. We will by that action have invited every reluctant Executive from now on to come before the Congress and ask what he shall do, whether or not he shall obey the law, whether or not he shall enforce it. It seems to me that this sets an extremely dangerous precedent and one which will open the way to all manner of dilatory tactics by reluctant Executives of the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, when this legislation was debated on the rule last Wednesday and also in the Committee of the Whole last Friday I made my position plain in opposition to the Smith amendment. I want to repeat one remark that I made at that time. I said that the steel management made no real, sincere effort to collective bargain at any stage of the negotiations. A national magazine last week stated that the day before negotiations were broken off word was served to the steelworkers that management could not go along with any part of the Wage Stabilization Board recommendations. The men who had been doing the collective bargaining on both sides had practically agreed to negotiate, but a few bankers in New York closed the doors to any kind of collective bargaining. They overruled their own men who had been active collective bargaining for 4 months previously. Phil Murray, in his speech in Gary, Ind., last Sunday stated that absentee ownership, absentee collective bargainers, killed collective bargaining as far as the steel dispute was concerned. He said that the collective bargainers, men who were in close touch with the workers in the mills, were ready to settle the steel strike until word came from the absentee owners in New York, the bankers, and they overruled the men that spent 4 months trying to collective bargain and settle the steel trouble.

A Member stated that President Truman and Phil Murray made a deal that the Taft-Hartley law would not be used. That is a flagrant misrepresentation. The facts are President Truman told the union that if they would defer their strike last January it was almost certain that the dispute could be settled by collective bargaining. If the small group of bankers in New York, the absentee owners—yes; the absentee collective bargainers—were in good faith during the 4 months' negotiations, the dispute would have been settled months ago.

Certain reactionary newspapers falsely told their readers a deal was made. This whole steel dispute could have been adjusted long ago if the steel bargainers who sat in on the negotiations were given power and authority to close the negotiations. The absentee bankers overruled the 5 months of negotiations and caused the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, we have many blue laws in New Jersey. They became blue because they were no longer appropriate; they passed into disuse. I hope the President will not find it necessary to use the Taft-Hartley law. It is a blue law.

We went through World War II without using the Taft-Hartley law. We have gone through 2 years of the Korean situation without using it. We can go through the future without using it.

To save the self-respect of the boys in Korea and that of their fathers who may

be in the factories, I hope the President does not find it necessary to use the Taft-Hartley Act.

I oppose both the Brown and the Smith amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, we have heard men from the other side of the aisle say today that they are sorry the Taft-Hartley law passed. We have heard others say that it would be futile for the great Government of the United States to take action under law. I only say to you that I have just returned from the West, and there are many, many people in this great America who are also sorry. They regret there are so many men representing people of the United States in this House, coming from industrial areas, who have not the courage to tell the men in organized labor in their districts that there is one thing certain in life—that they are going to have law and order in their picket lines. They will either have it as free men under law enforceable in local courts by poor men or they will have it by Executive decree, with the Army enforcing it, as planned by this administration.

However, I assume that it is again futile to tell you, of the extreme left, what the real voice of America is saying on behalf of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, first, I cannot get the point of view of a man who would call a strike to cut off aviation gasoline for our boys who are fighting for their lives and for our security on the battle front in Korea. I cannot get the point of view of a man who would call a strike and cut off the production of steel for those boys. However, that has been done twice by the same man who called the strike to cut off the production of aviation gasoline.

On the 10th of June the President called a joint session of the House and Senate. He came before us of his own volition and asked us at that time to advise him whether in the opinion of the Congress he should use the Taft-Hartley law or, on the other hand, whether Congress would enact a law which would give him the authority to again seize the steel plants.

On the 10th of June, the same day, the other body gave him their answer. The next day, on the 11th of June, I offered an amendment in this body which would have given him on that day, 2 weeks ago, the answer of the House of Representatives which we are going to give to him today. The administration leaders blocked a vote on that amendment on that day by raising a point of order against it. Today, finally, I am thankful to see we will get a vote on it. I rise to say I am in favor of the Smith amendment.

I am sure the great majority of the Members of this body want to appropriate every dollar which is necessary to provide adequate equipment, armament, and munitions for our forces in Korea,

and not only for our forces in Korea but for all our Armed Forces, wherever they may be.

I am sure that the Membership of this House want to see all the steel produced which is necessary to furnish planes, guns, tanks, mortars, and other armament which may be needed to carry the war in Korea to a victorious conclusion. I want to see all these things provided.

However, our military program must not be made a vehicle to carry radical and socialistic doctrines into effect. Congress must see to it that our military program must be divorced entirely from left-wing, radical, socialistic philosophies which new deal rubber stamps have been unable to enact into law through normal means, and which they are now trying to carry into effect through such devious methods as Wage Stabilization Board recommendations, followed by Presidential seizures, followed by strikes which paralyze essential war industries, and which in turn will paralyze our forces on the battlefield.

It is well known that the principal point of dispute between the steel companies and the heads of the steel workers union is the proposal for a compulsory union shop. The steel workers union heads are holding out for a provision in the contracts calling for a compulsory union shop, which would mean that every steelworker must join the union or lose his job.

This Philip Murray who called the strike and stopped production of aviation gasoline for our aviators in Korea, and who has twice called steel strikes and stopped production of steel, which is one of our Armed Forces' most vital needs, knows that he can never, under normal circumstances, force through such a provision in a contract. He is willing to jeopardize the lives of our boys now desperately fighting in Korea in order to satisfy his greed for power over the working people of America. He is willing to jeopardize the security of this country by stopping the production of steel at one of the most critical periods in this country's history in order to satisfy his greed for power over the working people of America. He is not only willing to do these things. He has already done them. Joseph Stalin, if he were occupying Philip Murray's position, could not have done more to help Russia and Communist China and to hurt America and hinder our war effort than Philip Murray himself has done.

It has been nauseating to me today to hear the statement made on the floor of this House that Philip Murray and his henchmen, who have called this strike and stopped steel production, have shown qualities of statesmanship.

The people of America can read today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD giving the debate on the Smith amendment and can see from that debate the reasons for the sorry plight our country is in today and the influences which have brought it to pass.

I sincerely hope that the Smith amendment will be adopted by an overwhelming vote, and by that action the House of Representatives will inform the

President of the United States that it desires him promptly to use the Taft-Hartley law which is now on the statute books, and which affords a complete remedy to bring an end to this unjustified steel strike and cause the production of vital and much-needed steel to begin at once.

THE SMITH AMENDMENT REQUESTING USE OF TAFT-HARTLEY INJUNCTION—STEEL STRIKE SELFISHNESS

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot see anything wrong in the President of the United States trying to use persuasion instead of compulsion. I think the atmosphere for collective bargaining is better if you can use persuasion.

If it is true that having the Taft-Hartley coercive procedure available he said to the unions, "If you will not strike, if you will forego going on strike now, if you will do that voluntarily, I will not use the Taft-Hartley Act," I think that was a perfectly proper thing for the President to do.

More time expired actually before the strike than could have been gained by use of the Taft-Hartley Act. I think it would be wrong now to change the rules and go back to the compulsion the Government promised not to use.

Mr. Chairman, my only point in coming to the well of the House is to comment on the statement made by the very distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott]. I am appalled, as I know you are, at some of the selfishness which goes on here at home while we have young men out there in the hills of Korea fighting in the slush and mud to protect our liberties. I think we could all do with less selfishness. All of us need to search our consciences much more here at home; to stop some of the grumbling; to realize how well off we are compared with people in other parts of the world, and particularly compared with those boys who by authority of acts passed by the Congress of the United States have been ordered from their homes and into the armed services with or without their consent.

There is selfishness involved in the steel strike. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] argued that the Government was stubborn in refusing to give the steel companies a price increase of \$5 or \$5.50 per ton, which was what they demanded in return for acceptance by them of the wage increases recommended by the Wage Stabilization Board. The Government offered a price increase of \$4.50 per ton, and refused to go higher. Yes, the Government was stubborn, but were not the steel companies also stubborn? The gentleman did not mention them in this connection. Is it not selfish to bring about a shut-down of desperately needed steel production rather than give up 50 cents per ton out of a price of over \$100 per ton, that is yielding record profits, and this while we are confronted with a menace not just to profit but to our liberties and our existence as a free nation.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman in directing criticism at the administration let the cat out of the bag. The steel crisis is not the result of a defense of lofty principles by the steel companies. It is a fight for profits as usual while American boys are dying on a foreign battlefield. Would not it be more consistent with patriotism to give up the 50 cents per ton in the interest of national defense? Are our precious liberties to be sacrificed on the altar of greed because we as a people refuse to act in the responsible, mature manner the times demand? The steel strike must, of course, be finally settled in a manner fair to all. But if one party insists on being unfair now, it may be that another will have to temporarily accept the unfairness in order to produce steel for defense of the free world. Such acceptance can be made honorably, not as a sign of weakness, but rather as a sign of strength, the strength that comes from patriotism worth more than 50 cents per ton.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am for the Smith amendment because it will give us steel. After all, the point of all this discussion is to determine how can we get our steel mills into production again to take care of the emergency which is confronting our country. There is no hope, I regret to say, if we go on as we are now without governmental guidance or any semblance of compliance with the law now on the statute books. The President asked our advice. We now have a chance to give it to him. That advice is: Use the Taft-Hartley law. Our workingmen who are patriotic citizens want to go back to work, and during the intervening days immediately after the calling of the Taft-Hartley law into effect, the strike will be settled, because the men will meet at the conference table in an atmosphere free of any constraint and will have a chance to talk across the table freely and fairly, and we will once again have steel. Let us vote for the Smith amendment which gives us the one chance to get steel into production in the immediate future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I do not know when the Congress has ever been in a more humiliating position than we are in today. No person here likes to vote for either of these amendments. We stultify ourselves when we say to the President of the United States, "Will you please execute the law which the Congress of the United States has enacted as the way to handle this sort of labor dispute?" Yet the President has left no other course. He stultified himself when he came before us and asked, "Do you want me to enforce the law or not to enforce the law?" For us to vote against the Smith amendment that is now before us would be to tell him that we do not want him to execute the law which we, ourselves, passed; and that we are not concerned over his failure

to use the law to get the strike settled and steel made. So, under the present circumstances, embarrassing and humiliating as they are and unjustifiable as it is that we are in such a predicament, it seems clear to me that we must vote for the Smith amendment to tell the President, in response to his own inquiry, that this is the law we have devised for just such situations as this, and his job is to enforce the law which the Congress has enacted, whether he likes it or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON].

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Chairman, for us to try to tell the President of the United States what he shall do is not only unconstitutional, but as the gentleman from Missouri pointed out a moment ago, it is setting a dangerous precedent on our part. Personally, I do not think the Taft-Hartley Act is a fair answer to the problems that exist today, nor do I think it is going to solve our present problem of producing steel. The Taft-Hartley Act would have provided an 80-day period. But the President secured 155 days of negotiation. At any time during that period, 30 percent of the union members of any single mill could have petitioned the NLRB and secured a secret ballot on the offer by management. The fact that they did not do that indicates to me that a secret ballot which can be called for under the Taft-Hartley Act is not going to satisfactorily solve this industrial dispute and paralysis which we now find ourselves in. I think our responsibility is to pass a better piece of labor legislation to make sure that we have a means at our disposal by which we can settle these industrial disputes and produce steel and other products needed in our economic system. Our responsibility is to get better legislation, legislation that is up to date, instead of trying to tell the President to use an outmoded piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the Taft-Hartley law seeks to accomplish four things. First. To determine the facts. There is not anybody in the Congress who does not know the facts, and there is not anybody in the country who does not know the facts.

Second. It provides delay for a cooling-off period. We have had twice that cooling-off period, as far as time is concerned, without the Taft-Hartley law.

Third. It provides for an injunction.

Fourth. It provides for a secret ballot.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON] explained, a secret ballot could have been had at any time.

If the amendment which I intend to offer prevails, the President will be requested to use Taft-Hartley, but not those provisions thereof for an injunction. An injunction is not necessary in this case and will accomplish nothing.

The only thing the Taft-Hartley law provides for that has not yet been had in the steel dispute is a secret ballot by the employees. If the employees had wanted such a ballot they could have

had it a long time ago. Obviously they do not want it. I doubt whether the employers want it. No one in or out of Congress has the right to seek to use the Taft-Hartley law for any purpose except to obtain such balloting upon the acceptance or rejection of the best offer of steel management. The fact is that there are many small steel mills throughout the country that long since would have settled with the union on the basis of the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board. These small mills have not done so because the big mill owners have threatened that they would cut off their source of supply if the small mill owners did consummate such contracts with the union.

The national-emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act provide for the appointment of a board of inquiry, an 80-day injunction against a strike, a vote by the employees on the employer's final offer, and a subsequent report to the Congress if the labor dispute is not settled during the 80-day period. The board of inquiry cannot make any recommendations for a settlement.

Thus the Taft-Hartley Act merely provides a delay in a strike and automatically operates against the interest of labor for the workers are compelled to stay on the job at terms and conditions which led them to strike, while management's position is not in any way changed during the injunction period.

There are two main objectives which the Government must seek in the current steel dispute—first, restoration of full production, and second, a fair settlement which will assure continued production of steel. Neither of these objectives can be assured by resort to the Taft-Hartley Act at this time.

The Taft-Hartley Act is undesirable under the present circumstances for the following reasons:

First. The inequities involved: The workers, who up to the time of the current strike had voluntarily stayed on their job some 150 days, would be forced to return to work at the terms and conditions which led to the strike. The union has cooperated fully with the stabilization rules but management has not, and yet resort to Taft-Hartley would operate against the workers automatically.

Second. Impracticalities involved: Forcing the workers to return to the job for 80 days without any change in terms and conditions would remove any incentive for management to settle during this period. Management would be assured that by the forces of law workers for 80 days would be compelled to operate the mills under the threat of an injunction. But even if the men did return to their jobs it is questionable whether the low morale that would prevail would result in the peak-production conditions that are required in the interest of national defense. In addition, Taft-Hartley procedure does not provide for any additional set of recommendations for a settlement. There has been a full hearing of the issues through the Wage Stabilization Board procedure and the fact-finding report of the Taft-Hartley Act board of inquiry would only

duplicate all that has taken place thus far. Also, the time involved at the outset in establishing a board of inquiry and obtaining its report to the President—a week or 10 days—would be an unnecessary waste of days within which the steel mills would, of course, stay closed. The so-called vote on the final offer provided in the Taft-Hartley procedure has proved meaningless in all of the nine cases where the Taft-Hartley emergency procedures have been invoked to date. In all of these cases the workers voted overwhelmingly to stand behind the bargaining position of their union leaders. The procedure has proved so meaningless that Senator Tarr in 1949 recommended the provision be deleted from the act.

Third. Questionable effectiveness: The Taft-Hartley procedure provides for an 80-day injunction granted by a district court. However, an injunction is always a matter of discretion for a court of equity, and in view of the voluntary postponement by the workers beyond the 80-day period of postponement required by the act, the court should rule that an injunction not be granted under these circumstances—Hecht against Bowles, a Supreme Court decision stemming from World War II, reaffirms the area of discretion given a court of equity under similar circumstances. Furthermore, if the court does grant an injunction it is possible that the individual workers may be so incensed at the injustice of this procedure that each one refuses to return to his job. Unless it can be shown that these refusals were part of a concerted action, the Government would not be able to force the men back on the job by court action. This was the situation in the mine workers' case in 1950 when the court held that in staying away from the mines the workers acted upon individual decisions and not a strike order.

Therefore, for reasons of fairness, practicality, and effectiveness, the Taft-Hartley Act does not provide the answer to the present steel dispute. What is needed is authority for the Government to operate the steel mills until a settlement is reached. An adequate seizure statute would provide the necessary authority. Under seizure the Government could immediately take possession and get the mills back into production. Given authority to change working conditions, the Government could make certain adjustments in pay for the workers in recognition of the merit of their claims for higher wages—claims which have been admitted by the steel companies to be valid. With the Government according such fair treatment to the workers, there is every likelihood that full production would be restored and maintained. By the same token pressures would be placed upon management to work out a fair settlement with the union so that the industry could be returned to the private owners and the companies could resume their full responsibility for the collective bargaining contract. The companies would be guaranteed just compensation but the possibility that just compensation would include something less than the full

profits of operation would be an additional incentive for the companies to reach a settlement. The seizure statute might contain a prohibition against putting into effect any changes in union security arrangements. It is submitted that this prohibition would still provide sufficient latitude of action by the Government to permit effective operation resulting in the conclusion of a fair settlement of the dispute.

I urge that the Brown amendment be defeated and I also urge that the Smith amendment, with or without my own amendment, be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have gotten rather far afield in some of the discussion on these amendments. I think we can bring it down to a very simple thing. I regret that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] offered his amendment. I am sure that what he wants is what we all want; namely, the production of steel.

I am afraid that the Brown amendment will interfere with the objective of this amendment very seriously. First, we have no constitutional right to order the President to do anything. In the second place, the Senate has already passed an amendment to this same legislation in almost identical language, so that when this House acts, if it acts on the Smith amendment at all, we will have replied to the President; namely, that "We are not going to pass any more law. We think the law that has been enacted, should be enforced."

Now, that is all there is to it. Why anybody should hesitate to say to the President, in a very polite and courteous manner, in response to his invitation, "We suggest you use the law of the land," is beyond me to comprehend.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Smith amendment because it is not the answer to the problem in the steel crisis. But I am opposed to it for a more important reason. It is because it does not belong in this bill. It will add to the confusion which surrounds all the great controversial issues that divide the Members of the Congress.

I know of nothing which threatens the future strength and welfare of our country more than the growing confusion which beclouds all the important issues that come before us. Those who gain by confusion are the forces of totalitarianism of both extremes. Totalitarians of the right and left make their appeals to emotion and prejudice. They dare not face the real issue and debate questions

on their merits. They resort to double talk, scare words, and the use of false labels in order to create confusion.

The Smith proposal should be entirely separate from this bill. If this amendment is accepted, Members who want to continue any controls will be forced to vote for the Smith proposal. If they want to oppose the Smith measure they have to vote against all controls.

Those who hope to profit by confusing the issue are gambling with the future welfare of our country and our democracy. Let us have a clear-cut decision on these issues so that the people can understand where each of us stands on every issue. Let those who want to kill all controls, except those on wages, stand up and be counted. Let them accept the responsibility for their acts.

The Smith proposal, no matter how you look at it, contains no merit. It is an effort to pass the buck for the irresponsibility of the coalition majority which dominates the House. It seeks to blame the President and the administration for the action and inaction of the coalition. The House has the power to legislate on the steel crisis. But it ducks its own responsibility. Instead of taking affirmative action it demands that the President follow a course which he believes wrong and dangerous.

President Truman lacks the power in this Congress to get approval for the major legislative proposals in his party's platform. Despite the fact that the people mandated Congress to enact that liberal Democratic Party program, and despite the President's stubborn and courageous fight for the people and for that program, he did not succeed.

All of which makes it quite clear that the Republican-Dixiecrat leaders in the House are resorting to a lot of double talk when they charge that the President is usurping his power or evading his responsibility.

The real truth is that the coalition is evading its responsibility as the majority and is seeking to place the blame for its shortcomings and ill-advised acts on the President and the House minority which supports the administration.

That may be good political strategy in an election year. But it is extremely dangerous to pass legislation that will increase antagonisms and which will divide our people when unity, understanding, cooperation, and good will are so essential to the defense effort and to the success of the free world in its fight against totalitarian tyranny.

If the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition which controls this Congress wants to destroy free labor unions, if it wants to give a free hand to special interests in exploit the consumers and to extend their monopolistic power, they should do it without faking the issue.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the sixth amendment to the defense production act, despite all of the arguments in favor of and against such amendment, is best expressed by its author, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], in the words of his amendment:

It is the sense of the Congress that by reason of the work stoppage now existing in

the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled and the Congress, therefore, requests the President to invoke immediately the national emergency provisions of sections 206 to 210 inclusive, of the National Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage.

An examination of sections 206 to 210 inclusive of the National Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 reveal the following:

When the labor management act of 1947 became law, the Congress of the United States placed in the sole discretion of the President of the United States the option as to whether or not that law should be used. Section 206 of the act provides:

Whenever, in the opinion of the President of the United States, a threatened or actual strike or walkout affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof \* \* \* will, if permitted to occur or continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe.

The act further provides that after the report of the board of inquiry is filed, the President may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States, having jurisdiction of the parties, for an injunction, whenever a district court has taken jurisdiction and issued an injunction, the President shall reconvene the board of inquiry which has previously reported with respect to the dispute. At the end of a 60-day period, unless the dispute has been settled, the board shall report to the President the current position of the parties and the efforts which have been made for settlement and shall include a statement by each part of its position and a statement of the employers' last offer of settlement. This report shall be made available to the public.

The National Labor Management Relations Board, within the succeeding 15 days, shall take a secret ballot of the members involved in the dispute on the question of whether they wish to accept the final offer of settlement made by their employer and certify the results thereof to the Attorney General within 5 days. Upon certification of the results of such ballot or upon settlement, whichever happens sooner, the Attorney General shall move the court to discharge the injunction, which motion shall then be granted and the injunction discharged. When such motion is granted, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of the proceedings, together with such recommendations as he shall see fit to make for consideration and appropriate action.

The President, for reasons which have not been disclosed, has failed to use the National Labor Management Relations Act of 1947. There is no doubt that his failure to use this act has resulted in the delay in the resumption of steel production. This delay lies directly and unequivocally at the door of the President of the United States. The blame cannot be transferred elsewhere. He alone is responsible for the present chaotic condition.

I oppose the Smith amendment because it is substituting the sense of Congress for the "opinion of the President of the United States," as specifically set forth in the National Labor Management Relations Act of 1947.

I have carefully examined the Constitution of the United States, especially article I, dealing with the legislative powers vested in Congress and can find no language in that article of the Constitution which, in my opinion, either directly or indirectly authorizes the Members of Congress to substitute their "sense" for the "opinion" of the President.

I have also carefully examined article II of the Constitution and can find absolutely no justification or basis for the President asking Congress for its advice with regard to executing the laws of the land.

Unfortunately, labor legislation or legislation affecting labor and management is brought to the floor of Congress for debate only in times of stress between management and labor. In my opinion, this results in bad legislation, because neither the representatives of management or the representatives of labor deal with the legislation in an impartial manner. Each feels that this is the opportunity for one to take advantage of the other.

If the Smith amendment becomes law, it will be a direct invasion by Congress of the President's rights and an attempt by Congress to substitute its opinion for the opinion of the President of the United States. If such a change is the will of Congress, it should not be made by an amendment such as offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], but it should be made by a change in the National Labor-Management Relations Act.

I am opposed to the Smith amendment because in my considered opinion it is the establishment of a precedent which will result, if carried out to its ultimate conclusion, in the destruction of our Republic. If this amendment is adopted and the precedent established, if any President of the United States or any representative of the executive branch of our Government does not like any present or future law which the Congress passes calling upon said President or representative of the Executive Department to use his discretion, all he need do is to state to Congress that he does not like the act or does not like to use his own discretion and ask that Congress substitute its discretion for his.

Much as been said that nothing could be gained by the use of the National Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 because more than 80 days has already expired. When the President seized the steel mills early in April, he gave as one of the reasons for his action that time would not permit the invoking of the provisions of the Labor-Management Act of 1947. When the President's action was before the United States Supreme Court, the Government's attorneys defended the President's action and stated that seizure was safer and more effective. When the President addressed Congress with regard to this matter, he

complained about the delays occasioned in the use of the Labor-Management Act of 1947. Yet throughout the entire steel crisis the administration has, by every means at its command, been stressing the importance of steel to the defense effort and the ill-effects that the steel shutdown would bring, not only to our own country, but also to the people of the noncommunist world.

We are now in the fourth week of a disastrous steel strike. Steel is not being produced for defense of ourselves or our allies of the noncommunist world, nor are we securing steel for vital domestic needs. It should be all too evident that the President is playing politics, not only with the steel mills but also with our national defense. He cannot shirk his responsibility by his failure to use every available means to again start steel production; to refrain in every way possible from having Federal intervention in labor-management negotiations, and to allow both management and labor to settle their differences by genuine collective bargaining.

Mr. D. B. Robertson, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, one of the oldest labor unions in existence in this country, said a week ago in Dallas, Tex., that "When we begin to run industry on a political basis there is no end of it. That is what we have been doing for the last 3 or 4 years."

It has always been my personal opinion that it is the duty of the Congress in labor-management matters to provide the rules and regulations under which collective bargaining shall proceed and that thereafter Government shall maintain a hands-off policy and allow the representatives of management and labor to settle their differences by true collective bargaining.

This is not the goal of the Smith amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am voting against the extension of all price and wage controls. I believe that the need for these emergency controls is rapidly passing, if it has not already passed. Furthermore, the record of the Truman administration in the handling of controls makes it extremely unwise, if not actually dangerous, to give the administration the power to continue to make a political football out of the Nation's economy.

The economic situation today demands a swift return to free markets. In 1946, price and wage controls were abruptly removed at a time when great inflationary pressure was present in the economy and many goods were scarce. Today there is little evidence of inflationary tendencies in the economy. The Nation's tremendous productive capacity has adjusted quickly to meet changes in our needs since the Korean war began. Almost all civilian goods are now available and in plentiful supply. In many cases capacity exceeds demand. In this situation the unnecessary prolongation of price and wage controls could do great harm. A buyer's market needs the flexibility that is hampered by price and wage controls.

In times of great national emergency, such as all-out war, price and wage con-

controls may be necessary to supplement indirect controls in the attempt to prevent sudden increases in the general price level and indicate to the public the Government's determination to stop inflation. But there is little, if any, need for these drastic measures today. In the case of materials urgently required for defense production, allocations can effectively limit civilian demand where this is necessary. I believe that tax, expenditure, monetary and credit policies, aided by allocation controls, can provide an adequate defense against inflation during the remainder of the rearmament period as it is now planned.

No system has yet been found that is as effective as the free market system in providing the driving force for economic growth and in regulating the flow of goods and services. Controls actually can impede the production of goods in short supply by preventing price adjustments that might bring forth greater output. The original controls established in 1951 over the machine-tool industry, for example, were so restrictive that the industry was severely handicapped in increasing production. By the time the controls were relaxed, the defense program had been seriously delayed. Another example is the recent potato shortage which was directly caused by the misuse of controls and the socialistic policies of the present leadership.

The underlying reason for my belief that price and wage controls should be eliminated is a conviction that tax, expenditure, monetary, and credit policies are fundamental instruments of government for economic stabilization in a dynamic, free economy, and that they can deal effectively with the present situation. If controls are maintained in order to cope with situations such as we now face, we may drift into accepting them as permanent. France had rent controls for nearly a quarter of a century resulting in an extreme shortage of housing. Except in times of great danger such as might arise in wartime, I believe that price and wage controls should not be used. I do not believe we are now in a situation that demands these controls.

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Smith amendment, providing for Congress to request the President to invoke provisions of the National Labor Relations Act in the current labor dispute in the steel industry.

I must confess, however, that my support is given with some reluctance for it seems to me the Congress is being forced to take an unprecedented step that should be unnecessary. We are, in effect, politely asking the President to fulfill his sworn duty to enforce the law of the land as passed by the Congress and affirmed by the judicial branch of Government.

That it should be necessary to take such a step is a devastating indictment of an Administration that seems determined to nullify the action of the people as expressed and affirmed in both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses. The expressed views of the President in attempting to justify such a course border dangerously close to an invitation

to disobedience of established law and order in the event compliance ultimately is ordered.

Mr. Chairman, it should not be necessary for the legislative branch of Government to order, direct or "invite" the Administrative branch to enforce the law of the land. That is the sworn duty of the President. In the present instance, the steel crisis could have been averted and the dispute might now be settled with satisfaction to the workers themselves and with fairness to all concerned. Under the circumstances, there is no alternative but to repeat again, by way of approval of the Smith amendment, the expressed legislative demand that the President act immediately, through legislation presently in effect, to seek a solution of the dispute that keeps thousands of men out of work and denies the Nation the production of steel so urgently needed for our military defense and our domestic economy.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

I believe it to be consistent with our responsibilities at this time to inform the President, as he requested in his recent address before this Congress, that it is the best judgment of the House of Representatives that he should immediately invoke the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in the present steel dispute.

It would, of course, be foolish for any Member of this body to assert or believe that the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are capable of settling the dispute now existing between management and labor in the steel industry. It is, however, the only means that you and I, as Members of the Congress, or the President can use at this time to put steel back into production. It is a temporary and expedient method, yes, but it is a means whereby the production of steel can be resumed.

It can be argued with justification that the House and Senate should have considered legislation before now which would make it impossible, when our country is faced with war, as we are now, and when American soldiers are committed to battle, as they are now, for major industries producing or manufacturing vital materials used in the war to close down production.

That would be drastic action. So is it drastic, Mr. Chairman, when we take young boys from their parents, husbands from their wives and children, and send them to far lands, some to be injured and some to be killed.

During the past 20 years, Mr. Chairman, the Congress has voted many powers to the President of the United States. Few, I am sure, are familiar with all of the powers that have been granted. Through the very superior work of Mrs. Mollie Z. Margolin, of the American Law Section, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, I have here a compilation and résumé of these powers. I shall insert it in the RECORD. I do so for a very good reason, and that is to dramatically call to your attention what might be called a modern trend of legislating.

It is seldom, if ever, that Congress actually writes into the laws the details and regulations under which most of our laws are administered. We have, for a great number of years, been delegating that power and responsibility to the President of the United States. The modern practice is for Congress to set out the broad principles which we think govern the problems confronting us and then authorize and direct the President to work out orders and regulations to make possible the administration of our acts.

This has brought the legislative and executive branches closer together and makes it more and more necessary that Congress and the President work in close harmony. We, the Congress and the President, share a great responsibility and therefore it should not be considered either rare, discourteous, or unparliamentary for either the President or the Congress to give to the other the benefit of his or our judgment on the many joint problems confronting us.

It cannot rightfully be said that it is discourteous or unusual, although it might be said to be uncommon, for Congress to request the President to use either one or many of the vast powers which we have granted to the office of the Presidency during the past years.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be a mistake for the House of Representatives to refuse to answer the question of the President as to whether he should use the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. At the present time there is no other legislation under which steel can be put into production.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the Members of the House will find interesting the tabulation of the powers granted the President by the Congress, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

POWERS WHICH HAVE BEEN VOTED TO THE PRESIDENT BY CONGRESS SINCE 1933

In this compilation of the powers which Congress has voted to the President in the last 20 years, the powers have been placed in various categories. In part I are the general powers, which the President may exercise at all times. Part II contains the emergency powers, which become operative only upon the occurrence of some specified contingency. Of these, some have become active upon the declaration by the President of a national emergency on December 16, 1950 (proclamation No. 2914; 15 F. R. 9029). Others are dormant, being contingent upon war, upon a national emergency declared by Congress, or upon some other specified unusual occurrence. The digest of each law in this category points out the event upon which the power is contingent.

In several instances the law which originally granted the President a certain power was enacted more than 20 years ago, but has been amended within the past 20 years by an act which reaffirms this power. Such acts have been listed separately in part III of this report.

The act of April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong.) as amended May 28, 1952 (Public Law 368, 82d Cong.) is referred to frequently in dealing with the emergency powers. This act extends until June 15, 1952, certain powers of the President which would have expired or become dormant on April 28, 1952, the date on which the Japanese Peace Treaty officially ended World War II, and on which the President's Proclamation No. 2974 (17

F. R. 3813) terminated the national emergency proclaimed on September 5, 1939 (proclamation No. 2352), and the unlimited national emergency proclaimed on May 27, 1941 (proclamation No. 2487). Since these powers were previously dependent upon war or specified emergencies, and have now been extended "notwithstanding any limitation, by reference to war or national emergency" (Public Law 313 sec. 1 (a)), they were considered new powers and were included in this compilation.

The laws dealing with the power to make appointments or removals, to create new commissions, to accept United States membership in international conferences, and to make presentation of medals, have been omitted since these are not new grants of powers but merely new applications of already existing powers.

A topical index has been attached referring to item numbers. Also attached is a chronological table of statutes covered by this compilation.

#### I. GENERAL POWERS

##### *Abaca production*

Item 1: The Abaca Production Act of 1950, approved August 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 435-437) provides for the continuation and expansion of Western Hemisphere production by the United States. The President is authorized to issue such rules and regulations and make such determinations as he may deem necessary to carry out this program. Temporary, expires April 1, 1960.

##### *Agriculture*

Item 2: Act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 37 (c)) as amended June 3, 1937 (50 Stat. 246, sec. 1 (h); 7 U. S. C. 610 (c)) empowers the President to approve the regulations made by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Agricultural Adjustment Act. This power does not extend to approval of agricultural marketing orders (61 Stat. 951, sec. 102).

##### *Armed services*

As Commander in Chief: From time to time certain powers are voted to the President which are incidental to his status as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. These have been omitted from this compilation. However, a few of these outstanding powers have been listed below by way of illustration:

Item 3: Act of June 15, 1933 (48 Stat. 155, sec. 4) authorizes the President to order officers of the National Guard, with their consent, into active service during peacetime.

Item 4: Act of December 13, 1941 (55 Stat. 800 c. 571, sec. 2) authorizes the President to terminate periods of service of all members of the Army of the United States earlier than the time prescribed by Congress.

Item 5: Act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 27, sec. 6) gives the President discretion as to the retirement of Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard officers after 20 years of service.

Item 6: Act of October 12, 1949 (63 Stat. 825, sec. 414) provides that the President may regulate disability retirement.

##### *Delegation of Authority*

Item 7: The President may delegate his authority under the Uniform Code of Military Justice and may provide for subdelegation of any such authority. Act of May 5, 1950 (64 Stat. 145, art. 140, sec. 1).

##### *Detail of Men*

Item 8: Philippine Commonwealth: The President is authorized to include the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands with the Latin-American Republics in the matter of assisting such Governments in military and naval matters, and may detail members of the Armed Forces for such purpose. Act of May 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 218 ch. 109).

Item 9: United Nations: The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with the

Security Council, which shall be subject to approval by Congress, concerning Armed Forces to be made available to the Security Council upon its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of the United Nations Charter. The President shall not require the authorization of Congress to make available to the Security Council Armed Forces under article 42 of the Charter (act of December 20, 1945; 59 Stat. 621 ch. 584 sec. 6). The President may detail to the United Nations, without the consent of Congress, up to 1,000 members of the Armed Forces to serve in non-combatant capacity (act of October 10, 1949; 63 Stat. 735 sec. 5).

##### *Atomic energy*

Item 10: Act of June 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 308 ch. 487, sec. 1) gives the President the power to approve the use of naval vessels as targets for testing atomic weapons.

Item 11: Act of August 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 755-775): The "Atomic Energy Act of 1946" gives the President the power:

1. To make a final decision in a disagreement between the Military Liaison Committee and the Atomic Energy Commission (sec. 2 (c)), as amended by act of October 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 762 ch. 763)).

2. To determine at least once each year the quantities of fissionable material which the Atomic Energy Commission shall produce in its own facilities (sec. 4 (ch. 2)).

3. To approve what materials may be regarded as source material (sec. 5 (b, 1)).

4. To determine the extent to which fissionable materials shall be utilized in the production of atomic bombs or other military weapons (sec. 6 (a, 2)).

5. To determine which property in control of Government agencies, is to be transferred to the Atomic Energy Commission (sec. 9 (a, 3)).

6. To utilize the services of any Government agency to the extent he may deem desirable in order to protect against the unlawful dissemination of restricted data and to safeguard facilities, equipment, materials, and other property of the Atomic Energy Commission (sec. 10 (b) (5B, iv)).

7. To exempt in advance, any specific action of the Commission in a particular matter from the provisions of law relating to contracts whenever he determines that such action is essential in the interest of the common defense and security (sec. 12 (b)).

Item 12: Act of October 30, 1951 (Public Law 235, 82d Cong.) gives the President the power to determine that an arrangement by the Atomic Energy Commission to produce fissionable material outside the United States or which will involve the communication of restricted data to another nation, would substantially promote and would not endanger the common defense and security of the United States.

##### *Bankruptcy*

Item 13: Act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1970-1971) provides that the President represent the United States when the United States or any agency thereof is a creditor under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act.

Item 14: Act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 788, ch. 666) authorizes the President or any officer whom he may designate to sell, exchange, etc., any bonds, notes, or other securities acquired on behalf of the United States under the provisions of the Transportation Act of 1920, including any securities acquired as an incident to a bankruptcy, receivership, etc.

##### *Civil aeronautics*

Item 15: The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, approved June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 1014, sec. 801) makes all overseas or foreign air-transportation certificates subject to the approval of the President.

Item 16: The Federal Airport Act, approved May 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 179, ch. 251, sec. 16

(b)) requires the approval of the President to the conveyance of Government-owned lands for public airports.

Item 17: Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 825, ch. 938) authorizes the President to direct the Secretary of Commerce and the Civil Aeronautics Board to undertake security measures relative to the regulation and control of air commerce.

##### *Coast and Geodetic Survey*

Item 18: Act of January 19, 1942 (56 Stat. 7, sec. 2) and act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 299, sec. 10 (a)) empower the President to make all promotions of officers, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

##### *Coast Guard*

Item 19: Act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 507, sec. 149), authorizes the President to detail officers and enlisted men to assist foreign governments in matters concerning which the Coast Guard may be of assistance.

Item 20: Act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 514, sec. 229), provides that the President may revoke commissions during the first 3 years of commissioned service.

##### *Commodity Credit Corporation*

Item 21: Act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107, sec. 3), directs the President or such officers as he shall designate to exercise all rights of the United States arising out of ownership of capital stock in the Commodity Credit Corporation.

##### *Control of consumer and real-estate credit*

Item 22: Title VI of the Defense Production Act of 1950, approved September 8, 1950 (64 Stat. 812-815), as amended by act of July 31, 1951 (Public Law 96, 82d Cong., sec. 106), and by act of September 1, 1951 (Public Law 139, 82d Cong., sec. 602), authorizes the President to prescribe regulations relative to consumer real-estate construction credit controls exercised by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Such regulations may, among other things, prescribe maximum loan or credit values, minimum down payments, maximum maturities, maximum amounts of credit, and so forth. The President may utilize the services of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Reserve banks, and any other available Federal or State agencies. Temporary; expires June 30, 1952 (Public Law 96, 82d Cong., sec. 111).

##### *Customs laws*

Item 23: Act of August 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 517, ch. 438), authorizes the President to establish or discontinue customs-enforcement areas.

Item 24: Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 773-774), as last amended by act of June 28, 1950 (64 Stat. 261-262, ch. 381, sec. 3), authorizes the President to restrict importations which tend to interfere with the operation of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Item 25: Act of April 30, 1946 (60 Stat. 151-155, secs. 401-501), authorizes the President to enter into executive agreements with the President of the Philippines.

Item 26: Act of July 15, 1947 (61 Stat. 322, sec. 3 (b) E) as last extended by act of July 31, 1951 (Public Law 96, 82d Cong. sec. 101 (c)) authorizes the President to control imports of fats and oils. Temporary, expires June 30, 1952.

Item 27: Act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 687 sec. 43) authorizes the President to approve regulations for import and export of game mammals from or to Mexico.

##### *Displaced persons*

Item 28: Act of June 16, 1950 (64 Stat. 227 sec. 12 "14") authorizes the President to regulate loans by Reconstruction Finance Corporation to finance the reception and transportation of eligible displaced persons. Temporary, expires June 30, 1953.

*Executive departments*

Item 29: Act of August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1290 c. 616) provides that the President may utilize the services of the executive departments, agencies, etc., in carrying out the reciprocal undertakings enunciated in the treaties between the American Republics.

Item 30: Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 809-810, 812 secs. 14, 19) authorizes the President to prescribe regulations concerning cash awards to employees for meritorious suggestions effecting economy.

Item 31: Act of January 27, 1948 (62 Stat. 8-9 sec. 401) provides that the President may approve the utilization of services, facilities, and personnel of Government agencies in carrying out any activity authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act.

Item 32: A series of Reorganization acts were enacted, the first one in 1932, and the most recent on June 20, 1949 (63 Stat. 203), the "Reorganization Act of 1949." The President was given the power to consolidate, group, coordinate, or reduce the Government agencies in order to produce efficiency and reduce expenditures. Temporary, expires April 1, 1953.

Item 33: The Classification Act of 1949, approved October 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 959 sec. 505 (b)) provides that no position shall be placed in or removed from Grade 18 of the General Schedule except by the President upon recommendation of the Civil Service Commission.

Item 34: Act of August 26, 1950 (64 Stat. 477 ch. 803 sec. 3) authorizes the President to extend to other agencies the power of suspension of civilian officers and employees in the interest of national security.

Item 35: Act of September 12, 1950 (64 Stat. 838 sec. 202) authorizes the President to approve transfer of balances of appropriations upon transfer of functions.

*Exports*

Item 36: Act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 463, ch. 461) authorized the President to control exports by curtailing or prohibiting the export of articles, materials, and supplies, including technical data. After several extensions, this act expired on February 28, 1949 (61 Stat. 946 sec. 3 (a)) and was replaced by the Export Control Act of 1949, approved February 23, 1949 (63 Stat. 7 ch. 11) which gives the President the same power but extends it also to the control of financing, transporting, and other servicing of exports. Temporary, expires June 30, 1953 (Public Law 33, 82d Cong.).

*Farmers*

Item 37: Act of July 22, 1937 (50 Stat. 525, 526, 530, secs. 23 (b), 32 (c), 45) as amended August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1069, sec. 45) authorizes the President to make allotments or appropriations and to make transfers of land under the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, the title to which has been acquired by the United States in the national defense program, but which is no longer needed for same.

*Foreign affairs*

Item 38: Act of June 24, 1938 (52 Stat. 1934, c. 644) as last amended June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 279-280, ch. 357) authorizes the President to designate a number of citizens of the American Republics to study at United States professional institutions, and at the United States Military and Naval Academies.

Item 39: Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418, ch. 701) requires the President's approval of the sale of surplus agricultural commodities by Commodity Credit Corporation to foreign governments.

Item 40: Act of June 15, 1940 (54 Stat. 396, sec. 1) empowers the President to authorize the manufacture and sale of coast-defense and antiaircraft material to the American Republics.

Item 41: The Bretton Woods Agreements Act, approved July 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 512-517) provides for the President's direction of the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Item 42: Act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 961, ch. 928) authorizes the President to designate 2 persons from each American Republic, not exceeding a total of 12 persons at any one time, to receive instruction at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.

Item 43: Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 706 sec. 5) provides for authorization and direction by the President of admission of commissioned officers of military services of foreign countries to the Naval Postgraduate School.

Item 44: Act of July 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 1210 c. 785) authorizes the President to assist, by grants-in-aid, the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment of veterans who served in the United States forces during World War II.

Item 45: Act of June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 389 sec. 205 (a)) authorizes the President to prescribe policies and directives regarding the procurement, utilization and disposal of Government property.

Item 46: The Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 714-721), as amended July 25, 1950 (64 Stat. 373-377); and the Mutual Security Act of 1951, approved October 10, 1951 (Public Law 165, 82d Cong.), authorize the President to extend military, economic, and technical assistance to friendly countries. Among these countries are the North Atlantic Treaty countries, and any other European country which the President determines to be of importance to the defense of the North Atlantic area, Greece, Turkey, Iran or other Near East countries, Republic of the Philippines, Republic of Korea, general area of China, the American Republics.

Item 47: The International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, approved October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 945-947) authorizes the President to regulate the quantities of wheat to be made available for export under this program, and to take any action which he deems necessary, including the restriction of exports and imports of wheat.

Item 48: The Act for International Development, approved June 5, 1950 (64 Stat. 204-79, title IV) as amended October 10, 1951 (Public Law 165, 82d Cong., sec. 2) authorizes the President to participate in multilateral technical cooperation programs carried on by the United Nations, and to plan and execute bilateral technical cooperation programs carried on by any United States Government Agency, for the purpose of assisting nations living in economically underdeveloped areas of the world to develop the resources of their lands.

Item 49: Act of September 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 1079 c. 1094) authorizes the President or such other officer or agency as he may designate to conclude and give effect to agreements with governments with which the United States was not at war in World War II, for the settlement of intercultural conflicts involving enemy property.

Item 50: The Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, approved October 28, 1951 (Public Law 213, 82d Cong.) provides for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination. The President is authorized to terminate all military, economic, and financial assistance to any nation which he determines is not effectively cooperating with the United States in this program. The President may direct the continuance of such assistance

to a country which permits shipments of items other than implements of war and atomic energy materials when unusual circumstances indicate that the cessation of aid would clearly be detrimental to the security of the United States.

Item 51: Act of October 31, 1951 (Public Law 249, 82d Cong.) gives the President the power of discretion regarding economic, technical, and military assistance to Spain. Temporary, expires June 30, 1952.

*Gold purchases*

Item 52: Act of January 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 341, sec. 8) provides for approval by the President of gold purchases made by the Secretary of the Treasury.

*Government corporations*

Item 53: Act of December 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 598-600, secs. 102-107), as amended September 12, 1950 (64 Stat. 834, sec. 105), provides for regulation by the President of the annual budget program of wholly-owned Government corporations.

*Housing*

Item 54: Act of August 10, 1948 (62 Stat. 1268, ch. 832, sec. 101, as amended; 12 U. S. C. 1738 (a)) gives the President the power to approve an increase in the aggregate amount of mortgages on veterans' housing which may be insured by the War Housing Insurance Fund, provided however, that the aggregate amount does not exceed \$6,650,000,000.

Item 55: Act of July 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 426, 427, secs. 304 (g), 305) provides that the Housing Authority obtain Presidential approval before entering into, amending, or superseding a contract for annual contributions, loans, or both. The President may increase the aggregate amount of annual contributions for which the Authority may contract or may determine that an increase in the number of dwellings is in the public interest.

Item 56: Act of July 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 419, sec. 108) authorizes the President in his discretion, to transfer to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, at fair market value, any surplus Federal real property which will be located within the area of a planned low-rent housing project.

Item 57: Act of July 31, 1951 (Public Law 96, 82d Cong., sec. 203), provides that the President shall, by regulation or order, establish maximum rents which he deems fair and equitable in any State which by its laws require Federal rent control or in any political subdivision of a State which does not have rent control upon receipt of a resolution enacted by its governing body that Federal rent control is necessary. Temporary, expires June 30, 1952 (sec. 211 (b)).

Item 58: The Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, approved September 1, 1951 (Public Law 139, 82d Cong., sec. 101), empowers the President to proclaim that an area is a critical defense housing area and entitled to the benefits provided by this act relating to housing and community facilities and services. Temporary, expires June 30, 1953 (sec. 104).

*Immigration*

Item 59: Act of June 20, 1941 (55 Stat. 252, ch. 209) authorizes the President to prescribe regulations in connection with refusing visas, etc., to aliens whose admission would endanger the safety of the United States.

*Information*

Item 60: Internal Security Act of 1950, enacted September 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 991, sec. 4 (b, c)) recognizes the power of the President to classify information as affecting the security of the United States, for the purpose of the prohibition against communicating same to foreign agents.

*Internal Revenue*

Item 61: Act of March 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 45, sec. 1), provides that the President shall

approve regulations as to the silver bullion transfer tax.

#### National forests

Item 62: Act of March 10, 1934 (48 Stat. 400, ch. 54), authorizes the President to establish fish and game sanctuaries in national forests.

Item 63: Act of May 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 224, ch. 220, sec. 1), authorizes the President to withdraw national forest lands from location, entry, or appropriation, in order to protect watersheds from which water is obtained by municipalities.

#### National parks

Item 64: Act of April 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 199, ch. 230), authorizes the President to approve the transfer to the Department of the Interior of surplus Federal real property administered by any agency, if such property is located within the boundaries of a national park or monument. Temporary, expires July 1, 1952.

#### Panama Canal

Item 65: Act of July 9, 1927 (50 Stat. 486, ch. 470 sec. 1) which declares that the Government of the United States possesses exclusive control over the air space above the Canal Zone, authorizes the President to make rules and regulations governing aircraft, air navigation, air navigation facilities, and aeronautical activities within the Canal Zone.

Item 66: Act of June 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 389, sec. 2 "274") gives the President the power to establish the rate of interest, not exceeding 3 percent per annum, on postal-savings certificates in the Canal Zone.

Item 67: Act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676, sec. 39) authorizes the President to provide for the registration and fingerprinting of aliens in the Canal Zone.

#### Price and wage stabilization

Item 68: The Defense Production Act of 1950, approved September 8, 1950 (64 Stat. 803-812, title IV) as amended July 31, 1951 (Public Law 96, 82d Cong., sec. 104) authorizes the President to stabilize prices and wages. Temporary—expires June 30, 1952 (Public Law 96, 82d Cong., sec. 111).

Item 68A: Title V of this act as amended (64 Stat. 812) authorizes the President to initiate voluntary settlements of labor disputes.

#### Priorities and allocations

Item 69: The Defense Production Act of 1950, approved September 8, 1950 (64 Stat. 799, title I) as amended July 31, 1951 (Public Law 96, 82d Cong., sec. 101 (a)) authorizes the President to grant priorities to contracts pertaining to the national defense and to allocate materials and facilities in such manner as he shall deem necessary to promote the national defense. Temporary—expires June 30, 1952 (Public Law 96, 82d Cong., sec. 111).

#### Productive capacity expansion

Item 70: The Defense Production Act of 1950, approved September 8, 1950 (64 Stat. 800-802, title III) as amended July 31, 1951 (Public Law 96, 82d Cong., sec. 103) provides that in order to expedite production, etc., under Government contracts, the President may authorize any procurement agency of the Government including Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force, to guarantee any public or private financing institution (including any Federal Reserve Bank) against loss of principal or interest on any loan, discount, etc., which may be made by such financing institution for the purpose of financing any defense contractor or subcontractor.

The President may also make provision for loans to private business enterprises for the expansion of capacity, the development of technological processes, or the production of essential materials.

The President is given the power to procure, transport, store, process, and refine essential, critical and strategic materials.

When in his judgment it will aid national defense, the President is authorized to install additional equipment, facilities, processes, or improvements to plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by the Government, and to install Government-owned equipment in plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by private persons. Temporary, expires June 30, 1952 (Public Law 96, 82d Cong., sec. 111).

#### Public lands

Item 71: Act of June 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 326-327, ch. 380), requires Presidential approval of grants of recreational demonstration projects to the States or to their political subdivisions.

#### Requisitions

Item 72: The Defense Production Act of 1950, approved September 8, 1950 (64 Stat. 799, title II), as amended July 31, 1951 (Public Law 96, 82d Cong., sec. 102 (a)), authorizes the President to requisition and condemn property which is needed for the national defense. Temporary, expires June 30, 1952 (Public Law 96, 82d Cong., sec. 111).

#### Rubber

Item 73: The Rubber Act of 1948, approved March 31, 1948 (62 Stat. 102-108), gives the President the power of allocation, specification, and inventory control of natural and synthetic rubber. Temporary, expires June 30, 1952 (64 Stat. 256 ch. 357).

#### Securities and exchanges

Item 74: Act of June 6, 1934 (48 Stat. 898, sec. 19 (4)), gives the President the power to approve summary suspension of all trading on any national security exchange for a period not exceeding 90 days.

#### Seizure of plants

Item 75: The Selective Service Act of 1948, approved June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 625 sec. 18) as last amended June 19, 1951 (Public Law 51, 82d Cong., sec. 1 (w)), authorizes the President to take immediate possession of and operate any plant, mine, or facility with which Government orders had been placed for articles or materials for use of the Armed Forces, and the owners of which had refused or failed either to give the orders precedence, to fill the orders within the prescribed time, to produce the kind or quality ordered, or to furnish same at the negotiated price.

If any producer of steel refuses to comply with the requirement to make available to Government contractors supplying the Armed Forces, quantities of steel in percentages deemed necessary for the expeditious execution of such orders, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to take immediate possession of the plant of such producer.

#### Silver

Item 76: The Silver Purchase Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1178-1181) requires Presidential approval of the regulation by the Secretary of the Treasury of transactions in silver, and authorizes the President, when in his judgment such action is necessary, to require, by Executive order, the delivery to the United States mints of any or all silver by whomever owned or possessed.

#### Tennessee Valley Authority

Item 77: Act of July 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 600 ch. 309) provides that the transfer of real property of the Tennessee Valley Authority to private persons for summer homes, resorts, etc., or to any Government agency, shall require approval of the President.

#### Veterans

Item 78: Act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 624 ch. 588 sec. 4) empowers the President to

approve or disapprove proceedings of boards of review set up under the GI bill of rights.

Item 79: Act of August 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 788 sec. 12) provides that the President shall have general direction over the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in the administration of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940.

## II. EMERGENCY AND WAR POWERS

### Aliens

Item 80: Act of April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong. sec. 1 (a) (40)), amended May 28, 1952 (Public Law 368, 82d Cong.), grants the President the power to determine that the interests of the United States require that additional restrictions and prohibitions be imposed upon the entry to and departure from the United States of aliens and citizens, and to regulate such entries and departures. Although the President had this power under act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559, c. 81), as amended June 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 252 c. 210, sec. 1), the power was restricted to wartime and to the emergency which ended on April 28, 1952, when the Japanese Peace Treaty became effective. The President can now exercise this power even though we are not at war. Temporary, expires June 15, 1952.

### American National Red Cross

Item 81: Act of April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong., sec. 1 (a) (32)), amended May 28, 1952 (Public Law 368, 82d Cong.), authorizes the President to utilize the services of the American National Red Cross to assist our Armed Forces. Although the act of April 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 90, 91, secs. 1, 2), as amended, gave this power to the President, that act restricted it to time of war or "when war is imminent." Temporary, expires June 15, 1952.

### Armed Forces

Item 82: Act of June 15, 1933 (48 Stat. 156, sec. 7), provides that in the event of an emergency declared by Congress, the President may extend the enlistment terms of the National Guard and of the National Guard of the United States for a period of 6 months after the termination of the emergency.

Item 83: Act of June 15, 1933 (48 Stat. 160, sec. 18), amended June 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 392, sec. 7), provides that during a period of war or emergency declared by Congress, the President may order units or members of the National Guard of the United States into active military service.

Item 84: Act of June 15, 1933 (48 Stat. 161, sec. 20), as amended September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 875, sec. 101), authorizes the President in time of war or national emergency determined by the President to appoint any officer of the Regular Army to a higher temporary grade without vacating his permanent appointment.

Item 85: Act of May 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 214, c. 195), provides that in time of actual or threatened hostilities the President may allow additional enlistments in the Medical Department of the Army in such numbers as he may deem necessary.

Item 86: Act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604, secs. 5, 6), as amended April 9, 1943 (57 Stat. 60 c. 38 sec. 1) and June 30, 1951 (Public Law 67, 82d Cong. sec. 2 (a)) provides that in time of war or national emergency determined by the President, the President may make temporary appointments and advancements of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Item 87: Act of October 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 763 c. 571), provides that during a war or a declared national emergency, the President may detail officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to assist, in military and naval matters, the governments of such countries as he deems it in the interest of our national defense to assist.

Item 88: Act of August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 893, 906, 907 secs. 507 (b), 514 (f), 515 (e)), provides that in time of emergency declared by the President, or by Congress, and in time of war, the President may suspend the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act pertaining to promotions and to mandatory retirement of Army officers, and may appoint temporary officers in the Army of the United States in commissioned grades.

Item 89: Act of August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 907 sec. 515 (d)), authorizes the President, in time of a national emergency expressly declared by Congress, to order any officer of any Reserve component of the Army of the United States into active Federal duty without his consent for as long a period as the President may prescribe.

Item 90: Act of October 12, 1949 (63 Stat. 810, 811 secs. 204 (d), 205 (d)), authorizes the President, in time of war, to suspend incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty and diving duty.

Item 91: Act of April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong. sec. 1 (c)), amended May 28, 1952 (Public Law 368, 82d Cong.) authorizes the President to continue in force the present appointments of warrant officers and of Reserve component officers of the Army and the Air Force, the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States, which were made under the provisions of title 10, United States Code section 591a, and which would have expired on April 28, 1952, when the Japanese Peace Treaty became effective. Although these officers could have been reappointed for the period of the national emergency declared December 16, 1950, and for 6 months thereafter, the President now has the power to continue these appointments in force without a new reappointment. Temporary, expires June 15, 1952.

#### *Coast and Geodetic Survey*

Item 92: Act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 299 sec. 10 (b)), provides that in time of emergency declared by the President or by Congress, and in time of war, the President is authorized to suspend the provisions of the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officer's Act pertaining to promotion.

#### *Communications*

Item 93: Act of June 14, 1934 (48 Stat. 1104, sec. 606 (c)), amended and superseded October 24, 1951 (Public Law 200, 82d Cong., sec. 1) provides that upon proclamation by the President that there exists war or a threat of war or a state of public peril or disaster or other national emergency, the President may suspend or amend for such time as he sees fit, the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission as to radio communications, and may cause the closing of any radio station, and the removal therefrom of its apparatus and equipment, or he may authorize the use or control of any such station by a department of the Government, upon just compensation to the owners.

Item 94: Act of January 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 18, ch. 18), provides that upon a proclamation by the President that there exists a state or threat of war involving the United States, the President, if he deems it necessary in the interest of national security, may suspend or amend the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission applicable to any or all facilities or stations for wire communications, may cause the closing of any facility or station and the removal therefrom of its apparatus and equipment, or may authorize the use or control of such facility or station by any department of the Government, upon just compensation to the owner.

#### *Contracts*

Item 95: Title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, approved December 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 839, sec. 201), as amended January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1257, ch. 1230), provides that during the national emergency proclaimed

by the President on December 16, 1950, the President may authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the national defense, to enter into or amend contracts and to make payments thereon without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, etc., of contracts, whenever he deems that such action would facilitate the national defense. Temporary, expires June 30, 1952.

Item 96: Act of April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong., sec. 1 (a) (3)), amended May 28, 1952 (Public Law 368, 82d Cong.), authorizes the President to designate a Government officer or agency to inspect the plants and audit the books of any contractor with whom a defense contract has been placed. The President was given this power by act of March 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 185-186, secs. 1301-1304), but that act restricted the power to the duration of World War II and would have expired on April 28, 1952, when the Japanese Peace Treaty officially ended the war. Public Law 313 extended this power beyond the termination of the war. Temporary, expires June 15, 1952.

#### *Emergency detention*

Item 96A: The Emergency Detention Act of 1950, enacted September 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 1021, secs. 102, 103), provides that in the event of invasion, declaration of war by Congress, insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy, the President may proclaim a state of internal security emergency, and may then through the Attorney General apprehend and detain certain persons who may conspire to engage in acts of espionage or sabotage.

#### *Foreign exchange*

Item 97: Act of March 9, 1933 (48 Stat. 1, 2, secs. 2, 4), amended December 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 839, sec. 301) provides that during the time of war or during any period of national emergency declared by the President, the President may regulate transactions in foreign exchange and certain transactions of member banks of the Federal Reserve System and may regulate transactions regarding alien property or its ownership.

#### *Hawaii*

Item 98: Act of June 19, 1936 (49 Stat. 1535), gives the President the power to determine that an emergency exists which requires the use for public defense, of certain territory transferred to the Territory of Hawaii, so that the United States may resume occupation of same.

#### *Labor*

Item 99: Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1013 c. 825, sec. 6), provides that in the event of a national emergency the President is authorized to suspend certain provisions of law relating to wages of laborers, etc., under public building contracts.

#### *Priorities*

Item 100: Act of April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong., sec. 1 (a) (33)), amended May 28, 1952 (Public Law 368, 82d Cong.) extends the war power which the President had been granted under act of February 4, 1887 (24 Stat. 380, sec. 6) as amended by section 2 of the act of June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. 586, c. 3591) to demand and receive preference and precedence over all other traffic for the transportation of troops and materials of war. Temporary, expires June 15, 1952.

Item 100A: Act of April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong., sec. 1 (a) (35)), amended May 28, 1952 (Public Law 368, 82d Cong.) extends the war power which was granted to the President by act of February 28, 1920 (41 Stat. 477, sec. 402 (15)) to certify to the Interstate Commerce Commission that it is essential to the national defense and security that certain traffic shall have preference or priority in transportation. Temporary, expires June 15, 1952. This authority is made applicable to freight forwarders by sec. 1 (a)

(36) of Public Law 313, 82d Congress as amended. Temporary, expires June 15, 1952.

#### *Public Health Service*

Item 101: Act of April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong., sec. 1 (a) (9)), as amended by act of May 28, 1952 (Public Law 368, 82d Cong.) extends the war power granted to the President by act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 689-691, secs. 212, 213, 216) to declare the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service to be a military service, making it a branch of the land and naval forces of the United States, subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and entitling its members to full military benefits such as death payments and veterans compensation. Temporary, expires June 15, 1952.

#### *Public works*

Item 102: Act of April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong., sec. 1 (a) (17)), amended by act of May 28, 1952 (Public Law 368, 82d Cong.) extends the power under the Lanham act, granted the President by act of June 23, 1941 (55 Stat. 362, 363, secs. 3, 4 (a)) which is needed to operate or reactivate existing public works necessary to the welfare of persons engaged in national defense activities. The power is vested in the Housing and Home Finance Administrator "with the approval of the President." Temporary, expires June 15, 1942.

#### *Ships and shipping*

Item 103: Act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 1993, 2010, secs. 302 (h), 712 (d)) provides that during a national emergency as proclaimed by the President, he may, in his discretion, suspend any or all provisions of section 302 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, relating to citizenship requirements of officers and crews of vessels, and may terminate private charter operation.

Item 104: Act of June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1095-1096 c. 715), provides that during time of war or national emergency, the President is authorized to arm American vessels.

Item 105: Act of August 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 427-428 ch. 656), authorizes the President to control the anchorage and movement of foreign flag vessels in the territorial waters of the United States, whenever he finds that the security of the United States is endangered by reason of actual or threatened war, or invasion, or insurrection, or subversive activity or of disturbances or threatened disturbances of the international relations of the United States.

Item 106: Act of April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong., sec. 1 (a) (38)) amended by act of May 28, 1952 (Public Law 368, 82d Cong.), extends the emergency power, which had been granted to the President by act of June 6, 1941 (55 Stat. 242 ch. 174 sec. 1) as amended, to purchase, charter, or requisition the use of foreign merchant vessels lying idle in waters within the jurisdiction of the United States, which are necessary for the national defense. Temporary, expires June 15, 1952.

#### *Strategic materials*

Item 107: Act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811, sec. 4), amended July 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 598 sec. 5) provides that stockpiles of strategic and critical materials shall be released for use, sale or other disposition only on order of the President when required for purposes of the common defense, or in time of war or national emergency with respect to common defense proclaimed by the President, on order of such agency as the President may designate.

#### *Transportation*

Item 108: Act of April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong., sec. 1 (a) (34)), as amended May 28, 1952 (Public Law 368, 82d Cong.), extends the war power which had been granted to the President by act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 645 ch. 418 sec. 1) to assume control, through the Secretary of the Army, of transportation systems, and to utilize same to the

exclusion of all other traffic for the movement of troops, war material and equipment, and other purposes connected with the emergency. The President may now exercise this authority through such officers or agencies as he may designate. Temporary, expires June 15, 1952.

### III. POWERS GRANTED BY ACTS WHICH HAVE BEEN AMENDED SINCE 1933

#### Armed Forces

Item 109: Act of July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 717), superseded by act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 558, sec. 8) provides that in time of war or national emergency declared by the President to exist, any commissioned or warrant officer of the Navy or Marine Corps on the retired list, who was ordered to active duty, may be temporarily advanced to and commissioned in such higher grade or rank on the retired list as the President may determine, but not above lieutenant commander in the Navy, or major in the Marine Corps.

Item 110: Act of January 28, 1915 (38 Stat. 800-801, sec. 1), superseded by act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 496, sec. 3) provides that upon a declaration of war or when the President directs, the Coast Guard shall operate as a service in the Navy and shall so continue until the President by Executive order transfers the Coast Guard back to the Treasury Department.

Item 111: Act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 219, sec. 6), last amended and superseded by act of September 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 1003, sec. 18 (a)), recognizes the power of the President in time of war or in case of national emergency, to designate places in which anything for the use of the Army, Navy, or Air Force is being prepared or constructed or stored, concerning which information is not to be published, which the President has determined would be prejudicial to the national defense.

#### IV. TOPICAL INDEX

(Each reference is to an item number)

Abacá production, 1.  
Act for International Development, 48.  
Aeronautics, civil (see civil aeronautics).  
Agricultural Adjustment Act, approval of regulations, 2; restriction of imports, 24.  
Agriculture, sale of surplus to foreign governments, 39.  
Alien property, control, 97.  
Aliens, in Canal Zone, registration, 67; property, control, 97; refusal of visas, 59; restriction on entry to and departure from United States, 80.  
Allocation, materials, and facilities, 69; rubber, 73.  
American National Red Cross, utilization of to aid Armed Forces, 81.  
American Republics, citizens, study at United States academies, 38, 42; coast-defense and anti-aircraft material, sale, 40; military, economic, and technical assistance, 46; use of executive agencies for reciprocal undertakings, 29.  
Appropriations, transfer of balances, 35.  
Armed Forces, continuation of certain appointments, 91; delegation of authority under Uniform Code of Military Justice, 7; detail, to assist foreign governments, 87; to assist Philippines, 8; to assist United Nations, 9; disability retirement, 6; incentive pay, hazardous duty, 90.  
Army, appointment of officers to higher temporary grades, 84; Medical Department, additional enlistments, 85; periods of service, termination, 4; Reserve components, order to active service, 89; suspension of mandatory retirement provision, 88; suspension of promotion provisions, 88.  
Arming American vessels, 104.  
Atomic energy, restricted data, communication to foreign nation, 12; restricted data, protection of, 11 (6); use of naval vessels as targets, 10.

Atomic Energy Act, 11.  
Audit, books of defense contractors, 96.  
Bankruptcy, sale of securities acquired by United States as incident to, 14; United States as creditor, 13.  
Bankruptcy Act, section 77, 13.  
Books, defense contractors, audit, 96.  
Bretton Woods Agreements Act, 41.  
China, general area, aid, 46.  
Citizenship, officers and crew of merchant vessels, 103.  
Civil aeronautics, Federal lands for public airports, 16; foreign air transportation certificates, 15; Panama Canal Zone, control, 65; security measures in control of air commerce, 17.  
Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, 15.  
Classification Act of 1949, 33.  
Coast and Geodetic Survey, promotion of officers, 18; suspension of promotion provisions, 92.  
Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act, 92.  
Coast Guard, detail to assist foreign governments, 19; officers, retirement, 5; revocation of commissions, 20; service in the Navy, 110.  
Commodity Credit Corporation, sale of agricultural surplus to foreign governments, 39; United States as owner of capital stock, 21.  
Communications, radio stations, control, operation, closing, 93; wire communications, control, operation, closing, 94.  
Community facilities and services, defense housing, 58.  
Consumer credit control, 22.  
Contracts, Atomic Energy Commission, exemption from legal provisions, 11 (7); national defense, exemption from legal provisions, 95; priority, 69; public buildings, wage provisions, suspension, 99.  
Contractors, inspection of plants, audit of books, 96.  
Control of consumer and real-estate credit, 22.  
Credit control, 22.  
Customs laws, customs enforcement areas, 23; executive agreements with Philippines, 25; fats and oils, import restrictions, 26; game mammals to and from Mexico, 27; restriction of imports interfering with Agricultural Adjustment Act, 24.  
Defense contractors, inspection of plants and audit of books, 96.  
Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, 58.  
Defense Production Act, title I, 69; title II, 72; title III, 70; title IV, 68; title V, 68A; title VI, 22.  
Delegation of authority under Uniform Code of Military Justice, 7.  
Detention, emergency, 96A.  
Displaced persons, loans for reception and transportation, 28.  
Embargo, nations threatening the security of the United States, 50.  
Emergency Detention Act of 1950, 96A.  
Enemy property, settlement of intercustodial conflicts with foreign governments, 49.  
Executive agreements with Philippines as to customs, 25.  
Executive departments, cash awards for meritorious suggestions, 30; positions at grade 18, 33; protection of atomic energy data, 11 (6); reciprocal undertakings with American Republics, 29; reorganization, 32; suspension of employees for security reasons, 34; transfer of appropriations with functions, 35; United States Information and Educational Exchange Act activities, 31.  
Expansion of productive capacity, 70.  
Export Control Act of 1949, 36.  
Exports, control, 36; game mammals to Mexico, 27; embargo, nations threatening security of United States, 50; wheat, 47.  
Facilities, allocation, 69.  
Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, 37.

Fats and oils, import restrictions, 26.  
Federal Airport Act, 16.  
Federal Reserve System, regulation of certain transactions, 97.  
Fish and game sanctuaries, 62.  
Foreign affairs, American Republics, citizens to study at United States academies, 38, 42; American Republics, sale of coast-defense, and anti-aircraft materials, 40; atomic energy, communications to other nations 12; commissioned officers, foreign, in naval postgraduate school, 43; detail of Armed Forces members to assist foreign governments, 87; detail of Armed Forces members to assist United Nations, 9; detail of Armed Forces members to assist Philippines, 8; detail of Coast Guard members to assist foreign governments, 19; embargo, nations threatening security of United States, 50; international wheat agreement, 47; military, economic, and technical assistance to friendly foreign countries, 46; sale of agricultural surplus to foreign governments, 39; settlement of intercustodial conflicts involving enemy property, 49; Spain, aid to, 51; technical cooperation program, 48; United States participation in monetary fund and in International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 41.  
Foreign air transportation certificates, 15.  
Foreign exchange, regulation of transactions, 97.  
Foreign vessels, control of anchorage and movement, 105; requisition, purchase, etc., 106.  
Forests, national (see National Forests).  
Freight, priority in transportation, 100A.  
Game sanctuaries, 62.  
Gold purchases, 52.  
Government corporations, annual budget program, 53.  
Greece, aid to, 46.  
Hawaii, occupation of territory transferred to, 98.  
Housing, contracts for annual contributions, 55; critical defense housing areas, community facilities, 58; insurance of mortgages on veterans housing, 54; loans, 55; low-rent projects, transfer of public lands, 56; maximum rents, 57.  
Immigration, refusal of visas to dangerous aliens, 59; restriction on entry and departure, 80.  
Imports, fats and oil, restriction, 26; game mammals from Mexico, 27; products interfering with Agricultural Adjustment Act, 24; wheat, 47.  
Information, classification, 60; concerning Army and Navy storage, not to be published, 111; security of atomic energy data, 11 (6), 12; United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, 31.  
Inspection, plants of defense contractors, 96.  
Insurance of mortgages on veterans housing, 54.  
Internal Revenue, silver bullion transfer tax, 61.  
Internal Security Act of 1950, 60, 96A.  
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, participation, 41.  
International Monetary Fund, participation, 41.  
International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, 47.  
Inventory control, rubber, 73.  
Iran, aid, 46.  
Korea, Republic of, aid, 46.  
Labor, disputes, voluntary settlement, 68A; public building contracts, wage provision suspension, 99.  
Lanham Act, continuation of certain authority, 102.  
Loans, displaced persons, 28; expansion of productive capacity, 70; guaranty under Defense Production Act, 70.  
Marine Corps, officers, retirement, 5; personnel, temporary appointment and advancement, 90; retired officers on active duty, temporary advancement, 109.

Merchant Marine Academy, citizens of American Republics at, 42.  
 Merchant Marine Act of 1936, suspension of certain citizenship requirements, 103.  
 Merchant vessels, crews and officers, citizenship, 103.  
 Mexico, game mammals, export and import, 27.  
 Military Academy, students from American Republics, 38.  
 Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, 46.  
 Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, 50.  
 Mutual Security Act of 1951, 46.  
 Naval Academy, students from American Republics, 38.  
 Naval Postgraduate School, commissioned officers of foreign countries at, 43.  
 National forests, fish and game sanctuaries, 62; withdrawal of land for protection of watersheds, 63.  
 National Guard, active military service, 83; enlistment terms, 82; officers, active service, 3.  
 National parks, transfer of surplus Federal lands, 64.  
 National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, 79.  
 Navy officers, retirement, 5; personnel, temporary appointment and advancement, 86; retired officers on active duty, temporary advancement, 109.  
 Near East countries, aid, 46.  
 North Atlantic Treaty countries, aid, 46.  
 Officer Personnel Act, 88.  
 Panama Canal Zone, aircraft control, 65; interest rate on postal savings certificates, 66; registration of aliens, 67.  
 Philippines, aid, 46; detail of Armed Forces members to assist in military matters, 8; Executive agreements regarding customs, 25; grants-in-aid, medical care of veterans, 44.  
 Plants, defense contractors, inspection, 96; seizure, 75.  
 Point 4 programs, 48.  
 Price and wage stabilization, 68.  
 Priorities, freight transportation, 100A; materials and facilities, 69; national defense contracts, 69; traffic, designated, transportation, 100A; transportation of troops and materials, 100.  
 Procurement, critical and strategic materials, 70.  
 Productive capacity, expansion, 70.  
 Public airports, conveyance of Federal land, 16.  
 Public buildings, contracts, wage provisions, suspension, 99.  
 Public Health Service, commissioned corps as a military service, 101.  
 Public lands, acquired for national defense, transfer under Farmers Home Administration Act, 37; grants of recreational demonstration projects to States, 71; national parks, transfer, 64; public airports, 16; Tennessee Valley Authority, transfer, 77.  
 Public works, continuation of certain authority for welfare of defense workers, 102.  
 Radio stations, control, closing, etc., 93.  
 Real estate, control of credit, 22; see also public lands.  
 Reconstruction Finance Corporation, loans for displaced persons, 28.  
 Red Cross, see American National Red Cross.  
 Rent control, 57.  
 Requisition, foreign merchant vessels, 106; property for national defense, 72.  
 Reorganization acts, 32.  
 Rubber, allocation, inventory control, etc., 73.  
 Securities, acquired by United States as incident to a bankruptcy, sale, 14.  
 Security, atomic energy data and information, 11 (6), 12; classification of information, 60; embargo nations threatening security of United States, 50; emergency detention, 96A; information regarding Army and Navy storage, 111; measures in control of air commerce, 17; refusal of visas to certain aliens,

59; restrictions on immigration, 80; suspension of civilian officers and employees, 34.  
 Seizure, plants, 75; radio stations, 93; transportation systems, 108; wire communication facilities, 94.  
 Selective Service Act of 1948, 75.  
 Ships and shipping, see Vessels.  
 Silver, bullion transfer tax, 61; regulation of transactions, 76.  
 Silver Purchase Act of 1934, 76.  
 Spain, assistance, 51.  
 Steel plants, seizure, 75.  
 Strategic and critical materials, abaca, 1; procurement, 70, rubber, 73, use, sale, etc., 107.  
 Transportation, control of systems, 108; freight, designated traffic priority, 100A; troops and war materials, priority, 100.  
 Transportation Act of 1920, 14.  
 Troops, priority in transportation, 100.  
 Turkey, aid, 45.  
 Tennessee Valley Authority, transfer of real estate, 77.  
 Uniform Code of Military Justice, delegation of authority, 7.  
 Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, embargo, 50.  
 United Nations, detail of Armed Forces, 9; technical cooperation programs, 48.  
 United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, 31.  
 Vessels, arming, 104; foreign, requisition, purchase, etc., 106; foreign flag, control of anchorage and movement, 105; officers and crews, citizenship, 103; private charter, suspension, 103; use as targets for testing atomic weapons, 10.  
 Veterans, administration of National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, 79; housing, insurance of mortgages, 54; review boards under GI bill of rights, 78.  
 Wage and price stabilization, 68.  
 Wheat, 47.  
 Wire communications facilities, control, closing, 94.

V. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF STATUTES COVERED

Date of act	Citation	Item number
Feb. 4, 1887	24 Stat. 380, ch. 104, § 6	100
June 29, 1906	34 Stat. 586, ch. 3591	100
Apr. 24, 1912	37 Stat. 90, 91, §§ 1, 2	81
Jan. 28, 1915	38 Stat. 800-801, § 1	110
Aug. 29, 1916	39 Stat. 645, ch. 418, § 1	108
June 15, 1917	40 Stat. 219, § 6	111
July 1, 1918	40 Stat. 717	109
Feb. 28, 1920	41 Stat. 477, § 402 (15)	100A
Mar. 9, 1933	45 Stat. 1, 2, §§ 2, 4	97
May 12, 1933	48 Stat. 37 (c)	3
June 15, 1933	48 Stat. 155, § 4	82
	48 Stat. 156, § 7	82
	48 Stat. 160, § 18	83
	48 Stat. 161, § 20	84
	48 Stat. 341, § 8	52
Jan. 30, 1934	48 Stat. 400, ch. 54	62
Mar. 10, 1934	48 Stat. 898, § 19 (d)	74
June 6, 1934	48 Stat. 1104, § 606 (c)	93
June 14, 1934	48 Stat. 1178-1181	76
June 19, 1934	49 Stat. 218, ch. 109	8
May 14, 1935	49 Stat. 392, § 7	83
June 19, 1935	49 Stat. 517, ch. 438	23
Aug. 5, 1935	49 Stat. 773-774	24
Aug. 20, 1935	49 Stat. 1013, ch. 825, § 6	99
June 19, 1936	49 Stat. 1535	98
June 26, 1936	49 Stat. 1970-1971	13
	49 Stat. 1993, 2010, §§ 302 (h), 712 (d)	103
June 3, 1937	50 Stat. 246, § 1 (h)	2
July 9, 1937	50 Stat. 486, ch. 470, § 1	65
July 22, 1937	50 Stat. 525, 526, 530, §§ 23 (b), 32 (c), 45	37
Mar. 8, 1938	52 Stat. 107, § 3	21
June 23, 1938	52 Stat. 1014, § 801	15
June 24, 1938	52 Stat. 1034, ch. 644	38
June 7, 1939	53 Stat. 811, § 4	107
Aug. 9, 1939	53 Stat. 1280, ch. 616	29
Aug. 11, 1939	53 Stat. 1418, ch. 701	39
May 14, 1940	54 Stat. 214, ch. 195	85
May 28, 1940	54 Stat. 224, ch. 220, § 1	63
June 13, 1940	54 Stat. 389, § 2 "274"	66
June 15, 1940	54 Stat. 396, § 1	40
June 28, 1940	54 Stat. 676, § 39	67
Aug. 13, 1940	54 Stat. 788, ch. 666	14
Sept. 9, 1940	54 Stat. 875, § 101	84
Mar. 17, 1941	55 Stat. 45, § 1	61
June 6, 1941	55 Stat. 242, ch. 174, § 1	106

V. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF STATUTES COVERED—continued

Date of act	Citation	Item number
June 20, 1941	55 Stat. 252, ch. 209	59
June 28, 1941	55 Stat. 362, 363, §§ 3, 4 (a)	102
July 18, 1941	55 Stat. 600, ch. 309	77
July 24, 1941	55 Stat. 604, §§ 5, 6	86
Dec. 13, 1941	55 Stat. 800, ch. 571, § 2	4
Dec. 18, 1941	55 Stat. 839, §§ 201, 301	95
Jan. 19, 1942	56 Stat. 7, § 2	18
Jan. 26, 1942	56 Stat. 18, ch. 18	94
Mar. 27, 1942	56 Stat. 185-186, §§ 1301-1304	96
June 6, 1942	56 Stat. 326-327, ch. 380	71
June 30, 1942	56 Stat. 463, ch. 461	36
Oct. 1, 1942	56 Stat. 763, ch. 571	87
Apr. 9, 1943	57 Stat. 60, ch. 38, § 1	86
July 1, 1944	58 Stat. 689-691, §§ 212, 213, 216	101
July 31, 1945	59 Stat. 512-517	41
Dec. 6, 1945	59 Stat. 598-600, §§ 102-107	53
Dec. 20, 1945	59 Stat. 621, ch. 584, § 6	9
Dec. 28, 1945	59 Stat. 624, ch. 588, § 4	78
Feb. 21, 1946	60 Stat. 27, § 6	5
Apr. 30, 1946	60 Stat. 151-155, §§ 401-501	25
May 13, 1946	60 Stat. 179, ch. 251, § 16 (b)	16
June 25, 1946	60 Stat. 308, ch. 487, § 1	10
July 23, 1946	60 Stat. 598, § 5	107
Aug. 1, 1946	60 Stat. 755-775	11
	60 Stat. 788, § 12	79
Aug. 2, 1946	60 Stat. 809-810, 812, §§ 14, 19	30
Aug. 9, 1946	60 Stat. 961, ch. 928	42
Aug. 14, 1946	60 Stat. 1069, § "45"	2, 37
July 15, 1947	61 Stat. 322, § 3 (b) E	26
July 31, 1947	61 Stat. 706, § 5	43
Aug. 7, 1947	61 Stat. 893, 906, 907, §§ 507 (b), 514 (f), 515 (e)	89
	61 Stat. 907, § 515 (d)	89
Dec. 30, 1947	61 Stat. 946, § 3 (a)	36
Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1947	61 Stat. 951, § 102	2
Jan. 27, 1948	62 Stat. 8-9, § 401	31
Mar. 31, 1948	62 Stat. 102-108	73
Apr. 24, 1948	62 Stat. 199, ch. 230	64
June 1, 1948	62 Stat. 279-280, ch. 357	38
June 3, 1948	62 Stat. 299, § 10 (a)	18
	62 Stat. 299, § 10 (b)	92
June 24, 1948	62 Stat. 625, § 18	38
June 25, 1948	62 Stat. 687, § 43	27
June 29, 1948	62 Stat. 1095-1096, ch. 715	104
July 1, 1948	62 Stat. 1210, ch. 785	44
Aug. 10, 1948	62 Stat. 1268, ch. 832, § 101	54
Feb. 26, 1949	63 Stat. 7, ch. 11	36
June 20, 1949	63 Stat. 203	32
June 30, 1949	63 Stat. 389, § 205 (a)	45
July 15, 1949	63 Stat. 419, § 108	56
	63 Stat. 426, 427, §§ 304 (g), 305	55
Aug. 4, 1949	63 Stat. 496, § 3	110
	63 Stat. 507, § 149	19
	63 Stat. 514, § 229	20
	63 Stat. 558, § 8	109
Oct. 6, 1949	63 Stat. 714-721	46
	63 Stat. 735, § 5	9
Oct. 11, 1949	63 Stat. 762, ch. 763	11
Oct. 12, 1949	63 Stat. 810, 811, §§ 204 (d), 205 (d)	90
	63 Stat. 825, § 414	6
Oct. 27, 1949	63 Stat. 945-947	47
Oct. 28, 1949	63 Stat. 959, § 505 (b)	3
May 5, 1950	64 Stat. 145, Art. 140, § 1	77
June 5, 1950	64 Stat. 204-209, title IV	48
June 16, 1950	64 Stat. 227, § 12 "14"	28
June 28, 1950	64 Stat. 261-262, ch. 381, § 3	24
July 26, 1950	64 Stat. 373-377	46
Aug. 9, 1950	64 Stat. 427-428, ch. 656	105
Aug. 10, 1950	64 Stat. 435-437	1
Aug. 26, 1950	64 Stat. 477, ch. 903, § 3	34
Sept. 8, 1950	64 Stat. 799, title I	69
	64 Stat. 799, title II	72
	64 Stat. 800-802, title III	70
	64 Stat. 803-812, title IV	68
	64 Stat. 812, title V	68A
	64 Stat. 812-815, title VI	22
Sept. 9, 1950	64 Stat. 825, ch. 938	17
Sept. 12, 1950	64 Stat. 834, § 105	35
	64 Stat. 838, § 202	53
Sept. 23, 1950	64 Stat. 991, § 4 (b, c)	60
	64 Stat. 1003, § 18 (a)	111
	64 Stat. 1021, §§ 102, 103	96A
Sept. 28, 1950	64 Stat. 1079, ch. 1094	49
Jan. 12, 1951	64 Stat. 1257, ch. 1230	95
May 16, 1951	Public Law 33, 82d Cong.	36
June 19, 1951	Public Law 51, 82d Cong., sec. 1 (w)	75
June 30, 1951	Public Law 67, 82d Cong., sec. 2 (a)	86
July 31, 1951	Public Law 96, 82d Cong.: § 101 (a)	69
	§ 101 (e)	26
	§ 102 (a)	72
	§ 103	70
	§ 104	68
	§§ 105, 111	22
	§ 203	57
Sept. 1, 1951	Public Law 139, 82d Cong.: § 101	58
	§ 602	22

V. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF STATUTES COVERED—  
continued

Date of act	Citation	Item number
Oct. 10, 1951	Public Law 165, 82d Cong.	46, 48
Oct. 24, 1951	Public Law 200, 82d Cong., §1.	93
Oct. 26, 1951	Public Law 213, 82d Cong.	50
Oct. 30, 1951	Public Law 235, 82d Cong.	12
Oct. 31, 1951	Public Law 249, 82d Cong.	51
Apr. 14, 1952 as amended May 28, 1952.	Public Law 313, 82d Cong. as amended by Public Law 368, 82d Cong.:	
	1 (a) (3).....	96
	1 (a) (9).....	101
	1 (a) (17).....	102
	1 (a) (32).....	81
	1 (a) (33).....	100
	1 (a) (34).....	108
	1 (a) (35).....	100A
	1 (a) (36).....	100A
	1 (a) (37).....	106
	1 (a) (40).....	80
	1 (c).....	91
	10 U. S. C. 591a.....	91

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER to the Smith amendment: After the last word in the Smith amendment insert "Except that in view of the fact that the workers in the steel industry have voluntarily withheld any work stoppage for a period in excess of the maximum time during which an injunction could have been in force, the President is requested to proceed as though such injunction had been granted without, however, applying for such an injunction."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane, and imposes additional legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, it simply elaborates on the request in the Smith amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] offers an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] advises that his amendment elaborates on the Smith amendment.

The Chair is of the opinion that it elaborates on the Smith amendment to the extent of amending existing law not within the purview of this bill or the jurisdiction of this committee and is not germane.

The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. SMITH of Virginia and Mr. MULTER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 190, noes 133.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, today it seems to me that many of the people of the country must be looking at the Congress, and especially the House, with a feeling that, I believe, Will Rogers described years ago as similar to that of distracted parents discovering junior approaching the china cabinet armed with a hammer.

It seems that in this case junior will do great damage before it is possible for his parents to catch up with him. The catching up will have to wait until November, I suppose.

But even in the midst of events which are tragic for the people of this country, it is possible to find examples of pure comedy—not slapstick comedy but comedy as defined by the dramatists of the ancient Greeks.

Let me make clear at this point that I respect the views of every Member of this House, and do not question the motives of any Member of this House. Of course, I mean that statement in the sense that I respect the right of all Members to have whatever views and motives they desire.

But in the Greek meaning of comedy it is truly comic to watch not only the rank and file but also the leadership of the Republican Party following the leadership of a handful of distinguished gentlemen from certain States in the South on crippling amendments to this bill. To see the members of the party of the great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, slavishly following the lead of gentlemen who are the bitterest enemies of that great principle for which Lincoln stood, the principle of the equality of all men in the eyes of God and in law, is truly comic.

The phalanx of House Republicans led by a handful of those who have been unkindly called Dixiecrats is a curious sight. In symbolic terms one is reminded of the old saw about the tail wagging the dog.

Mr. Chairman, in this case the situation is even more peculiar and one would think zoologically impossible did not one observe it with one's own eyes and hear it with one's own ears. Here we have a case of the most backward part of the Democratic donkey leading the whole Republican elephant around by the nose.

What a fate of the party of Lincoln.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this bill up to the present time has been as devoid of politics as any bill which has been considered on this floor for a good, long while. Now, we quite often hear the remark made about an unholy alliance which is said to exist between certain southern Democrats and certain northern Republicans. There is nothing unholy about any coalition of Americans sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States when they join hands to protect the American system of government. I am glad the gentleman from Missouri brought this out in order that we may know where the opposition comes from to the majority of this House which has stood up here repeatedly during the last 15 years and has fought off these

attempts of Socialist-minded individuals to infiltrate the great Democratic Party—to destroy it as effectively as the Fabian Socialists of Great Britain destroyed the great Liberal Party of Great Britain. I hope you keep that up if you want to develop the issue.

If you want the issue clearly stated, keep the issue before the people that there are two great political philosophies in America today: One, perhaps not wholly but at least partly sponsored by those for whom the gentleman from Missouri was speaking, which perhaps without their knowledge is being used as a vehicle by the American Socialist movement—the American Fabian Socialist movement masquerading under the name of Americans for Democratic Action—which would as effectively destroy the American system of government as the Fabian Socialist movement in Great Britain destroyed democracy in Great Britain. They did not wake up to it in Great Britain until it was too late.

It is the duty and the purpose of the Republican Party, with the help, I hope, of those Americans on my right who are jealous of the American system and want to see it preserved, to recognize that not in spite of but because of the American system of government we have become great, and we are going to continue to join hands to save America from the onslaughts of those who would destroy it.

Mr. FOAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOAGE: On page 5, line 3, at the end of section 104 insert the following subsection lettered (c):

"(c) Paragraph 2 of subsection (b) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Any ceiling price now or hereafter established for any material or service shall be suspended whenever the President finds that during the preceding 30 days the average price of such material or service has been 2 percent or more below the ceiling price established for such material or service; and whenever a ceiling price on any material is suspended at any level of production, processing, or distribution, the ceiling price of such material shall also be suspended at all subsequent levels of distribution of such material: *Provided*, That whenever the ceiling price for any material or service has been suspended pursuant to the provisions of this section, the President may require any seller of such material or service to report periodically sales made above the ceiling price in effect at the time such ceiling price was suspended. No ceiling price shall be reestablished or maintained for such material or service unless the President finds that the average price of such material or service has (1) equaled or exceeded for a period of the preceding 30 days or (2) has exceeded by more than 10 percent for any 1 day, the ceiling price previously established, and any ceiling price so reestablished shall be no less than the ceiling price previously established: *And provided further*, That upon presentation of evidence to the President to the effect that the average price of any material or service has been below ceiling price for as much as 30 days the President shall make an investigation and make his findings public within 15 days after the presentation of such evidence.

"For the purpose of this section any material shall be considered to be another

material when it is substantially altered in form."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would, in short, automatically decontrol the price of any commodity when it remains as much as 2 percent below the ceiling price for more than 30 days.

I recognize that we have probably already adopted amendments which, if they are retained in the bill, will accomplish almost everything this amendment attempts to accomplish. I believe, however, that this amendment carefully spells out a workable method of decontrol, and avoids the meat-ax approach. I believe that if we can adopt this amendment, whether we retain the other amendments or not, we will still have a method of automatic decontrol that will be workable and will not completely wreck price control.

In all fairness, I think I should say it is my intention and expectation to vote against any continuation of price control. I think the time has come to abandon it. I think price control is, at this time, tending to prevent production and that it is definitely building up trouble for us all in the future. But if we are to retain it, and I do not know what this House wants to do, we should make it workable, we should make it honest, we should make it real price control of high priced goods rather than a method of creating jobs for certain individuals. Price controls on articles or services which may be had in the open market at less than ceiling are not only useless; they are dishonest. They are a useless expense. They are an unnecessary irritation and burden on business.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Is not the effect of your amendment an invitation to all producers to lower their prices by 2 percent for a period of 30 days and thereafter—

Mr. POAGE. Exactly.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman permit me to finish my question—and thereafter be able to increase their prices by 10 percent above ceiling?

Mr. POAGE. No, sir. The gentleman doubtless did not have the opportunity to hear the reading of my amendment by the Clerk. My amendment very carefully provides that if a price goes back to 10 percent above the ceiling, which is the figure he named, even for 1 day then controls may be reimposed. If the price goes up as much as 2 percent above the ceiling price for 30 days, then ceilings may be reimposed at the original figure. No, sir, we take care of the very thing that you suggested. We do offer an invitation to everybody to lower their prices—and surely those who propose price controls will not object to a method of encouraging dealers to lower their prices? Surely the gentleman from Illinois does not object to encouraging everybody to lower their prices. Certainly this amendment does, as the gentleman from Illinois pointed out, offer encouragement to lower prices and to keep them low because if you as a dealer keep prices below the ceiling price, then

you will not be aggravated by the 10,000 inspectors, by the multitude of red tape, the volume of irritations which afflict every business in these United States under the present system.

Let me call attention to the fact that it is not only the price situation which is involved in this matter of decontrol, it is the eternal irritation to business. It is the irritation here and there and yonder, the regulations, the inspectors, and the expense. Why, the expense of maintaining the records to meet price control is oftentimes far more burdensome on business than the mere control of prices itself.

Mr. YATES. Is not the gentleman therefore arguing in favor of the committee provision that says when a price falls below the ceiling by 7 percent, there need not be any further report to the Office of Price Stabilization?

Mr. POAGE. No; I am not arguing in favor of the committee provision because I do not think it goes far enough to give us the relief we need. We are now paying tremendous sums for these inspections. We ought to cut out some of them. Just because the Congress is debating this matter today, we are getting the OPS to lift the ceiling on hundreds of articles which should have been done months and months ago. Unfortunately the only way you can get them to lift ceilings is to lead them to the chopping block, and threaten them with extinction; and then they become practical. We had ceilings on cotton for nearly 2 years while cotton on the open market never reached to within \$25 per bale of the ceiling price. What good did this do?

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman stated frankly that he is against price-control legislation. Is my friend in favor of parity and price-support legislation for agricultural products?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I am in favor of parity and price-support legislation. I am in favor of encouraging production of those articles on which the American people must depend for their food and raiment. I am not in favor of a price-control program which discourages production. Price control, if used where it is not needed, can be very dangerous as well as expensive. I don't believe we need price control at present. I believe that its bad effect more than outweighs any advantages that may come from it. I know that price control which is maintained simply to prove that the Government has some kind of paramount right over the people is bad. I know that when control is retained after the price sinks below ceiling price it cannot be to protect the public from unfair prices. It must, therefore, be either for the purpose of asserting the power of big Government or for the purpose of supporting the job holders who administer these ineffective controls.

OPS has had repeated opportunities to decontrol items which are selling at less than ceiling price. Nothing was done until Congress gave evidence that it would clean house for OPS. Then and

only then did that agency show the slightest interest in decontrol. Experience has shown that if we are to get any effective decontrol after this bill is extended, if it is extended, we must write a clear-cut formula in the law itself. That is what this amendment does.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I sat here for 2 or 3 days last week and was a bit dismayed at the meat-ax tactics being used to kill this legislation. To my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Texas, I say that it would be better to do the job up brown, cut it off, kill it completely, rather than to keep a shell and render it totally inoperative. For a long time I have studied the idea, both last year and this year, of an automatic recontrol amendment. I confess to you that after studying it for several weeks and months, I have not been able to find one which I believe would work. In other words, as I see it, it is either to have some reasonable system of price control or to have none. It is my humble judgment that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] wants none, and that he is attempting to leave the corpse of price control barely breathing, with the amendment he has offered. It is impossible to administer any such provision as this amendment would set up. While I would like to see all of these articles which are soft in the market decontrolled, and I cannot see any need in keeping ceiling prices on articles that for a reasonable period of time stay below ceiling, I do not think you can confine it to a 30-day period. Neither do I think you should allow a 10-percent increase in any 1 day before you reimpose it.

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

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Well, it is not 10 percent. It allows 2 percent if it stays up 30 days. If it stays up any one day, you can reimpose it.

Mr. RAINS. In other words, your amendment would allow a 9-percent increase for 1 day.

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

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKINNON. The 30-day period has to expire before price controls can go back into operation. Prices can go up even more than 10 percent in a 30-day period. Then you are faced with the problem of roll-backs, of higher prices, and a dozen other things that are all bad.

Mr. RAINS. I submit to the House that the amendment is thoroughly unworkable, and that it is just another knife in the back of any kind of price control.

I do not like controls any more than you do. I admit that. But I say this to you, if we take off controls I want somebody else to bear the burden for the price increases—or let us put it another way—for the wage increases that I know are going to happen. I want someone else to bear the burden of

causing more inflation, of increasing the cost of living to the people of America.

I would like to say one more thing. I have watched many of my good friends, who today want to take off price controls who only 2 years ago were demanding complete and total freezes in prices and wages. In other words, they switch from one extreme to another when the situation of emergency is the same.

This is the second anniversary of the terrible and bloody fighting in Korea. As far as I am concerned, I would like to think that I at least did a little on my part to hold in line prices and wages when these boys get back home. I do not make any ardent argument all inclusive for price controls. If we could retain the committee bill, we would at least be holding in status quo wages and prices.

I do not know whether you have read the bill passed in the other body but I do know that it was passed by substantial majority. We are doing a lot of fiddling in the closing days of this session, and we are adopting one amendment after another which will either have to be stricken in conference or the bill will never come out of conference.

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

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as there is some kinship between the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and the one which I offered and which was agreed to last Friday, I welcome this opportunity to comment further on my amendment, especially since the OPS has gone out of its way to say things about it that are not true.

For instance, in a letter under date of June 24 from the Director of the ESA to the Speaker of the House, Mr. Putnam said:

The Talle amendment would destroy price controls outright.

Either he has not read the law which he is supposed to administer or he has not read my amendment, or both. So I want to answer.

Mr. Chairman, during the interval since last Friday when the House approved my amendment to title IV of the Defense Production Act, I have been besieged with visitors, long distance telephone calls, telegrams, and letters from all over the Nation. My office has been flooded with newspaper accounts and editorials concerning the so-called Talle amendment. So far as I have been able to determine, the principal opposition to it comes from the cult of that gasping group in our society, the self-styled liberals on the payroll of the DPA, the NPA, the ESA, and the OPS. There is a line in the beautiful Song of Solomon, "The voice of the turtle is heard in the land." If I may indulge in paraphrase, I believe it appropriate to suggest that today "the anguished squeal of the bureaucrat is heard through the land."

Be that as it may, my purpose at the moment is to explain my amendment and the need for it in simple, clear lan-

guage. At the outset, I want to emphasize that it is in the nature of a transition proposal, a cushion as it were. In this connection, let me say some people do not realize that the controls authorized in the Defense Production Act are not permanent. At least, I hope not. They are temporary. They will expire next Monday evening, if not extended. The Senate after due deliberation, passed a bill proposing to extend controls for 8 months. The House Committee on Banking and Currency was more generous—we agree to a 12-month extension.

Now the underlying thought behind my amendment is that it would be much wiser to embark upon the gradual decontrol of our free enterprise system in an orderly, methodical manner, rather than to select an arbitrary date in the future on which to lift controls en masse. Despite reports to the contrary, my proposal does not scrap title IV. On the contrary, it assumes there will be a standby price control authority appropriately staffed to meet whatever needs may exist or arise in the transition period. I, for one, do not want Government control merely for the sake of control. I am not one who believes you have to burn down a house to roast a pig. I want only such controls as the economic situation warrants—and no more.

A cushion period, such as I am proposing, will avert repetition of the widespread price rises that followed the lifting of World War II controls in 1946. Of course, in 1946 we were emerging from a long and terrible war. There was a huge backlog of demand for automobiles, refrigerators, radios, and all kinds of consumer goods that had not been produced in adequate quantity over a 5-year period. The price spiral affected principally commodities that were in short supply. A comparable situation does not exist in 1952. The economic conditions are not parallel, and some may argue that a transition stage is not necessary. Nevertheless, it is a safeguard.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, everyone who believes in free enterprise will agree that there is no justification for controlling competitive goods which are available in abundant supply. All my amendment does is to free such goods from price control. It provides that ceiling prices for any material shall be suspended whenever and as long as it is selling below the ceiling price and has been selling below that price for 3 months, or is in adequate or surplus supply to meet current civilian and military demands and has been in such status for a period of 3 months. In this latter case, the amendment provides that a commodity is in adequate or surplus supply whenever it is not being allocated or rationed.

I want to call special attention to the use of the word "suspended" and the words "as long as" in my amendment. Can any reasonable person doubt the meaning of those words? The amendment is just what it purports to be—a formula for suspending controls on commodities that are not scarce, and for keeping controls off such commodities

as long as the supply is adequate to meet our needs.

There is nothing whatever in my amendment which bars the reimposition of price ceilings. Other sections of the Defense Production Act set forth the authority and the procedure for imposing such ceilings. My amendment merely spells out a formula for determining whether a commodity is in short supply, and provides for the removal of controls on items that are not in short supply.

Let me discuss the two parts of the formula in more detail. First, it provides that price ceilings shall be lifted on any material selling below ceiling price for 3 months. Bearing in mind that the material can be reconrolled under the act, if necessary, what reasonable person can object to this proposal? To maintain controls over commodities selling below ceiling prices is an abuse of governmental power and an unconscionable waste of public funds.

The second part of the formula provides that price ceilings shall be suspended on goods that are in "adequate or surplus supply." The problem is, then, to determine adequacy of supply. The acid test for ascertaining the extent of supply of any material is simply a question of checking to find out if civilian and military needs are being satisfied. If not, title I of the act clothes the President with full authority to allocate and ration materials of every kind and to prevent hoarding. If the supply of any material is so abundant that it is not necessary for him to invoke this power, there is no necessity for controlling the price of that commodity. The President has imposed allocation control over metals and raw materials that have been adjudged to be in short supply. If there are other commodities in short supply over which he is not exercising distribution control, then he is derelict in his administration of the Defense Production Act. Free competition will assure fair prices for any commodity in adequate supply that is sold competitively. And we have plenty of statutes, including the rationing power, to take care of monopoly or price-conspiracy situations.

Mr. Chairman, one of the principal functions of the free price system is the distribution of consumer goods. Under this system, each consumer has a money income, each commodity has a money price, and the consumer buys what he wants and can afford. Thus, the free price system brings about a precise adjustment of consumer goods to consumer preferences and income. When you interfere with this machinery by artificially controlling prices, the result is maldistribution. Such price tampering, even on a small scale, may have strange but disastrous results; it may send oranges scheduled for Memphis to Atlanta; it may direct fluid milk needed for evaporation into cheese production; it may channel cotton into sheets rather than into shirts; it may result in the feeding to beef cattle of corn needed for hog production; it may result in the shipping of vegetables to the cannery rather than to the fresh market. Any one of such developments can disorgan-

ize a market resulting in serious financial loss and unemployment.

As a matter of fact, since price control, by definition, destroys prices and profits as the means of distribution, it follows logically that some other method must be employed simultaneously for distributing a controlled commodity if the normal distribution pattern is not to be upset. In other words, when you control prices only in a price economy, you automatically disrupt the distribution machinery. Unless you take countermeasures to control distribution, a breakdown of the economic machine cannot be long avoided. That is the reason why the British find it necessary to ration goods and to subsidize production as well as to fix prices. Therefore, it is my judgment that if the supply of a commodity is so scarce as to warrant price fixing, it warrants rationing as well.

I hardly think it necessary, Mr. Chairman, for me to demonstrate in detail to Members of the Congress the superiority of the free-price system over a government-controlled system in directing production, in allocating labor and resources, and in distributing consumer goods. I do, however, want to point briefly to one facet of price controls that is often overlooked—namely, they are in themselves inflationary:

First. Controls are expensive to administer—both in money and in manpower. This is inflationary.

Second. Controls, if they do hold prices down temporarily, encourage and expand consumption. Increased consumption aggravates the inflationary spiral.

Third. Controls restrict production. What could be more inflationary?

At best, price controls are a temporary stopgap solution. They do not solve the problem of inflation. As I have pointed out on numerous previous occasions, inflation is primarily a monetary phenomenon. It is an economic condition in which there are more dollars than goods in circulation. The practical solution is to remove restraints from the productive machinery, thereby stimulating production. The only practical way I know to achieve minimum prices is through maximum production.

During World War II, I supported the price control and rationing programs as necessary because of the military demand on our productive machinery which resulted in the sharply curtailed production of civilian goods.

In 1950, I voted for the 1-year controls contained in the Defense Production Act because we were then embarking on a multi-billion dollar program for mobilizing our industrial machinery and directing production into special channels, and the outlook indicated the use of cutbacks in the production of consumer goods. Strong controls, including rationing of scarce goods, applied for a brief time at that point, could have been beneficial, that is, holding prices in check while industrial adjustments were made. But what happened? For six full months, while the industrial mobilization program was getting under way, the Truman administration sat on its hands. Raw materials were diverted from civil-

ian production, consumer goods became scarce, prices and costs started spiraling. Finally, half a year later, in January 1951, the price freeze came—catching the price structure in motion and therefore out of balance. Then came the attempted rollbacks, causing further headaches and inequities.

Nevertheless, in 1951 I supported another 1-year extension of these controls, though with serious misgivings. At that time I expressed doubt as to the capability of the Truman administration to administer the program effectively. Unfortunately, I was 100 percent right in my doubt. The control agencies have confused themselves, to say nothing of our citizens, with mountains of regulations and orders. They have burdened our businessmen with unending reports and questionnaires, and have harassed them with investigations. Not only have these agencies frittered away vast sums of public money, they have added incalculable billions to the operating costs of our free enterprise system, resulting in higher prices on all consumer goods.

And yet, these bureaucratic empire builders had the temerity to come before the Banking and Currency Committee to ask not merely for extension of controls but for added powers to play around further in the economic mess they have created through their blundering and bungling.

Mr. Chairman, I say the time has come to start dismantling the control bureaucracy. And I say further that my amendment sets forth a simple and sound economic guide for proceeding with the dismantling. It provides an orderly means for achieving decontrol as rapidly as conditions justify that action. It will strike some of the shackles from agriculture and from industry, thereby stimulating production. It is a genuine anti-inflation measure, and deserves the full support of every Member of this Chamber who has faith in the American free-enterprise system—the system that has given the American people the greatest individual freedom and the highest standard of living ever known to man.

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

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, OPS would continue to operate.

Mr. TALLE. That is correct.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Therefore the OPS could easily discover whether the conditions the gentleman outlines in his amendment exist.

Mr. TALLE. Certainly.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Therefore you are not abolishing the office.

Mr. TALLE. No, sir.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What the gentleman is saying in effect is that if these conditions exist in the economy of the country there is no need for controls, because that would be control for control's sake.

Mr. TALLE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike price controls just as much as anybody else. I want to see a free economy and a free market as soon as conditions permit. But I say that if we are going to have price control let us have something that is workable, equitable, and effective, or not have any at all.

The Poage amendment seeks to do two things: One is to relieve the seller of the burden of filing reports. The committee has felt the same need. The amendment we have in the bill, put in by the committee, provides that when prices drop below 7 percent the seller does not have to make reports, he is freed of the onerous work of reporting. Perhaps that percentage is too high. Maybe it ought to be 5 percent, maybe it ought to be 2 percent, or some other figure. I happen to know that my friend, the gentleman from Florida, is going to offer an amendment that will give the House a voice in what that figure ought to be. You will have a chance to exercise your judgment as to where that suspension of controls in the matter of filing reports may be terminated, whether it should be 2 percent, 7 percent, or whatever it may be. That is going to be within your determination in a few minutes. Therefore, the committee and the Members of the House are going to have a chance to take care of that objective in the Poage amendment and this action will relieve the seller from filing reports. Let us not adopt the Poage amendment for that purpose because that purpose is taken care of.

The second thing the Poage amendment seeks to do is to raise prices. Do you want to raise prices? You can do it either by adopting the Poage amendment or by cutting out price controls entirely. I would suggest if you want to raise prices, let us eliminate price control completely, let us save the taxpayers a little money by making it unnecessary to have an Office of Price Stabilization and the attendant expense. Let us do away with price controls completely. Let us be honest with the people of the country and say: We do not need price controls any longer, we do not want them, therefore we are honestly doing away with them.

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

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is it fair to assume that under the Poage amendment, if adopted, and the law is extended, in order to ascertain these various changes in individual items, down and up and everything else, suspension and reimposing, you would have to increase the personnel of the OPS by a tremendous number of employees?

Mr. McKINNON. That is correct, but that would be the smaller cost to this Nation. The great cost would be in the increased cost of living and the terrible inflation in everything we buy, particularly the increase in the cost to this Government in connection with its national defense procurement program.

The Poage amendment says that the President cannot impose price controls unless the average—it is going to take a

long time to determine what the average is—has exceeded for 30 days the ceiling price established.

Now, in 30 days the price can go up 1 percent a day to 9 percent and you could conceivably have an increase of 270 percent in 30 days time, although I will admit that is an exaggeration. But you could have a great increase in price in the 30-day period before the President can reimpose price controls.

That poses another problem. If prices go up 10, 15, or 20 percent and price ceilings are reimposed, what levels are you going to reimpose them at—at the new level, which means an increase of 10, 15, or 20 percent to the consumer, or are they going to be rolled back to present ceilings? If they are rolled back to the old level what kind of equity are you going to have so far as people who are caught with the inventories at the higher price are concerned? We had a terrific fight on this floor a year or so ago on the matter of rollbacks. Many of you thought rollbacks were not fair and would penalize the merchants and farmers; therefore, we did away with rollbacks. If you adopt this amendment you will have inequitable rollbacks, and even worse, the public will be subjected to a higher cost of living. Either way is going to be disastrous to our economy.

This amendment should be defeated. It is inconceivable to me that an amendment like this could work fairly. The Poage amendment, in my opinion, is an invitation to higher cost to consumers and I may say further that the gentleman from Texas would not have submitted this if he had not wanted higher prices.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The last refuge of a scoundrel is hiding behind the American flag. Once again we hear the cry of "socialism" raised in this House. Once again we must be on our mettle and determine the sincerity of those who raise the cry.

When I first came into politics in New York State, the Socialist Party was in its heyday. Under the leadership of Eugene Debs and Meyer London it had attained the strongest position it had ever reached in the history of our State. In the city of New York, the Socialist Party had succeeded in electing six assemblymen. The Socialist Party in our city and State was then defeated and destroyed in one election by the man who brought me into politics and a man whose policies I have endeavored to follow through the years. I refer to that great American and great Governor the Honorable Alfred Emanuel Smith. I am a member of a church that has fought socialism throughout the centuries and will fight it as long as it rears its head anywhere in the world. Following two such leaderships, I cannot be sympathetic with socialism, but I am sufficiently mature to realize that the cry of Americanism and socialism is raised by the Republican Party every time an effort is made to help the mass of our people.

When Governor Smith was a member of the legislature and worked for the passage of the Workmen's Compensation

Act; when he strongly urged widows' pensions which would keep the children in their mothers' homes and keep them out of orphan asylums; when he fought for State parks and old-age pensions and fair factory laws, the Republican Party fought both Al Smith and these legislative proposals tooth and nail. When they could not justify their opposition on the grounds of pure reason they again brought out their label of socialism.

The Republican Party, itself, had a great American and a great President in the person of Theodore Roosevelt, but when he championed the cause of the people and fought the control of big business over the masses; when he waged his momentous battle for conservation of natural resources, the Republican Party turned against him and labeled the program socialism and cast him out into the exterior darkness.

Eighty million working people of this country struggling day after day and week after week in their efforts to meet the high cost of living have expressed publicly and privately their strong and earnest desire not only for the continuation of controls, but for the strengthening of controls. When this representative body, which should be responsive to the call of the people ignores their desires and labels the demand as socialism then, gentlemen, this has ceased to be a representative legislative body.

Gentlemen, you know that the continuation of controls is not socialistic in any manner, form, or shape. It is merely a safeguard erected by the people's representatives against the profiteer who would heartlessly take advantage of existing conditions. You know in your hearts that this is the only way that we can prevent the inflation that has bled Europe and Asia white. You further know that this is simple Christian justice that recognizes the problem of the American citizen. However, from the way the Republican side has voted all day, it is evident that once again you are not interested in human rights. You are taking your dictation from the National Association of Manufacturers. You are taking it from the United States Chamber of Commerce and the American real estate boards. To you, human rights do not mean anything. However, the day of reckoning is coming in November and the people of this country who fortunately have an opportunity to express themselves every 2 years will reaffirm their faith in all the things that the Democratic Party has fought for for the last 20 years.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in answer to the gentleman from New York who just spoke, that every charge that he made, that the

Republican Party or those of us who want to see some semblance of common sense knocked into this Production Control Act, is absolutely false on the record. The Republican Party throughout the years has played a very strong part in making this the strongest Government in the world. It has tried to protect the working people of this country and it has, and always will have, a large share of the support of the working people of this country. We in the Republican Party oppose policies that we know are detrimental or unfair to labor. We tell the rank and file of labor why we do so and do not try to deceive them. We support legislation beneficial to labor.

If those who follow the dictates of the left-wing crowd continue as they have, then the great bulk of the Jeffersonian Democrats and the great bulk of labor will be with the Republican Party. Your party has exploited labor too long now for political purposes. Labor has got on to your political motives, your unbearable taxes, and will continue to leave you.

May I say further that there are some pretty formidable elements, good people who want to do away with controls. If we must keep them, they do not want controls kept for the sole purpose of playing politics in order to continue to spend \$68,000,000 a year for 13,600 political jobs, many of which are not necessary. I refer to the great Farm Bureau representing millions of producers. I refer, yes, to the chambers of commerce of this country, and to a great many of the finest patriotic, thinking people in America.

Those who are administering price control are absolutely in the opposite direction from the purposes of the act, which was to get greater production. Their controls are decreasing production. The consumers know they cannot consume goods that are not produced. That prices go up when manufactured and agriculture production goes down. That prices go down when as production increases. What we need is greater production to help reduce the high cost of living.

The OPS retards and reduces production. It hurts the consumer as well as the producer. It is bad for both of them. It is a farce and should be abolished.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have before me an editorial from one of America's most distinguished newspapers, the Philadelphia Inquirer, which for a hundred years has been the bible of the Republican Party in Pennsylvania. This is an editorial of June 23. It reads as follows:

What was in actuality a minority of the House of Representatives has voted a series of stultifying amendments that have virtually crippled the anti-inflation bill.

If these actions prevail, the bill would eliminate curbs on just about everything but rents and wages, would kill credit and price restrictions except on commodities which are rationed or allocated.

This bit-in-the-teeth runaway system of dealing with a question of vast national im-

portance is downright shocking. The serious aspect of the matter is that the action put over in a lightly attended House session can involve highly dangerous consequences. In the present delicate situation of the American economy there is a good deal of force in the heated protest of Economic Stabilizer Roger L. Putnam that the votes jammed through to take the heart out of controls were actually votes for inflation.

We are not fond of controls. Few people are. But it is by no means established that conditions have arisen to justify discarding them entirely and let food and other necessities run wild. Last week saw the cost of living at its highest peak. With all restraints taken off the prices ahead of us may become appalling.

Steps such as are contemplated in the current House amendments should be taken only after the most thoughtful study, not shoved through by a headstrong group that took advantage of week-end absenteeism.

Fortunately what has been attempted is not irretrievable. The amendments must be approved by a roll call vote Wednesday. This whole illogical mess, which proposes to keep wage controls but permits costs of living to go whenever they may, ought to be cleared up. The amendments should be expunged.

Congress should not pass a fake controls bill which has been rendered meaningless. It must consider the inflationary dangers grimly close to us now. It must not gamble on the effects upon the defense program, on numerous labor contracts, and on the living standards of American homes if prices are to be permitted to go where they please, because they will go up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, the remarks I was about to make have been much better made by the previous speaker who read the editorial from a paper which has been friendly to, and has worked with the Republican Party throughout the years. Therefore, I will not be repetitious, but simply want to say that it is about time we calmed down and considered what we are doing for the best interests of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, last Friday a series of amendments to the price stabilization provisions of the Defense Production Act were offered to the Committee of the Whole House and adopted. One of these is such an outrageous piece of legislation that I want to examine it briefly with you. I refer to the amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

I congratulate Mr. TALLE, and his fellow Republicans. Rarely has the work of the advocates of profiteering and complete decontrol been done so thoroughly and so well.

The Talle amendment would end price controls on all food, on all clothing and apparel, on all other consumer goods, on all things farmers buy, on practically everything business buys, on almost everything the Government buys; and it would do so immediately, by next Monday.

Does this legislation come right out and say this is its intent? If it did, I think I could respect its forthrightness, much as I might deplore its willingness to scuttle the only safeguards this country has against the threat of a crippling inflation.

But the Talle amendment is not forthright. It is not clear. Instead, it cloaks itself in some 158 words of pious double talk. It pretends concern for some program of protective controls. It has been designed to wear the engaging air of plausibility, to appear in the light of sense and reason, not only to the gentlemen of the House, but to the American public as well.

I am not shocked to find that the gentlemen on the Republican side of the House are up to their old tricks of defending the schemes of privileged business, to get rid of price controls. I expect this. What horrifies me is the smiling treachery behind this particular attack, and its callous disregard of the economic facts of our time.

The amendment has two parts. The first part would prohibit the Office of Price Stabilization from placing controls on the price of any commodity that has sold below ceilings for 3 months or more. The second part would forbid ceilings for any commodity in "adequate supply." Mr. TALLE's amendment would consider that a commodity not being allocated or rationed by the Government is in adequate supply. Let me speak of the second part of this amazing document first.

At first blush, the words "adequate supply" are disarming. If goods are in adequate supply, they argue, there should be no need to be concerned with their prices in any way.

Mr. Chairman, to my certain knowledge there has been no rationing of consumer goods of any kind in the last 2 years. Using the logic of the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa there should have been no need for any concern about prices. Prices should have adjusted themselves right along, happily for the consumer and the businessman, and the farmer.

But have they? Does anyone acquainted with the record think that prices, although there has been no need for rationing, have not consistently presented the picture of a dangerous inflationary trend?

Here are the facts. In the last 2 years, and with no slightest hint of rationing for consumers' goods, prices as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics have been steadily rising. The cost of living has gone up 11 percent. Eight percent of that rise came before the institution of direct price controls.

Today, the cost of living is within one-tenth of 1 percent of its all-time high.

Apparently, inflation does not always obey the simple rules which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa would lay down for it. Apparently, we can have, and have had, dangerous inflationary pressures, without the accompanying scarcities the gentleman from Iowa would have us believe are the inevitable concomitant of higher prices.

Were there any real shortages, right after Korea, when prices zoomed suddenly? You all know that the real shortages were few. Actually, what we in this country were treated to then, in the 8 months that followed Korea, and before direct price controls, working with other Government controls, took effect, was a

dangerous rash of scare buying, pure and simple.

Nobody was talking about rationing anything.

Businessmen, concerned over stocks of raw materials, built up inventories.

People spent out of their savings. They borrowed if they lacked cash. Total consumer credit rose to a record \$20,000,000,000 at the end of 1950.

Wholesale prices were leaping.

Consumers' prices rose at the average rate of 1 percent a month.

A family that was spending \$3,600 annually for its cost-of-living budget in January 1950 suddenly found, 8 months after Korea, that an additional \$300 was needed to purchase what \$3,600 bought before. Where the family income remained the same—and there are undoubtedly many millions of Americans whose income has remained the same—the family was \$300 poorer.

These losses, these price rises, this really dangerous flurry of inflation had not a thing in the world to do with whether or not the commodities concerned were in adequate supply. They had not a thing in the world to do with any real or supposed need for rationing.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that when we look at the Talle amendment in this way all its fine pretense of reason and logic fall away and what is disclosed is a fraud, and the smiling fraud walks among us, wired for sound, and the sound track seems to be saying: "Look, we Republicans, we defenders of privileged businesses, are really anxious to retain all necessary price controls. But let us put price controls only on things that are not in adequate supply."

Once you tie price control to rationing, you have really opened the door to higher and higher prices. You are really doing the bidding of big business, which wants all price protections removed so it can take higher and higher profits at the expense of millions and millions of Americans. Once say unless it is rationed, no ceilings, no controls, and you would see prices rocket right off into space. You could have no price controls unless a program of rationing with all the red tape of ration books and blue points and red points and lining up at the stores went along with the price controls.

But the first part of the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa makes another set of assumptions. It assumes that prices are generally below ceilings and are going to remain below. It assumes that there is a soft-market bandwagon rolling and all the consumer has to do is go out and jump aboard.

Where is this soft-market bandwagon?

It does not show up in recent investigations by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living, as I said earlier, is right now within one-tenth of 1 percent of its all-time high.

Among the items that BLS recently found selling at or near their 1951-52 peak prices were corn flakes, corn meal, bread, vanilla cookies, milk, ice cream, bananas, onions, flour, rolled oats, veal cutlets, cheese, apples, canned peaches, canned corn, and canned baby food. Women's suits, boys' suits, men's and children's shoes, and other items of apparel were at their peaks or close to

them. Automobiles, auto repairs, and insurance were also. Rents, beer, haircuts, permanent waves—I could go on with the list. In March, items representing one-half the average urban consumer's purchases were at their peaks. Practically 71 percent were within 2 percent of their peaks. Less than a tenth were as much as 10 percent below their peaks.

Where prices have been materially below established ceilings OPS has realistically been proceeding with a program of orderly suspensions. I do not need to go into that. The House knows that whatever suspensions are economically, safely possible are going forward. There is no warrant at all for the propaganda which tries to give the impression that unnecessary controls are being maintained.

Our economy today is not a soft one. Basically, the economy is firm, with widespread upward pressures on prices.

Recently OPS found that food retailers, as an industry, were right in their claim that they needed some price relief. Higher retail mark-ups had to be granted on a wide range of foods, including dry cereals, canned vegetables and fruits and soups, and frozen foods. The price increases for these items are expected to be about 1 cent an item. The Nation's food bill, as a result of this one necessary action, is probably going to have to go up another \$100,000,000 a year.

The dairy industry has been asking for higher ceilings. High-protein feeds, which affect beef prices, are currently pressing OPS ceilings. Increases in freight costs are bringing other pressures for price increases. OPS has recently been compelled to issue a number of special regulations permitting distributors to pass on increases in transportation costs.

In the service trades generally, OPS is constantly receiving requests for higher ceilings because of increasing labor costs, usually the largest single cost item in this field.

That is the picture that confronts us today. It is a picture of production at high levels, with goods of nearly every kind available, no scarcities worth even the mention of the need for rationing, and yet prices are rising. Prices are, for the most part, at peak or right up to peak. And they are still rising.

I submit that the job before the House of Representatives is not one of trying to find ways to kill price control with feigning talk. We are not here to joust with such will-o'-the-wisps as "adequate supply." Our responsibility is prices. Let us confine ourselves to what has happened to prices, and what is likely to happen to them, without adequate controls. Let us not be bemused by the generally irrelevant talk of items or commodities that may be selling below the protective ceilings, or by the myth which would set up scarcities and rationing as the only preconditions requiring a firm program of price controls.

That is special interests double-talk of the most dangerous sort. But it does not fool the American people. They are up to their necks in high prices right

now. They are not likely to look kindly on this latest Republican big business move to push them under.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POAGE) there were—ayes 22, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 3, strike out from line 19 to line 4 on page 4, inclusive.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to strike out that provision of this bill which places a floor under food prices instead of dealing with a ceiling on them. And it does that by legislating into effect a fixed floor of 90 percent of parity for basic agricultural commodities for another year. Right now, or at the end of this crop year, the law provides in these basic commodities that parity may be established at a sliding scale of 75 percent to 90 percent, depending upon whether there has been a surplus of growing according to the Secretary of Agriculture in which case he fixes the parity percentage low, and if there is a shortage he fixes the parity percentage high in order to encourage growing.

There is a bill pending upon which a rule has been obtained by the Committee on Agriculture seeking to do this very thing, and one other thing which is not important for the discussion here for 2 years, whereas the provision in this DPA bill makes it 1 year.

It seems to me that in the interest of even fundamental and orderly legislating we should not pass this here, but we should wait until debate takes place and the opportunity occurs for the consideration of the bill, upon which a rule has been granted, which bill is H. R. 8122.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to state for myself why I have taken this position with respect to agricultural bills. I hope very much that the Members from the cities, and this is very important to them, will listen. The general idea here seems to be that all matters affecting agriculture are the business only of those who represent rural areas or those who are members of the Committee on Agriculture. I do not think anything else could be further from what is right for Members of the Congress, and if we needed any proof of it, here is the proof. The fact is that the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which makes the consumers' price index now shows for May 15, which is the last figure, that the index for food prices has climbed to 230.8 which is almost the high which was reached between November 1951 and January 1952, and that the food price index far outstrips the index for everything which is at 189, again close to the high mark. Anyone who has analyzed food costs in his own community will realize that food costs have generally gone up an average of one-third more than price increases across the board of everything else which enters into the cost of living.

Business has gotten bad in the big cities in soft goods, because the people say they do not have the money to pay for their food and the taxes which are necessarily being levied in connection with the defense mobilization program.

All I say about these farm price parities and farm price floors is that there has to be an adversary proceeding. Somebody has to have an interest which will test out whether these increases in the guaranties and price flows for agricultural commodities are right or wrong. They cannot be permitted to go by default. They cannot be permitted to go by consent.

The farm people themselves do not want it that way. Two of the great national organizations in the farm field, the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation, have recorded themselves as being against H. R. 8122 on which a rule has been granted.

It is an oversimplification to think that everybody can get a cut at will out of this economic pie. That is, if food prices go up, then wages will go up, and the thing will equalize itself. The farmer has got into a squeeze on that, because in 1951 he had the highest total gross income he had ever had, \$37,000,000,000, yet his net was \$3,000,000,000 lower than it was in 1947—\$14,000,000,000 against \$17,000,000,000. The answer is that this kind of situation is catching up with him and his costs are taking away from him what he gains by the higher guaranties of the farm price program.

Now, there are many millions of people in our country who are pure consumers—Government workers, social security beneficiaries, veterans on pension and their families, and many who live on savings and annuities. Not enough of us seem to realize that. They cannot get their cut out of any increase in wages or salaries or prices in order to make up what they pay in inflationary prices for food and other items. To these are to be added millions of nonfactory workers, white collar whose salaries lag behind the cost of living. Then, too, all other workers are caught in the squeeze of rising prices and taxes to eat up rising wages. All these need the protection for which I am contending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida: Page 9, line 8, after "are", strike out "7 per centum or more."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment, an amendment that seems to me would bring some benefit not only to the consumer but to the little merchants, producers, and manufacturers.

The only thing this amendment does is this: It provides that if the little merchant sells material or services for less than ceiling, he does not have to

make a report to the President. Now, that looks like sense.

Our merchants are so encumbered at the present time with all of these rules and regulations that they just pile up on the desk. People cannot even read them. I just want to read one that came to the Atlanta office. This is a verbatim copy of an order. It reads like this:

He—

Retailer—

may establish his ceiling price by referring to the listing of comparable categories in appendix C of Ceiling Price Regulation 7 and using pricing rule 5 for mark-up. If necessary he may use rule 6 and appendixes D and F. The extension of in-line pricing is effected by expanding use of appendixes C, D, and F of CPR 7 to give additional categories (860-985 and 1050-1070). These categories were previously added to appendix B by amendments 2 and 8 to CPR 7.

If there is any Member of Congress who can interpret this I will pay for the time he spends trying to interpret it. When we are trying to bring about some simplification, why should we not say to these merchants, "Now, so long as you stay below the ceiling price you make no report to the President or anyone else?"

Instead of that it is 7 percent. He would have to hire a Philadelphia lawyer to determine whether or not he is above or below 7 percent, as provided in this section.

I say to you this would help the little merchant, because he will not have to employ men to help him see whether or not he sold 7 percent or below at the ceiling price that has been promulgated.

The only thing he has got to do if you pass my amendment is to say: "Go ahead and do your business; we are with you, but if you sell below ceiling prices you make no report." That would be an incentive for the merchant to keep his goods below ceiling prices, which, I say, is good for the consumer. Certainly it would be worth something to him instead of going ahead and having to make out all these reports and to figure out whether it is 7 percent, 1 percent, half a percent, or  $6\frac{2}{3}$  percent below ceiling. In other words, you have a play of from 1 to 7 percent to penalize him for refusing to send in a report, and do not think they would not penalize him. They sent out 14,000 warnings the other day in south Florida alone, according to a report in the Miami Herald.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I cannot; my time is too limited.

Mr. MORANO. I want to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Then I shall have to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman is making a splendid statement. He has made a real contribution to the small-business man, and I am going to support his amendment when the vote comes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his support and endorsement of this amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. My time is so limited; I hope the gentleman will not press it.

Mr. RAINS. I am with the gentleman, too.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Just to show the type of orders that they have issued, listen to this: I have been informed that the OPS in setting the price of an article passed an order containing 26,911 words dealing with that article. Whereas you might be interested to know that the Declaration of Independence contains only 1,458 words, including the signatures; the Constitution of the United States has only 4,543 words, including the signatures; the Ten Commandments have only 297 words, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address has only 266 words, and the Lord's Prayer has only 56 words. But when you get to the OPS they send out an order which the little merchant would have to spend half his time trying to read. Generally, a simple regulation is never used when a complicated one can be used instead by the OPS.

Mr. RIVERS. If the gentleman will yield, the OPS never heard of the Lord's Prayer.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am not going to say that, but I do think this amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Is the gentleman's amendment designed to help the merchants, the producers, or the consumers?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. It is designed to help all of them, every one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Kansas: Page 6, line 15, strike out section 106 and insert as follows:

"The first sentence of section 402 (k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto shall be issued under this title or remain in effect under this title, for more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1952, which shall deny a seller of materials at retail or wholesale his customary percentage margins over costs of the materials or his customary charges during the period May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950, or on such other nearest representative date determined under section 402 (c), as shown by his records during such period, except as to any one specific item of a line of material sold by such seller which is in short supply as evidenced by specific Government action to encourage production of the item in question."

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to permit wholesalers and retailers to have their historical and individual mark-up. This is an amendment to what was originally known as the Herlong amendment. When the House passed the Herlong amendment last year, it was passed in the same form and manner as I have presented this amendment. In other

words, the House of Representatives believed that an individual wholesaler or retailer had the right to mark his goods on the basis of his historical individual practices. This amendment permits the individual wholesaler or retailer to follow that customary practice.

The other day I walked through one of the great department stores of Washington, and there I saw offered for sale hundreds and hundreds of items. Some of the items were large, some of the items were medium-sized, and some of them were quite small. Following that I went through a hardware store, and there I saw hundreds of items offered for sale, some of them large and some of them small. Then I went to a clothing store, and I saw hundreds of items offered for sale. This is the interesting thing: The Office of Price Stabilization has permitted drygoods and department stores their individual mark-ups, their historical individual mark-ups. The Office of Price Stabilization has permitted the hardware merchants and wholesalers their individual historical mark-ups. They have permitted the clothing merchant to do the same. As a matter of fact, only one group of merchants has been discriminated against arbitrarily, and I say this advisedly, and not permitted their individual historical mark-up, while over a million wholesalers and retailers in this country are granted that relief.

Mr. Chairman, individual mark-ups for the nonfood retailer, with very few exceptions, are permitted. The grocers in the small and large towns are required to follow a mark-up system provided for them by the OPS.

Mr. Chairman, some people say that it may be impossible for the OPS to go into these various businesses and determine whether or not they are complying with the regulations. If that is true in one branch of the wholesale and retail trade, it must be true in the millions of others. So the only purpose of my amendment is to permit a fair and reasonable mark-up for the grocers, both large and small, and to bring them in line with the rule laid down for other wholesalers and retailers.

I hope the Committee will accept the amendment, because once before the House did accept it, believing that it was a fair and proper manner of fixing prices.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, those who administer price control believe that this amendment would make it impossible of administration. If we are going to have individual cases, if the administration has to get evidence on the historical mark-up of each individual, it seems that it would be labor that would be absolutely impossible to perform. I venture to say that the distinguished gentleman, for whom I have a high regard, will not vote for this bill whether this amendment is in it or is not in it. I am sorry, instead of having these whittling amendments, that the issue is not clearly made as to whether or not we want price control. The gentleman from Iowa a little while ago said that his amendment was

not destructive of price control at all, but as I understand his amendment it will take off ceilings and they cannot be put back in until rationing is established. As one of the characters in Shakespeare said: The wound is not so deep as a well or not as wide as a church door, but it is enough. This is another amendment that will have the same purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIVERS) there were—ayes 56, noes 42.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. COLE of Kansas and Mr. MULTER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 105, noes 83.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 5, after line 3, insert a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 105. (a) Paragraph (iii) of subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(iii) Price of rentals for (a) materials furnished for publication by any press association of feature service, or (b) books, magazines, motion pictures, periodicals, or newspapers, other than as waste or scrap; or rates charged by or wages paid to any person in the business of operating or publishing a newspaper, periodical, or magazine, or operating a radio-broadcasting or television station, a motion picture or other theater enterprise, or outdoor advertising facilities."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, do not get alarmed over the reading of that long amendment. Actually, it is just quoting from the present law. This is not a whittling amendment; it is not a crippling amendment; it is offered in the spirit of bringing into conformity the present law, and also to make this section in the present law conform to the amendments which have been included in this bill by the Committee.

I have talked to members of the Committee on both sides of the aisle, and all the members I have talked to have voiced no objection to this amendment.

Briefly, what it does is this: Under the present law there is no ceiling on prices charged by newspapers, periodicals, magazines, radio stations, television stations, motion picture houses, and so forth.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. When there is no price control, there should be no wage control. That is the basis of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is the basis of the amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. I have no objection to it.

CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: On page 6, line 11, add a new subsection to be numbered 105 (f) to read as follows:

"The provisions of section 12 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U. S. Code, sec. 212), relating to child labor shall not apply with respect to any employee employed in agriculture while not legally required to attend school."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes, sir; I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my position is simply this: As I understand, this is emergency legislation. I presume that the point of order made by the gentleman from New York is based on the proposition that this is an attempt to amend another law in the Defense Production Act. My position is that this is emergency legislation, and that it does not amend another law, but merely creates an exemption during the effective period of this act, and has nothing in the world to do with amending or appealing any section of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the point is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, which is not a part of this act and, therefore, is not germane to the bill now before us.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] offers an amendment to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] makes a point of order on the ground that the amendment is not germane to the bill before the Committee. The Chair has had an opportunity to read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS]. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is not germane to the bill before the Committee since it proposes in effect an amendment to another law with reference to which the Committee on Banking and Currency would have no jurisdiction. Therefore, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have the amendment in other language, which I think meets the objec-

tion raised by the gentleman. May I offer it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may offer an amendment at this time, if he desires to do so.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: On page 6, after line 11, add a new subsection to be numbered 105 (f) to read as follows:

"Employment of any employee in agriculture, while such employee is not legally required to attend school shall be deemed to not constitute oppressive child labor."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Texas on the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my position is the same as it was on the other amendment, that it is not an amendment to any existing law.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, what I have said on the other amendment applies to this amendment with equal force.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] offers an amendment to which the gentleman from New York makes the point of order on the ground that it is not germane. The Chair has had opportunity to read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] and, of course, the section of the bill to which the amendment is offered. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment in its present form is germane in that the gentleman from Texas proposes a further exemption from the wage control provisions of the existing bill. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the Secretary of Agriculture has called upon the farmers in this country for larger production. Production, of course, will provide the bulwark against rationing and against price controls. In 1949, the Congress amended the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and I want to read that amendment to show you how unfair it was to the farmers and to the people who are depending upon their ability to obtain work at harvesttime in order to earn a livelihood.

Subsection C of section 213 reads as follows:

The provisions of section 212 of this title relating to child labor shall not apply with respect to any employee employed in agriculture outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while he is so employed, or to any child employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures or theatrical productions or in radio or television productions.

The next section goes on and extends it to newspaper boys.

Of course, this in effect says that it is more important to this country to have a bunch of kids acting on the stage and in motion pictures to entertain people than

it is to have a bunch of children learning the responsibilities of life and how to be honest Americans and pay their bills and not depend upon the state for sustenance. If that is the place that this country has gotten to, we had better take stock and back up a little bit.

This amendment I have offered does not in any manner exploit child labor. I do not care what some of these sob-sisters have put out in the way of propaganda all over this country to try to exploit child labor and jump on a bill which I introduced before this Congress. It does not do anything in the world but put compulsory school attendance of the child back in the hands of the State where it belongs.

Under the present law a child can go and make a fabulous sum in motion pictures and entertain you and the rest of the people, while he should be in school, but another child, maybe the child of a poor migrant worker family, does not have the same right—and I am not talking about wetbacks now—don't get crossed up on that—these are people who live in the United States and depend upon the harvest to make their living to carry them through the winter and into the next harvest season. Those children, even though they are not legally required to attend school in the particular State or district, because they have already met the compulsory attendance requirements, cannot go into the field and help their families make a living for themselves if school is in session in the district where the harvest is being had, or where they have moved with their families.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You say they cannot do that, although they have met all the legal requirements in the State where they came from?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is exactly correct. In other words, if you have a 120-day compulsory attendance provision in a State and the child has attended 120 days in that State already and has gotten it behind him, and he goes with his parents and his brothers and sisters into a harvest area simply because any school in the district is in session, he cannot work, and if the farmer puts him to work some of these labor agents come in and threaten to put the man in jail and fine him \$10,000 for doing it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In some agricultural areas they organize the school days to fit in with the harvest days also?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is exactly right, simply for the reason that man has not been able to change nature yet, as much as we have tried sometimes.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The further fact is that it is almost impossible today to get

labor out on the farms to harvest the crops.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. DONDERO, this device in this law of 1949 was nothing in the world but a device designed to cut off a pipeline of labor to the small farmers in this country, so that farm labor could be organized; and when it is, you are going to break the small farmers in the United States, and there are going to be some hungry people in this country.

I repeat that this amendment does not exploit children, and if anyone will show me that it does I would be willing to withdraw the amendment. The truth is that children will be exploited if the amendment is not adopted.

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

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. Chairman, may I recall, for the information of my colleagues, that I am a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, which considered the amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act in the Eighty-first Congress. This matter was thoroughly discussed when that legislation was written. All of these people have had ample opportunity to come before our committee and we turned down their request, the same request that the gentleman is making today, because we did not feel that we should encroach upon the standards set up for the protection of children in this country from exploitation by anyone who desired to take advantage.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

I know that the House has been doing some peculiar things today, but I sincerely hope they have not lost their equilibrium to the point that they are going to violate the child-labor laws of this country or approve an amendment that will in any way interfere with the standards that have already been set up, standards that are upheld and observed all over the Nation with the exception of that peculiar section down near the Rio Grande.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wonder if the gentleman would explain at what age the gentleman from Texas is attempting to relax current provisions affecting children in farm labor?

Mr. BAILEY. Any age from the time they are large enough to do any work up until they come out from under the provisions of the Child Labor Standards Act.

Mrs. CHURCH. May I say to the gentleman from West Virginia that I think any such move would be a step backward in the matter of protecting our children. I shall most certainly oppose the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. As I recall, this question arose in the Eighty-first Congress and it refused to cut the work age down to as low as 11 or 12.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Misstatements have been made, and I challenge them.

Mr. BAILEY. I sincerely hope that without any further discussion the House will vote down this amendment. Everybody knows the child-labor laws of this country. We have standards set up that should not be violated. We gave these people permission to use wetback Mexican labor down there, but now they want to go further and put the children to work in violation of the child-labor laws of the country and I am opposed to it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, under the present Child Labor Standards Act States are permitted to shut down the schools during seasons of unusual agricultural labor needs and let all the school children work in the fields if they want to. What is proposed in this amendment is to keep the schools going for some of the children so that they can continue their study, but to permit the taking of other children from the school for work in the fields.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is one of the main points in this entire situation. Your school systems have been concentrated and the result has been that if you close down the schools in the agricultural areas you are penalizing 75 percent of the children because only 25 percent are working in agriculture. Why not let them be legally excused and do the work?

Mr. McCARTHY. That establishes the point. Some children will be taken out of school, but the school will be continued. If work in the field is such a good thing, as the gentleman from Michigan states, it must be good for all of the children and the whole school system should be shut down. I do not think the committee should accept this amendment which is clearly discriminatory and permits the withdrawal from the schools of about 25 to 30 percent of the children.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Will this amendment permit them to work on their own farms or on the farms of other families?

Mr. McCARTHY. As I understand the amendment, they could be used on any farm.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does the gentleman from Michigan believe in putting a harness on the children or just pulling the truck without the benefit of a harness?

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from New York knows that is a perfectly asinine statement, unfair and demagogic, and should not have been made on the floor of this House.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has tried to indicate that I am not familiar with this problem. I confess that I am a product of the city streets, but I have grown up in a strong knowledge of what good value there is in farm work; and I have been a proud member of an Illinois farm family since my marriage 34 years ago. I make a distinction however, between working upon one's own family farm as against the gentleman's proposition to remove present protection from our children working commercially for hire, on farms. It has taken us years to build up this protection.

I would say to the gentleman from Texas that there is one thing with which I am thoroughly familiar and that is the long struggle in this country to take American children out of any possible exploitation, a struggle in which I have gladly taken part. I believe that farm work is health-building and character-building, as stated by the gentleman from Michigan, and I also think that discipline taught by any means is much needed. Any one step nevertheless which might even tend to put more of our children into the path of what we have known as the evils of child labor should not be taken by this House. I would particularly say to those who believe as I do that industry merits much protection and also to those who agree that we are in an emergency: If we relax one iota in the protection of our children, we shall not survive; and I am not sure that we should.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The gentlewoman misunderstands the amendment and I want to point it out, because I think she is fair and I think she tries to do the right thing. The language in this amendment is the identical language that was employed in the Fair Labor Standards Act from 1938 to 1949 when the Labor Department conceived some trick language down here to make their enforcement problems easier.

Mrs. CHURCH. If I had misunderstood the amendment, I would be happy so to state. I do not think however, that I have misunderstood it, or its implications. Whether the language was tricky or not tricky, this amendment would relax a protection on some of our children, and I would not take a chance on that.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Does not the gentlewoman think the children of the migrant labor on our farms should have the same rights as the children in the cities?

Mrs. CHURCH. I think that all children merit the continuation of all protection previously written into law.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the gentlewoman from Illinois has just stated in her opposition to this amendment. We can put any interpretation on this amendment that we want to but the plain facts are that we are letting down some of the barriers that we as Members of the Congress have voted to protect the youth of this country and see to it that the majority of them, at least, get the education that they deserve. The reason we voted this amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949 was because the majority of the Members of Congress thought that this protection should be given to these children, and if we give in now to this segment of agriculture, under the pretense that it is all right for them to work on the farm, we are letting down the barriers that many men and women have been fighting for for years and years in this country to guarantee to these children, who were prevented from getting an education in the past, under the guise of working on the farm or anywhere else, to get that education. The gentleman from Michigan talks about these city people not understanding the problems of the farmer. I appreciate the fact that he had a son who started to work on the farm and worked until he got through high school or college, I presume, but at least he had the sense of responsibility to his child, while he was working on that farm, to see to it that he got a good and proper education, and that is something that the children of these farm workers, that this amendment pertains to, will not be getting if you vote for this amendment today. You will be discriminating against the child, that is what you will be doing by accepting this amendment. I find myself in the same position as the son of the gentleman from Michigan. I was born and brought up on a farm. I still live on that same farm. I milked cows a long time, from the time I was 9 or 10 years old, until I graduated from high school. I think that is a good thing for any young fellow to do. But, thank God my father had sense enough to see to it that I got an education while I was working on that farm. If I thought this amendment would allow that to be done, I would vote for it, because I know it is a good thing for any young fellow to have the experience that goes with a man working on the farm. But, I am convinced just as sure as I stand before you this afternoon that that is not the case. The people who are arguing for this amendment are the ones who argued against the amendment being enacted into law when it was enacted by the overwhelming vote of this Congress. If we adopt this amendment or one like it we are letting down the barriers that many good men and women have been fight-

ing for for years, for the youths of our country, to see to it that they get a proper education.

One of the worst conditions existing in our country today are the children of the migratory farm workers. There we have a condition, I will say to my friend from Texas, that we should be looking into at the present time. There are thousands and thousands of children of migratory farm workers today that are not getting any education at all, and we, as Members of Congress, are not doing anything about it. That is an actual fact. I do not know how many thousands of migratory farm workers there are today going from Texas right up to Minnesota, and there is not one way in the world that it can be checked upon whether or not they are going to school 1 day or 5 days or 10 days, and those conditions that exist with the children of migratory farm workers existed with the children of farmers in your area which caused the Congress to take the action it did in the amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949. If we vote for this amendment today, we are breaking down the barriers for the protection of the children of our country, and we should see to it that they at least get a semblance of a decent education.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROGERS of Texas), there were—ayes 10, noes 97.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how many amendments are at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands there are now 15 amendments at the desk, to all sections of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on each amendment that is offered to the bill be limited to not to exceed 10 minutes.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I do this for this purpose. There may be amendments which for clear understanding demand more than 10 minutes of debate. There may be other amendments which may be disposed of in 2 minutes. I am afraid that if we set the time at 10 minutes on each amendment, it is an invitation to speak 10 minutes on each amendment whether we have to or not.

I would think the better procedure might be to dispose of as many amendments as we can, restricting the time on each amendment as we come to it.

May I say that when we have disposed of the amendments which are in order at the present time, then if the gentleman cares to ask unanimous consent that the reading of the rest of the bill be dispensed with, I do not think there will be any objection to it. At that time the gentleman may be able to limit debate on all the remaining amendments.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Never since I have been here have I placed myself in opposition to a chairman's request of this nature, but in view of the proceedings here today and on this bill in the last several days, I will object to any limitation of debate on any amendment or upon the bill itself. I think the public should be fully acquainted with the conduct of the House on such extremely important legislation as this. If nobody else objects, I will.

Mr. SPENCE. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAGUE: On page 6, insert "or services" after "materials" in lines 16 and 17.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to reach the problem which faces the Nation's frozen food locker plants insofar as processing charges are concerned. This problem arises from the fact that the Office of Price Stabilization has frozen processing charges which locker plants may levy but will provide no price adjustment relief to compensate for increased costs.

Locker plants perform many functions in each community. They enable their patrons to spread out the use of seasonal surpluses of food by packaging and quick freezing it and then storing it at zero degrees in separate lockers. Besides renting lockers, these plants provide a wide scope of meat processing services, including slaughtering, chilling, aging, cutting, grinding, wrapping, labeling, quick-freezing, smoking, and curing. Not all plants provide slaughtering, smoking, and curing services, but nearly all of them do provide the other meat-processing services. Most of these services are performed at a very low cost to the consumer, the average charge for chilling, cutting, wrapping, and freezing of carcass meats being only 3 to 4 cents per pound for the entire job. These charges together with locker rentals are today frozen at their January 1951 level. These are controlled by ceiling price regulation 34 which is administered by the Service Trades Branch of the Office of Price Stabilization.

Up until only a few years ago many locker plants actually operated their processing departments at a loss. This service was provided as a sort of loss leader to make the use of frozen food lockers attractive. This loss was entirely offset by the subsidy received from the rental of lockers. But the advent of the home freezer has changed this picture. Today it is no longer possible for locker plants to gain locker rental income from each customer thus subsidizing the processing that is done for him because more and more home freezers customers are having their meat processing done at locker plants and then are storing the meat at home in their home cabinets. This processing volume continues to increase while locker rentals decline.

There is another and far more important factor—this is the matter of rising processing costs. Recently Locker Management magazine, the leading trade publication in the locker field, conducted a survey to ascertain the average direct and indirect processing cost increases which have taken place during the past year. This survey reveals the following percent increases which locker plants have had to absorb:

	Percent
Paper.....	20.8
Tape.....	22.3
Cures, seasoning.....	31.7
Wages.....	15.3
Electric power.....	15.7
Water.....	8.8
Fuel.....	9.0
Repairs.....	48.0
Office supplies.....	41.2
Insurance.....	16.6
Laundry.....	38.0
Taxes.....	15.2

The only basis for relief which is now available to locker plants is one of overall financial hardship. According to OPS, a locker plant which can prove that it is making less profit than it did in 1949 will be eligible for relief and will be granted permission to raise its prices. Incidentally, 1949 was one of the worst profit years the industry has ever had and is, therefore, a very unrealistic base for this purpose. Since many plants have taken on the sale of frozen foods, meats, packaging supplies, and so forth in the past few years, many of them have been able to hold to or even improve their profit positions as compared to 1949, in spite of the fact that they are losing money in their processing departments. Thus, since OPS will grant no locker plant departmental relief, the progressive operators are the ones who are being penalized. This policy will result in the creation of many inequities and discourages rather than encourages progressive advancement in the industry.

It is clearly understood that the intention of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended in 1951, was to guarantee American industry its customary margins and to permit the pass-through of cost increases. However, since the act does not specifically make this provision in regards to retail services, the Office of Price Stabilization has refused to provide relief from mounting locker plant processing costs. This stand has also been taken by the Office of Price Stabilization in regards to retail services provided by other service industries—laundries, dry-cleaning establishments, and so forth. In order to correct this problem by legislative action, we respectfully recommend, therefore, that the wording of section 106, paragraph (k) of the Defense Production Act, as amended, be amended by the appropriate addition of two words throughout the section, making it read as follows:

No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto shall be issued or remain in effect under this title, which shall deny to sellers of materials or services at retail or wholesale their customary percentage margins over costs of the materials or services during the period May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950—

And so forth.

We believe that this slight addition to the wording of the act will make manda-

tory the granting of relief to our Nation's retail service industries by the Office of Price Stabilization and will, therefore, broaden the scope of the fair and equitable treatment intended by the act as previously amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Kansas: Page 9, line 3, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 110. Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section, administration of salary stabilization for executive, administrative, supervisory, and professional personnel shall be under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, under stabilization policies promulgated by the Economic Stabilization Administrator. The term 'supervisory personnel' as used herein shall have the same meaning as the term 'supervisor' as defined by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and the terms 'executive,' 'administrative,' and 'professional' shall have the same meaning as the corresponding terms as defined in existing regulations of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division for the purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill but attempts to amend other legislation that is not before us. It attempts to impose other duties upon the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department, and also attempts to change the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to place the responsibility for salary stabilization in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The purpose of the bill before the House is to determine the process and the laws in connection with salary stabilization. The amendment which I offer merely transfers the responsibility of salary stabilization from the Wage Stabilization Board to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, as it was during World War II.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the title which we are considering in this bill has to do with price controls, wage and salary stabilization. The manner of stabilizing salaries and wages surely is not only germane to the bill, because the bill compels the President to stabilize wages and salaries when he controls prices, but in this particular section he is compelled to stabilize wages and salaries, even though the present act was silent on the manner in which he stabilizes salaries. An amendment which provides the machinery for stabilization of salaries would surely be in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] offers an amendment to the bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULDER] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

The Chair has had an opportunity to read the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE]. The Chair has also had an opportunity to reread section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] proposes to change the existing provisions of section 403 by making specific, whereas 403 now leaves discretion.

The Chair is of the opinion, therefore, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] is germane and therefore overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULDER].

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, salary stabilization and wage stabilization are handled by two separate administrative bodies today; salary stabilization is now processed by the Salary Stabilization Board. Wages are administered by the Wage Stabilization Board. During the last war salary stabilization was handled by an appropriate division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Bureau of Internal Revenue now has all the facts, statistics, and information necessary properly to administer salary stabilization laws, regulations, and rules. The Salary Stabilization Board is thus required to duplicate 100 percent all of the work, the gathering of statistics and facts which are already in the possession of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

During the last war the salary stabilization program was handled satisfactorily, efficiently, and ably by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

There are reasons why there should be a distinction between the methods of handling and processing wage stabilization and salary stabilization, for the latter has to do with executives and supervisory personnel, and it can be done more efficiently by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

This appears to be not a very controversial issue, but one which I think would correct the situation as it now prevails. This proposed amendment will provide that the administration of salary stabilization shall be handled by the Bureau of Internal Revenue while the basic policy will be set up by the Economic Stabilizer.

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

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment and to express the hope that it is adopted.

The gentleman has well pointed out that the Bureau of Internal Revenue handled this matter of salary stabilization very well during World War II.

The necessity for the adoption of this amendment arises out of the fact that the present Wage Stabilization Board is

to be abolished and a new statutory board created in its place; hence comes the necessity for providing for the manner of salary stabilization to which the gentleman's amendment refers. As I said before, I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. MCKINNON. Is it not true that with the adoption of the Lucas amendment the newly created Wage Stabilization Board is given jurisdiction over and the responsibility of establishing wage and salary policies, and the gentleman's amendment would simply create a duality of control?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I would say to the gentleman that it does change perhaps the policy not only of present law but although not in any material sense, it might also change a part of the Lucas amendment.

The Lucas amendment is an effort to process wage-stabilization problems. Frankly, it has nothing to do with nor is it basically concerned with salary stabilization; salary stabilization is completely different; it involves different problems; it does not involve the usual bargaining between labor and management and all of those various ramifications that are involved in wage stabilization. So I do not believe it would materially affect the Lucas amendment having to do with wage stabilization.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it should be pointed out in respect to what the gentleman from California has just said, that the Lucas amendment preserves the tripartite character of the make-up of the Wage Stabilization Board. That is, there are representatives of labor and of industry, then there are representatives of the general public. That is a perfectly reasonable manner in which to handle wage stabilization matters. You do not have any necessity for any such tripartite arrangement in respect to salary stabilization because there is no such diversity of interest as exists in respect to wage stabilization.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. That is just what I was trying to say.

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

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

Mr. MCKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Let me make an observation on the debate that has just taken place. We of the Committee on Education and Labor have heard all of the testimony of Mr. Wilson. In that testimony was much testimony dealing with the stabilization of salaries brought in there by management. In many cases management has offered to employees salaried positions where there was no organization existing at all. They came along and asked for increases for these salaried employees. So they did process

them in connection with the yardstick they had but not beyond that. So the question of salaries is very important in this discussion. If the Lucas amendment is left in the bill they will still be concerned with salaries as well as wages.

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the whole intent of the House in recent years has been to follow the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report which is to streamline our Government and put responsibility in the hands of a single agency to do the whole job. In line with that thinking one of the great problems of management is where wages stop and salaries begin, who is the man who is working as a wage earner and where does the wage earner stop when the position is turned into a supervisory job or salaried position? Ofttimes it is hard to determine between a man on salary and a man on wages. In view of the Hoover Commission report, in view of the idea of streamlining the Government and making it more effective and efficient, in view of the fact we have adopted the Lucas amendment setting up a new Stabilization Board, it appears to me a wise solution to the situation would be to let one agency, the Wage Stabilization Board, take over the whole stabilization program, administering wages as well as salaries. In that way you do not have the conflict of jurisdiction between two separate boards or agencies. You would have a streamlining effect and a quicker operation. We have too much delay now in the matter of wage stabilization without complicating it further.

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. I take it the gentleman understands that presently under the Defense Production Act by Executive order a salary stabilization board has been created that is right now dealing with matters of salary stabilization, but matters of wage stabilization have been left to the Wage Stabilization Board up to this time.

Mr. MCKINNON. I think the gentleman has given a better argument against the amendment than I could, if present conditions allow the law already in operation to operate satisfactorily. Furthermore, may I say that the present two boards are closely correlated; they work closely together, whereas if this amendment is adopted you would have them completely separated; you would have a lack of cooperation which is so essential in our wage-stabilization program.

Mr. HALLECK. Certainly what I said is not an argument against the amendment; it is an argument for the amendment. If the Lucas amendment stands up in the House there is no need for the recreation of a Wage Stabilization Board as we have it under Executive order. This simply tries to cure that deficiency by availing ourselves of the services of an already constituted agency of the Government that is well qualified to handle the matter.

Mr. MCKINNON. I might point out to the gentleman that the Lucas amend-

ment does basically two things: It creates a new tripartite board with certain jurisdiction. The jurisdiction and the limitations on jurisdiction that the Lucas amendment sets forth as opposed to the old law is such that the newly created Wage Stabilization Board will be more limited than the old Wage Stabilization Board has been. But it still does not take away the necessity for streamlining the stabilization of wages and salaries into one over-all board and one over-all group, and under the Cole amendment you would have the Internal Revenue Bureau completely independent of the Wage Stabilization Board, while the need is to keep them together.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. The basic policies will still be fixed by the Economic Stabilizer under my amendment, and it will have a direct line of supervision.

Mr. MCKINNON. What is the sense then of having two separate agencies?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 59, noes 56.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. COLE of Kansas and Mr. MCKINNON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 77.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to the pending section, the Clerk will read.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHELLEY. At what point of the bill are we now? I have an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read through line 10 on page 9 of the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, about half an hour ago I had the opportunity of reading to the Committee an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer criticizing severely the action of this Committee in adopting the amendments thus far agreed to. Certainly nobody would accuse the Philadelphia Inquirer of being pro-Democratic. It has been the bible of the Republican Party for 100 years.

I have a statement here which Mr. Bernard Baruch wrote to a distinguished Member of the other body.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The editorial writer who wrote that editorial did not sit on the committee for 6 weeks and hear all the evidence, did he?

Mr. FLOOD. But I am sure the conclusion of the Philadelphia Inquirer for my friends on that side of the aisle should be paramount and absolute whether or not he did.

Mr. Baruch had this to say:

Removal of price, wage, rent, and other mobilization controls would be a tragic, perhaps mortal, blow to our efforts to rebuild our defenses in time to avert another war.

I might say that Mr. Baruch repeated those words this week before the War College here in Washington. Mr. Baruch is certainly no long-haired, flat-heeled, wild and woolly left-wing screwball by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. Baruch said that there should be absolutely no exemption or favoritism for any group. His letter hit hard, without citing names, at recent testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee in which large organizations have asked either that all price and wage control be removed or that their own groups be given immunity.

Mr. Baruch said:

The issue before your committee—and the Nation—is a simple one. It is a question of which is to be put first—the national interest or the selfish interest.

It is not how little in the way of economic controls we stagger along with, but of how much we are willing to give up in the defense of our liberties.

This is Mr. Baruch. The elder statesman, in answer to a question by a distinguished Member of the other body, said further:

Whether the greatest danger of inflation is behind us or ahead depends upon the law the Congress enacts and the courage with which it is administered.

Mr. Baruch declared that removing prices and wage controls would sap the stability and soundness of our economic system, and would double or treble the cost to the people in rearming for defense. There is no avoiding the issue; until the gap between Soviet armament and our American defenses is bridged, there can be no basis for peace or the elimination of control.

In a curt note to the Senator, Mr. Baruch says further:

You know well enough what to do, damn the political torpedoes, full speed ahead.

Those are the words of that brave, old American.

Mr. Baruch said that the issue before the Congress has now become this and I quote:

The test of what we prize most highly—

Mark this—

petty profits and trivial comforts or freedom—American freedom.

Mr. Baruch said it is the test of whether we are a nation united in awareness of our common interests, or whether we are a mere aggregation of pressure groups divided in a scramble for selfish gain.

There are words far beyond your poor power, gentlemen, to detract. There are the words of an American whose patriotism cannot be questioned.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that everybody in the country except the Members

of Congress know that what Mr. Baruch has said is absolutely true. I have been informed that since yesterday morning and up to 1 hour ago the telegraph office of the Capitol had received in excess of 8,000 telegraphic messages protesting against the decontrol action taken in this House.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. I have here a memo taken from the wire ticker which I am advised says that tomorrow General Eisenhower will make a statement at Denver that gradually, and very gradually only should any change be made in existing controls on prices and wages.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we all know Mr. Baruch is a great and wise man. The gentleman spoke about physical hardships. I never heard of Mr. Baruch suffering any physical hardship. My understanding from the press is that two or three, maybe more, Presidents have invited him down here to advise them, and that he has given them sound advice. However, I never learned or have been aware that he had ever been a candidate and then elected to any public office where he is responsible to anyone for the success of a program. Last week, my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] offered an amendment which he believed would have taken care of some of these thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands who have been thrown out of employment and others who will be out of employment because of production activities being changed over from civilian production to war production.

Our colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] used that occasion to call up the old, old issue of sectionalism. In at least four, perhaps five, instances he referred to the issue as being one of sectionalism. See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 7721. Then he stated that I had abused him because I had said they dragged out the "old bloody shirt" issue. He, not I, brought up the issue of sectionalism. What he actually said was, "Let us not fight the War Between the States over again." If commenting on an issue he raised is abuse, then I am guilty of abusing him. Then, inadvertently, he went on to pay me a compliment or two, refusing to yield for a reply or correction. He said I was a great friend of labor. I plead guilty to that, even though he made the statement with intent to belittle it—did not mean it. A friend of labor? Yes, I always have been. What section of labor? The men and women who do the work, the laborer, the worker. Friend of what group? Not—and do not mistake me for one moment—not for one moment a friend or advocate of those who in labor organizations seek power for their own benefit or for the benefit of some political organization.

Ever since the last day of 1936 and the first day of 1937, from the well of this

House and in other places I have opposed the programs of John L. Lewis, of Walter Reuther, and of Phil Murray, the latter of whom now has under control and dictates what 650,000 working men and women shall do; programs designed to gather more power to themselves to control government; that is, to say whether women and men shall or shall not work at jobs and wages with which they are satisfied.

I voted in favor of asking the President to use the Taft-Hartley Act, although I do not think that will solve the present situation in the steel strike or in other strikes to follow. Labor is in the position of power it is today because and only because this Congress has given labor organizations and the members of labor organizations special privileges. Privileges for which I voted in many instances and which were designed to strengthen unions. What would I do to provide a remedy when employees go on strike in an industry where the strike adversely affects the public health, safety, and welfare? I would take away from those on strike those special privileges. Just as if a father who lets his boy drive the car and when he finds that the boy is driving at an excessive speed, going through stop lights, getting a group of his friends in the car and racing down the street, takes the car away from that young man. I would do the same thing with labor organizations when they make the public suffer. When they go on a strike which ties up steel production, which prevents an adequate supply of munitions of war or equipment to the men who have been drafted to fight abroad, I would say, "All right. We cannot make you work, that is true; we do not intend to make you work, but get out of the way and let someone else work. Go on strike. Remain on strike for an unreasonable length of time and you are out of a job and we will hire someone else to make what is needed to protect the public. If you want to come back later on without the special privileges, which otherwise would be yours; come back and you will be welcome."

It is true that you cannot make men work, but there is no reason why if you can draft young men to fight abroad you cannot say to these men here, "You shall continue production, or get out of the way for those who will stand back of the men who have been conscripted."

The true issue was earlier stated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] when he said in effect that it was time we learned just who governed this country.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 111, through section 114 of the bill, be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would it be in keeping for the Chairman at this time to add a limitation of time on the balance of the bill, say until 4:30?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think that is desirable. I do not know how much damage could be done to the bill, when after all time had expired amendments might be presented which we would not have any opportunity to know what they contain.

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

There was no objection.

The bill reads as follows:

SEC. 111. (a) Title VI of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby repealed. The table of contents in the first section of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out "Title VI. Control of consumer and real estate credit." and inserting in lieu thereof "Title VI. [Repealed]."

(b) Section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) After the date of enactment of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1952, no voluntary program or agreement for the control of credit shall be approved or carried out under this section."

SEC. 112. The first sentence of section 707 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "his."

SEC. 113. Section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) No action for the recovery of any cooperative payment made to a cooperative association by a market administrator under an invalid provision of a milk marketing order issued by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 shall be maintained unless such action is brought by producers specifically named as party plaintiffs to recover their respective share of such payments within 90 days after the date of enactment of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1952 with respect to any cause of action heretofore accrued and not otherwise barred, or within 90 days after accrual with respect to future payments, and unless each claimant shall allege and prove (1) that he objected at the hearing to the provisions of the order under which such payments were made and (2) that he either refused to accept payments computed with such deduction or accepted them under protest to either the Secretary or the Administrator. The district courts of the United States shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all such actions regardless of the amount involved. This subsection shall not apply to funds held in escrow pursuant to court order. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, no termination date shall be applicable to this subsection."

SEC. 114. (a) Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out "1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "1953."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out "1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "1953."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 9, after line 23, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 701 (c) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the colon at the end of the first sentence thereof and adding the following: 'during such period.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment to this section of the bill which has to do with the competitive position of established business. The base period was the period preceding June 24, 1950. There seems to have been some uncertainty in respect to the intent of the language which was enacted at that time, so there has been a little confusion in the administration of the law. I have offered this amendment merely to clarify the fact that it is the period preceding June 24, 1950, that is meant when we say that the competitive position of established business shall be maintained.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: Page 9, strike out everything in lines 11 to 23, inclusive.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, originally when the Defense Production Act was passed it contained provisions for credit controls. When the bill originally came to the floor we struck out general credit controls but enacted the consumer credit controls and real estate credit controls, and also voluntary bank credit controls.

The bill as it is now before us strikes out all credit controls. My amendment would strike that provision out of the bill so as to restore to the act and continue as part of the law the credit controls as originally enacted. I think that those credit controls, even though we may not need them now, must be continued and should be continued on a standby basis so that if the time occurs either while we are out of session or something happens quickly before the Congress can act again, we would have these standby credit controls in such shape that we could act promptly. I therefore urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does that amendment strike out regulations X and W?

Mr. JAVITS. The amendment, as I understand it, proposes that the power remain to impose regulations X and W if the Federal Reserve Board considers that necessary to control inflation.

Mr. Chairman, I proposed to offer the same amendment which has been offered by my colleague from New York. I would like to spend just a minute in going over the reasons:

First, the power to control credit if needed has been retained in the other body, so it is not a matter of first impression or a matter to be treated lightly. It will arise importantly in the conference.

Second, I think it epitomizes the error into which it is awfully easy to fall.

I think it is demonstrated, with all deference and respect in the adoption of the price decontrol amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], which was adopted and which I think is unwise. We are proceeding upon the assumption that the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing. We appropriate colossal sums for military defense. In the year 1952 we will be spending, at the beginning of the year, at the rate of \$55,000,000,000 a year for defense alone, and by the end of the year at the rate of \$60,000,000,000 a year. We will be spending throughout the year 1952 \$42,000,000,000 for hard goods, the actual planes, ships, and tanks of military defense. That is our one hand, our right hand. Then with our left hand we completely disregard the fact that just out of that spending a great inflation can be created and the proposal is to jettison controls.

It is one thing to say that you want this decontrolled and you do not want reports sent in on that, and you want to set standards by which there should be mandatory decontrol. Those could be matters of detail; but it is quite another thing to dismantle the fire department, created to extinguish an inflation fire, and put it out of business. I fear that is what is being done with respect to prices by saying that no food prices may be decontrolled unless there is rationing which we know there is not going to be, according to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], and in the amendment to take fresh and canned fruits and vegetables out from under control; and we fall into the same error if we defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York on the credit control machinery.

The Federal Reserve Board has shown itself very sensitive to the fact where real estate credit controls under regulation X or consumer credit control under regulation W are not required, they have been rather quick to withdraw them. Instead of encouraging them in that kind of action, which has been responsive to our financial and economic situation, the bill now proposes to withdraw completely that power, and to leave the country defenseless as to a threat of credit inflation in the next 6 months, I say advisedly, 6 months in which the world and the Russians are waiting for the country to be defenseless in any respect, 6 months in which policy may be in suspense in connection with the heat of a controversial presidential campaign, 6 months in which, if we ever needed control machinery, we ought to keep it in effect. I think it is very unwise if we take this out. You dismantle what we have had dealing with the engines of inflation, consumer credit, and real estate credit, and you leave only the power to cope with bank credit which does not begin to answer the situation at a time when consumer credit alone is around the \$14,000,000 or \$15,000,000 mark. I repeat, we have been acting in a way in which the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing and is an evidence of it.

I hope very much that good common sense will reassert itself and that we will pass this amendment and cause this effort to dismantle the credit control machinery to be stricken out of the bill.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last year when this bill was under discussion I made this statement verbatim, punctuatum, litteratim, and spellatim. The only scarcity in America today is the scarcity of storage space. When we thought this stupid, ill-advised, nonsensical regulation W should have been repealed a year ago, I called that to the attention of this august body, but the body down at the other end of the Capitol did not see fit to give the people of this Nation 21 months for installment buying last year. With great reluctance the brass heads in the Federal Reserve, came here the other day and agreed to remove regulation W with production at an all time high. The people down here on F Street in Washington were begging you to take television sets for practically nothing. Refrigerators, furniture, and all kinds of merchandise were sticking out their ears. All of the retailers and wholesalers had their shelves full. Why, you could not find a foot of storage space in Charlotte, N. C., Atlanta, Ga., or Memphis, Tenn., or any of the other sections of this country. You could not find storage space with a microscope. Then these school boys—and that is what I call them, advisedly, with no reflection on my distinguished friend—in the departments beg you for standby controls over these items.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The committee, by a substantial vote, cut out consumers credit and real estate credit.

Mr. RIVERS. Why, of course you did. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia was the leader in that. That indicates his fine vision for which he is noted, and I am glad to be on his side in this. I want to say this to you in that connection, and I want to get this in, too: You heard about the song "Marching Through Georgia." I saw the gentleman march through Michigan the other day without any encumbrances or road blocks. But, I will say this to you, if you fall asleep for one fleeting moment and give these people controls through regulation W and regulation X, your conscience will smite you for the next 6 months. There is not enough money and there is not enough credit in the United States to buy all the consumer goods on hand in 6 months. If we need these things we will be back here in plenty of time. Do not lapse for 1 minute. Keep the controls out of their hands and your people one of these days will rise up and call you blessed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 9, after line 23, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 705 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(f) Any person subpoenaed under this section shall have the right to make a record of his testimony and to be represented by counsel."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I believe every man has a right to counsel by reason of the Constitution of the United States. I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 11, line 10, after "1953", insert "Provided, however, That title 4 and all authority thereunder shall terminate at the close of July 31, 1952."

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, on several occasions during the debate on this measure the call has been made for an outright vote on the continuation of wage and price controls. I have thought and now think that under the existing circumstances in the world and in this country that the allocation of strategic materials should remain in force. I have felt that the provisions for loans and other activities which would tend to produce the materials necessary for carrying on our present war and defense production should remain in effect. But I think if there has been anything clearly demonstrated in this House it has been that there is no need for price control.

I hold in my hand a magazine, a nationally known and pretty well accepted magazine, that contains a solid page listing the articles that now are selling under ceiling prices. Call on the textile folks and they will tell you that some of them at the present time would be delighted to get cost of production. One of the largest producers in the country told me just 2 days ago over the phone that he would be glad to get cost of production if he could, that then he would not have to shut down four of the largest textile plants in this country on Saturday night.

What were we doing the other day? We were talking of 18 States in which a tremendous amount of unemployment exists. Why? Because the plants are closed down and there is no market for their products.

Mr. Chairman, this does not affect the other parts of the bill. It permits price and wage control, and I might say we have had very little wage control, to remain in effect until July 31, 1952. That will give them time to bundle up their unused blanks, petitions, regulations, orders, and so forth, that they are so busily engaged in passing out at this time.

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

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Does the gentleman's amendment eliminate rent control?

Mr. BARDEN. No, it has no bearing on rent control, it has no bearing on the allocation of strategic materials, it has no bearing on the defense plant construction loans and those things. It simply relates to price and wage control. And neither price nor wage control should be abolished without the other—if one goes the other should go.

Mr. Chairman, let us think for a moment. We have just listened to a debate here that is clear evidence to me that at the present moment there is a lack of faith and confidence in our economic system. Have we become so afraid? Do we not have faith in our American way of life? Do we not have faith in our competitive economic system? Have we reached the point that we cannot leave this House for 6 months without shuddering for fear something is going to come down and destroy our economy? I sometimes wonder how those people figured out a comfortable living this long. These laws are for economic emergencies. If we permit them to gnaw into the very vitals of our economic system we will wake up some day and find that our normal American economy will not function. Think for instance of France, which now has every single control, every one of the regimentation acts that were passed in World War I, plus many others. In what condition is France today? Her economy is paralyzed.

You can look at Great Britain. Do you think the regimentation, the detailed regulation of the internal economy of Great Britain is strengthening the functioning of that economy? I do not think so.

I do not think there is a man or woman in this House who can stand up here now and name even one-third enough items that are selling for even ceiling prices to justify the continuing of price and wage controls.

This amendment is just bringing it down to a practical point. I do not think the House wants to continue price control. I believe I can sense the feeling of this House. At any rate this is the time for each Member to use his best judgment regardless of how the total vote adds up.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman for his honesty in offering this amendment. It seems he wants to do that which by indirection we have been doing all day. He says the natural law of supply and demand should now govern our commercial and industrial world. I wish that were true. But is the world in a normal condition? Are there any reasons for apprehension? On the horizon in the east there are always dark and ominous clouds, and every now and then we can hear the hiss of the angry winds that come before the storm. You can sometimes see a flash in the distance, and hear the rumble of thunder. I do not want price control or wage control unless it is necessary. But, I think

in this vote you are holding in the hollow of your hand the destiny of your country. There is no more insidious enemy to the American people, and there is no more insidious enemy to the economy of our Nation than inflation. Who knows what the result will be if you strike down price control and wage control? I am in favor of discontinuing wage control if you destroy price control. But with the Government of the United States spending more than a billion dollars a week for defense and going into the pockets of our people, and with the national characteristic of the American citizen to buy what he wants regardless of the price, what is going to be the effect of destroying price controls at this time? Why have we been considering the bill these last few days if it is the opinion of this House that these things should be stricken down? Why did we not strike them down at the commencement of the consideration of the bill so that we might avoid taking up all the time that we have taken up, and avoid using all the energy that has been used in consideration of these matters? I hope you will not vote on this matter lightly. If the minority party, aided by some of the Members on our side, do this, then the responsibility will be known. The Democratic Party is in favor of the continuation of price controls and of wage controls, and everybody who has studied the conditions and the history of our country for the last few years knows that. You can use your own judgment about this. But, when you cast your vote, you will be casting one of the most important votes that you have ever cast since you have been Members of the Congress. If the injury occurs, it cannot be repaired. If you continue price controls for the next year, or the next 6 months, we can then consider the discontinuance of it. But right now, with the condition of the world, and with the uncertainty of what may take place abroad, and whether or not we may be engulfed in a world war, no man knows. We cannot afford under the circumstances which now exist to do away with price controls and wage controls. Not only will a spiral of inflation rob our people and destroy their savings but it will also rob our Government. The immense amount of materials it must purchase for our defense effort involving billions upon billions of dollars is also under price control; and a rise in these prices will cost the Government a sum that cannot be estimated. The appropriations for this purpose will have to be supplemented and supplemented if the destruction of price control results as I anticipate. Has price control held down prices in the United States? I do not think anyone can deny that they have, and I do not think anyone would deny that for a continuation of the stability of our prices we must have price control. I hope the committee will not agree to this amendment.

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

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It extends price and wage

controls until July 31, 1952, and all the authority thereunder shall cease as of that date.

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the seriousness of this occasion. I am well aware of the need of our country to protect itself by mobilizing our military might. I voted for price and wage controls in World War II. I voted for the price and wage stabilization bill of 1950 because at that time I, together with many Members of this House, believed that it was quite possible the Korean war might become inflamed to such an extent that we would be immersed in a worldwide conflagration. That we would then siphon from consumer production a great percentage of the goods needed for our military. But the situation today is different. I want to read to you parts of two articles which set forth the difference in the situation today and as it was then, and why today we should end price and wage controls.

First I read to you from a pamphlet, "Ending price-wage controls, a statement by the program committee of the Committee for Economic Development." The Committee for Economic Development is a committee of businessmen who have in the past supported price and wage controls, and their policies are forward-looking and progressive. I quote:

The need for price and wage controls is rapidly passing, if it has not already passed. We believe that price and wage controls are inappropriate instruments for the control of inflation except in times of great emergency. No emergency now exists which requires their use. Price and wage controls place too much power in the hands of Government. They tend to distort production and limit the ability of the economy to respond to changing needs. They involve substantial waste and inefficiencies in production and distribution and, as now employed, are unfair to large sections of the economy.

Any renewal of inflation during the present rearmament period should be met by action with respect to taxes, Government expenditures, and monetary and credit policy. Such measures can effectively control inflation except in extreme emergencies, and do not involve the heavy economic costs of price and wage controls.

WE ARE NO LONGER IN AN EMERGENCY THAT CALLS FOR PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

In the past 15 months there has been little evidence of general inflationary pressure. Many prices have fallen below their ceilings, and many more would not rise if their ceilings were removed. We do not believe that removal of price and wage controls would be the signal for a general increase in prices.

Defense expenditures are still rising, and are scheduled to continue to increase until the end of the year, after which they are scheduled to remain at their peak level for about 2 years. We believe, however, that the impact of the defense program on the economy has already largely been felt, even though Government expenditures have not reached their scheduled high point. This is so because business firms buy and install the machinery needed to produce military equipment, hire and train the necessary labor, purchase needed materials, and put production lines into operation before the Government pays for the goods delivered to it under the rearmament program. The public has already anticipated the change in civilian markets brought on by the defense program.

I hold in my hand another very interesting statement which appears in the

Journal of Commerce of Friday, June 20, 1952. It is a statement by Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers.

He predicted today that there will be a continuing, noninflationary pick-up in business activity throughout the last half of this year and the first half of 1953.

I want you to listen to this. Chairman Keyserling says:

There is no serious danger of inflationary pressures of a generalized and over-all character over the next year, the President's top economist told a national group of business editors. This means that the United States can maintain price stability, he added.

Mr. Keyserling said his appraisal of the next 12 months is based upon the fundamental relationship between supply and demand. He emphasized the expansion of national production since Korea, particularly in essential defense areas, has made a more important contribution than credit restraints or wage and price controls to the growing easiness in the United States economy.

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

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. SPENCE. If it appears desirable to discontinue price control, why did not the amendment provide that it should be discontinued on June 30 as the present law provides, instead of July 31?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I shall not argue with the gentleman about that.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may answer the question of the chairman who asked why it did not provide for it to end June 30 instead of July 31?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. For the simple reason that I gave when I was on the floor; and that was it allows a period of 1 month for an orderly closing up of their offices.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a fine amendment for this reason: Those of us—and I am one of them—who are opposed to the continuation of controls on prices and wages will have an opportunity to express ourselves on this one particular subject. Unless it is stricken from the bill and the bill comes up on a final vote with this title in it, we cannot vote against the bill, since a number of us favor allocations, a number of us favor the Smith amendment, and other good things in the bill. This amendment is the only way to vote out controls and vote for the other good provisions in the bill.

Those of us who have watched price control and what it is doing to the dealers in our districts feel very intensely over it. I have more complaints about the operation of control over prices than any other complaint. To let the memberships know how the people of my district feel, I will tell you about a questionnaire I sent out recently. The citizenry of my district is like the citizenry of yours—good, common people who want to do right. I submit a ques-

tionnaire to them every year. I do not send that questionnaire directly to them because when the answers come back it would be said that I had picked out the ones to whom I had sent the questionnaire; I send it to the papers in my district and they publish it as a public service.

I got some 1,200 answers to this questionnaire I speak of, and as I say, the people of my district are just like the people in yours. There were 20 questions that I asked, but I shall read you only three and give the answers received. I asked: "Do you favor regulation of prices and wages?" The answers came back: Yes, 271; no, 883.

I asked: "Do you favor control of consumer credit?" The answers were: Yes, 279; no, 837.

Consumer credit has since been done away with, regulation W or X.

"Do you favor imposing Federal quotas for beef slaughter?" The answers came back: Yes, 104; no, 1,029.

That comes from the people of my district who are against controls on wages and on prices. I think this Congress should give those people some relief. I want my people to know that I am against the continuation of these controls but that I am for some of the other provisions of this bill.

In my opinion there is absolutely no excuse for such price controls as we now have in effect, a free nation, except in case of total war. Total war forces many undesirable things upon us. Controls have never worked and they never will work except in a totalitarian government. Controls kill the incentive to produce and eventually drive what goods that are available into the black market.

Continued price control will lead to a breakdown of respect for the law, and a consequent breakdown in public morality. Price controls create an opportunity for the unscrupulous to make money by violating price-ceiling regulations with only a slight possibility of getting caught. They establish a premium for dishonesty and violation of law. The disrespect for law created by price controls and related measures inevitably will result in the deterioration of the moral stamina of all citizens. Price controls continued for any significant period of time thus break down those ideals and concepts which are basic to a Christian democracy.

Controls waste manpower—our scarcest resource—not only in the Government where millions of man-hours must be spent on the unproductive job of writing regulations and the impossible job of enforcing them, but at every level of industry where people subject to regulations must try to interpret and comply with them. In time, price controls lead to subsidies, because special incentives become necessary to get needed production. Subsidies increase Government costs in a period when the Federal budget is already inflated. They conceal the true cost of an item and give the public an unrealistic idea of its worth. Some contend that controls will hold down prices and prevent inflation

but while they may hold down prices to a certain extent, I believe it far better to have plenty of goods at some price than no goods at a controlled price. It is better to maintain the incentive to produce than to place prices in a strait-jacket. Controls do not prevent inflation—I believe we have seen that fallacy demonstrated in the last couple of years.

So many OPS rules and regulations have been put out that the average small-business man does not have time to read them—in many instances they have to take one of their employees off the work he has been doing and give him the job of endeavoring to read the OPS regulations in order that the businessman can continue to run his small business and not be harassed with the thought that he is breaking some OPS rule or regulation. Not only are these rules and regulations numerous but they are almost impossible for the average person to interpret.

Only harm to our economy and thus to our mobilization effort can come from the continuation of price, wage, and civilian material controls. The record against economic controls is overwhelming. They impede production, impair incentives, and increase costs both to industry and Government, and they require tons of useless red tape. They lead to demands for even more controls to attempt to shore up the inevitable failures of existing controls. One of the most vicious aspects of all Government controls is the fact that control mechanism, in addition to being ineffective, inevitably lead to exercise of additional powers entirely removed from congressional intent at the time that controls were adopted.

I am sure the membership of this House has been receiving complaints, as have I, from business people. They are told that they must file an application before they can do certain things—then an order comes out that the application must be filed on a certain form but have you ever tried to secure one of those specified forms? We are told they are not available—they have not come from the printer, and so forth. Our people will file a request, under the OPS rules and regulations, and wait weeks to hear something. They then contact their Congressman and in some instances the Congressman has to make daily phone calls for even weeks, before he can secure any information—and we are told there is insufficient staff; however, on page 1132 of the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, on H. R. 6546, a witness stated that in Helena, Mont., where they have a district office, the OPS payroll was \$246,780 a year. This is an indication of the high cost of the price stabilization program—and remember that is the cost for just one OPS office.

We have recently been very conscious of the Constitution. In 1777 Mr. Wither- spoon, in a letter to George Washington, stated:

To fix the price of goods, especially provisions in the market, is as impractical as it is unreasonable. The whole persons concerned, buyers and sellers, will use every art to defeat it and will certainly succeed.

Controls do not work any better today than they did then. We have learned a lot since 1777, but I do not believe that we will ever learn enough to substitute successfully man-made controls for that great old law of ours, supply and demand. We should return to the system that we know works, free enterprise, and the rewarding of individual initiative.

I think it is unnecessary to extend controls any further. The matter of controls is a fallacy.

Price control is expensive, wasteful, and unfair and does not prevent inflation. Production and distribution is the answer and only answer to inflation.

We have reached the place where there is just too much Government in business and too little business in Government.

I am including in my remarks, for the information of the House, an editorial in the Fort Lauderdale Daily News. It exemplifies the burden that the taxpayer is carrying to maintain this expensive agency.

#### READ THIS AND WEEP

Back in March of this year the enterprising Missoula Times in Missoula, Mont., sent its reporters around to the district office of the OPS in Helena, Mont., with the assignment to find out, if possible, what it was costing United States taxpayers each year just to pay the salaries of the employees in this one, fairly small office.

The Times reporters were fortunate enough to obtain the payroll figures for this office as they stood on February 12 of this year. The Times published these payroll figures in the March 14 issue and they must have been quite an eye opener for the citizens and taxpayers around Missoula and Helena.

As a public service to taxpayers in this area we are reprinting below the figures published by the Missoula Times and we sincerely hope all of our readers will take the time to examine this payroll for it shows in cold, hard figures the full extent of the terrible rooking American taxpayers are taking from a politically inspired and economically worthless Federal Government effort to control prices. Here are the figures just as they appeared in the Missoula Times.

*Payroll—Helena district office employees, Office of Price Stabilization, February 12, 1952*

Title	Base salary
District director	\$9,600
Clerk stenographer	3,175
District price executive	8,360
Clerk stenographer	2,950
District price economist	7,040
Price economist	5,940
Chief, food branch	7,040
Business analyst	5,940
Business analyst	5,060
File clerk	2,750
Business analyst	5,940
File clerk	2,750
Chief, Ind. Nat. and Mfd. Goods	7,040
Business analyst	5,940
Business analyst	5,060
Clerk stenographer	2,950
Clerk stenographer	2,950
Chief, fuel and chemicals	7,040
Business analyst	5,940
Clerk typist	2,750
Business analyst	5,940
Attorney adviser	7,040
Clerk stenographer	2,950
District enforcement director	9,600
Clerk	3,410
Clerk stenographer	2,950
Chief, trial section, attorney	8,360
Trial attorney	7,040
Clerk stenographer	2,950

*Payroll—Helena district office employees, Office of Price Stabilization, February 12, 1952—Continued*

Title	Base salary
General attorney (supervisor)	\$7,040
General attorney	5,940
General attorney	5,060
General attorney	5,940
Special agent in charge	7,040
Investigator	5,940
Investigator	5,940
Livestock marketing specialist	5,660
Investigator	4,205
File clerk	2,750
District information officer	7,040
Clerk stenographer	2,950
District executive officer	7,040
Administrative assistant	4,205
File clerk	3,175
Clerk typist	2,750
Clerk	2,750
File clerk	2,750
File clerk	2,750
Total	246,780

There you see it. In this one OPS district office we, the taxpayers, are supporting 48 Federal employees at a total payroll cost of \$246,780 a year. Multiply this figure by all the other district OPS offices in the country, most of which are larger than the Helena office, and you can begin to see how a political party perpetuates itself in power. Then add to the costs of maintaining the district offices the costs of the innumerable local OPS offices and it becomes quite clear why the Federal Government finds it necessary to grab off one-third of our entire national income just to support itself and its millions of employees.

The ordinary citizen might think that now that many price controls are being relaxed and there is less for the OPS to do that some of these fancy-titled employees could be released. But that wouldn't be wise in an election year. So instead of reducing its payroll the OPS just keeps on growing bigger and ever bigger and adding more and more employees all of whom can vote next November for the party responsible for their pay checks.

We, the poor, bemused little taxpayers are supposed to stand up and cheer because the Federal Government is making such a tremendous effort to protect our pocketbooks from high prices. But the catch is that we still have high prices and in addition we are paying the salaries of an army of employees whose major function seems to be to pat themselves on the back for a marvelous job. The truth of the matter is that the taxpayers of this country are shelling out for something they could easily do without. Price control has now become a matter of wasting dollars to save pennies. It is no bargain for us taxpayers and the sooner we can get rid of this bureaucratic monstrosity the better off we will be.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the author of this amendment, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] is a very fine character and thoroughly sincere. He is against control of wages and control of prices. The gentleman who has just left the well of the House, Mr. ROGERS, of Florida, I am sure, is sincere. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] is one of the best men on our committee. He is against continuing controls and always has been against controls and has been conscientious about that. There are a lot of people throughout the various sections of the country and in this Chamber against continuing controls

and they are thoroughly conscientious in their views.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like controls either, but I am afraid to take them off of wages and prices at this particular time. Why do I make that statement? Of the \$133,000,000,000 that we have appropriated for national defense, more than \$100,000,000,000 remains to be spent. I am afraid we would make a mistake to take controls off of wages and off of prices at this particular time.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

It seems that the very people who are constantly clamoring for economy in the operation of emergency agencies and for simplification of the work and for elimination of duplication are the same people who constantly sponsor amendments to complicate, confuse, duplicate, and make it more expensive, if not impossible to administer the controls legislation. While we are on the subject of economy, incidentally, permit me to correct a few of the inaccuracies that we have heard with reference to these emergency agencies.

Among other things we have been told that the Office of Price Stabilization is increasing its staff and now has in excess of 16,000 employees. The facts with reference to that statement are as follows: The Office of Price Stabilization never had more than 12,263 employees. Since April 30, 1952, the agency has separated 347 employees. Because of the decontrol actions OPS is taking, that agency will release an average of 160 employees per month, each and every month, from July 1952 through February 1953.

You heard considerable about the delays in getting action on applications filed with the various emergency agencies. These agencies now require that all applications must be processed and action taken within 30 days after the filing thereof.

Particular attention has been given by every emergency agency to small business, with the result that all the procedures have been streamlined so that small business can have its wants and needs attended to and taken care of with a minimum of paper work and with maximum speed.

The instant amendment flies in the face of all of those procedures. It would have the Economic Stabilization Administration attempt to set policy. It would have the Wage Stabilization Board attempt to stabilize wages and then would require the same businessmen who must supply those two agencies with information on which they must act, to go to the Internal Revenue Bureau and start all over again when they desire to adjust salaries. Throughout all of the debate up to this time we have not heard a word of criticism leveled at the Salary Stabilization Board, yet this amendment would destroy that Board and require a new department to be set up in the Treasury Department under the jurisdiction of the Internal Revenue Bureau to do the work that is now being done so well.

The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MULTER and Mr. BARDEN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 118, noes 87.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I am terribly disheartened at the action taken in the Committee of the Whole today and Friday in emasculating the bill under consideration.

It would seem to me that the Barden amendment just adopted is at least a more honest and direct approach than the previous amendments which would actually have the same effect, although under the guise of continuing price and wage controls. We have now reached the stage where the special interests and those who speak for them here in the House are out in the open. They do not want any price or wage controls whatsoever—this in the face of a terrific threat to our economic system, and in the face of one of the greatest emergencies facing the American people since the Declaration of Independence was signed.

It is difficult to imagine what is passing through the minds of those who have voted for these devastating amendments. Do they feel that the poorer and less fortunate of our people should be forgotten? Do they feel that only the wealthier of our people who do not need price or wage controls are the ones entitled to the protection of the Congress?

Whatever it is that is motivating them in their efforts to permit prices to rise to such an extent that the ordinary necessities of life may be denied to the very people who cannot afford to pay these high prices, is a mystery to me. I have no doubt that the American people will soon realize the effects of this "special interest" legislation; and will be heard from in no uncertain terms in November.

Over the years I have voted consistently to maintain price controls; even though in each succeeding year amendments were introduced and passed which further weakened real and effective controls. I have voted for these bills even though I felt they were not going as far as they should, on the theory that they were better than no controls at all.

The entire question is now out in the open. The question is: Are we more interested in property rights than we are in human rights? As for myself, I can only say that I will continue to fight on behalf of the mass of our people who must have these controls during this period of emergency.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8210) to amend and extend the

Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

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

There was no objection.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. THOMAS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

#### KOREA EMERGENCY RESOLUTION

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1 minute to put the House on notice that in view of the bombing of the Yalu power plants and the possibility of a breakdown in truce negotiations, if it becomes necessary for United Nations troops to move to the Yalu this House put the aggressor on notice, through the U. N., that with a move to the Yalu, we will automatically zone off a safety belt north of the Yalu for patrolling of our planes; if U. N. troops occupy the Yalu they will certainly expect frontal protection against surprise or other attack. I recommend that the Congress, through proper authorities, forthwith advise the United Nations that if we move to the Yalu, a safety-belt will be zoned off. Precedent exists for the step. The Soviet is loaded with safety belts—its satellites.

#### HANDICAPPED PEOPLE

Mr. FURCOLO. 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. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to again call the attention not only of the Members but also of the Nation, and particularly the employers of the Nation, to the work that our handicapped people are able to do if given an opportunity.

Members will recall that during the past few years I have often spoken with them about the handicapped people and their problems.

Several weeks ago I mentioned several instances where various departments and agencies of the Federal Government had hired people who were deaf or blind or crippled, or had some other handicap. The people so hired did wonderful work. In fact, they did such an excellent job that more handicapped people were hired. They proved what many of us have always believed; namely, that handicapped people do not ask for anything more than a chance to prove their ability. They are willing to go on their own merit and ability. They do not ask any favors or special concessions. They simply say, "Give me a chance. If I don't work out, let me go. But do not refuse me the chance to prove that I can do the work in spite of my handicap."

Today I want to direct the country's attention to the fact that approximately 10 percent of the civilian employees working in the Air Force of the United States are handicapped people. More than 30,000 such persons—physically handicapped—are doing a good job for the Air Force. They are proving their worth every day. They are proving that they can make a contribution to this Nation.

Among their number is almost every type of physically handicapped person. There are literally hundreds of illustrations and all who hire people should be familiar with them.

I hope the employers of this Nation will give some thought to those illustrations. I hope they will think that that is some proof that handicapped people can do a job—perhaps may be able to fill positions that are vacant right in the employer's own establishment.

Giving employment to a physically handicapped person will not only be helpful to both the employer and the employee, but it will also benefit this Nation. The manpower shortage is going to increase and we cannot overlook the productive potential of the handicapped. They can do a job and they have something to offer. Let us give them their opportunity.

If the Members and the employers of the Nation will investigate, they will find there is ample proof that they can do a job and contribute to this Nation's productive effort.

I ask the employers of this Nation to consider the cases that have been cited and then to give some thought to whether or not they may have openings for handicapped people.

#### PRICE CONTROL

Mr. KENNEDY. 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. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, since the start of the Korean war, 2 years ago, I have been a vigorous supporter of strict across-the-board controls in order to offset inflation and keep the cost of living within bounds.

Last year I spoke at length, on the floor, urging the House of Representatives to strengthen the 1950 defense production bill. The original bill was, however, weakened rather than strengthened by Congress in 1951.

And now, again this year, we witness the same forces who were responsible for the weakened 1951 bill going all-out to completely kill controls.

In hearing the arguments of these anticontrols forces, one is supposed to be convinced that the inflation danger is past.

And yet just last week the cost-of-living index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics showed prices to be just one-tenth of 1 percent under the all-time peak reached in January. When one considers the fact, moreover, that since a drop last February prices have been steadily increasing, it is obvious that the threat of inflation has not been turned aside.

There are many deficiencies in this controls bill before us, most of them the result of House action last week. The most dangerous of these, of course, is the Talle amendment, which would virtually kill controls. And now by the acceptance of the Barden amendment, which would end all controls next month, this House is faced with a most serious situation.

I want to take this opportunity of recording my unalterable opposition to any such injustice to the American consumer. Tomorrow I will vote to rescind the action of the House last week by voting against the Talle amendment.

I will likewise vote against the Lucas amendment to abolish the present Wage Stabilization Board. I believe, as the Education and Labor Committee's minority report, in which I concurred said last week, "that the wage-stabilization program should be administered by a board tripartite in nature"; and the attempt to abolish it is but another method of loosening or invalidating presently set up stabilization processes.

With the cost of living still on the upgrade, with the Korean struggle continuing, with defense expenditures expected to exceed \$60,000,000,000 in the next year, the duty of the House is clear.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

#### RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from a committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1952.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
United States Capitol, Washington,  
D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary effective immediately.

Sincerely yours,

TOM PICKETT,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS DELAWARE RIVER

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8315) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the Pennsylvania-New Jersey bridge bill?

Mr. FALLON. That is right. It grants the consent of the Congress to build an additional bridge across the Delaware River under a compact between the two States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I understand it, there is no difference of opinion on this matter and it is not controversial.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the bill now before the House and the one that is to follow. They are companion bills, and are similar to the bills I have introduced dealing with the same matters.

The purpose of the bills is to provide for the development of the port of Philadelphia, and the area surrounding it in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

The need for increased port facilities, an additional crossing of the Delaware River, and rapid transit for the surrounding area is recognized by all business, financial, civic, and governmental agencies. There is a unanimous demand for this legislation by all parties. Both political parties have supported it locally, in the State legislatures, and now in Congress. There is not a dissenting voice. It is imperative to have favorable action at the earliest possible day to the end that the development program can be started and the public be given early relief.

In urging the passage of the pending bills, I wish to bring to your attention the industrial importance of that section of the Delaware River that comes within the objectives of the pending compacts.

That portion of the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey lying on either side of the Delaware River, for many miles north and south of Philadelphia on the Pennsylvania side, and Camden on

the New Jersey side, comprises what is generally known as the port of Philadelphia.

This portion of these two States constitutes one of the greatest industrial areas within the entire United States. It is unnecessary for me to enumerate the numerous and varied industries in the city of Philadelphia and along the Pennsylvania side of the river that go to make that portion of the State of preeminent importance, and the port of Philadelphia the second largest in the Nation.

It is also appropriate that I should bring to your attention that on the New Jersey side of the river, and, within what may be described as the port of Philadelphia, an area that also has an outstanding number and variety of industrial establishments. In the city of Camden, directly opposite the city of Philadelphia, there are industries of Nationwide and world-wide reputation. I need only mention the RCA Victor plant, that manufactures radios, television sets, and electrical instruments of untold value in our defense effort; the Campbell Soup Co., with a capacity of making 7,000,000 cans of soup in a single day; the Esterbrook Pen works whose products are also known around the world; the New York Shipbuilding Corp., that is one of the largest shipbuilding plants in the world, and from which have gone forth some of our greatest naval and commercial ships; the R. H. Hollingshead Co., the Radio Condenser Co., and many others too numerous to mention. In addition to these, all along the river front are great petroleum plants operated by the Cities Service, Texaco, and Socony-Vacuum Companies; and on the Pennsylvania side of the river are facilities operated by the Atlantic, Gulf, Sinclair, and Sun Oil Cos. On the lower Delaware, on the New Jersey side, are the great Dupont factories, together with Government installations. Adding to the greatness of this area is the plant of the National Steel Co., soon to be built on the New Jersey side and the U. S. Steel Co. works on the Pennsylvania side almost completed. The latter when completed will be the greatest steel plant in the world.

The products from all these local establishments, the manufactured goods, the products of our mines and farms, as well as those that come from foreign countries make this one of the greatest shipping ports in the world. The port of Philadelphia is second only to that of New York.

In addition to all this industrial activity the area that is brought within the jurisdiction of these compacts constitutes a great residential area. Philadelphia is known as the city of homes. New Jersey is an area that is fast building up residential facilities that are increasing the population of all the south Jersey counties to a degree that is astonishing.

The future of all this area is beyond description. Already the growth has been phenomenal. Each day brings a new problem because of the rapid growth that is taking place. It is to provide for this expansion, both industrial and residential, that has brought together on both sides of the river the political, civic, educational, industrial and all

other progressive groups to devise ways and means of meeting the situation. After years of conferring and studying it was determined the problem could be solved only by the manner provided in these compacts now awaiting your approval.

When the plan was determined upon it was laid before the legislatures of the two States. It was approved by each of them and the governors of the two States. The plan calls for a port authority, similar to that which has produced such satisfactory results in the New York area. It enables an authority composed of representatives of both States to do any or all of those things that will promote the welfare of the industrial, commercial and individual welfare of the citizens by providing the facilities that are necessary to enable commerce, both interstate and intrastate, to progress and move in a satisfactory way. It sets up a great service organization that requires the cooperation of both States if it is to succeed.

If the affected area did not lie within two States either State could, through its own legislature, provide the necessary legislation to make it effective, but, as the area covers a part of two States across a State boundary line, and, although both States agree, it is nevertheless necessary to come to Congress to obtain its approval. All this because it is an agreement between two States.

I submit that it is the duty of Congress to grant approval. The clause in the Constitution that requires congressional approval was never intended to interfere or prevent a matter of this kind. That clause was adopted when our States, especially the small ones, were suspicious, jealous, and fearful of larger States or States of a section of the country combining against others in a manner that would be detrimental to their best interests. This is no such case. These compacts are detrimental to no State or the citizens of any State. They do not financially obligate the Federal Government. They accomplish something for the benefit of commerce in the building of wharves, docks, bridges, tunnels, terminals, warehouses, and rapid transportation between the two States for all citizens that would have use for these facilities regardless of what State or section of our country they happen to be residents.

It is inconceivable that the Congress would fail to give its approval. To do so would be setting up a theory of government that would stifle all progress. It would prevent two sovereign States from accomplishing something that would be of great benefit to a whole area and to all the people.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize the fact that these bills only give the same privilege to New Jersey and Pennsylvania as had already been given to New York and New Jersey. We seek to have the same advantages in the Philadelphia area as now prevail in the New York area. There is no disadvantage shown to exist to the citizens of the United States as a result of the port of New York Authority, nor will there be any as a result of a similar authority for the

port of Philadelphia. We respectfully urge approval of the compacts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the supplemental compact or agreement set forth below, and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided,* That nothing therein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, over or in regard to any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of said supplemental compact or agreement or otherwise affected by the terms thereof: *Provided further,* That the consent of Congress hereby given shall not be construed to affect in any manner whatsoever the application of the internal-revenue laws of the United States to the bonds or other securities or obligations issued by the commission, their transfer and the income therefrom (including any profits made on the sale thereof):

SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

AMENDING AND SUPPLEMENTING THE AGREEMENT ENTITLED "AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY CREATING THE DELAWARE RIVER JOINT COMMISSION AS A BODY CORPORATE AND POLITIC AND DEFINING ITS POWERS AND DUTIES," CHANGING THE NAME OF THE DELAWARE RIVER JOINT COMMISSION TO THE DELAWARE RIVER PORT AUTHORITY, CHANGING THE METHOD OF APPOINTMENT OF THE COMMISSIONERS, EXTENDING THE JURISDICTION, POWERS, AND DUTIES OF SAID THE DELAWARE RIVER PORT AUTHORITY, AND DEFINING SUCH ADDITIONAL JURISDICTION, POWERS, AND DUTIES

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby solemnly covenant and agree each with the other, as follows:

(1) Article I of the "Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties," which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 1st day of July, 1931, and on behalf of the State of New Jersey by the New Jersey Interstate Bridge Commission by its members on the 1st day of July, 1931, and which was consented to by the Congress of the United States by Public Resolution No. 26, being chapter 258 of the Public Laws, Seventy-second Congress, approved the 14th day of June, 1932, is amended to read as follows:

Article I

The body corporate and politic, heretofore created and known as the Delaware River Joint Commission hereby is continued under the name of the Delaware River Port Authority (hereinafter in this agreement called the "commission"), which shall constitute the public corporate instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey for the following public purposes, and which shall be deemed to be exercising an essential governmental function in effectuating such purposes, to wit:

(a) The operation and maintenance of the bridge, owned jointly by the two States across the Delaware River between the city of Philadelphia in the Commonwealth of

Pennsylvania and the city of Camden in the State of New Jersey, including its approaches, and the making of additions and improvements thereto.

(b) The effectuation, establishment, construction, operation and maintenance of railroad or other facilities for the transportation of passengers across any bridge or tunnel owned or controlled by the commission, including extensions of such railroad or other facilities within the city of Camden and the city of Philadelphia necessary for efficient operation in the Port District.

(c) The improvement and development of the Port District for port purposes by or through the acquisition, construction, maintenance or operation of any and all projects for the improvement and development of the Port District for port purposes, or directly related thereto, either directly by purchase, lease or contract, or by lease or agreement with any other public or private body or corporation or in any other manner.

(d) Cooperation with all other bodies interested or concerned with, or affected by, the promotion, development or use of the Delaware River and the port district.

(e) The procurement from the Government of the United States of any consents which may be requisite to enable any project within its powers to be carried forward.

(f) The construction, acquisition, operation and maintenance of other bridges and tunnels across or under the Delaware River, between the city of Philadelphia and the State of New Jersey, including approaches and the making of additions and improvements thereto.

(g) The promotion as a highway of commerce of the Delaware River, and the promotion of increased passenger and freight commerce on the Delaware River and for such purpose the publication of literature and the adoption of any other means as may be deemed appropriate.

(h) To study and make recommendations to the proper authorities for the improvement of terminal, lighterage, wharfage, warehouse and other facilities necessary for the promotion of commerce on the Delaware River.

(i) Institution through its counsel, or such other counsel as it shall designate, or intervention in, any litigation involving rates, preferences, rebates or other matters vital to the interest of the port district; provided, that notice of any such institution of or intervention in litigation shall be given promptly to the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to the Attorney General of the State of New Jersey, and provision for such notices shall be made in a resolution authorizing any such intervention or litigation and shall be incorporated in the minutes of the commission.

(j) The establishment, maintenance, rehabilitation, construction and operation of a rapid transit system for the transportation of passengers, express, mail, and baggage between points in New Jersey communities within the port district and within a 35 mile radius of the city of Camden, N. J., and points within the city of Philadelphia, Pa., and intermediate points. Such system may be established by either utilizing existing rapid transit systems, railroad facilities, highways and bridges within the territory involved or by the construction or provision of new facilities where deemed necessary.

(k) The performance of such other functions which may be of mutual benefit to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey insofar as concerns the promotion and development of the port district for port purposes and the use of its facilities by commercial vessels.

(2) Article II of said agreement is amended to read as follows:

*Article II*

The commission shall consist of 16 commissioners, eight resident voters of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and eight resident voters of the State of New Jersey, who shall serve without compensation.

The present members of the commission, including ex-officio members, shall continue to serve, respectively, as commissioners until the expiration of their terms or the terms of office by virtue of the holding of which they are members of the commission and until succeeding commissioners shall be appointed and qualify, except that the terms of the present members of the commission for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall expire as of the date of the coming into force of the supplemental compact or agreement authorized by the act of the 1951 General Assembly of said Commonwealth providing for amendment of this article.

The commissioners for the State of New Jersey shall be appointed by the Governor of New Jersey with the advice and consent of the Senate of New Jersey, for terms of 5 years, and in case of a vacancy occurring in the office of commissioner during a recess of the legislature, it may be filled by the Governor by an ad interim appointment which shall expire at the end of the next regular session of the senate unless a successor shall be sooner appointed and qualify and, after the end of the session, no ad interim appointment to the same vacancy shall be made unless the Governor shall have submitted to the senate a nomination to the office during the session and the senate shall have adjourned without confirming or rejecting it, and no person nominated for any such vacancy shall be eligible for an ad interim appointment to such office if the nomination shall have failed of confirmation by the senate.

Six of the eight commissioners for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall be appointed by the Governor of Pennsylvania for terms of 5 years. The Auditor General and the State Treasurer of said Commonwealth shall ex-officio be commissioners for said Commonwealth, each having the privilege of appointing a representative to serve in his place at any meeting of the commission which he does not attend personally.

All commissioners shall continue to hold office after the expiration of the terms for which they are appointed or elected until their respective successors are appointed and qualify, but no period during which any commissioner shall hold over shall be deemed to be an extension of his term of office for the purpose of computing the date on which his successor's term expires.

(3) Article IV of said agreement is amended to read as follows:

*Article IV*

For the effectuation of its authorized purposes the commission is hereby granted the following powers:

- (a) To have perpetual succession.
- (b) To sue and be sued.
- (c) To adopt and use an official seal.
- (d) To elect a chairman, vice-chairman, secretary and treasurer, and to adopt suitable bylaws for the management of its affairs. The secretary and treasurer need not be members of the commission.
- (e) To appoint, hire, or employ counsel and such other officers and such agents and employees as it may require for the performance of its duties, by contract or otherwise, and fix and determine their qualifications, duties, and compensation.
- (f) To enter into contracts.
- (g) To acquire, own, hire, use, operate and dispose of personal property.

(h) To acquire, own, use, lease, operate, mortgage and dispose of real property and interests in real property, and to make improvements thereon.

(i) To grant by franchise, lease or otherwise, the use of any property or facility owned or controlled by the commission and to make charges therefor.

(j) To borrow money upon its bonds or other obligations, either with or without security, and to make, enter into and perform any and all such covenants and agreements with the holders of such bonds or other obligations as the commission may determine to be necessary or desirable for the security and payment thereof, including without limitation of the foregoing, covenants and agreements as to the management and operation of any property or facility owned or controlled by it, its tolls, rents, rates or other charges to be established, levied, made and collected for any use of any such property or facility, or the application, use and disposition of the proceeds of any bonds or other obligations of the commission or the proceeds of any such tolls, rents, rates or other charges or any other revenues or moneys of the commission.

(k) To exercise the right of eminent domain within the Port District.

(l) To determine the exact location, system and character of and all other matters in connection with any and all improvements or facilities which it may be authorized to own, construct, establish, effectuate, operate or control.

(m) In addition to the foregoing, to exercise the powers, duties, authority and jurisdiction heretofore conferred and imposed upon the aforesaid Delaware River Joint Commission by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or the State of New Jersey, or both of the said two States;

(n) To exercise all other powers not inconsistent with the constitution of the two States or of the United States, which may be reasonably necessary or incidental to the effectuation of its authorized purposes or to the exercise of any of the foregoing powers, except the power to levy taxes or assessments, and generally to exercise in connection with its property and affairs, and in connection with property within its control, any and all powers which might be exercised by a natural person or a private corporation in connection with similar property and affairs.

(o) To acquire, purchase, construct, lease, operate, maintain and undertake any project, including any terminal, terminal facility, transportation facility, or any other facility of commerce and to make charges for the use thereof.

(p) To make expenditures anywhere in the United States and foreign countries, to pay commissions, and hire or contract with experts and consultants, and otherwise to do indirectly anything which the commission may do directly.

The commission shall also have such additional powers as may hereafter be delegated to or imposed upon it from time to time by the action of either State concurred in by legislation of the other.

It is the policy and intent of the Legislatures of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey that the powers granted by this article shall be so exercised that the American system of free competitive private enterprise is given full consideration and is maintained and furthered. In making its reports and recommendations to the Legislatures of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey on the need for any facility or project which the commission believes should be undertaken for the promotion and development of the Port District, the commission shall include

therein its findings which fully set forth that the facility or facilities operated by private enterprise within the Port District and which it is intended shall be supplanted or added to are not adequate.

(4) Article XI of said agreement is amended to read as follows:

*Article XI*

The effectuation of its authorized purposes by the commission is and will be in all respects for the benefit of the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, for the increase of their commerce and prosperity and for the improvement of their health and living conditions; and since the commission will be performing essential governmental functions in effectuating said purposes, the commission shall not be required to pay any taxes or assessments upon any property acquired or used by it for such purposes, and the bonds or other securities or obligations issued by the commission, their transfer and the income therefrom (including any profits made on the sale thereof) shall at all times be free from taxation within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

To the end that municipalities may not suffer undue loss of tax revenue by reason of the acquisition and ownership of property therein by the commission, the commission is hereby authorized and empowered, in its discretion, to enter into a voluntary agreement or agreements with any municipality, whereby it will undertake to pay a fair and reasonable sum or sums to compensate the said municipality for any loss of tax revenue in connection with any property acquired by the commission after one thousand nine hundred and fifty other than property acquired for bridge, tunnel or passenger transportation purposes. Any such payment or payments which the commission is hereby authorized and empowered to make may be made on an annual basis, in which case the payment or payments shall not be in excess of the amount of the taxes upon the property when last assessed prior to the time of its acquisition by the commission, or such payment or payments may be made in a lump sum or sums, or over a stated period of years, as shall be agreed upon by and between the commission and such municipality. Every municipality wherein the property shall be acquired by the commission is authorized and empowered to enter into such agreement or agreements with the commission to accept the payment or payments which the commission is herein authorized and empowered to make.

(5) Article XII of said agreement is amended to read as follows:

*Article XII*

The commission shall make annual reports to the Governors and Legislatures of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, setting forth in detail its operations and transactions, and may make such additional reports from time to time to the Governors and legislatures as it may deem desirable. Copies thereof shall be available for public information and use.

Whenever the commission after investigation and study shall have concluded plans, with estimates of cost and means of financing, for any new project for a purpose other than any described in Article I, subdivisions (b) or (j) hereof, for transportation across or under the Delaware River within the Port District or improvement of the Delaware River's port facilities, the commission shall make to the legislature of each State a detailed report dealing only with the contemplated project and shall request of said legislatures authority to proceed with the project described and it shall not be within the power of the commission to construct,

erect or otherwise acquire any new facility or project, for a purpose other than any described in Article I, subdivisions (b) or (j) hereof, unless and until the legislatures of both States shall have authorized the commission to proceed with the project outlined in its special report thereon.

In addition to other powers conferred upon it, and not in limitation thereof, the commission may acquire all right, title and interest in and to the Tacony-Palmyra bridge, across the Delaware River at Palmyra, New Jersey, together with any approaches and interests in real property necessary thereto. The acquisition of such bridge, approaches and interests by the commission shall be by purchase or by condemnation in accordance with the provisions of the Federal law consenting to or authorizing the construction of such bridge and approaches, or the acquisition of such bridge, approaches or interests by the commission shall be pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of section 48; 5-22 and 48: 5-23 of the Revised Statutes of New Jersey, and for all the purposes of said provisions and sections the commission is hereby appointed as the agency of the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania exercising the rights and powers granted or reserved by said Federal law or section to the State of New Jersey and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania jointly or to the State of New Jersey acting in conjunction with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The commission shall have authority to so acquire such bridge, approaches and interests, whether the same be owned, held, operated or maintained by any private person, firm, partnership, company, association or corporation or by any instrumentality, public body, commission, public agency or political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of, or created by or in, the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or by an instrumentality, public body, commission or public agency of, or created by or in, a political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. None of the provisions of the preceding paragraph shall be applicable with respect to the acquisition by the commission, pursuant to this paragraph, of said Tacony-Palmyra bridge, approaches and interests. The power and authority herein granted to the commission to acquire said Tacony-Palmyra bridge, approaches and interests shall not be exercised unless and until the Governor of the State of New Jersey and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have filed with the commission their written consents to such acquisition.

It shall not be within the power of the commission to construct, erect, or otherwise acquire any new facility or project for a purpose described in Article I, subdivision (j) hereof, unless and until the commission shall have made to the Legislature and Governor of the State of New Jersey and to the Legislature and Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a detailed report dealing only with such contemplated facility or project, and the Governor of said State and the Governor of said Commonwealth shall have filed with the commission their written consent to such construction, erection or acquisition.

Notwithstanding any provision of this agreement, nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit or impair any right or power granted or to be granted to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission or the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, to finance, construct, operate and maintain the Pennsylvania Turnpike system or any turnpike project of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, respectively, throughout the Port District, including the right and power, acting alone or in conjunction with each other, to

provide for the financing, construction, operation and maintenance of one bridge across the Delaware river south of the city of Trenton in the State of New Jersey; provided that such bridge shall not be constructed within a distance of ten miles, measured along the boundary line between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, from the existing bridge, operated and maintained by the commission, across the Delaware River between the city of Philadelphia in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the city of Camden in the State of New Jersey, so long as there are any outstanding bonds or other securities or obligations of the commission for which the tolls, rents, rates, or other revenues, or any part thereof, of said existing bridge shall have been pledged. Nothing contained in this agreement shall be construed to authorize the commission to condemn any such bridge.

Anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding, no bridge or tunnel shall be constructed, acquired, operated or maintained by the commission across or under the Delaware River north of the boundary line between Bucks County and Philadelphia County in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as extended across the Delaware River to the New Jersey shore of said river, and any new bridge or tunnel authorized by or pursuant to this compact or agreement to be constructed or erected by the commission may be constructed or erected at any location south of said boundary line notwithstanding the terms and provisions of any other agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey. Except as may hereafter be otherwise provided in conformity with Article IX hereof with respect to specific properties designated by action of the Legislatures of both of the signatory States, no property or facility owned or controlled by the commission shall be acquired from it by any exercise of powers of condemnation or eminent domain.

(6) Said agreement is further amended by adding thereto, following the last article thereof, a new article reading as follows:

#### Article XIII

As used herein, unless a different meaning clearly appears from the context:

"Port District" shall mean all the territory within the counties of Delaware and Philadelphia in Pennsylvania, and all the territory within the counties of Atlantic, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, Ocean and Salem in New Jersey.

"Commission" shall mean the Delaware River Port Authority and, when required by the context, the board constituting the governing body thereof in charge of its property and affairs.

"Commissioner" shall mean a member of the governing body of the Delaware River Port Authority.

"Terminal" shall include any marine, motor truck, railroad and air terminal, also any coal, grain and lumber terminal and any union freight and other terminals used or to be used in connection with the transportation of passengers and freight, and equipment, materials and supplies therefor.

"Transportation facility" and "facilities for transportation of passengers" shall include railroads operated by steam, electricity or other power, rapid transit lines, motor trucks, tunnels, bridges, airports, boats, ferries, carfloats, lighters, tugs, floating elevators, barges, scows, or harbor craft of any kind, and aircraft, and equipment, materials and supplies therefor.

"Terminal facility" shall include wharves, piers, slips, ferries, docks, drydocks, ship

repair yards, bulkheads, dock walls, basins, car floats, float bridges, dredging equipment, radio receiving and sending stations, grain or other storage elevators, warehouses, cold storage, tracks, yards, sheds, switches, connections, overhead appliances, bunker coal, oil and fresh water stations, markets, and every kind of terminal, storage or supply facility now in use, or hereafter designed for use to facilitate passenger transportation and for the handling, storage, loading or unloading of freight at terminals, and equipment, materials and supplies therefor.

"Transportation of passengers" and "passenger transportation" shall mean the transportation of passengers by railroad or other facilities.

"Rapid transit system" shall mean a transit system for the transportation of passengers, express, mail and baggage by railroad or other facilities, and equipment, materials and supplies therefor.

"Project" shall mean any improvement, betterment, facility or structure authorized by or pursuant to this compact or agreement to be constructed, erected, acquired, owned or controlled or otherwise undertaken by the commission. "Project" shall not include undertakings for purposes described in Article I, subdivisions (a), (d), (e), (g), (h) and (i).

"Railroad" shall include railways, extensions thereof, tunnels, subways, bridges, elevated structures, tracks, poles, wires, conduits, powerhouses, substations, lines for the transmission of power, car barns, shops, yards, sidings, turnouts, switches, stations and approaches thereto, cars and motive equipment.

"Bridge" and "tunnel" shall include such approach highways and interests in real property necessary therefor in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or the State of New Jersey as may be determined by the commission to be necessary to facilitate the flow of traffic in the vicinity of a bridge or tunnel or to connect a bridge or tunnel with the highway system or other traffic facilities in said Commonwealth or said State; *Provided, however*, That the power and authority herein granted to the commission to construct new or additional approach highways shall not be exercised unless and until the Department of Highways of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall have filed with the commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said Commonwealth and the State Highway Department of the State of New Jersey shall have filed with the commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said State.

"Facility" shall include all works, buildings, structures, property, appliances, and equipment, together with appurtenances necessary and convenient for the proper construction, equipment, maintenance and operation of a facility or facilities or any one or more of them.

"Personal property" shall include choses in action and all other property now commonly, or legally, defined as personal property, or which may hereafter be so defined.

"Lease" shall include rent or hire.

"Municipality" shall include a county, city, borough, village, township, town, public agency, public authority or political subdivision.

Words importing the singular number include the plural number and vice versa.

Wherever legislation or action by the Legislature of either signatory State is herein referred to it shall mean an act of the legislature duly adopted in accordance with the provisions of the constitution of such State.

In witness whereof, this 23d day of August, 1951, Alfred E. Driscoll has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the State of

New Jersey and caused the great seal of the State to be attached thereto.

[GREAT SEAL] ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,  
Governor, State of New Jersey.

Attest:

LLOYD B. MARSH,  
Lloyd B. Marsh  
Secretary of State.

In witness whereof, this 30th day of August, 1951, John S. Fine has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and caused the great seal of the Commonwealth to be attached thereto.

[GREAT SEAL] JOHN S. FINE  
Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Attest:

GENE D. SMITH  
Gene D. Smith  
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

SEC. 2. Subject to the provisions of the compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Commission, as amended and supplemented, the Delaware River Port Authority (herein called the "commission"), formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, is hereby authorized to construct, acquire, finance, operate, maintain and own bridges and tunnels across or under the Delaware River, including any bridge heretofore constructed under the authority or with the consent of the Congress, with such approaches thereto and highway connections as may be necessary or desirable, in accordance with the applicable provisions of section 502 (b) of the General Bridge Act of 1946 and section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U. S. C., sec. 403), and is further authorized to effectuate, establish, maintain, rehabilitate, construct and operate railroad or other facilities for the transportation of passengers across any such bridge or tunnel owned or controlled by the commission and a rapid transit system for passengers, express, mail, and baggage between points within the city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and points within the State of New Jersey, and intermediate points.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any limitation on the collection of tolls as prescribed by section 506 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended, or as prescribed by any Act heretofore enacted by the Congress authorizing or consenting to the construction or acquisition of any bridge constructed or acquired by the commission, the commission is hereby authorized to fix, charge and collect tolls or other charges for the use of any bridge or tunnel heretofore or hereafter established, controlled, constructed, or acquired by the commission, and to combine any two or more of such bridges or tunnels, or combine any one or more of such bridges or tunnels, with any railroad, rapid-transit system, or other properties or facilities for transportation, terminal or port improvement purposes (each such bridge, tunnel, railroad system, or other property or facility being hereinafter referred to as a "facility") heretofore or hereafter established, controlled, constructed or acquired by the commission, and combine the tolls or revenues therefrom, and to fix, charge, and collect tolls or other charges for the use of such facilities so combined, and to use or pledge any such tolls or other charges for purposes of financing, acquiring, constructing, operating or maintaining any facility or facilities, all to the extent provided by and in accordance with the provisions of the aforesaid compact or agreement as amended and supplemented, as consented to by the Congress, and the laws of the State of New Jersey and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with respect thereto or to said commission: *Provided*, That, as a specific exemption from the provisions of section 506 of the General Bridge Act of

1946, as amended, the collection of tolls for the use of any bridge hereafter constructed or acquired by the commission, in excess of amounts reasonably required for the operation and maintenance thereof under economical management, shall cease at the expiration of fifty years from the date of the opening of traffic by the commission of the bridge latest constructed or acquired by said commission after the effective date of this Act, and the rate of such tolls shall be subject to the provisions of section 503 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "thereof", insert a parenthesis.

Page 24, line 8, after the word "desirable", insert a comma.

Page 26, line 2, after the word "opening", strike out the word "of" and substitute the word "to."

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.

#### PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW JERSEY PORT AUTHORITY

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8316) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain, and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object; will the gentleman from Maryland explain the bill?

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, this bill creates a port authority between the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and allows those two States to enter into a compact, which was agreed upon by their respective legislatures. It allows them to build toll bridges across the Delaware River. The tolls will terminate in 50 years from the date of the beginning of the last bridge. The money that is collected from the tolls can be used for other purposes that have to do with commerce. This simply gives the two State legislatures the right to enter into these compacts. We had before our committee the Governors of the two States, Members of the United States Senate from the two States, and many of the Members of the House from the two States. It was the thought of the committee that this does nothing but to give the States the right to form a compact which they would have a right to do. Had it not involved interstate commerce, they would not have to come to the Congress at all. There is a serious

traffic condition in Camden and Philadelphia area the existing facilities cannot take care of. There are few places in the United States like it, where a river is the boundary line between the two cities, and it is necessary that they have some means of income from the bridges to complete other public-works projects for the public good, which they probably could not finance otherwise.

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

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The nearest thing we have as a precedent to this is that which obtains in the State of New York, where they have used the income from the tolls to build other bridges, and in fact that was the only way they could get it.

Mr. FALLON. With one exception: In this compact they must go back to the legislatures of both States in order to start any new project. As I understand the New York compact, the Commission decides which projects to finance out of the tolls of existing bridges and tunnels.

Mr. DONDERO. That is right.

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

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI] who has reserved the right to object, if he would submit what his objection really is. It is difficult for me to understand the position he takes at this time, in view of the fact that there is no difference of opinion whatsoever in southern New Jersey nor in the State of Pennsylvania. The mayors of Camden and Philadelphia are of the same political persuasion as is the gentleman who has reserved the right to object. They have been in Washington and testified before the committees in support of these bills.

This legislation is desired by every civic organization, financial, business, and all other groups, and so far as I know, the reservation of objection that has now been made by the gentleman from north New Jersey is the first and only objection that has been made by anybody to this legislation. The compacts were passed without objection by the legislatures of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and approved by the respective governors of both States. They have the approval of all who are in authority in the areas that are affected by it, and I hope that the gentleman will give the matter the consideration which I think the importance of the bills are entitled to have. I do not want to believe that the gentleman is opposed to the same degree of progress in south New Jersey as has come to north New Jersey, nor to the opportunity these bills will give to the area within the jurisdiction of the bills to have the same opportunity to develop. I certainly hope that under the circumstances the gentleman will withdraw his reservation of objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to state that I have no objection to anyone having any progress in any State. The question of progress

is, of course, at whose expense and for whose benefit. The booby trap in this bill is that it pledges tolls on a bridge or tunnel for 50 years even though the bridge might be paid for in 10 years. It allows for one project to finance others, to finance white elephants at commuters' expense. It soaks the toll payer. He unknowingly finances projects for big business which may not be purely for public purposes, though so stated.

I rise against abuses created in the northern part of the State in the operation of the Port of New York Authority over the past 30 years. I do not want to sit silent to allow this compact to go into effect without serving notice on that body and on all concerned that such abuse must cease and that it must not be given a chance to exist in the operation of this bill now before us.

I expressed my protest on such abuse on two separate occasions: First, before Chairman CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. His subcommittee heard my resolution; it called for the abolition of the New York Port Authority until such time as abuses were corrected. The resolution was tabled. Second: I appeared before Senator CHAVEZ's committee which considered the merits of the elements in this bill. I stated my objections. They are on record. I said I would fight the bill on the House floor if loopholes now in the New York-New Jersey Compact setting up the New York Port Authority were not closed.

Accordingly, in keeping with my statement, I fight this bill because it gives a hosing to toll-paying passengers.

For instance, this bill asks 50 years to amortize the payment of any installation. I do not think that that is fair to the toll-paying motorist. The Holland and the Lincoln Tunnels have over the years, and are today, keeping the whole New York Port Authority going. Tolls on these two projects are pledged way into the future. Pledged not to amortize the cost of the Holland and the Lincoln Tunnels, not pledged merely to service and maintain them, but pledged to pay off obligations incurred by the New York Port Authority on other installations including white elephants, and even on some in competition with private enterprise. The Holland and the Lincoln Tunnels have long since been paid for.

That is what I object to. If project No. 1 is going to pay for itself, and then you want project No. 2, let it be financed the same way project No. 1 was financed. I am objecting to piggy-back pledging these tolls for the next 50 years for various white elephants that might grow up, as they have grown up in the New York Port Authority area.

In the United States, a motorist pays a toll in the belief he is helping to pay off the cost and to service and repair the direct installation he uses. Nine out of ten toll payers through the Holland and the Lincoln Tunnels would hit the roof if they knew the truth, if they knew they were paying for warehouses, bus terminals, airports and white elephants. Basic morality would make them froth at the mouth at the facts, especially in

the light of these tolls being pegged at 50 cents for so many years with no relief in sight for bread-and-butter commuters. That is the shame of this 50-year toll pledge deal. I tell you it is wrong, wrong, wrong. You are on slippery ground.

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

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I think I know the objection the gentleman has to this type of legislation. In an attempt to meet those objections, amendments were made to the compact. I assure him that this is not the same kind of compact that he has complained about. The States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania find that they cannot finance this badly needed tunnel or bridge. The traffic between Philadelphia and Camden will amount to nearly 35,000,000 automobiles 2 years hence. There is only one crossing at this time. It is anticipated that the new bridge or tunnel, whichever the legislatures decide to construct, will take care of the traffic for some time to come; but it is entirely possible that in the near future it will be necessary to construct another bridge, and it is impossible to obtain the financing from the banking concerns that are going to finance these projects unless they are given 50 years within which to collect the tolls.

Furthermore, I would like to call the gentleman's attention to one other very important fact, that over 95 percent of the traffic across the Delaware River in the Philadelphia-Camden area is local traffic; so the people throughout the United States are not affected by compelling them to pay tolls for any unreasonable length of time.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I appreciate the viewpoint of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. WALTER], and if I may have just a few more minutes in which to state my objections for the RECORD, then I will go along with this.

The same talk made now here in favor of this legislation was heard, I understand, in this Congress around 1921 when New York and New Jersey wanted to set up a port authority. It was only for local purposes; it was only to facilitate commerce. Fine.

But you and I know that the motorists of the United States have been financing New York's huge projects. You hear of risk capital, venture capital. Why are the Port of New York Authority bonds tax-free? GI's cannot buy tax-free United States Government bonds, but the New York Port Authority can issue tax-free bonds. Some gravy, eh? That is No. 1.

Bond issuance and the parceling out of insurance are hush hush. How many GI's of World War II or of Korea hold New York Port authority tax-free bonds? How many disabled veterans hold them? Who gets the business? How? Why?

I say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], for the RECORD, the abuses I know of in the operation of the Port of New York Authority must not exist in the operation of the Delaware Commission. With your pledge that

they will not exist, I withdraw my objections to this bill.

However, I think the motorists of America and the AAA should be made to realize that a new movement is taking place in the United States; it puts the bite on tourists, vacationers, and commuters to finance big business operations, warehouses, bus terminals, airports, grain elevators, and so forth. Apprised of the facts, if the people consent, fine.

However, if we can use the World Bank for reconstruction and development, the Export-Import Bank, the RFC, and other fiscal sources for credit, where is the courage of private bankers? Why can not they insist, as does the Export-Import Bank, that each project justify itself? The Export-Import Bank allows no piggy-backing of projects for credit. Its profit record is first class; its losses miniscule.

If project No. 1 across the Delaware River could pay for itself, if a New Jersey turnpike could pay for itself and justify the risk capital that went into it, why cannot other projects justify themselves? I will tell you why some want this 50 years: Because they figure that with a 50-year period, although they may have a couple of white elephants, it will pay them off, but at the expense of bread-and-butter motorists.

Carried to an extreme, I say it is a racket. I want to go on record as saying such, but on Mr. WOLVERTON's assurances of no abuses, I will go along with this thing, and withdraw my objections so that I do not further oppose my very good friend, Mayor Brunner, who, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] assures me, is for the bill. I rather think Mayor Brunner is for the bridge and not the booby traps in the bill.

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

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I want to express appreciation to Mr. SIEMINSKI, the gentleman from North Jersey, for his action in withdrawing his objection, notwithstanding the sincerity of the views he has expressed. I can assure him it will be greatly appreciated in South Jersey and for the gentleman's comfort, may I say further, that amendments have been made to this bill that will eliminate the tax objection to which the gentleman has made reference. The amendments provide that the bonds and the obligations issued by the authority shall be subject to the internal revenue laws of the United States.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Good. I just want the gentleman to know that I am going to pounce on this if it allows to come into being evils that now exist in the operations of the Port of New York Authority.

Go ahead with your bridge or tunnel, I will not hold up progress, but I serve notice personally, privately, and officially, and unofficially as far as this bill is concerned, in receding from my objections, I do not recede to grant a continuation of public abuse; I do not recede to promote private rackets under the guise

of public works at the expense of bread-and-butter toll-paying commuters.

I recede to promote progress, to promote the prompt convenience of the commuters of South Jersey and of northern Pennsylvania. I trust they will be alert to the facts involved. Good luck.

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

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the supplemental compact or agreement set forth below, and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided,* That nothing therein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, over or in regard to any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of said supplemental compact or agreement or otherwise affected by the terms thereof: *Provided further,* That the consent of Congress hereby given shall not be construed to affect in any manner whatsoever the application of the internal-revenue laws of the United States to the bonds or other securities or obligations issued by the commission, their transfer and the income therefrom (including any profits made on the sale thereof):

**SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

**AMENDING AND SUPPLEMENTING THE AGREEMENT ENTITLED "AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY CREATING THE DELAWARE RIVER JOINT COMMISSION AS A BODY CORPORATE AND POLITIC AND DEFINING ITS POWERS AND DUTIES," CHANGING THE NAME OF THE DELAWARE RIVER JOINT COMMISSION TO THE DELAWARE RIVER PORT AUTHORITY, CHANGING THE METHOD OF APPOINTMENT OF THE COMMISSIONERS, EXTENDING THE JURISDICTION, POWERS AND DUTIES OF SAID THE DELAWARE RIVER PORT AUTHORITY, AND DEFINING SUCH ADDITIONAL JURISDICTION, POWERS AND DUTIES**

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby solemnly covenant and agree each with the other, as follows:

(1) Article I of the "Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties," which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-one, and on behalf of the State of New Jersey by the New Jersey Interstate Bridge Commission by its members on the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-one, and which was consented to by the Congress of the United States by Public Resolution Number Twenty-six, being chapter two hundred fifty-eight of the Public Laws, Seventy-second Congress, approved the fourteenth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-two, is amended to read as follows:

**Article I**

The body corporate and politic, heretofore created and known as the Delaware River Joint Commission hereby is continued under the name of the Delaware River Port Authority (hereinafter in this agreement called the "commission"), which shall constitute the public corporate instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the

State of New Jersey for the following public purposes, and which shall be deemed to be exercising an essential governmental function in effectuating such purposes, to wit:

(a) The operation and maintenance of the bridge, owned jointly by the two States across the Delaware River between the city of Philadelphia in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the city of Camden in the State of New Jersey, including its approaches, and the making of additions and improvements thereto.

(b) The effectuation, establishment, construction, operation and maintenance of railroad or other facilities for the transportation of passengers across any bridge or tunnel owned or controlled by the commission, including extensions of such railroad or other facilities within the city of Camden and the city of Philadelphia necessary for efficient operation in the Port District.

(c) The improvement and development of the Port District for port purposes by or through the acquisition, construction, maintenance or operation of any and all projects for the improvement and development of the Port District for port purposes, or directly related thereto, either directly by purchase, lease or contract, or by lease or agreement with any other public or private body or corporation or in any other manner.

(d) Cooperation with all other bodies interested or concerned with, or affected by the promotion, development or use of the Delaware River and the Port District.

(e) The procurement from the Government of the United States of any consents which may be requisite to enable any project within its powers to be carried forward.

(f) The construction, acquisition, operation and maintenance of other bridges and tunnels across or under the Delaware River, between the city of Philadelphia and the State of New Jersey, including approaches and the making of additions and improvements thereto.

(g) The promotion as a highway of commerce of the Delaware River, and the promotion of increased passenger and freight commerce on the Delaware River and for such purpose the publication of literature and the adoption of any other means as may be deemed appropriate.

(h) To study and make recommendations to the proper authorities for the improvement of terminal, lighterage, wharfage, warehouse and other facilities necessary for the promotion of commerce on the Delaware River.

(i) Institution through its counsel, or such other counsel as it shall designate, or intervention in, any litigation involving rates, preferences, rebates or other matters vital to the interest of the Port District; provided, that notice of any such institution of or intervention in litigation shall be given promptly to the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to the Attorney General of the State of New Jersey, and provision for such notices shall be made in a resolution authorizing any such intervention or litigation and shall be incorporated in the minutes of the commission.

(j) The establishment, maintenance, rehabilitation, construction and operation of a rapid transit system for the transportation of passengers, express, mail, and baggage between points in New Jersey communities within the Port District and within a thirty-five (35) mile radius of the city of Camden, New Jersey, and points within the city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and intermediate points. Such system may be established by either utilizing existing rapid transit systems, railroad facilities, highways and bridges within the territory involved or by the construction or provision of new facilities where deemed necessary.

(k) The performance of such other functions which may be of mutual benefit to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the

State of New Jersey insofar as concerns the promotion and development of the Port District for port purposes and the use of its facilities by commercial vessels.

(2) Article II of said agreement is amended to read as follows:

**Article II**

The commission shall consist of sixteen commissioners, eight resident voters of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and eight resident voters of the State of New Jersey, who shall serve without compensation.

The present members of the commission, including ex-officio members, shall continue to serve, respectively, as commissioners until the expiration of their terms or the terms of office by virtue of the holding of which they are members of the commission and until succeeding commissioners shall be appointed and qualify, except that the terms of the present members of the commission for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall expire as of the date of the coming into force of the supplemental compact or agreement authorized by the Act of the 1951 General Assembly of said Commonwealth providing for amendment of this article.

The commissioners for the State of New Jersey shall be appointed by the Governor of New Jersey with the advice and consent of the Senate of New Jersey, for terms of five years, and in case of a vacancy occurring in the office of commissioner during a recess of the legislature, it may be filled by the governor by an ad interim appointment which shall expire at the end of the next regular session of the senate unless a successor shall be sooner appointed and qualify and, after the end of the session, no ad interim appointment to the same vacancy shall be made unless the governor shall have submitted to the senate a nomination to the office during the session and the senate shall have adjourned without confirming or rejecting it, and no person nominated for any such vacancy shall be eligible for an ad interim appointment to such office if the nomination shall have failed of confirmation by the senate.

Six of the eight commissioners for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall be appointed by the Governor of Pennsylvania for terms of five years. The auditor general and the state treasurer of said Commonwealth shall ex-officio be commissioners for said Commonwealth, each having the privilege of appointing a representative to serve in his place at any meeting of the commission which he does not attend personally.

All commissioners shall continue to hold office after the expiration of the terms for which they are appointed or elected until their respective successors are appointed and qualify, but no period during which any commissioner shall hold over shall be deemed to be an extension of his term of office for the purpose of computing the date on which his successor's term expires.

(3) Article IV of said agreement is amended to read as follows:

**Article IV**

For the effectuation of its authorized purposes the commission is hereby granted the following powers:

- (a) To have perpetual succession.
- (b) To sue and be sued.
- (c) To adopt and use an official seal.
- (d) To elect a chairman, vice-chairman, secretary and treasurer, and to adopt suitable bylaws for the management of its affairs. The secretary and treasurer need not be members of the commission.
- (e) To appoint, hire, or employ counsel and such other officers and such agents and employees as it may require for the performance of its duties, by contract or otherwise, and fix and determine their qualifications, duties, and compensation.
- (f) To enter into contracts.

(g) To acquire, own, hire, use, operate and dispose of personal property.

(h) To acquire, own, use, lease, operate, mortgage and dispose of real property and interests in real property, and to make improvements thereon.

(i) To grant by franchise, lease or otherwise, the use of any property or facility owned or controlled by the commission and to make charges therefor.

(j) To borrow money upon its bonds or other obligations, either with or without security, and to make, enter into and perform any and all such covenants and agreements with the holders of such bonds or other obligations as the commission may determine to be necessary or desirable for the security and payment thereof, including without limitation of the foregoing, covenants and agreements as to the management and operation of any property or facility owned or controlled by it, the tolls, rents, rates or other charges to be established, levied, made and collected for any use of any such property or facility, or the application, use and disposition of the proceeds of any bonds or other obligations of the commission or the proceeds of any such tolls, rents, rates or other charges or any other revenues or moneys of the commission.

(k) To exercise the right of eminent domain within the Port District.

(l) To determine the exact location, system and character of and all other matters in connection with any and all improvements or facilities which it may be authorized to own, construct, establish, effectuate, operate or control.

(m) In addition to the foregoing, to exercise the powers, duties, authority and jurisdiction heretofore conferred and imposed upon the aforesaid Delaware River Joint Commission by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or the State of New Jersey, or both of the said two States;

(n) To exercise all other powers not inconsistent with the constitutions of the two States or of the United States, which may be reasonably necessary or incidental to the effectuation of its authorized purposes or to the exercise of any of the foregoing powers, except the power to levy taxes or assessments, and generally to exercise in connection with its property and affairs, and in connection with property within its control, any and all powers which might be exercised by a natural person or a private corporation in connection with similar property and affairs.

(o) To acquire, purchase, construct, lease, operate, maintain and undertake any project, including any terminal, terminal facility, transportation facility, or any other facility of commerce and to make charges for the use thereof.

(p) To make expenditures anywhere in the United States and foreign countries, to pay commissions, and hire or contract with experts and consultants, and otherwise to do indirectly anything which the commission may do directly.

The commission shall also have such additional powers as may hereafter be delegated to or imposed upon it from time to time by the action of either State concurred in by legislation of the other.

It is the policy and intent of the Legislatures of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey that the powers granted by this article shall be so exercised that the American system of free competitive private enterprise is given full consideration and is maintained and furthered. In making its reports and recommendations to the Legislatures of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey on the need for any facility or project which the commission believes should be undertaken for the promotion and development of

the Port District, the commission shall include therein its findings which fully set forth that the facility or facilities operated by private enterprise within the Port District and which it is intended shall be supplanted or added to are not adequate.

(4) Article XI of said agreement is amended to read as follows:

#### Article XI

The effectuation of its authorized purposes by the commission is and will be in all respects for the benefit of the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, for the increase of their commerce and prosperity and for the improvement of their health and living conditions; and since the commission will be performing essential governmental functions in effectuating said purposes, the commission shall not be required to pay any taxes or assessments upon any property acquired or used by it for such purposes, and the bonds or other securities or obligations issued by the commission, their transfer and the income therefrom (including any profits made on the sale thereof) shall at all times be free from taxation within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

To the end that municipalities may not suffer undue loss of tax revenue by reason of the acquisition and ownership of property therein by the commission, the commission is hereby authorized and empowered, in its discretion, to enter into a voluntary agreement or agreements with any municipality, whereby it will undertake to pay a fair and reasonable sum or sums to compensate the said municipality for any loss of tax revenue in connection with any property acquired by the commission after one thousand nine hundred and fifty other than property acquired for bridge, tunnel or passenger transportation purposes. Any such payment or payments which the commission is hereby authorized and empowered to make may be made on an annual basis, in which case the payment or payments shall not be in excess of the amount of the taxes upon the property when last assessed prior to the time of its acquisition by the commission, or such payment or payments may be made in a lump sum or sums, or over a stated period of years, as shall be agreed upon by and between the commission and such municipality. Every municipality wherein the property shall be acquired by the commission is authorized and empowered to enter into such agreement or agreements with the commission to accept the payment or payments which the commission is herein authorized and empowered to make.

(5) Article XII of said agreement is amended to read as follows:

#### Article XII

The commission shall make annual reports to the Governors and Legislatures of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, setting forth in detail its operations and transactions, and may make such additional reports from time to time to the governors and legislatures as it may deem desirable. Copies thereof shall be available for public information and use.

Whenever the commission after investigation and study shall have concluded plans, with estimates of cost and means of financing, for any new project for a purpose other than any described in Article I, subdivisions (b) or (j) hereof, for transportation across or under the Delaware River within the Port District or improvement of the Delaware river's port facilities, the commission shall make to the legislature of each State a detailed report dealing only with the contemplated project and shall request of said legislatures authority to proceed with the project described and it shall not be within the

power of the commission to construct, erect or otherwise acquire any new facility or project, for a purpose other than any described in Article I, subdivisions (b) or (j) hereof, unless and until the legislatures of both States shall have authorized the commission to proceed with the project outlined in its special report thereon.

In addition to other powers conferred upon it, and not in limitation thereof, the commission may acquire all right, title and interest in and to the Tacony-Palmyra bridge, across the Delaware River at Palmyra, New Jersey, together with any approaches and interests in real property necessary thereto. The acquisition of such bridge, approaches and interests by the commission shall be by purchase or by condemnation in accordance with the provisions of the Federal law consenting to or authorizing the construction of such bridge and approaches, or the acquisition of such bridge, approaches or interests by the commission shall be pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of section 48:5-22 and 48:5-23 of the Revised Statutes of New Jersey, and for all the purposes of said provisions and sections the commission is hereby appointed as the agency of the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania exercising the rights and powers granted or reserved by said Federal law or sections to the State of New Jersey and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania jointly or to the State of New Jersey acting in conjunction with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The commission shall have authority to so acquire such bridge, approaches and interests, whether the same be owned, held, operated or maintained by any private person, firm, partnership, company, association or corporation or by any instrumentality, public body, commission, public agency or political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of, or created by or in, the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or by any instrumentality, public body, commission or public agency of, or created by or in, a political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. None of the provisions of the preceding paragraph shall be applicable with respect to the acquisition by the commission, pursuant to this paragraph, of said Tacony-Palmyra bridge, approaches and interests. The power and authority herein granted to the commission to acquire said Tacony-Palmyra bridge, approaches and interests shall not be exercised unless and until the Governor of the State of New Jersey and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have filed with the commission their written consents to such acquisition.

It shall not be within the power of the commission to construct, erect, or otherwise acquire any new facility or project for a purpose described in Article I, subdivision (j) hereof, unless and until the commission shall have made to the Legislature and Governor of the State of New Jersey and to the Legislature and Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a detailed report dealing only with such contemplated facility or project, and the Governor of said State and the Governor of said Commonwealth shall have filed with the commission their written consents to such construction, erection or acquisition.

Notwithstanding any provision of this agreement, nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit or impair any right or power granted or to be granted to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission or the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, to finance, construct, operate and maintain the Pennsylvania Turnpike System or any turnpike project of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, respectively, throughout the Port District,

including the right and power, acting alone or in conjunction with each other, to provide for the financing, construction, operation and maintenance of one bridge across the Delaware river south of the city of Trenton in the State of New Jersey; provided that such bridge shall not be constructed within a distance of ten miles, measured along the boundary line between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, from the existing bridge, operated and maintained by the commission, across the Delaware river between the city of Philadelphia in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the city of Camden in the State of New Jersey, so long as there are any outstanding bonds or other securities or obligations of the commission for which the tolls, rents, rates, or other revenues, or any part thereof, of said existing bridge shall have been pledged. Nothing contained in this agreement shall be construed to authorize the commission to condemn any such bridge.

Anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding, no bridge or tunnel shall be constructed, acquired, operated or maintained by the commission across or under the Delaware River north of the boundary line between Bucks county and Philadelphia county in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as extended across the Delaware River to the New Jersey shore of said river, and any new bridge or tunnel authorized by or pursuant to this compact or agreement to be constructed or erected by the commission may be constructed or erected at any location south of said boundary line notwithstanding the terms and provisions of any other agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey. Except as may hereafter be otherwise provided in conformity with Article IX hereof with respect to specific properties designated by action of the legislatures of both of the signatory States, no property or facility owned or controlled by the commission shall be acquired from it by any exercise of powers of condemnation or eminent domain.

(6) Said agreement is further amended by adding thereto, following the last article thereof, a new article reading as follows:

#### Article XIII

As used herein, unless a different meaning clearly appears from the context:

"Port District" shall mean all the territory within the counties of Delaware and Philadelphia in Pennsylvania, and all the territory within the counties of Atlantic, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, Ocean and Salem in New Jersey.

"Commission" shall mean the Delaware River Port Authority and, when required by the context, the board constituting the governing body thereof in charge of its property and affairs.

"Commissioner" shall mean a member of the governing body of the Delaware River Port Authority.

"Terminal" shall include any marine, motor truck, railroad and air terminal, also any coal, grain and lumber terminal and any union freight and other terminals used or to be used in connection with the transportation of passengers and freight, and equipment, materials and supplies therefor.

"Transportation facility" and "facilities for transportation of passengers" shall include railroads operated by steam, electricity or other power, rapid transit lines, motor trucks, tunnels, bridges, airports, boats, ferries, carfloats, lighters, tugs, floating elevators, barges, scows, or harbor craft of any kind, and aircraft, and equipment, materials and supplies therefor.

"Terminal facility" shall include wharves, piers, slips, ferries, docks, drydocks, ship re-

pair yards, bulkheads, dock walls, basins, carfloats, float-bridges, dredging equipment, radio receiving and sending stations, grain or other storage elevators, warehouses, cold storage, tracks, yards, sheds, switches, connections, overhead appliances, bunker coal, oil and fresh water stations, markets, and every kind of terminal, storage or supply facility now in use, or hereafter designed for use to facilitate passenger transportation and for the handling, storage, loading or unloading of freight at terminals, and equipment, materials and supplies therefor.

"Transportation of passengers" and "passenger transportation" shall mean the transportation of passengers by railroad or other facilities.

"Rapid transit system" shall mean a transit system for the transportation of passengers, express, mail and baggage by railroad or other facilities, and equipment, materials and supplies therefor.

"Project" shall mean any improvement, betterment, facility or structure authorized by or pursuant to this compact or agreement to be constructed, erected, acquired, owned or controlled or otherwise undertaken by the commission. "Project" shall not include undertakings for purposes described in Article I, subdivisions (a), (d), (e), (g), (h) and (i).

"Railroad" shall include railways, extensions thereof, tunnels, subways, bridges, elevated structures, tracks, poles, wires, conduits, powerhouses, substations, lines for the transmission of power, car barns, shops, yards, sidings, turnouts, switches, stations and approaches thereto, cars and motive equipment.

"Bridge" and "tunnel" shall include such approach highways and interests in real property necessary therefor in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or the State of New Jersey as may be determined by the commission to be necessary to facilitate the flow of traffic in the vicinity of a bridge or tunnel or to connect a bridge or tunnel with the highway system or other traffic facilities in said Commonwealth or said State: *Provided, however*, that the power and authority herein granted to the commission to construct new or additional approach highways shall not be exercised unless and until the Department of Highways of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall have filed with the commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said Commonwealth and the State Highway Department of the State of New Jersey shall have filed with the commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said State.

"Facility" shall include all works, buildings, structures, property, appliances, and equipment, together with appurtenances necessary and convenient for the proper construction, equipment, maintenance and operation of a facility or facilities or any one or more of them.

"Personal property" shall include choses in action and all other property now commonly, or legally, defined as personal property, or which may hereafter be so defined.

"Lease" shall include rent or hire.

"Municipality" shall include a county, city, borough, village, township, town, public agency, public authority or political subdivision.

Words importing the singular number include the plural number and vice versa.

Whenever legislation or action by the legislature of either signatory State is herein referred to it shall mean an act of the legislature duly adopted in accordance with the provisions of the constitution of such State.

In witness whereof, this 23d day of August, 1951, Alfred E. Driscoll has affixed

his signature hereto as Governor of the State of New Jersey and caused the great seal of the State to be attached thereto.

[GREAT SEAL] ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,  
Governor, State of New Jersey.

Attest:

LOYD B. MARSH  
Lloyd B. Marsh,  
Secretary of State.

In witness whereof, this 30th day of August, 1951, John S. Fine has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and caused the great seal of the Commonwealth to be attached thereto.

[GREAT SEAL] JOHN S. FINE,  
Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Attest:

GENE D. SMITH  
Gene D. Smith,  
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

SEC. 2. Subject to the provisions of the compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Commission, as amended and supplemented, the Delaware River Port Authority (herein called the "commission"), formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, is hereby authorized to construct, acquire, finance, operate, maintain and own bridges and tunnels across or under the Delaware River, including any bridge heretofore constructed under the authority or with the consent of the Congress, with such approaches thereto and highway connections as may be necessary or desirable, in accordance with the applicable provisions of section 502 (b) of the General Bridge Act of 1946 and section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U. S. C., sec. 403), and is further authorized to effectuate, establish, maintain, rehabilitate, construct and operate railroad or other facilities for the transportation of passengers across any such bridges or tunnel owned or controlled by the commission and a rapid transit system for passengers, express, mail, and baggage between point within the city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and points within the State of New Jersey, and intermediate points.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any limitation on the collection of tolls as prescribed by section 506 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended, or as prescribed by any Act heretofore enacted by the Congress authorizing or consenting to the construction or acquisition of any bridge constructed or acquired by the commission, the commission is hereby authorized to fix, charge and collect tolls or other charges for the use of any bridge or tunnel heretofore or hereafter established, controlled, constructed, or acquired by the commission, and to combine any two or more of such bridges or tunnels, or combine any one or more of such bridges or tunnels, with any railroad, rapid-transit system, or other properties or facilities for transportation, terminal or port improvement purposes (each such bridge, tunnel, railroad, system, or other property or facility being hereinafter referred to as "facility") heretofore or hereafter established, controlled, constructed or acquired by the commission, and combine the tolls or revenues therefrom, and to fix, charge, and collect tolls or other charges for the use of such facilities so combined, and to use or pledge any such tolls or other charges for purposes of financing, acquiring, constructing, operating or maintaining any facility or facilities, all to the extent provided by and in accordance with the provisions of the aforesaid compact or agreement as amended and supplemented, as consented to by the Congress, and the laws of the State of New Jersey and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with respect thereto or to said commission: *Provided*,

That, as a specific exemption from the provisions of section 506 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended, the collection of tolls for the use of any bridge hereafter constructed or acquired by the commission, in excess of amounts reasonably required for the operation and maintenance thereof under economical management, shall cease at the expiration of fifty years from the date of the opening of traffic by the commission of the bridge latest constructed or acquired by said commission after the effective date of this Act, and the rate of such tolls shall be subject to the provisions of section 503 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended.

Sec. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "therefrom", insert (including any profits made on the sale thereof).

Page 14, line 17, after the word "transactions", insert a comma.

Page 26, line 2, after the word "opening", strike out the word "of" and insert the word "to."

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.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FALLON. 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 the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7860) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, SIKES, and TABER.

#### OFFICE OF SUPERVISOR OF NEW YORK HARBOR

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8234) to amend section 5 of the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of Supervisor of New York Harbor, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? The Chair understands that

the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN] objected yesterday, but that he has withdrawn his objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the bill that transfers supervision from the Navy to the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. LARCADE. That is correct. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN] has withdrawn his objection.

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

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to prevent obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City, by dumping or otherwise, and to punish and prevent such offenses," approved June 29, 1888, as amended (33 U. S. C. 451), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. That an officer of the Corps of Engineers shall be designated by the Secretary of the Army as supervisor of the harbor, to act under the direction of the Chief of Engineers in enforcing the provisions of this act, and in detecting offenders against the same. This officer shall have personal charge and supervision under the Chief of Engineers, and shall direct the patrol boats and other means to detect and bring to punishment offenders against the provisions 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.

#### CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMON- WEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 430, approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, BENTSEN, Mrs. BOSONE, Messrs. CRAWFORD, and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

#### BUNKER HILL DEVELOPMENT CORP.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4277) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp., with Senate amendment 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 1, strike out all after "for" down to and including "York" in line 5 and

insert "alleged damages arising out of the construction of Stewart Field, a United States Air Force Base located at Newburgh, N. Y., in such a manner as to allegedly destroy a housing development of said corporation, and for alleged damages to the property of said corporation by reason of the alleged failure of the Government to provide proper drainage from said Stewart Field, which resulted in the storm flooding of the property of the corporation."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ROBERT A. BUCHANAN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4455) for the relief of Robert A. Buchanan, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "reinstate" and insert "renew."

Line 4, strike out "N-8683625" and insert "N-8683265."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### STAMEY CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1267) to reimburse the Stamey Construction Co. and/or the Oklahoma Paving Co., as their interests appear, with a Senate amendment 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 conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Stamey Construction Co. and/or Oklahoma Paving Co."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDING MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 404) to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945,

with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after "claim", insert "not in excess of \$2,500."

Page 5, line 6, after "contrary," insert "All such settlements shall be reported to the Congress annually by the heads of the departments concerned and the report shall state with respect to each settlement the name of the claimant, the amount claimed, and the amount paid."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this then limits the payments that can be made to \$2,500?

Mr. LANE. Yes. Not only that, but the department shall report to the Congress all the payments made, and the amounts paid, and to whom they were paid.

Mr. GROSS. As the bill passed the House, was it unlimited, or was there a limit of \$5,000 or \$6,000?

Mr. LANE. It was unlimited.

Mr. GROSS. I ask this question, may I say to the gentleman, because there is a bill pending before the House to pay ECA employees, who were evacuated from Korea, for personal property losses, very much in excess of what this bill provides.

Mr. LANE. This puts on a limitation of \$2,500 and publicizes the names and the amounts.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDING THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7594) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That paragraph 1518 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1001, par. 1518) is hereby amended by inserting "(a)" after "1518."; and by striking out the two provisos at the end of the first subparagraph and all the second subparagraph, and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(b) Except as provided in subparagraphs (c) and (d), the importation of the feathers or skin of any bird is hereby prohibited. Such prohibition shall apply to the feathers or skin of any bird—

"(1) whether raw or processed;

"(2) whether the whole plumage or skin or any part of either;

"(3) whether or not attached to a whole bird or any part thereof; and

"(4) whether or not forming part of another article.

"(c) Subparagraph (b) shall not apply—

"(1) in respect of any of the following birds (other than any such birds which, whether or not raised in captivity, is a wild bird): chickens (including hens and roosters), turkeys, guinea fowl, geese, ducks, pigeons, ostriches, rheas, English ring-necked pheasants, and pea fowl;

"(2) to any importation for scientific or educational purposes;

"(2) to the importation of fully manufactured artificial flies used for fishing;

"(4) to the importation of birds which are classifiable under paragraph 1682; and

"(5) to the importation of live birds.

"(d) Notwithstanding subparagraph (b), there may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in each calendar year the following quotas of skins bearing feathers:

"(1) For use in the manufacture of artificial flies used for fishing: (A) not more than 5,000 skins of grey jungle fowl (*Gallus sonneratii*), and (B) not more than 1,000 skins of mandarin duck (*Dendronessa galeriulata*); and

"(2) For use in the manufacture of artificial flies used for fishing, or for millinery purposes, not more than 45,000 skins, in the aggregate of the following species of pheasant: Lady Amherst pheasant (*Chrysolophus amherstiae*), golden pheasant (*Chrysolophus pictus*), silver pheasant (*Lophura nycthemera*), Reeves pheasant (*Syrmaetus reevesii*), blue-eared pheasant (*Crossoptilon aurtum*), and brown-eared pheasant (*Crossoptilon mantchuricum*).

For the purposes of this subparagraph any part of a skin which has been severed shall be considered to be a whole skin.

"(e) No article specified in subparagraph (d) shall be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption except under a permit issued by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of subparagraph (d) (including regulations providing for equitable allocation among qualified applicants of the import quotas established by such subparagraph). Whenever the Secretary of the Interior finds that the wild supply of any species mentioned in subparagraph (d) is threatened with serious reduction or with extinction, he shall prescribe regulations which provide (to such extent and for such period as he deems necessary to meet such threat)—

"(1) in the case of grey jungle fowl or mandarin duck, for the reduction of the applicable import quota; or

"(2) in the case of any species of pheasant, for the reduction of the import quota established for pheasants, for the establishment of a subquota for such species of pheasant, or for the elimination of such species from the import quota for pheasants, or any combination thereof.

The authority granted to the Secretary of the Interior by the preceding sentence to reduce any import quota shall include authority to eliminate such quota.

"(f) Any article of a kind the importation of which is prohibited or subjected to a quota by subparagraphs (b), (c), and (d) and which is in the United States shall be presumed for the purposes of seizure and forfeiture to have been imported in violation of law and shall be seized and forfeited under the customs laws unless such presumption is satisfactorily rebutted, except that such presumption shall not apply to articles in actual use for personal adornment or for scientific or educational purposes. Any article so forfeited may (in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury

and under such regulations as he may prescribe) (1) be placed with any agency of the Federal Government or of any State government, or any society or museum, for exhibition or scientific or educational purposes, or (2) be destroyed."

SEC. 2. Such paragraph 1518 is further amended by striking out "That nothing in this act" at the beginning of the third subparagraph thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "(g) Nothing in this act."

SEC. 3. Paragraph 1535 of such act is hereby amended by striking out the proviso at the end thereof.

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall take effect at the close of the thirtieth day after the day on which this act is enacted. For the period beginning on the thirty-first day after the day on which this act is enacted and ending on December 31, 1952, the import quota established by paragraph 1518 (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this act, shall be the import quotas specified in such paragraph 1518 (d) for a full calendar year.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "birds" and insert "bird."

Page 2, line 15, strike out "rirk neck" and insert "ring-necked."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "fully manufactured" and insert "fully-manufactured."

Page 3, line 20, strike out "subparagrah" and insert "subparagraph."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill would strengthen the provisions of existing tariff laws so as to aid in the conservation of wild birds. At the present time, feathers of wild birds can be imported only for use in the manufacture of artificial flies for fishing and for scientific or educational purposes. There are now no limitations on the importation of feathers of wild birds used in the manufacture of artificial flies for fishing and where such feathers are imported for this purpose the importers are only required to file affidavits to this effect.

Abuses have grown up under the affidavit system in that feathers of wild birds have been diverted from the stated purpose. Also some importers have claimed that the feathers are from domestic birds rather than wild birds. In general, the millinery industry cannot now legally import feathers of wild birds for its use.

This bill would remedy these abuses by setting up quotas for the importation of feathers and skins of certain wild birds for use in the manufacture of artificial flies used for fishing and for millinery purposes, and would continue to permit the importation of the feathers and skins of certain domestic birds. These importations would be under the administration of the Secretary of the Interior and a permit would be required before the feathers of birds could be entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption under the quotas established. If it should develop that wild birds are becoming extinct or their numbers are being seriously reduced, the Secretary of Interior would reduce or eliminate the quotas.

The National Audubon Society, and other organizations interested in the conservation of wild life, the Associated

Fishing and Tackle Manufacturers and the Feather Industries of America, Inc., have agreed that this bill would eliminate abuses with relation to the importation of feathers for use in the manufacture of artificial flies, the inequities as to the millinery industry and would limit the quantities imported to the maximum amount needed for the above purposes without endangering the supply of wild birds.

The Departments of Commerce and Interior reported favorably on this bill and the Treasury Department anticipates no administrative difficulties in administering it. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DINGELL. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill would strengthen the provisions of existing tariff laws so as to aid in the conservation of wild birds. At the present time, feathers of wild birds can be imported only for use in the manufacture of artificial flies for fishing and for scientific or educational purposes. There are now no limitations on the importation of feathers of wild birds used in the manufacture of artificial flies for fishing and where such feathers are imported for this purpose the importers are only required to file affidavits to this effect.

Abuses have grown up under the affidavit system in that feathers of wild birds have been diverted from the stated purpose. Also some importers have claimed that the feathers are from domestic birds rather than wild birds. In general, the millinery industry cannot now legally import feathers of wild birds for its use.

This bill would remedy these abuses by setting up quotas for the importation of feathers and skins of certain wild birds for use in the manufacture of artificial flies used for fishing and for millinery purposes, and would continue to permit the importation of the feathers and skins of certain domestic birds. These importations would be under the administration of the Secretary of the Interior and a permit would be required before the feathers of birds could be entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption under the quotas established. If it should develop that wild birds are becoming extinct or their numbers are being seriously reduced, the Secretary of Interior would reduce or eliminate the quotas.

The National Audubon Society, and other organizations interested in the conservation of wild life, the Associated Fishing and Tackle Manufacturers, and the Feather Industries of America, Inc. have agreed that this bill would eliminate abuses with relation to the importation of feathers for use in the manufacture of artificial flies, the inequities as to the millinery industry and would limit the quantities imported to the maximum amount needed for the above purposes

without endangering the supply of wild birds.

The Departments of Commerce and Interior reported favorably on this bill and the Treasury Department anticipates no administrative difficulties in administering it. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

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.

#### DUTIES AND IMPORT TAXES ON METAL SCRAP

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6845) to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 2 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 869, 81st Cong., ch. 1119, 2d sess.), is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this measure simply extends to June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap. This suspension of duties has been in existence for 3 or 4 years now. It is felt that the duty should not be imposed at the present time on scrap metal because of the emergency requirements.

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.

#### FERMENTED MALT LIQUORS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6241) to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on fermented malt liquors lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1951 where such fermented malt liquors were in possession of, first, the original taxpayer; second, a dealer who sells fermented malt liquors at wholesale; or, third, a dealer who sells fermented malt liquors at retail.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this a bill to pay losses on liquor that has been damaged in floods, or something of that kind? May we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. FORAND. Yes, I can give the gentleman an explanation. This does not pay for the merchandise itself, it merely provides for the refund or credit of taxes that have been paid on beer that was lost in the flood. It was intended that this should be covered in the In-

ternal Revenue Act of 1951, when we did the same thing for distilled liquors, but, unfortunately, through an oversight beer was left out. This just provides for the refund of the taxes, and it must be a refund or credit only to the original taxpayer, the wholesaler, or the retailer.

Mr. GROSS. What about service station operations on the western border of Iowa, that were affected by the Missouri River flood? Are those service station operators going to be reimbursed for their tax loss on gasoline? And what about the drug stores that were flooded? Are they going to be reimbursed for the taxes paid on cigarettes?

Mr. FORAND. I would not object to anybody getting a refund of taxes on merchandise he cannot dispose of.

Mr. GROSS. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to object to the consideration of this bill until more people are brought under it. If this is good legislation for the liquor dealers it is good legislation for everybody who suffers a loss from a flood who has paid a Federal tax on the goods damaged.

I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. FORAND. Has the gentleman introduced any legislation to that effect?

Mr. GROSS. No, but this legislation ought to be amended to take in everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman is free to introduce any legislation he wants. I assure the gentleman I will go along with him on the refund of taxes on any merchandise that is lost in a flood. Once you have paid a tax on something you do not have, you are entitled to a refund. I hope the gentleman will change his mind and go along with us on this.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not seem disposed to do that. Objection is heard.

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3115, REVISED STATUTES

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6245) to amend section 3115, Revised Statutes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 3115, Revised Statutes, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 258), is amended to read as follows:

"If the owner or master of such vessel furnishes good and sufficient evidence—

"(1) that such vessel, while in the regular course of her voyage, was compelled, by stress of weather or other casualty, to put into such foreign port and purchase such equipments, or make such repairs, to secure the safety and seaworthiness of the vessel to enable her to reach her port of destination; or

"(2) that such equipments or parts thereof or repair parts or materials, were manufactured or produced in the United States, and the labor necessary to install such equipments or to make such repairs was performed by residents of the United States, or by members of the regular crew of such vessel; or

"(3) that such equipments, or parts thereof, or materials, or labor, were used as dunnage for cargo, or for the packing or shoring thereof, or in the erection of bulkheads or other similar devices for the control of bulk cargo, or in the preparation of tanks for the carriage of liquid cargo.

then the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to remit or refund such duties, and such vessel shall not be liable to forfeiture, and no license or enrollment and license, or renewal of either, shall hereafter be issued to any such vessel until the collector to whom application is made for the same shall be satisfied, from the oath of the owner or master, that all such equipments or parts thereof or materials and repairs made within the year immediately preceding such application have been duly accounted for under the provisions of this and the preceding sections, and the duties accruing thereon duly paid; and if such owner or master shall refuse to take such oath, or take it falsely, the vessel shall be seized and forfeited."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, at the beginning of the line insert "Sec. 3115."

Page 2, line 14, after "cargo" insert a comma and the following: "and that the need for such equipments, or parts thereof, or materials could not reasonably have been foreseen when the vessel left the United States."

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.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR AND SUSPENSIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar may be in order on Wednesday of next week, and that the Speaker on Wednesday of next week may recognize for suspension of the rules.

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

Mr. COLMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, may I call the attention of the distinguished majority leader to the bill H. R. 7888, on which there is a resolution out of the Rules Committee? Since that is a privileged resolution, I was hopeful the majority leader might see fit to place that bill on the program for consideration at the earliest possible date.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I recollect the rules, seven legislative days after being reported out of the Rules Committee it is a privileged matter having equal status with other privileged matters that might be before the House at the time. I understand the gentleman, as a member of the Rules Committee, is serving notice on me that he would like to have the resolution programed for next week, when the resolution will have been out of committee over seven legislative days. Is that correct?

Mr. COLMER. That is correct, on my behalf and on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is acting within his rights. I appreciate

the fact that he has taken the method he has to call it to my attention. Under those circumstances, I shall program it for next week. For the gentleman's information, so that he may not think it will be Friday or Saturday of next week, I shall do everything I can to program it for Wednesday.

Mr. COLMER. I just hope the gentleman can program it as early as Wednesday and not later than Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assure the gentleman I shall do everything I possibly can, and as I am talking now I see no reason why it cannot be programed for Wednesday. Of course, I do not know what the situation will be then in relation to conference reports, and so forth. My friend of course is aware of that, as well as I am or any other Member. However, I shall program it for Wednesday. That means that if there is any other matter which takes priority it will be on the program and be the first order of free business.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

#### IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 520)

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 was ordered to be printed as a House document:

##### To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5678, the proposed Immigration and Nationality Act.

In outlining my objections to this bill, I want to make it clear that it contains certain provisions that meet with my approval. This is a long and complex piece of legislation. It has 164 separate sections, some with more than 40 subdivisions. It presents a difficult problem of weighing the good against the bad, and arriving at a judgment on the whole.

H. R. 5678 is an omnibus bill which would revise and codify all of our laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality.

A general revision and modernization of these laws unquestionably is needed and long overdue, particularly with respect to immigration. But this bill would not provide us with an immigration policy adequate for the present world situation. Indeed, the bill, taking all its provisions together, would be a step backward and not a step forward. In view of the crying need for reform in the field of immigration, I deeply regret that I am unable to approve H. R. 5678.

In recent years, our immigration policy has become a matter of major national concern. Long dormant questions about the effect of our immigration laws now assume first-rate importance. What we

do in the field of immigration and naturalization is vital to the continued growth and internal development of the United States—to the economic and social strength of our country—which is the core of the defense of the free world. Our immigration policy is equally, if not more, important to the conduct of our foreign relations and to our responsibilities of moral leadership in the struggle for world peace.

In one respect, this bill recognizes the great international significance of our immigration and naturalization policy, and takes a step to improve existing laws. All racial bars to naturalization would be removed, and at least some minimum immigration quota would be afforded to each of the free nations of Asia.

I have long urged that racial or national barriers to naturalization be abolished. This was one of the recommendations in my civil rights message to the Congress on February 2, 1948. On February 19, 1951, the House of Representatives unanimously passed a bill to carry it out.

But now this most desirable provision comes before me embedded in a mass of legislation which would perpetuate injustices of long standing against many other nations of the world, hamper the efforts we are making to rally the men of east and west alike to the cause of freedom, and intensify the repressive and inhumane aspects of our immigration procedures. The price is too high, and in good conscience I cannot agree to pay it.

I want all our residents of Japanese ancestry, and all our friends throughout the Far East, to understand this point clearly. I cannot take the step I would like to take and strike down the bars that prejudice has erected against them, without, at the same time, establishing new discriminations against the peoples of Asia and approving harsh and repressive measures directed at all who seek a new life within our boundaries. I am sure that with a little more time and a little more discussion in this country the public conscience and the good sense of the American people will assert themselves, and we shall be in a position to enact an immigration and naturalization policy that will be fair to all.

In addition to removing racial bars to naturalization, the bill would permit American women citizens to bring their alien husbands to this country as non-quota immigrants, and enable alien husbands of resident women aliens to come in under the quota in a preferred status. These provisions would be a step toward preserving the integrity of the family under our immigration laws, and are clearly desirable.

The bill would also relieve transportation companies of some of the unjustified burdens and penalties now imposed upon them. In particular, it would put an end to the archaic requirement that carriers pay the expenses of aliens detained at the port of entry, even though such aliens have arrived with proper travel documents.

But these few improvements are heavily outweighed by other provisions of the bill which retain existing defects in our

laws, and add many undesirable new features.

The bill would continue, practically without change, the national origins quota system, which was enacted into law in 1924, and put into effect in 1929. This quota system—always based upon assumptions at variance with our American ideals—is long since out of date and more than ever unrealistic in the face of present world conditions.

This system hinders us in dealing with current immigration problems, and is a constant handicap in the conduct of our foreign relations. As I stated in my message to Congress on March 24, 1952, on the need for an emergency program of immigration from Europe:

Our present quota system is not only inadequate to meet present emergency needs, it is also an obstacle to the development of an enlightened and satisfactory immigration policy for the long-run future.

The inadequacy of the present quota system has been demonstrated since the end of the war, when we were compelled to resort to emergency legislation to admit displaced persons. If the quota system remains unchanged, we shall be compelled to resort to similar emergency legislation again, in order to admit any substantial portion of the refugees from communism or the victims of overcrowding in Europe.

With the idea of quotas in general there is no quarrel. Some numerical limitation must be set, so that immigration will be within our capacity to absorb. But the over-all limitation of numbers imposed by the national origins quota system is too small for our needs today, and the country by country limitations create a pattern that is insulting to large numbers of our finest citizens, irritating to our allies abroad, and foreign to our purposes and ideals.

The over-all quota limitation, under the law of 1924, restricted annual immigration to approximately 150,000. This was about one-seventh of 1 percent of our total population in 1920. Taking into account the growth in population since 1920, the law now allows us but one-tenth of 1 percent of our total population. And since the largest national quotas are only partly used, the number actually coming in has been in the neighborhood of one-fifteenth of 1 percent. This is far less than we must have in the years ahead to keep up with the growing needs of our Nation for manpower to maintain the strength and vigor of our economy.

The greatest vice of the present quota system, however, is that it discriminates, deliberately and intentionally, against many of the peoples of the world. The purpose behind it was to cut down and virtually eliminate immigration to this country from southern and eastern Europe. A theory was invented to rationalize this objective. The theory was that in order to be readily assimilable, European immigrants should be admitted in proportion to the numbers of persons of their respective national stocks already here as shown by the census of 1920. Since Americans of English, Irish, and German descent were most numerous, immigrants of those three national-

ities got the lion's share—more than two-thirds—of the total quota. The remaining third was divided up among all the other nations given quotas.

The desired effect was obtained. Immigration from the newer sources of southern and eastern Europe was reduced to a trickle. The quotas allotted to England and Ireland remained largely unused, as was intended. Total quota immigration fell to a half or third—and sometimes even less—of the annual limit of 154,000. People from such countries as Greece or Spain or Latvia were virtually deprived of any opportunity to come here at all, simply because Greeks or Spaniards or Latvians had not come here before 1920 in any substantial numbers.

The idea behind this discriminatory policy was, to put it baldly, that Americans with English or Irish names were better people and better citizens than Americans with Italian or Greek or Polish names. It was thought that people of west European origin made better citizens than Rumanians or Yugoslavs or Ukrainians or Hungarians or Balts or Austrians. Such a concept is utterly unworthy of our traditions and our ideals. It violates the great political doctrine of the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal." It denies the humanitarian creed inscribed beneath the Statue of Liberty proclaiming to all nations, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

It repudiates our basic religious concepts, our belief in the brotherhood of man, and in the words of St. Paul "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

The basis of this quota system was false and unworthy in 1924. It is even worse now. At the present time, this quota system keeps out the very people we want to bring in. It is incredible to me that, in this year of 1952, we should again be enacting into law such a slur on the patriotism, the capacity, and the decency of a large part of our citizenry.

Today, we have entered into an alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty, with Italy, Greece, and Turkey against one of the most terrible threats mankind has ever faced. We are asking them to join with us in protecting the peace of the world. We are helping them to build their defenses, and train their men, in the common cause. But, through this bill, we say to their people: You are less worthy to come to this country than Englishmen or Irishmen; you Italians, who need to find homes abroad in the hundreds of thousands—you shall have a quota of 5,645; you Greeks, struggling to assist the helpless victims of a Communist civil war—you shall have a quota of 308; and you Turks, you are brave defenders of the eastern flank, but you shall have a quota of only 225.

Today we are protecting ourselves, as we were in 1924, against being flooded by immigrants from Eastern Europe. This is fantastic. The countries of Eastern Europe have fallen under the Communist yoke; they are silenced, fenced off by barbed wire and mine fields; no

one passes their borders but at the risk of his life. We do not need to be protected against immigrants from these countries; on the contrary, we want to stretch out a helping hand, to save those who have managed to flee into Western Europe, to succor those who are brave enough to escape from barbarism, to welcome and restore them against the day when their countries will, as we hope, be free again. But this we cannot do, as we would like to do, because the quota for Poland is only 6,500, as against the 138,000 exiled Poles all over Europe, who are asking to come to these shores; because the quota for the now subjugated Baltic countries is little more than 700, against the 23,000 Baltic refugees imploring us to admit them to a new life here; because the quota for Rumania is only 289, and some 30,000 Rumanians who have managed to escape the labor camps and the mass deportations of their Soviet masters, have asked our help. These are only a few examples of the absurdity, the cruelty of carrying over into this year of 1952 the isolationist limitations of our 1924 law.

In no other realm of our national life are we so hampered and stultified by the dead hand of the past as we are in this field of immigration. We do not limit our cities to their 1920 boundaries; we do not hold corporations to their 1920 capitalizations; we welcome progress and change to meet changing condition in every sphere of life except in the field of immigration.

The time to shake off this dead weight of past mistakes is now. The time to develop a decent policy of immigration—a fitting instrument for our foreign policy and a true reflection of the ideals we stand for, at home and abroad—is now. In my earlier message on immigration, I tried to explain to the Congress that the situation we face in immigration is an emergency—that it must be met promptly. I have pointed out that in the last few years we have blazed a new trail in immigration, through our displaced persons program. Through the combined efforts of the Government and private agencies, working together not to keep people out, but to bring qualified people in, we summoned our resources of good will and human feeling to meet the task. In this program, we have found better techniques to meet the immigration problems of the 1950's.

None of this fruitful experience of the last 3 years is reflected in this bill before me. None of the crying human needs of this time of trouble is recognized in this bill. But it is not too late. The Congress can remedy these defects, and it can adopt legislation to meet the most critical problems before adjournment.

The only consequential change in the 1924 quota system which the bill would make is to extend a small quota to each of the countries of Asia. But most of the beneficial effects of this gesture are offset by other provisions of the bill. The countries of Asia are told in one breath that they shall have quotas for their nationals, and in the next, that the nationals of the other countries, if their ancestry is as much as 50 percent Asian, shall be charged to these quotas.

It is only with respect to persons of oriental ancestry that this invidious discrimination applies. All other persons are charged to the country of their birth. But persons with Asian ancestry are charged to the countries of Asia, wherever they may have been born, or however long their ancestors have made their homes outside the land of their origin. These provisions are without justification.

I now wish to turn to the other provisions of the bill, those dealing with the qualifications of aliens and immigrants for admission, with the administration of the laws, and with problems of naturalization and nationality. In these provisions, too, I find objections that preclude my signing this bill.

The bill would make it even more difficult to enter our country. Our resident aliens would be more easily separated from homes and families under grounds of deportation, both new and old, which would specifically be made retroactive. Admission to our citizenship would be made more difficult; expulsion from our citizenship would be made easier. Certain rights of native born, first generation Americans would be limited. All our citizens returning from abroad would be subjected to serious risk of unreasonable invasions of privacy. Seldom has a bill exhibited the distrust evidenced here for citizens and aliens alike—at a time when we need unity at home, and the confidence of our friends abroad.

We have adequate and fair provisions in our present law to protect us against the entry of criminals. The changes made by the bill in those provisions would result in empowering minor immigration and consular officials to act as prosecutor, judge, and jury in determining whether acts constituting a crime have been committed. Worse, we would be compelled to exclude certain people because they have been convicted by "courts" in Communist countries that know no justice. Under this provision, no matter how construed, it would not be possible for us to admit many of the men and women who have stood up against totalitarian repression and have been punished for doing so. I do not approve of substituting totalitarian vengeance for democratic justice. I will not extend full faith and credit to the judgments of the Communist secret police.

The realities of a world only partly free, would again be ignored in the provision flatly barring entry to those who made misrepresentations in securing visas. To save their lives and the lives of loved ones still imprisoned, refugees from tyranny sometimes misstate various details of their lives. We do not want to encourage fraud. But we must recognize that conditions in some parts of the world drive our friends to desperate steps. An exception restricted to cases involving misstatement of country of birth is not sufficient. And to make refugees from oppression forever deportable on such technical grounds is shabby treatment, indeed.

Some of the new grounds of deportation which the bill would provide are unnecessarily severe. Defects and mistakes

in admission would serve to deport at any time because of the bill's elimination, retroactively as well as prospectively, of the present humane provision barring deportations on such grounds 5 years after entry. Narcotic drug addicts would be deportable at any time, whether or not the addiction was culpable, and whether or not cured. The threat of deportation would drive the addict into hiding beyond the reach of cure, and the danger to the country from drug addiction would be increased.

I am asked to approve the reenactment of highly objectionable provisions now contained in the Internal Security Act of 1950—a measure passed over my veto shortly after the invasion of South Korea. Some of these provisions would empower the Attorney General to deport any alien who has engaged or has had a purpose to engage in activities "prejudicial to the public interest" or "subversive to the national security." No standards or definitions are provided to guide discretion in the exercise of powers so sweeping. To punish undefined "activities" departs from traditional American insistence on established standards of guilt. To punish an undefined "purpose" is thought control.

These provisions are worse than the infamous Alien Act of 1798, passed in a time of national fear and distrust of foreigners, which gave the President power to deport any alien deemed "dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States." Alien residents were thoroughly frightened and citizens much disturbed by that threat to liberty.

Such powers are inconsistent with our democratic ideals. Conferring powers like that upon the Attorney General is unfair to him as well as to our alien residents. Once fully informed of such vast discretionary powers vested in the Attorney General, Americans now would and should be just as alarmed as Americans were in 1798 over less drastic powers vested in the President.

Heretofore, for the most part, deportation and exclusion have rested upon findings of fact made upon evidence. Under this bill, they would rest in many instances upon the "opinion" or "satisfaction" of immigration or consular employees. The change from objective findings to subjective feelings is not compatible with our system of justice. The result would be to restrict or eliminate judicial review of unlawful administrative action.

The bill would sharply restrict the present opportunity of citizens and alien residents to save family members from deportation. Under the procedures of present law, the Attorney General can exercise his discretion to suspend deportation in meritorious cases. In each such case, at the present time, the exercise of administrative discretion is subject to the scrutiny and approval of the Congress. Nevertheless, the bill would prevent this discretion from being used in many cases where it is now available, and would narrow the circle of those who can obtain relief from the letter of the law. This is most unfortunate, because the bill, in its other provisions, would impose harsher restrictions and

greatly increase the number of cases deserving equitable relief.

Native-born American citizens who are dual nationals would be subjected to loss of citizenship on grounds not applicable to other native-born American citizens. This distinction is a slap at millions of Americans whose fathers were of alien birth.

Children would be subjected to additional risk of loss of citizenship. Naturalized citizens would be subjected to the risk of denaturalization by any procedure that can be found to be permitted under any State law or practice pertaining to minor civil lawsuits. Judicial review of administrative denials of citizenship would be severely limited and impeded in many cases and completely eliminated in others. I believe these provisions raise serious constitutional questions. Constitutionality aside, I see no justification in national policy for their adoption.

Section 401 of this bill would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy. This committee would have the customary powers to hold hearings and to subpoena witnesses, books, papers, and documents. But the committee would also be given powers over the executive branch which are unusual and of a highly questionable nature. Specifically, section 401 would provide that "the Secretary of State and the Attorney General shall without delay submit to the committee all regulations, instructions, and all other information as requested by the committee relative to the administration of this act."

This section appears to be another attempt to require the executive branch to make available to the Congress administrative documents, communications between the President and his subordinates, confidential files, and other records of that character. It also seems to imply that the committee would undertake to supervise or approve regulations. Such proposals are not consistent with the constitutional doctrine of the separation of powers.

In these and many other respects, the bill raises basic questions as to our fundamental immigration and naturalization policy, and the laws and practices for putting that policy into effect.

Many of the aspects of the bill which have been most widely criticized in the public debate are reaffirmations or elaboration of existing statutes or administrative procedures. Time and again, examination discloses that the revisions of existing law that would be made by the bill are intended to solidify some restrictive practice of our immigration authorities, or to overrule or modify some ameliorative decision of the Supreme Court or other Federal courts. By and large, the changes that would be made by the bill do not depart from the basically restrictive spirit of our existing laws—but intensify and reinforce it.

These conclusions point to an underlying condition which deserves the most careful study. Should we not undertake a reassessment of our immigration policies and practices in the light of the conditions that face us in the second half

of the twentieth century? The great popular interest which this bill has created, and the criticism which it has stirred up, demand an affirmative answer. I hope the Congress will agree to a careful reexamination of this entire matter.

To assist in this complex task, I suggest the creation of a representative commission of outstanding Americans to examine the basic assumptions of our immigration policy, the quota system and all that goes with it, the effect of our present immigration and nationality laws, their administration, and the ways in which they can be brought into line with our national ideals and our foreign policy.

Such a commission should, I believe, be established by the Congress. Its membership should be bipartisan and divided equally among persons from private life and persons from public life. I suggest that four members be appointed by the President, four by the President of the Senate, and four by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The commission should be given sufficient funds to employ a staff and it should have adequate powers to hold hearings, take testimony, and obtain information. It should make a report to the President and to the Congress within a year from the time of its creation.

Pending the completion of studies by such a commission, and the consideration of its recommendations by the Congress, there are certain steps which I believe it is most important for the Congress to take this year.

First, I urge the Congress to enact legislation removing racial barriers against Asians from our laws. Failure to take this step profits us nothing and can only have serious consequences for our relations with the peoples of the Far East. A major contribution to this end would be the prompt enactment by the Senate of H. R. 403. That bill, already passed by the House of Representatives, would remove the racial bars to the naturalization of Asians.

Second, I strongly urge the Congress to enact the temporary, emergency immigration legislation which I recommended 3 months ago. In my message of March 24, 1952, I advised the Congress that one of the gravest problems arising from the present world crisis is created by the overpopulation in parts of Western Europe. That condition is aggravated by the flight and expulsion of people from behind the iron curtain. In view of these serious problems, I asked the Congress to authorize the admission of 300,000 additional immigrants to the United States over a 3-year period. These immigrants would include Greek nationals, Dutch nationals, Italians from Italy and Trieste, Germans and persons of German ethnic origin, and religious and political refugees from communism in Eastern Europe. This temporary program is urgently needed. It is very important that the Congress act upon it this year. I urge the Congress to give prompt and favorable consideration to the bills introduced by Senator HENDRICKSON and Representative CELLER (S. 3109 and H. R. 7373), which will imple-

ment the recommendations contained in my message of March 24.

I very much hope that the Congress will take early action on these recommendations. Legislation to carry them out will correct some of the unjust provisions of our laws, will strengthen us at home and abroad, and will serve to relieve a great deal of the suffering and tension existing in the world today.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 25, 1952.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill printed as a House document.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### SHOULD AN OLD MASSACHUSETTS INDUSTRY BE PENALIZED?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my alarm over the strangulation of the fishing industry of Massachusetts by vastly increased imports of groundfish fillets from other nations. If the trend continues, as it shows every sign of doing, the investment of many millions of American capital will be wiped out and thousands of men who have made fishing a lifelong career will be out of work. The ports of Boston, New Bedford, and Gloucester are particularly affected.

In the case of Gloucester, a community of some 25,000 people, the fishing industry gives employment, directly or indirectly, to more than two-thirds of the entire working population. Consequently, the banking, mercantile, in fact the entire business structure of the city depends for survival on the local fisheries. If they are destroyed, Gloucester will become a dead city, since it can turn to no other industry.

In 1940, less than 10,000,000 pounds of fillets entered this country from foreign sources, principally from Canada and Newfoundland. Five years later, this figure had risen to more than 43,000,000 pounds. In 1950, imports mounted to nearly 67,000,000 pounds, and, in 1951, soared to more than 87,000,000 pounds.

For the first 4 months of 1952 imports had reached 42,734,478 pounds compared with 31,662,446 pounds in the same period of 1951. If imports continue at the same rate throughout the current year, total imports will rise to the fantastic total of more than 110,000,000 pounds. In other words, imports would reach something like 75 percent of total New England production. I think it fair to say that, unless emergency measures are taken to correct the situation, the crack of doom is sounding for an industry which has

flourished in New England for many generations.

The increased imports are coming from Iceland, Norway, Denmark, Greenland, particularly Iceland, whose production of groundfish fillets mushroomed during World War II. Before 1940 annual Iceland production was around 1,000,000 pounds. By 1945 it had grown to 53,000,000, and in 1949 to 80,000,000 pounds. Because of the loss of European markets, Iceland exports dropped thereafter, but the United States has taken more than 15,000,000 pounds in the first 4 months of this year.

I am a firm believer in the philosophy of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, for which Cordell Hull labored so long and ably; and I am a firm believer in subsequent international agreements by which other nations have been enabled to sell their products in the United States, as we sell our products to them. World trade can never be a one-way street. But neither the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act nor any international agreement has ever contemplated the assassination of an industry, such as is now happening in Massachusetts.

To make that perfectly clear, Congress last year passed H. R. 1612, now Public Law No. 50 of the Eighty-second Congress, otherwise known as the Bailey amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This resolution provides that if a product on which a concession has been granted is being imported into this country in such amounts that the domestic industry is being seriously injured, or is threatened with serious injury, then the concession may be withdrawn, modified, or an import quota established to afford proper and adequate protection to that industry. The fishing industry of Massachusetts is asking for such relief through the United States Tariff Commission.

It is rather ironic that the filleting of fish, an American idea for which a huge market has been developed, has backfired against its originators. Formerly, whole fish, bones and all, were sold to the retail markets. Fillets consist of boneless slabs of flesh cut from the sides of fish. These slabs are wrapped in cellophane and packed in 5- or 10-pound laminated cardboard boxes. Foreign nations have seized this popular idea and, because of lower labor and other costs and because of governmental subsidies of various kinds, have been able to take over a large part of the American market.

Under prevailing tariff formulas, it has been determined that in the current year, more than 31,000,000 pounds of groundfish fillets can be imported at the very low rate of 1 1/8 cents per pound, and an unlimited amount at the rate of 2 1/2 cents. These rates offer small obstacles to foreign producers, whose costs of processing, packing, and freezing fillets give them an advantage of from 11 to 15 cents a pound in shipping fillets to this country. When a duty of 1 1/8 or 2 1/2 cents is deducted, foreign operators still have a wide margin of operation.

These other countries pay considerably lower sums to their fishermen than we

do. The same is true of workers who process the fish. In addition, the governments of these competing countries have subsidized the building of vessels, processing plants, and freezers and even have subsidized transportation. In some cases, American money has financed these subsidies schemes, so that American taxpayers have helped foreign governments to compete unfairly with our own countrymen.

Two years ago, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, with industry's cooperation, asked Congress to supply funds for study of the possibility of freezing fish at sea. Such a development would be revolutionary in its implications for our Massachusetts fishing industry because of cost reductions. The appropriation requested was small, just enough to cover bare necessities, such as transfer of a trawler to the Fish and Wildlife Service. Yet Congress cut the amount so drastically that it has become impossible to operate the trawler for more than 6 months at a time, seriously hampering the progress of the study.

At the same time, ECA was able to find \$750,000 to give to Portugal to build and maintain a hospital ship for its countrymen who were fishing the Grand Banks. ECA was able to give Indonesia \$1,200,000 to develop its commercial fishery potentials. Iceland got \$315,000 to buy industrial supplies and commodities, including cardboard boxes used in packing fillets. I make no criticism of ECA's remarkable efforts to strengthen the war-torn economies of other countries, but I do insist that when its efforts tend to wreck American industry, action should be taken to redress the balance.

As I have said, the present tariff duties represent no obstacle to the foreign producer. His heavy original advantage of low cost allows him a very high mark-up at the selling point. Our own domestic fillet is based upon actual cost of manufacturing plus a normal mark-up. The foreign producer, having a greater gross profit at the outset, assures himself of a substantial net profit by offering his fillets at prices slightly below those listed for American-produced fillets.

It is freely admitted by the Massachusetts fishing industry that if the American housewife were able to buy foreign fillets for much less than domestic fillets would cost her, then it could not logically sustain a case against importers. But that is not true.

There is very little difference, if any, between the retail prices of the domestic fillet and the retail price of the imported fillet. So, actually, the domestic producer finds himself in the unhappy predicament of providing an umbrella for the foreign producer. Surely such a situation cannot have been contemplated by the philosophy of the reciprocal-trade pacts.

I have spoken of the need for emergency relief, and I now cite to you some very significant evidence, namely, the telltale one of rising inventories. On January 1, 1952, there were nearly 21,000,000 pounds of ocean perch in cold storage, compared with less than 10,000,000 pounds in 1951. In other words,

there was an increase of 11,000,000 pounds—an amount impossible to move on any regular-price schedule. The result is to throw fish on the market at sacrifice prices—real losses.

These are the portents of disaster.

I am obviously not arguing for exclusion of all foreign groundfish fillets from the American market, but only for a realistic approach of live and let live. I believe a fair and equitable quota limitation should be established. I believe that the rate of duty on all fillets should be adjusted so as to provide a greater degree of protection for the domestic industry.

Recognition of the problem was given by the Committee on the New England Economy in its July 1951 report to the President of the United States, when it said that one of the major problems "facing the New England fishing industry is the increasing competition from foreign sources. Imports provided only 4 percent of United States consumption of fresh and frozen fish in 1931; they accounted for 23 percent in 1948."

As a Member of Congress from Massachusetts, I believe it is my grave duty to call attention to what seems a classic case of inequity and injustice to an industry which for many generations has been interwoven with the honorable and gallant traditions of my State.

#### 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:

Mrs. KEE and to include a sermon delivered by the Rev. E. A. deBordenave, rector of Old Christ Church, Philadelphia, Pa., on the occasion of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI and to include a resolution by the Back of the Yards Council of Chicago.

Mr. LYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLLING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CLEMENTE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANTAFF and to include a letter.

Mr. RANKIN on the so-called soldiers' voting bill and include a speech he made on this subject when the matter was before the House several years ago.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW and to include an editorial.

Mr. MULTER in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter, and to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a colloquy between herself and the gentleman from Texas last week, which through error was not in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SKES and to include extraneous material.

Mr. RHODES and to include an editorial.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida to revise and extend his remarks made today and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BONNER.

Mr. DOYLE in three instances and to include appropriate material.

Mr. HAVENNER and to include a radio broadcast.

Mr. LYLE to include with his remarks on the Smith amendment a compilation of powers heretofore granted by the Congress to the President of the United States.

Mr. POULSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of New York in three instances and to include two resolutions and an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENISON and to include extraneous matter, and also to extend his remarks previous to the vote on the Smith amendment.

Mr. OSTERAG in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania and to include a statement on two bills which passed on June 23.

Mr. SADLAK and to include an editorial.

Mr. FINE and to include extraneous material.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAVIN.

Mr. O'NEILL and to include an editorial.

Mr. JOHNSON.

#### 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. 2813. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Collbran reclamation project, Colorado;

H. R. 7405. An act to provide for an economical, efficient, and effective supply management organization with 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; and

H. R. 7714. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2214. An act to amend section 709 of title 18 of the United States Code.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 21, 1952:

H. R. 5990. An act to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; and

H. R. 6291. An act to amend section 281 (f) of the Social Security Act with respect to effective dates of agreements entered into with States before January 1, 1954.

On June 24, 1952:

H. R. 160. An act to amend section 5192 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the reserves of certain national banks;

H. R. 699. An act for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Richards, owner of the Bozarth Nursing Home, Toppenish, Wash.;

H. R. 812. An act for the relief of Karel Vaclav Malinovsky;

H. R. 856. An act for the relief of Dr. James F. Spindler;

H. R. 885. An act for the relief of Heinrich von Biel, Margarethe von Biel, and Doris Schumann;

H. R. 966. An act for the relief of Mrs. Solveig Normanson;

H. R. 1097. An act for the relief of Ethel White, Frankie Ezell, and Ralph James;

H. R. 1261. An act for the relief of Alexander L. Wiesiolowski;

H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of Francis A. Gunn;

H. R. 1690. An act for the relief of Carl M. Campbell, James R. White, and Frederick J. Powers;

H. R. 1788. An act to authorize the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole Tribes of Indians to make contracts with approval of the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of Margaret Frankel;

H. R. 2221. An act for the relief of Gertrude Manhal;

H. R. 2296. An act for the relief of Mother Anna Fasulo;

H. R. 2413. An act for the relief of the Klooman Instrument Co., Inc.;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of Mrs. Beverly Brunell Roth;

H. R. 2595. An act for the relief of Clarice D'Amico and Chiara Antonucci;

H. R. 2629. An act for the relief of Dr. Leonidas M. Peppas;

H. R. 2718. An act for the relief of Enrique M. Orpilla;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of Philip Fugh, Sarah Liu Fugh, and John Fugh;

H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of James Nels Ekberg;

H. R. 2832. An act for the relief of Leszek Kazimierz Pawlowicz;

H. R. 3155. An act for the relief of Sebastiano Bello, Dino Bianchi, Pierino Ciccarese, Vincenzo Dall'Aida, Vittorio De Gasperi, Salvatore Puggioni, Giovanni Battista Volpato, and Leone Montini;

H. R. 3220. An act for the relief of Joseph Wynn Steel and William Peter Kruse;

H. R. 3501. An act for the relief of Takae Nomura;

H. R. 3534. An act for the relief of Gabriella Rubido Zichy;

H. R. 3616. An act for the relief of the Pacific Fruit Express Co.;

H. R. 4067. An act for the relief of Samuel Thomas Wong;

H. R. 4070. An act for the relief of Isabelle F. Story;

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of Clarence Sudbeck;

H. R. 4344. An act for the relief of Clyde R. Sharp;

H. R. 4465. An act for the relief of Angela Moniz McCracken;

H. R. 4543. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla Crowley;

H. R. 5185. An act for the relief of Epi-  
fania Giaccone;

H. R. 5208. An act for the relief of Sor Eufrasia Gomez Gallego, Sor Francisca Gil Martinez, and Sor Rosalia De La Maza;

H. R. 5301. An act for the relief of Leonard Jesse Richards (Michio Inoue);

H. R. 5349. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edith P. Powell;

H. R. 5479. An act for the relief of the estate of Floyd L. Greenwood;

H. R. 5526. An act for the relief of Dr. J. Ernest Ayre;

H. R. 5543. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elisabeth Rosalia Haste;

H. R. 5599. An act to provide for the conveyance of the Centre Hill Mansion, Petersburg, Va., to the Petersburg Battlefield Museum Corp., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5687. An act for the relief of Peter Mihaly Berend;

H. R. 5755. An act for the relief of Chong So Yong;

H. R. 5759. An act for the relief of Chizuko Nakagami;

H. R. 5957. An act for the relief of Veronica Merita Ritson;

H. R. 6010. An act for the relief of Mrs. Len-  
nie G. Clarkson and William E. Clarkson;

H. R. 6023. An act for the relief of Fred Augustus Snead, Jr.;

H. R. 6117. An act for the relief of Delina Meulenkamp;

H. R. 6152. An act for the relief of Lucille Hujima;

H. R. 6231. An act for the relief of Gordon Uglow;

H. R. 6259. An act to authorize the admission of Wong Ng Chin Chun to the United States;

H. R. 6264. An act for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne;

H. R. 6500. An act to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder;

H. R. 6635. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6754. An act to provide that salaries of rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes shall not be reduced by reason of increases in the length of such routes;

H. R. 6857. An act to amend section 7a of the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928;

H. R. 6943. An act to fix the seniority rights and service of Albert O. Raeder as sergeant in the District of Columbia Fire Department;

H. R. 7030. An act to amend certain acts and parts of acts which require the submission of documents to the Post Office Department under oath, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7253. An act to authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-In Asylum of certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7496. An act 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, 1955, the period for authorization for appropriations for carrying out the purposes of the act as amended;

H. R. 7758. An act to revise certain laws relating to the mail-messenger service;

H. R. 7783. An act to increase certain rates of veterans' compensation provided for specific service-incurred disabilities, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7877. An act to amend section 1699 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the unloading of mail from vessels.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL to be absent from the sessions of the House for the balance of the week beginning at 4:30 this after-

noon to attend a meeting of the Missouri Basin Conservation Commission in Denver, as well as the Democratic Party congressional and State assemblies in Colorado on Friday and Saturday.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for 1 week, on account of official business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 26, 1952, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1602. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of April 1952, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1603. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of each of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1604. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of each of certain laws enacted by the First Guam Legislature, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 360, Eighty-first Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1605. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend section 372 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of additional judges when permanently disabled judges fail to retire"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1606. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to provide an income credit in the case of civil service annuities received by nonresident alien individuals not engaged in trade or business within the United States"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1607. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, of the exchange stabilization fund created by section 10 (b) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, including a summary of operations of the fund from its establishment to June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 10 (a) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### 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. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 51. A bill to change

the name of Medicine Creek Reservoir in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska to Harry Strunk Lake; without amendment (Rept. No. 2296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMULLEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7487. A bill to amend section 1 of the act approved June 27, 1947 (61 Stat. 189); with amendment (Rept. No. 2297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7553. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Coronado International Memorial, in the State of Arizona," approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 630); without amendment (Rept. No. 2298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REGAN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8341. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681); without amendment (Rept. No. 2299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LARCADE: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8194. A bill to amend an act approved May 26, 1928, relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 2307). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMULLEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7104. A bill to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1065), as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8273. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday; without amendment (Rept. No. 2309). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 556. An act authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 554. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; with amendment (Rept. No. 2311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6436. A bill to change the name of the Bonneville Power Administration to the Columbia Power Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 2313). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. S. 1989. An act to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington as Rufus Woods Lake; without amendment (Rept. No. 2314). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee of Conference. H. R. 7072. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Report No. 2315). Ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. McMULLEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6274. A bill to authorize the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles I. Chattin; without amendment (Rept. No. 2295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6938. A bill for the relief of Wong Gook Ying; without amendment (Rept. No. 2300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6969. A bill to effect entry of a minor child adopted by United States citizens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7164. A bill for the relief of Peter Roussetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos Metritikas; without amendment (Rept. No. 2302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7713. A bill for the relief of Giesela Helen Snowdy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7833. A bill for the relief of Prof. Werner Richter; with amendment (Rept. No. 2304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7850. A bill for the relief of Leopold Laufer and Elfriede Laufer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8163. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Hohmeier; without amendment (Rept. No. 2306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2582. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain tract of land in Russell County, Ala., to W. T. Heard; without amendment (Rept. No. 2312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:  
H. R. 8355. A bill to establish a legal holiday to be known as American Management Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:  
H. R. 8356. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOVRE:  
H. R. 8357. A bill to provide for the control of noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:  
H. R. 8358. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOODWIN:  
H. Res. 709. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 1918) for the relief of Dewey J. Crites, Jack Mayta, and James Willette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

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

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature urging the establishment of a national cemetery for the New England area, to be located within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HESELTON: Memorial of the Senate of Massachusetts urging the establishment of a national cemetery for the New England area, to be located within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Senate of Massachusetts urging the establishment of a national cemetery for the New England area to be located within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, urging the establishment of a national cemetery for the New England area, to be located within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:  
H. R. 8359. A bill for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:  
H. R. 8360. A bill to provide for perfecting the title of C. A. Lundy to certain lands in the State of California heretofore patented by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:  
H. R. 8361. A bill for the relief of Pavol J. Oias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:  
H. R. 8362. A bill for the relief of Carlo Andreoli or Carlo Mario Fernando Andreoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HARDEN:  
H. R. 8363. A bill for the relief of Sin Hyun Sook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:  
H. R. 8364. A bill for the relief of the Sheamatson Trucking Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:  
H. R. 8365. A bill for the relief of Iechek Fajncajg and Chaja Fajncajg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:  
H. R. 8366. A bill for the relief of Elie Joseph Hakim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:  
H. R. 8367. A bill for the relief of Kogyo and Shizuye Kathleen Yonegaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:  
H. R. 8368. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Aitcheson Lock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:  
H. R. 8369. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Sasaki; 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:

770. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 25 residents of Ellwood City, Pa., urging that Army

clubs for enlisted men, post exchanges and other service-connected recreation areas should be prohibited from serving and selling alcoholic drinks; to the Committee on Armed Services.

771. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of 50 people in Pendleton, Lapel, Fortville, and McCordsville, Ind.; in behalf of H. R. 2188 (Bryson bill); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

772. Also, petition of 75 members of the Friends Church of Amboy, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188 (Bryson bill); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

773. Also, petition of 51 members of the South Kokomo, Ind., W. C. T. U.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

774. Also, petition of 57 people in Macy, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188 (Bryson bill); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

775. Also, petitions of 301 residents of the city of Anderson, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188 (Bryson bill); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1952

(Legislative day of Saturday, June 21, 1952)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

God our Father, we would make our hearts, cleansed by Thy forgiving grace, a temple of Thy presence, knowing that only to the pure dost Thou grant the vision of Thy face. We come asking not that Thou wouldst give heed to the faltering petitions our lips frame, but that Thou wilt bend Thy ear to the crying of our deep needs. We bring to the altar of prayer our inmost selves, cluttered and confused, where good and evil, the petty and the great are so entwined. May the eternal immensities shame our little thoughts and ways. May the vision of what we might be convict us of what we are. In this great day of Thy testing, when mankind faces the blessing or the curse, life or death, may we not miss the things belonging to our peace and to the peace of the world. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 25, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 2256. An act for the relief of Col. Julia O. Flikke and Col. Florence A. Blanchfield; and

S. 3019. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend

the application of the special-inducement pay provided thereby to physicians and dentists, and for other purposes.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1267. An act to reimburse the Stamey Construction Co. and/or the Oklahoma Paving Co., as their interests appear; and

H. R. 4277. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 404. An act to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 1853. An act to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands; and

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Robert A. Buchanan.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7860) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. SIKES, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 430) approving the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mrs. BOSONE, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6245. An act to amend section 3115, Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 6845. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7594. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8234. An act to amend section 5 of the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of Supervisor of New York Harbor;

H. R. 8271. An act to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 8315. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8316. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain, and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said Commission, and for other purposes.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 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. 2198. An act to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally;

H. R. 404. An act to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 1267. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Stamey Construction Co. and/or Oklahoma Paving Co.;

H. R. 4277. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.; and

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Robert A. Buchanan.

### SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from October 1, 1951, to March 31, 1952, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 26, 1952.

### THIRD SPECIAL REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the