

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 698. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct an investigation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 8283. A bill for the relief of Lloyd D. Bernard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8284. A bill for the relief of Ezra H. Y. Eliahou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 8285. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laura J. McClure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 8286. A bill for the relief of Angelo Staffani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 8287. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosaline Spagnola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 8288. A bill for the relief of Steven J. Charia, Nevanka Olga Maria Charia, Tania Charia, and Igor Ivan Charia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 8289. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonietta Palmieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8290. A bill for the relief of Ludmilla Orange; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 8291. A bill for the relief of Lester Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 8292. A bill for the relief of Wally Krausnick Paeschke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 699. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 8255) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Cooper Tire & Rubber Co."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 700. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 4507) for the relief of John J. Braund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 1952

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 10, 1952)

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

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

O Lord our God, Thy goodness is ever before us and Thy mercy has followed us all our days. Facing problems and difficulties that test our power to the limit, save us from being cynical or faint-hearted. May we be strengthened in our own day and generation by the remembrance of joyous adventurers, builders of our free land, who came before us and who have nobly striven and bravely dared in the cause of Thy kingdom. We

are inspired by the thought of those whose lips were fragrant with prayer, whose eyes were radiant with hope, whose hearts were strong with courage, and whose minds were like lighted temples. O God, to us may strength be given to follow in their train. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 18, 1952, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

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 18, 1952, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1932) to authorize the establishment of facilities necessary for the detention of aliens in the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws, and for other purposes.

## ABSENTEE VOTING BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES—COMMUNI- CATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is in receipt of a communication from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read the communication, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, June 19, 1952.

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,

President of the Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I urge that the Congress give early and favorable attention to the measures now pending before it to enable the men and women in our armed services to exercise their right to vote. Close to a million members of our armed services may be unable to cast their votes this year unless the Congress acts on these matters before adjournment.

On March 28, in a message to the Congress, I recommended that certain steps be taken to facilitate the exercise of the franchise by our servicemen and service-women and by certain Federal personnel serving overseas. These recommendations were based on a careful study made by an expert committee of the American Political Science Association. A bill to effect improvements in existing law, in accordance with these recommendations, was introduced as S. 3061 by Senator GREEN in the Senate and as H. R. 7571 by Representative McCORMACK in the House. I was pleased to see a few days ago that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration had favorably reported Senator GREEN's bill with amendments.

The study made by the committee of the American Political Science Association pointed out the obstacles to soldier

voting that are presented by the laws of many of our States. The committee recommended prompt remedial action by these States and special Federal action for this year only to aid service men and women from States that fail to take action to improve their laws before November.

In a letter to me on April 30, which I transmitted to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the Secretary of Defense described the efforts he was making to encourage the States with inadequate legislation to improve their laws, but concluded that since the majority of the States in this category would not convene their legislatures in 1952 the prospects for further State action this year was not bright. I notice that the report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration on S. 3061 comes to the same conclusion and urges Federal action to rectify the situation. The Senate committee report finds that servicemen's voting laws are inadequate in at least one-half of the States and urges speedy enactment of the bill.

There is another important reason why the Congress should take early action. The basic legislative affirmation in our Federal laws of the right of service people to vote is contained in two provisions of the servicemen's voting law of 1946, which are effective only in time of war. Since the Japanese Peace Treaty came into effect on April 28, 1952, thereby terminating the state of war, these provisions, together with other war and emergency powers, have been temporarily extended from time to time by the Congress—on the last occasion to June 30. However, the pending measure for the permanent continuation of some of the war and emergency powers, House Joint Resolution 477, does not include these provisions affirming the right of members of our armed services to vote. Therefore, unless action is taken on S. 3061 and H. R. 7571, the very declaration of the right of our soldiers to vote will disappear from the Federal statutes. When we have soldiers overseas defending the cause of freedom, it is unthinkable that we should go backward instead of forward in enabling them to exercise the rights that all citizens possess.

In addition to enunciating the basic rights of our service people to vote, S. 3061 makes a series of recommendations for State action, prescribes certain steps for Federal agencies to follow, particularly with respect to post-card applications for State ballots, provides for a temporary Federal ballot for use in those States which do not give service people an adequate opportunity to vote, and contains a number of important miscellaneous provisions, such as those making voting matter postage free and protecting against fraud and undue influence in voting in the Armed Forces.

All these provisions are important if we want our service people to exercise the rights they are defending for us. I hope the Congress will take prompt action to pass this vital legislation.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The communication will lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe that yesterday the majority leader made an announcement that immediately upon disposition of the unfinished business, which is the civil-functions appropriation bill, it was his intention to move to proceed to consideration of Senate bill 3061, a bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, regardless of State laws. The announcement by the majority leader with regard to the bill to which the President's letter refers will be found on page 7529 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 18, 1952.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I had intended to make the same statement. The majority leader has assured me that my bill, which has been recommended for favorable action and is on the calendar, would probably be brought up tomorrow.

#### EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY AUSTRALIAN SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a letter to the United States Ambassador to Australia by the president of the Australian Senate, expressing appreciation of the resolutions adopted by the United States Senate on the death of His Majesty King George VI, which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and to lie on the table, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, June 13, 1952.

The VICE PRESIDENT,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am enclosing a copy of a letter sent to Ambassador Pete Jarman by the president of the Australian Senate, reporting a resolution passed by the senate expressing appreciation of the resolutions passed by the United States Senate on the death of His Majesty King George VI.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,  
Assistant Secretary.

(Enclosure: Copy of letter from president, Australian Senate.)

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,  
Canberra, Australia, May 21, 1952.  
His Excellency Mr. PETE JARMAN,  
Ambassador of the United States of America.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to advise that when the Senate of the Commonwealth of Australia met this day I informed members of the resolution passed by the Senate of the United States on February 6, 1952, in connection with the death of His Majesty King George VI.

The following resolution was thereupon passed by the senate:

"That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Australia thanks the Senate of the United States most sincerely for its resolution of February 6, 1952, relating to the death of His Majesty King George VI, and records its appreciation of the feelings of sorrow and sympathy to which the resolution gives expression."

I shall be glad if you will arrange for the terms of this resolution to be conveyed to the Senate of the United States.

I have the honor to be, with high consideration,

Your Excellency's obedient servant,  
EDWARD MATTNER,  
President of the Senate.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

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

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

##### REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### CONSTRUCTION OF TWO SURVEYING SHIPS FOR COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the construction of two surveying ships for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

##### PROCESSING TAX ON COCONUT OIL—LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OF PHILIPPINE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to the request of the Ambassador of the Philippines, a letter from the president of the Chamber of Commerce of the Philippines relating to the elimination of the 3 cents processing tax on coconut oil (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

##### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Erie County Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N. Y., signed by Jean A. Martin, clerk, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of E. H. Bumhour, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the adoption of Senate Resolutions 41 and 105, relating to amendment of the cloture rule; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The petition of E. H. Bumhour, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the elimination of the so-called Dirksen, Fulbright, Robertson, and Bricker amendments to the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter from the Governor of the State of Montana, transmitting a copy of House

bill 329, of the Montana Legislature, authorizing the State of Montana to join with other States and with the United States in an interstate civil defense and disaster compact (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Ponce (Puerto Rico) Chamber of Commerce, praying for the repeal of the Andresen amendment to the Defense Production Act, relating to the importation of oils, cheese, and butter from other countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A declaration of policy adopted by the convention of the Illinois Bankers Association, at Chicago, Ill., relating to the preservation of a dual banking system, and so forth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by "DOBRUS" (Democratic organization of Ukrainians formerly persecuted by the Soviet Government), of New York, N. Y., favoring the approval of the Genocide Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Democratic State Committee of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., signed by Orlando J. Antonsanti, acting chairman, and Jose A. Benitez, secretary, praying for the approval of the Puerto Rican Constitution; ordered to lie on the table.

#### THE DEFENSE BUDGET—STATEMENT FROM THE AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a statement on the defense budget from the Air Force Association to the Members of the Senate. It is signed by Harold C. Stuart, president of the Air Force Association, and L. A. Larson, commander, State of Wisconsin.

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

##### A STATEMENT ON THE DEFENSE BUDGET FROM THE AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION TO MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Within a few days you will be called upon to engage the enemy in a battle for command of the air, just as surely as if you were piloting an F-86 over MIG Alley.

I refer, of course, to the forthcoming vote in the Senate on the defense budget for the 1953 fiscal year, and particularly the airpower portions of the budget.

##### WHERE COMMAND OF THE AIR BEGINS

As Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, then our chairman of the board, stated more than a year ago in Air Force magazine, "the battle for command of the air begins not over the battlefield but in the White House, in Congress, in the press, on the drawing boards, and on the production lines."

Since that time the administration has seen fit to postpone the readiness date for the Air Force program from 12 to 18 months beyond the critical target date of July 1, 1954, recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The House of Representatives has stretched out our airpower capability even further, to late 1957. Activity on the drawing boards and production lines has been deliberately retarded. Our citizens have become confused over the increasing gap between the airpower strength of Russia and the free world.

##### THIS BUDGET IS THE TURNING POINT

The 1953 defense budget, as Air Secretary Finletter recently put it, "is the turning



point in the decision as to whether we will have the kind of an Air Force that can determine whether we will have war or not have war."

The Air Force Association took exception to this defense budget at a time when it was decidedly unpopular to do so, when we were a voice in the wilderness crying against the airpower stretch-out as "a shabby excuse for programing the Nation's military requirement beyond the critical security date while maintaining a business-as-usual civilian economy and assuring a politics-as-usual election year."

Since then the arguments advanced to support the stretch-out have fallen by the wayside, one by one. The evidence is available to you in statements made before your Appropriations and Armed Services Committees, and particularly your Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee; and yet a number of misconceptions continue to prevail regarding our airpower capability.

You have been told, for example, that the Air Force has nearly 15,000 planes in active use, as if this indicated an adequate airpower build-up. The important question, of course, is how does the strength of our Air Force compare with that of Russia? Your Appropriations Committee received the answer recently from Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Acting Chief of Staff of the Air Force. The Soviet Union, he said, has "about 20,000 aircraft in organized air units and an equal number in the back-up and various other forms of reserve."

#### RUSSIA'S AIR SUPERIORITY

Then General Twining made a point which illustrates how misleading that 15,000-plane figure (which includes thousands of non-combat types) can be. "The figure to keep in mind," he said, "is the number of aircraft in organized combat air units; for that is a measure of immediate combat potential. Almost all of the 20,000 aircraft in the Soviet Union's organized air units are land-based combat aircraft. This is twice as many combat aircraft as are presently in organized combat units of the United States Air Force and naval aviation combined. Compared to the sizable reserves of Soviet aircraft, the United States Air Force has virtually none."

You have been told, "We are trying to build the world's best air force, not the biggest." If this is an effort to justify the fact that Russia's MIG-15's outnumber our F-86's by about a 6-to-1 margin in Korea, the American airmen over MIG alley cannot appreciate this reasoning. They know that the Reds can take air supremacy away from them almost at their leisure. They know that our 8-to-1 superiority in air combat to date—also cited to help justify the airpower stretch-out—is hardly a realistic barometer of relative air strength in the Korean war. The Soviet Union is committing to combat only a portion of its vast jet armada in the Far East and is using MIG alley as a training area, probably for future conflicts.

#### A MOST DANGEROUS CONCEPT

But more important than our position in Korea is this theory that we do not have to match the Soviet Union in numbers of modern aircraft. This is a most dangerous concept to be promulgated upon the public. General Spaatz has said that in counting our air-power needs the United States has but one alternative: "We must outmatch Russia in numbers of modern planes, and must build aircraft toward that goal."

There is no valid reason why the United States, in its position of world leadership, should be outnumbered in the air by the Soviet Union. At this critical juncture in our history, you are being called upon to rectify this situation.

As for building the world's best air force, we must not delude ourselves with the belief that we are necessarily ahead of the enemy in the race for qualitative superiority. The MIG-15, at least as good as our best operational interceptor, is merely an indication of what Russia can do in quality of weapons—and she now has better and faster planes in production.

At present our Air Force is sadly lacking in modern planes. General Twining, before your Appropriations Committee, explained that "the large-scale production of jet-propelled aircraft, with speeds approaching and exceeding that of sound, has rendered obsolete or obsolescent all comparable piston-driven combat aircraft." And he added that the Air Force inventory of combat aircraft is made up of planes "of which nearly three-quarters still consist of World War II piston-driven types." Thus, only one-fourth of the aircraft in today's Air Force can be classed as modern.

#### ONLY 25 MODERN WINGS

This, in itself, answers another claim; namely, that the 95-wing Air Force, authorized in 1950, will be achieved this summer virtually on schedule. The 95-wing program, it must be remembered, called for modern aircraft in all units. Under that program, 80 wings were to have been combat types. From General Twining's statement it can be concluded that at present we have an Air Force of less than 25 modern combat wings. And still we stretch out our airpower capability.

The key to "the world's best air force" is to be found in its research and development program. The record shows that Congress hasn't cut, in recent years, the military's request for airpower research and development funds. However, serious cuts have occurred before the requests reached Congress, at the Department of Defense level.

#### THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CUTBACK

The Air Force, for example, requested some \$725,000,000 in research and development funds for the 1953 fiscal year, and made strong pleas to the Research and Development Board of the Department of Defense that it grant the Air Force this money. Instead, the Board arbitrarily cut the request to \$580,000,000. It was subsequently reduced to \$525,000,000, which amount the Senate is now considering. Despite the truly "fantastic" weapons in the offing, Air Force research and development is being handicapped by this cut-back in funds.

We ask that the Senate consider the funds proposed for the Air Force in terms of modern air weapons on hand to control world balance of power. It seems clear to us that without this balance in our favor the free world is subject to blackmail of the worst sort, and possibly surprise atomic attack.

The airpower stretch-out already has taken its toll. It has slowed the pace of aircraft production below the industry's capability. It has retarded vital research and development programs. It has weakened the aircraft industry's subcontracting program, and thereby weakened the industry's production base. It has increased the unit cost of air weapons. (Due solely to the stretch-out, for example, the unit cost of the B-36 already has been increased by some \$160,000.) It has proved beyond question of doubt that a stretch-out of production schedules breeds further stretch-outs.

#### ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-THREE WINGS BY JULY 1, 1954

The issue, as we see it, is one of integrity. The slippage we hear so much about is too often a state of mind. We have bypassed target dates for security, and subsequently delivery dates for military goods as if they

had no meaning. You, Mr. Senator, must hold the line. Only you can make it possible to return to the Joint Chiefs of Staff original estimate of the situation (which has never been refuted) that 143 modern wings (126 combat plus 17 transport wings) must be in being by July 1, 1954; that anything less would be hazardous to the Nation's security.

The Senate is being asked to consider an Air Force budget for fiscal year 1953 which, according to the administration, should total \$20,700,000,000, and which would deliver the air power desired by late 1955 or early 1956. The Senate also is considering a budget of \$19,200,000,000, approved by the House, which would deliver this air power late in 1957. The Senate should provide, we submit, funds for a budget which would deliver 143 modern wings by July 1, 1954, a budget which, it is estimated, would cost about \$25,500,000,000, and which should include, as a priority item, \$725,000,000 for Air Force research and development.

#### WE NEED SENATE LEADERSHIP

It will be argued, of course, that we have lost so much time due to stretch-out that the July 1, 1954 date, under limited mobilization, is impossible of achievement. The stretch-out, however, is based on an it-can't-be-done philosophy. As an organization, we are in close touch with both the military and the industry. We think it can be done—that 143 modern wings by July 1, 1954, can be achieved—without full mobilization—if the Nation is given the necessary leadership.

We ask the Senate to assume that position of leadership and, in so doing, alert our military, our industry, and our people to the extent that, as a Nation, we become fully aware of the threat which Communist aggression has imposed upon us.

HAROLD C. STUART,

President, Air Force Association.

L. A. LARSON,

Commander, State of Wisconsin.

JUNE 13, 1952.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H. R. 6500. A bill to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder; without amendment (Rept. No. 1793).

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

S. 2459. A bill to equitably adjust the salaries of auditors at central accounting post offices; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1797).

By Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 3072. A bill to extend the 1½ cents per pound second-class mailing rate to publications of certain alumni associations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1798);

H. R. 7758. A bill to revise certain laws relating to the mail-messenger service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1799); and

H. R. 7877. A bill to amend section 1699 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the unloading of mail from vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 1794).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 5426. A bill relating to the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1795).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 7405. A bill to provide for an economical, efficient, and effective supply management organization within the Department of Defense through the establishment of a single supply cataloging system, the standardization of supplies and the more efficient use of supply testing, inspection, packaging, and acceptance facilities and services; with amendments (Rept. No. 1796).

### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 19, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1527. An act for the relief of Sisters Dolores Illa Martori, Maria Josefa Dalmau Vallve, and Ramona Cabarrocas Canals; 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.

### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3360. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of 150 years of Highway Freight Transportation Progress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3361. A bill for the relief of Norberto Linaza Yrigoyen and Maria Josefa Maseda Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 3362. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Lemoine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 3363. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lotte Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution authorizing an inquiry by the Federal Trade Commission into certain practices and activities of private companies engaged in the production, distribution, or sale of electrical energy in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

### POSTAGE STAMP COMMEMORATING 150 YEARS OF HIGHWAY FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION PROGRESS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of 150 years of Highway Freight Transportation Progress. I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement relating to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

The bill (S. 3360) to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of 150 years of Highway Freight Transportation Progress, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the importance of overland freight transportation and the need for publicly owned interstate highways was first given formal recognition by the Seventh Congress in 1802. That act of 1802, entitled "An act to enable the people of the eastern division of the territory northwest of the river Ohio to form a constitution and State government, and for other purposes," provided:

That one-twentieth part of the net proceeds of land lying within the mid State (Ohio) sold by Congress, from and after the 13th of June next, after deducting all expenses incident to the same, shall be applied to the laying out and making public roads, leading from the navigable waters emptying into the Atlantic, to the Ohio, to the said State, and through the same, such roads to be laid out under the authority of Congress, with the consent of the several States through which the road shall pass.

That legislation marked the first recognition of the industry which now employs 5,500,000 men and women. The trucking industry now moves, all or part of the way, 75 percent of everything the Nation eats, wears, and uses.

The importance of the trucking industry to Michigan and to the Nation cannot be overestimated since it serves every business, agricultural, industrial, and defense activity in the Nation.

In view of these facts, I hope this bill will receive early consideration, together with the companion bill which I understand is being introduced in the House by Representative J. CALEB BOGGS, of Delaware, who is interested in the proposed legislation.

### PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES OF PRIVATE UTILITIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution authorizing an inquiry by the Federal Trade Commission into certain practices and activities of private companies engaged in the production, distribution, or sale of electrical energy in interstate commerce. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in connection with the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 168) authorizing an inquiry by the Federal Trade Commission into certain practices and activities of private companies engaged in the production, distribution, or sale of electrical energy in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON ON PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES OF PRIVATE UTILITIES

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF ELECTRICITY

America today stands at a critical point in her destiny. As the world's greatest industrial country, her future is dependent upon maintaining the pace of her development. This cannot be done without electricity—without the whole pattern of power resources required by the factories of our immense economy. On the one hand we can view endless vistas of progress—limited only by our resources and our power, and on the other hand we can see the threat of the degrading, abject slavery of communism.

Electric power has a vital role to play in keeping America strong and helping to shape that future. The reason is all around us. It is thus of direct concern to every American to see that the development of electric power not only continues unflinchingly in the future, but also that it is sold at a price that will make possible its widest, maximum usage.

Consequently, electric power is a matter not exceeded in importance by any other subject now pressing for action before this Congress. Merely mention aluminum, copper, steel, atomic energy, hydrogen bomb or practically any aspect of modern industry and living, and you will find that electric power is a basic part thereof.

#### KNOWING WHAT POWER COSTS

America has expanded to its present heights by means of private enterprise, initiative, and inventiveness. In the realm of electric power America has grown still greater by the sharp yardstick of public power that only recently entered the power scene. For a long time it was a trade mystery, but now, for the first time, the public knows what it costs to generate, transmit, and distribute electric power. Now also, for the first time, the American people know what the same private utilities are charging their customers for electricity in the same State, and in other parts of the Union. We likewise know what public power is doing throughout America and the world.

Naturally, this has irked the private utilities. The private utilities are like the private conveyors of mail before the Federal post office system was established—or the private owners of roads and pikes that preceded our present public-roads system—or the railroad buccaneers of the nineteenth century—or the private suppliers of city water that preceded the municipal ownership of our water services. Similarly, the private utilities have long regarded their monopoly to supply electric service as an exclusive domain in which they could operate pretty much like private enterprise.

#### PUBLIC YARDSTICK

The public never shared this view. Early in the development of these private utilities, the State recognized that since they were affected with a public interest, a private utility could not operate the same as private enterprise. The rights of the public had to be protected—and all activities that were contrary to such public interest were to be regulated and modified or prohibited. But such regulation, with the end-



less series of legal battles, never worked effectively. So yardsticks were developed in the form of public power projects—not to supplant the private utilities—but to afford effective competition—and thus keep the service up; and the rates down.

It is important to recite these obvious facts—as they are not so obvious to the private utilities. At times they seem to forget that they are granted an exclusive monopoly privilege, without any competition, and are guaranteed a profit on their investment—upon condition that they serve the public at the lowest rates consistent with sound operating practices.

#### THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION UTILITY INVESTIGATION

This is a subject very close to the pocket-book of most of the American people. Back in 1928, the public was aroused by certain activities of the private utilities—so an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission followed.

While that is a long time ago, many of us still remember the findings of the Federal Trade Commission pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 83 of the Seventieth Congress, first session. With a staff of 50 economists, lawyers, and accountants, the Federal Trade Commission spent over 7 years investigating the propaganda and related activities of the private utilities in the United States.

It is important that we now recall the principal conclusions that the Commission found, in over 80 volumes of sworn testimony and documentary exhibits. For once again it is being charged in responsible quarters that the same utilities are engaging in the same activities—at a time when all of us believed that the private utilities had cleaned house.

And what did the Federal Trade Commission find? Before answering this question, we should state that all the findings of the Federal Trade Commission were drawn—not from adverse or conflicting testimony—but from the documents, declarations, and sworn testimony of the private utilities themselves.

#### SUMMARIZING THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION INVESTIGATION

In now summarizing these findings, it should be recognized that I am not opposing the right of the private utilities to set forth their views honestly and openly upon any subject—provided that they do so with their own funds and not with money received from customers that should be used to improve service or reduce rates.

Turning now to the investigation of the private utilities, which began in 1928, we find the private utilities were engaged in 12 different types of propaganda activities. The essence of the findings of the Federal Trade Commission which follow discloses that these propaganda activities of the private utilities were not open and above-board, but concealed. Secretly, they had others whom they financed or controlled, speak in their behalf—thus giving the public the impression that the various private groups or individuals were honestly setting forth their own private views. As a matter of record, these so-called private views were actually the carefully planned views of the private utilities, in disguise.

Here, then, are the main findings of the Federal Trade Commission:

##### KINDS OF PUBLICITY

1. Since 1919, the electric utilities have carried on an aggressive national propaganda campaign, using their own agencies as well as outside organizations, and actively employing all forms of publicity, except "sky writing." This propaganda was National, State and local in character. It was carried on by geographic associations, State associations, State committees or "bureaus of pub-

lic-utility information." There were 28 such bureaus, and they covered 36 of the most populous States.

2. The Federal Trade Commission found that in circulating such propaganda, the private utilities frequently engaged in secret activities in order to block the full expression of opposing views on public power. Often methods of indirect approach were employed by the private utilities in order to get their propaganda to the public. In doing so, injunctions of secrecy were given, so that the private utility source of such propaganda would not be known to the public.

I remind you, I am reciting the conclusions of the Federal Trade Commission—reached after 7 years of searching investigation—beginning in 1928.

##### DISPARAGING PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

3. The Federal Trade Commission found that the subject of this concealed private-utility propaganda was to disparage all forms of public ownership of utilities, and the preachment of the economy, efficiency, and general excellence of the privately owned utilities. This was done under the greatest campaign ever conducted by private interests in this country.

##### CAREFULLY CONSIDERED PLANS

4. The Federal Trade Commission found that these propaganda activities were carefully considered and planned by the heads of the private-utility industries. The sponsors and planners of this propaganda fully recognized its character and objective.

##### USING SUBSIDIZED AGENCIES

5. The Federal Trade Commission findings show that the private utilities carried on their propaganda through a number of subsidized agencies. They took full advantage of the good will that was induced by their advertising expenditures, and in a number of instances newspapers, or a controlling interest in them, were acquired.

I continue with the Federal Trade Commission's conclusions.

##### INFLUENCING EDUCATION

6. The Federal Trade Commission findings disclose that the private utilities influenced schools, colleges, and universities in numerous effective ways. School men were influenced to favor the private utilities through jobs, speaking engagements, planning utility courses, making utility studies, writing articles, by having direct money payments made to many educational institutions, through favorable textbooks, by eliminating matter in publications deemed unfair or prejudicial by the utilities, or by bringing pressure on the largest publishers for the effect it would have on the smaller ones.

##### PRIVATE-UTILITY COMMITTEES

7. The Federal Trade Commission findings reveal that the private utilities had various committees for keeping in touch with the industries of this country. Likewise these committees kept in touch with many associations such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions Club, Women's Clubs, churches or clergymen.

##### OPPOSING PUBLIC POWER

8. The Federal Trade Commission findings disclose that the private utilities made repeated attacks upon every outstanding public-power project whether in existence or contemplated, including much propaganda against the proposed Muscle Shoals and Boulder Dam Government projects.

##### PINNING THE RED LABEL UPON OPPONENTS

9. The Federal Trade Commission findings show that a favorite method of attack was—not to meet the public-ownership argument—but to pin the Red label on their proponents, and thus condemn those who advocated the public ownership of public

utilities as Bolsheviks, Reds, or parlor pinks.

Evidently creeping socialism was then unknown. To many of my colleagues, who have supported public power on this floor, some of the above labels will have a very familiar ring.

##### UPHOLDING STATE REGULATION

10. While the Federal Trade Commission found that only in a few instances was there any effective State regulation, nevertheless the utilities proclaimed the complete effectiveness of such regulation as a foil to any further Federal or local regulation, or to any form of public ownership and operation.

##### DIRECT POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

11. The Federal Trade Commission found that in many States, the utilities engaged in direct political activities against any project of a public nature, and favored men and measures agreeable to the privately owned utility program.

##### CREATING A HALO AROUND THE PRIVATE UTILITIES

12. Finally, the Federal Trade Commission found that while the private utilities were engaged in all these activities to disparage public or municipal ownership and operation, the utilities pursued their ultimate objective of creating a halo around their own practices.

##### ARE THEY DOING THE SAME THINGS AGAIN?

The charge has been made—in highly responsible quarters—that the private utilities or their agents again are engaged in similar activities directed against: the public ownership of electric utilities; the public ownership of the generation, transmission, or distribution of electric power; rural electric cooperatives; multipurpose projects; preference for public bodies in Federal power developments; the construction and operation of Federal transmission lines; wheeling, and other private utility contracts concerning the transmission and distribution of electric power; and related public power matters.

There is a well established American tradition that a person is innocent until he is proven guilty. In order for us to find out the facts, I have introduced the resolution asking that the Federal Trade Commission make an investigation of the activities of the private utilities in this country. I am pleased to say that Senators GILLETTE, GREEN, HILL, KEFAUVER, LANGER, LEHMAN, MORSE, MURRAY, and TOBEY join me in offering this resolution.

#### DEFINITION OF PHRASE "PEACE-LOVING STATE" IN UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. BREWSTER (by request) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 85), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas it is universally admitted that the common people of all countries are overwhelmingly opposed to war; and

Whereas history very definitely indicates that the dictatorship state breeds war and that real democracy promotes peace; and

Whereas for all practical purposes the tremendous power of religion to prevent war has never been harnessed; and

Whereas the record of the United Nations clearly indicates the great need for growth and progress; and

Whereas there is an extremely urgent need to strengthen and promote democracy on a scale never before attempted in the world's history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States favors the adoption of the following definition of the phrase,

"peace-loving state," as used in article 4, of the United Nations Charter:

"A peace-loving state is hereby defined as any nation which gives its people the right to vote in a referendum for peace or war, except in the case of direct invasion and except for the use of joint military power by this Organization."

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that any member nation of the United Nations which does not comply with this definition taking the necessary political action within 5 years after its adoption by the United Nations, shall be automatically dropped from membership in the United Nations.

SEC. 3. The Congress requests the President to instruct our Chief Delegate to the United Nations to take all steps possible to effect the purposes of this resolution.

#### AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE—AMENDMENT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the resolution (S. Res. 203) amending the cloture rule with respect to the number required for adoption of a cloture motion. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, together with a statement I have prepared in connection with the amendment, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike all after the word "Resolved," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That (a) subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, is amended to read as follows:

"2. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'"

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other

matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

"(b) Subsection 3 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to cloture, is amended to read as follows:

"3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the fourteenth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays), he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'"

"During the period intervening between the statement of the motion to bring debate to a close and the taking of the vote thereon the time for general debate on such motion shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents thereof, and shall be controlled by one Senator designated by the Presiding Officer to control such time for the proponents and one Senator designated by the Presiding Officer to control such time for the opponents. Time available to, but not used by, either such side shall be yielded to the other side.

"If the question so submitted on the motion to bring debate to a close shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

The amendment in the nature of a substitute is similar to Senate Resolution 105, which was submitted by me, for myself

and several other Senators, earlier this session. It would provide first for effective cloture, and secondly, it would remove the immunity of the rules themselves to change through the process of orderly debate.

The amendment recommended by the majority of the rules committee to the Wherry rule, rule 22, makes little if any significant change in the present situation.

The proposal I and my colleagues are submitting as a substitute would make rule 22 into an effective rule to limit debate. Our proposal consists of three parts: The first part of the proposed substitute provides for cloture or limitation of debate by a vote of two-thirds of those present and voting, after a waiting period of 2 days. This section of the rule is designed to be invoked for legislation of a national emergency nature where at least two-thirds of the Senate desired speedy action. Under this section of the rule, two-thirds of the Senate could order that debate on a question or motion be henceforth limited to 1 hour per Senator and that no dilatory motions would thereafter be entertained.

To meet the need for democratic decisions on nonemergency legislation, a separate section of the rule is proposed. This second section would make cloture possible after 15 days by the vote of a majority of those present and voting. The 15-day period is provided to give Senators in a minority position ample opportunity to appeal to public sentiment and to arouse public support for their position.

The two sections of this rule are independent of one another but they are interconnected. Cloture may be invoked under section 2, or it may be invoked under section 3 of the proposed new rule. If cloture fails under section 2, cloture may be attempted under section 3.

The proposed new rule repeals outright that provision of rule 22, now found in subsection 3, which exempts amendments to the rules, or any motion incident thereto, from any limitation of debate whatever.

There are several reasons why I am submitting this substitute cloture rule today. The foremost reason is that I believe its adoption is essential to the elimination of the present barrier to civil rights legislation, consisting of the filibuster.

I say this and will continue to say it as long as I am in the Senate—the battle for men's minds and souls in the world-wide struggle against communism can be lost on the floor of the United States Senate because we are immobilized in our attempts to assure equal opportunity and equal rights for all of our citizens.

Here we sit today in the most influential and potentially powerful deliberative body in the world and there is a sword of Damocles hanging over our heads suspended by only the thread of self-restraint on the part of individual Members of the Senate. That thread can break at any time, on any issue. It could happen and thus prevent the ratification of the essential Western European defense treaties which will soon come before us. A filibuster could start on the military appropriation bill or on a measure to authorize funds for our atomic weapons program. This threat is an intolerable reflection on the judgment of the majority of the United States Senate.

I need not go into the long legal and constitutional arguments which were brought out in the hearings held on the cloture rule last year.

My colleagues who are supporting this change in rule XXII and I believe that the present cloture rule is the type which Fascist or Communist minorities work hardest to obtain in democratic legislatures. The principle of majority rule is one of the great bulwarks against totalitarian minority groups who attempt to invade the democratic legislatures of the free world.



Such a rule as the present rule XXII of the United States Senate, if it were to be adopted by the legislative bodies of France or Italy, would surely bring the legislative wheels of these countries to an immediate halt. These great democracies would be at the mercy of their undemocratic minorities. A rule XXII in the present French Parliament would be worth more than a million new party members to the French Communist Party. I ask my colleagues, Is this the example the Senate of the United States wants to set for the free world?

I am convinced, and many students of our Constitution are convinced, that there is no sanction in the Constitution of the United States for the present clause 3 of rule XXII. There are five instances in the Constitution where a two-thirds vote of the quorum, not of the entire Senate membership, is required. The five instances are—impeachment, expulsion, overriding a veto, Senate ratification of a treaty, and proposals to amend the Constitution.

The only time the Constitution makes mention of a vote of the two-thirds of the entire membership is in the remote case when it might be called upon to elect a Vice President of the United States.

Here, in a mere procedural rule, the Senate has seen fit to require an absolute two-thirds. I repeat—nowhere can a constitutional sanction be found for this rule—and no stretch of the imagination can conceive of arguments as to why such a rule adopted by the Senate of one Congress should bind a succeeding Senate.

This will be, I am sure, an issue in the coming elections. It will be an issue among all those who believe in removing this dangerous threat to effective self-government, and who feel that the majority should rule, while giving to the members of the minority the same protections as are accorded to the members of the majority.

I have little hope that we can get action on this measure this year.

But we must have action, and I believe that the people of this country are going to insist on action.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

#### 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. FLANDERS:

A Declaration to a World in Crisis, adopted at the conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership, held in Holland, May 22 to May 25, 1952.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Editorial entitled "New Bill," published in the June 14, 1952, issue of the Pilot.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

Editorial entitled "Full Year of Stalemate," published in the Elizabeth City (N. C.) Daily Advance of June 17, 1952.

#### PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF CHARGES BY SOVIET UNION OF GERM WARFARE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to speak upon what I consider to be a

very important matter relating to our foreign policy. I ask that I may have 10 minutes in which to address the Senate and present the matter for the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise today in order to present what I feel is a constructive suggestion to cope with what has become a major problem of American foreign policy. I refer to the problem caused by the Soviet Union's spreading of the big lie, the monstrous lie that we have been using germ warfare in Korea.

I am going to make a suggestion which I earnestly trust President Truman may see fit to accept, and which I hope the State Department and our military may also feel is worthy of acceptance.

Yesterday Mr. Jacob Malik, Soviet Representative on the U. N. Security Council, called a meeting to discuss what we know to be phony charges that the United States has waged germ warfare in Korea. Thus, once more the Soviet Union showed its intent to use every instrumentality available to it to try to impress upon the world the outrageous lie of American guilt of spreading germ epidemics in Korea.

Now, Mr. President, I am not only seeking to nail this particular big lie "to the mast" and expose it for the foul fraud that it is; I am taking this step because I am firmly convinced that all of us must be more adequate in meeting the challenges of this age of propaganda, whether those challenges exist at home or abroad.

BIG LIE USED TO POISON MINDS OF AMERICANS, TOO

Josef Stalin did not invent the technique of the big lie any more than Adolph Hitler did; nor is the big lie confined simply to international relations. The scapegoat technique, for example, is as old as the oldest dictatorships of history. Here at home there have been propaganda experts, too, who have used every foul device systematically to poison the minds of the public. They utilize propaganda stratagems to create waves of emotionalism, of synthetic thinking, rather than calm, reasonable, logical review of the facts. I will not name them, let the shoe remain on whoever foot it fits.

In this political period, where passion runs high on all sides, where anxious men and their supporters seek highest public office—in this time is provided the greatest opportunity for true leaders to demonstrate their leadership, their worthiness for public office, by rejecting the use of false weapons of propaganda, the big lie or the little lie, the big smear or the little smear. Let the November 1952 election be won on fact, not on falsehood. Let each side have the courage and fair play to talk issues, not personalities, to promote understanding, not bigotry.

Sometimes some of us in public life feel that we might almost interrupt completely our regular functions in order to smash down the propaganda weapons

so maliciously used in current affairs. But then we recognize, as did Lincoln, that if we were to spend our time debunking the falsehoods spread about others or about ourselves, we would have time for little else.

REDS USE BIG LIE FOR MANY REASONS

But in the field of international relations, we must devote attention toward "debunking" the big lie. Why? Because the Soviet Union is using the big lie for many ominous purposes, not just one.

First she is spreading the big lie about us as a diversionary tactic in order to arouse fear and bitter hatred of the United States among her own population and the populations of the slave states. In that way, she is trying to channel the discontent against Soviet tyranny into a hatred of the far-distant American people. The Soviets have read the lesson of history—how dictators have used hatred of foreigners in order to divert hatred against domestic authorities.

Secondly, the Soviets are hoping to weaken the infant democratic movements in the Asiatic countries by destroying the various peoples' admiration for the great fountainhead of representative government—the United States.

By weakening the democratic movements, the Soviet Union thereby hopes to strengthen the Communist minorities throughout Southeast Asia, for example.

Third, the Soviets have the specific purpose of alibiing the obvious existence of genuine epidemics of disease—for which they themselves are responsible—which have apparently decimated masses within the North Korea and Chinese Red armies; epidemics due to the primitive medical conditions and callous disregard for human life existing in the Red lands.

Naturally the Soviets cannot confess their own inefficiency and disrespect for human life, and so they seek to shift the blame to the United States.

REDS MAY BE PREPARING "BW" USE

Fourth, the grave possibility is that the Soviets are seeking to pin on us a charge of the use of a diabolic weapon—bacteriological warfare—which they themselves may be preparing to use in the future in Korea or elsewhere. Warnings to this effect have repeatedly been made by United Nations military authorities. Who knows, too, how germ warfare may figure in the Kremlin's plans against continental United States itself—in the event of a third world war?

WE UNDERESTIMATED RED PROPAGANDA EFFECTIVENESS

Mr. President, I have often warned against either over-estimating or under-estimating the Soviet Union. In this instance of germ warfare charges, I believe that America and indeed United Nations diplomats sadly underestimated the Soviet propaganda wizards.

When the first charges of germ warfare were made against us, a great many so-called skilled diplomats here and elsewhere dismissed them lightly and assumed that the falsehoods would be completely ignored by the civilized world.

But the well-oiled machinery of the Cominform and its puppet Communist Parties in lands like France and Italy

were sadly underrated in their ability to "sell" the big lie.

The Soviets have not missed the slightest bet for propaganda attack; thus on Gen. Matthew Ridgway's arrival in France, he was greeted by Communist demonstrators carrying banners calling him "microbe killer" and Fascist criminal." General Ridgway's reaffirmation in Italy on Tuesday that the germ charge was a fraud was of course hooted and jeered at by the Red forces.

And so, the lie campaign continues. In the streets of the cities of Europe have appeared innumerable posters and signs showing the Americans as killers engaged in microbe manslaughter.

As one illustration of the amazing gullibility of even so-called informed individuals, I cite the instance of John W. Burton, permanent head of the Department of External Affairs for the previous Australian Labor Government. Mr. Burton has now lent his name to the present anti-American drive.

I have seen other evidences that not just known sources sympathetic to communism, but sources which we might regard as being genuinely "neutral" or even leaning toward our side—have swallowed the Red line hook, line, and sinker.

I say that the time is overdue for American diplomacy to seize the offensive to "scotch" the big lie.

To be sure, we have already taken such steps as transmitting Voice of America broadcasts which have rebutted the Soviet charges.

We have challenged the Communists to permit an open investigation by the International Red Cross, an organization known for its impartial and unselfish service. The Soviets, however, contended that such an investigation would not be satisfactory since the Russians said that the International Red Cross had become a "tool" of the United States.

#### REDS INSIST ON RATIFICATION OF GERM WARFARE PROTOCOL

Soviet Russia, with typical craftiness has demanded immediate ratification of the Geneva Protocol of June 1925 concerning biological warfare. Jacob Malik has cited the fact that the United States, although a signatory to that protocol did not ratify it, whereas the Soviet Union, Britain, France, China, and five other members of the Security Council had ratified or acceded to the convention.

We, however, have rightly pointed out that the Soviet Union continues completely to refuse to enter into a conference on general and effective control of various types of weapons.

We feel that it is absurd for us to attempt to deal piecemeal with any one weapon such as biological warfare alone, when obviously the "Big H"—the hydrogen bomb and other dreadful weapons hover over the world.

#### IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATIONS SUGGESTED

Mr. President, I specifically recommend that the President of the United States call upon the Government of the Soviet Union to accept an impartial investigation of the charges of germ warfare under the following conditions:

First. The Committee on Investigation shall be appointed by three well-

known statesmen, of a caliber recognized for political and diplomatic independence, and whose nations are likewise recognized for their independence and sovereignty.

Second. The report of this Committee shall be given due note in the press of the Soviet Union and that of our country. In particular, the Soviet Union shall pledge itself to print the report within the pages of Pravda, and I for one shall pledge to print the report, subject to intrinsic limitation on space, within the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I believe that statesmen of the caliber of Prime Minister Nehru of India and President Soekarno of the Republic of Indonesia shall be the type to recommend this investigation committee.

I believe further that the Committee should consist of outstanding leaders of Asia, since it is they who are most vitally concerned with the charges which have been leveled. We dare the Soviet Union to accept this challenge. We dare it to place its faith in the judicial decision of Asia's own statesmen.

#### BIGGER LIES STILL TO COME

Mr. President, I want us to succeed in smashing this big lie because we may be sure there will be bigger lies to come. The germ-warfare charge is but one of the opening rounds of a bout which may be of relatively unlimited duration.

If we of the West prove our weakness in this early round, we can be sure that the skilled Soviet "boxers," completely ignoring the Marquis of Queensbury rules, will be using thumbing, gouging, and every other illegal device of the prize ring or the propaganda ring.

Communism being founded upon the lie, is at home in its spreading of lies. There is no fabrication too bold, no falsehood too immoral for those whose code of conduct is based upon absolute audacity, absolute immorality in achieving their ends.

But I refuse to accept the idea that we of the democracies must be perpetually second best in the propaganda game.

We have the brains. We have the truth. We have the cause. There is no reason under the sun why the Nation which has perfected advertising to an art, a Nation which knows salesmanship better than any other nation, should be perpetually second best in the propaganda war.

#### TO LOSE BATTLE OF MINDS IS TO LOSE BATTLE OF BATTLEFIELD

Let us bear in mind, too, that the Soviets know that their propaganda lies fall on particularly fertile soil in the minds of the largely illiterate masses of Asia, peoples who are just beginning to have the opportunity and facilities to exercise their native reason and judgment, peoples long oppressed in darkness—peoples now longing for the light.

We have learned only belatedly that we must win the battle of men's minds if we are to win the battle of the physical battlefield. Today in North Korea, in Indochina, in Malaya, misguided native peoples, armed and equipped by the Kremlin, are murdering American boys, French boys, and English boys; and they, in turn, are dying.

The Soviet masters of the Kremlin are planning for still further outbreaks in southeast Asia and elsewhere. It is up to us to make absolutely sure that more misguided millions in these and other areas do not become the dupes of international communism and do not take up arms to destroy the very forces of freedom which are one of their greatest hopes for achieving the better way of life. By point 4 and other aids, by our own previous record of unselfishness, by our own traditional support of the yearnings for the sovereignty of all ex-colonial peoples, by our own traditions of 1776, we have signified our common bond with the restless, rising masses of Asia. Let us not lose them by our failure to antidote the poison which is being inoculated into them.

#### WE MUST ANTIDOTE POISON WITH TRUTH SERUM PROMPTLY

Poison does not cure itself. Poison requires a specific antidote. The venom of the Communist snake must be combated by the more powerful serum of truth.

It is time to make sure that never again do we allow ourselves to fall so far behind in using the antidote so long after the snake bite occurs.

We have lost uncounted millions already—in whom the venom of hatred against the West has taken hold. Let us lose none further.

Let the leaders of both Democratic and Republican Parties address themselves to constructive problems of this sort, above and beyond partisan politics, in the international realm.

Meanwhile, as we combat the propaganda lie on the foreign front, let us ever remember that we have a responsibility on the domestic front, to set an example of fairness, of decency, of sportsmanship, which we have come to think of as characteristic of the American way.

#### CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, H. R. 7268.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Civil functions, Department of the Army—Cemeterial expenses," on page 3, line 2, after the word "cemeteries", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert \$4,319,350."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized for a few minutes to make a statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did I understand the Senator from Tennessee to say that he will make a statement before the committee amendments are considered?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I should like to make a very brief statement.



Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan, and the Senator from New Hampshire desire to make a motion to recommit the bill. We should like to make that motion prior to the consideration of any amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the bill as reported to the Senate recommends appropriations in the amount of \$666,774,699, which is \$45,853,101 below the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget and \$174,339,799 above the amount of the bill as passed the House.

Before considering this bill which provides for carrying on the civil functions of the Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1953 I should like to make a few observations.

During the past 128 years, that is, since 1824, appropriations for the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers have totaled \$8,000,000,000, including the \$680,900,000 in the approved budget estimate for the fiscal year 1953. Of this amount \$5,911,000,000 was for construction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works which briefly states the accomplishments of the Corps of Engineers in the development of our rivers and harbors in the interest of navigation, flood control, and power development.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ENGINEERS,  
Washington, June 12, 1952.

Hon. KENNETH McKELLAR,  
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McKELLAR: In response to your verbal request, I am pleased to furnish you the following information regarding the Federal Civil Works program.

The total appropriations during the past 128 years (since 1824) for navigation, flood control and related improvements have amounted to \$8,000,000,000, including \$680,900,000 in the approved Bureau of the Budget estimate for fiscal year 1953. This total appropriation has been utilized (or allocated insofar as the amount for fiscal year 1953 is concerned) as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	River and harbor	Flood control	Total
New work (construction)...	2,410.3	3,500.7	5,911.0
Maintenance and operation...	1,342.7	233.6	1,576.3
Miscellaneous and surveys...	276.9	244.8	521.7
Total.....	4,029.9	3,979.1	8,009.0

Of the total appropriations for rivers and harbors, about half has been for seacoast and Great Lakes harbors and channels and the remainder has been used for inland and intracoastal waterways.

These relatively small appropriations over a century and a quarter have permitted the improvement of 417 commercial ports (286 coastal and 131 Great Lakes), as well as the provision of a number of harbors for refuge and for small fishing and recreational craft. These harbors and channels have been improved progressively to meet the needs of maritime and lake commerce to provide this country with the best port facilities avail-

able to any nation in the world. Cargo handled at these ports has risen from about 463,000,000 tons in 1929 to 630,000,000 tons in 1950. These facilities have proved their essentially as basic elements of our economic and industrial structure, and in our ability to wage war or aid the nations associated with us in keeping the peace.

The federally improved inland and intracoastal waterways, exclusive of the Great Lakes channels, aggregate some 27,000 miles in length. However, about 80 percent of the commerce is carried on some 15 major waterways, which have also received about 80 percent of the Federal expenditure for this purpose. Total traffic moving on the improved inland waterways has shown a tremendous increase from 8,600,000,000 ton-miles in 1929 to 51,700,000,000 ton-miles in 1950, an increase of about 500 percent in the 22-year period. In terms of transportation savings to shippers and receivers of cargo, these waterways are currently paying off at a rate of well over \$2 for every dollar of Federal cost. Moreover, during World War II these waterways proved their value to the national defense by providing protected routes for bulk movement of petroleum and other basic materials, thus relieving the overburdened railroads to accommodate faster-moving traffic. In addition, more than 4,000 landing craft and small war ships were built along inland waterways and floated to the sea via federally improved channels.

The current Federal flood-control program is relatively new and dates essentially from 1928, when the major project for the Alluvial Valley of the Mississippi River was authorized by Congress. Since that time and through fiscal year 1951 a total of 330 flood-control and multiple-use projects, including those for the Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers, have been placed in operation, and over 80 projects are now under construction.

The works completed or in operation now serve to prevent flood damages estimated to average more than \$300,000,000 annually, and since 1928 they have prevented an accumulated flood damage of well over \$5,000,000,000 as compared with the total of \$2,300,000,000 that has been appropriated for their construction and operation through fiscal year 1952. The major project for the Alluvial Valley of the Mississippi River has at its present stage of completion returned over \$5 in benefits for every dollar expended; and the general flood-control program, where projects have been in operation less than a decade, on the average, has already repaid in benefits more than half of its cost, and the useful life of these projects is actually just beginning.

The works completed or in operation now protect over 860 communities and over 26,000,000 acres of agricultural land, with an aggregate population of about 4,600,000 in protected areas. These works are distributed widely over the country; located in 46 States of the Union.

Appropriations for prosecution of the program for flood control and related purposes have produced other important features. Hydroelectric power installations authorized by Congress and constructed under this program total about 1,000,000 kilowatts of generating capacity and an additional 5,500,000 kilowatts are now under construction to meet the expanding industrial needs for both civil and military requirements. In addition the program is producing large collateral benefits. Civil works projects are aiding in control of stream pollution; municipal water supplies are being provided from 12 reservoirs; the works are providing important facilities for preservation of fish and wildlife that would not otherwise be available; and recreational facilities provided by reservoir management programs attracted 26,000,000 visitors in 1951.

The Federal appropriations for flood control have proved to be one of the soundest

investments of public funds that this country has ever made.

The relatively small appropriations for surveys have enabled the Corps of Engineers to keep this program up to date and present to Congress soundly conceived reports and recommendations on new improvements and modifications of existing projects which have been found necessary over the years. Appropriations for miscellaneous work are those for the continuing and general authorities which Congress has delegated to the Chief of Engineers. These include such work as removal of wrecks, clearing and snagging of navigation channels, flood fighting and emergency repair of flood protection works. Appropriations under these general and continuing authorities and for surveys account for about 6.5 percent of the total civil works appropriation to date. Although this work thus constitutes a very small part of the civil works program it has been most important in keeping the program up to date and in permitting the accomplishment of minor work of an emergency or annually recurring nature in an economical and effective manner.

I trust that the foregoing summary of the appropriations for civil works and of the status and accomplishments of the civil works program will provide the information you desire. If further details and supporting data are needed I shall be glad to supply them.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. CHORPENING,  
Brigadier General, USA, Assistant  
Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to digress long enough to say that I believe the Army engineers to be the greatest organization of engineers anywhere in the world. They know their business; they are honest and upright, and efficient in every sense of the world. When they come before the committees of Congress they give to the committees accurate, full, and sound advice. Their management and control of the work entrusted to them has been characterized by ability and professional skill. I can say that from personal knowledge and observation of their activities during my service in the House and in the Senate for a period of nearly 42 years.

Mr. President, I should now like to call the Senate's attention to the number of United States dollars we are spending to develop the power, water, and soil resources of foreign countries. Direct appropriations for such projects from ECA funds in the fiscal year 1951 amounted to \$244,575,000; but, in addition, almost \$4,000,000,000 has been set aside in a drawing account, called counterpart funds, for such projects.

Today we are spending for such purposes more money abroad than we are spending at home. Not only are we spending these enormous sums of money in foreign countries, but we are spending them without limitation. On the other hand, in this bill the House has provided a limitation on the expenditure of funds in the United States, and that limitation would prohibit any expenditures for planning in connection with projects in the United States in the future. The attitude of the House of Representatives seems to be that we do not need to plan for America, but that we must make plans for Great Britain and for France and for Germany and for Italy and for Austria and for Asia and for Africa and

for South America. Oh, yes; it seems to be quite all right, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, to spend money to make plans for projects in foreign countries, and \$8,000,000,000 is requested for both planning and construction abroad. On the other hand, if it is desired to improve the Missouri River or the harbor of Detroit or provide for a dam in Texas or for a project in Wisconsin, the House of Representatives takes the position that it will refuse to agree to appropriate money for plans for such purposes. In short, the House will refuse to appropriate funds for planning for the building up of the United States, although it is willing that unlimited sums of money be appropriated for planning and for all kinds of construction in various other countries of the world.

I wish to state to the Senate that I believe now, and I have always believed, that our first duty is to the people of the United States. We were chosen by our constituents to legislate for America, and for America first.

On the other hand, some persons seem to take the attitude that it is quite all right for us to provide for private buildings, if you please, in foreign countries and for the construction of dams on foreign rivers and housing projects in various other countries of the world, without any limitation at all; and such funds are voted without a word of protest, so far as many Members of Congress are concerned. Yet the same Members of Congress take the attitude that limitations must be placed upon appropriations for building up the United States.

Mr. President, the United States is coming out at the little end of the horn. The provisions voted by the House of Representatives will not even allow the appropriation of funds for planning for projects in the United States.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee repeat the figures he gave a few moments ago in regard to the amount of money spent over a long period of years by the Army Corps of Engineers?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. During the last 128 years—a very long period of time—the appropriations for the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers have amounted to a total of approximately \$8,000,000,000, including \$680,900,000 in the approved budget items for the fiscal year 1953. Of this amount, \$5,911,000,000 has been for construction. The expenditure of that money has built up our country and has aided tremendously in making the United States the greatest country in all the world.

Yet under the bill as it has come to us from the House of Representatives, the House has provided for stopping these projects; the House would not even allow the appropriation of planning money for such projects.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It seems to be quite difficult to visualize that during more than a century, only approximately \$8,000,000,000 has been spent under the supervision of the Army Corps of Engineers for all the various projects in the United States, because the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee knows that that sum only approximates the amount we are spending currently, in 1 year, on various projects abroad. Is not that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. All of us know that to be so. If there is a Member of the Senate who thinks for a moment that we shall ever get back any part of the money spent abroad, I should like to have him rise and say so. I challenge any Member of the Senate to say that he believes we shall get back any part of that money.

Mr. President, we are making vast gifts to foreign governments; but while we are making those gifts, we are cheese-paring on every United States project. I recall a project in the West for which an appropriation of \$244,000 was requested, but that item was reduced in the House of Representatives, before the bill reached the Senate committee. Thereafter some of the members of the Senate committee challenged the item still further, and motions were made to reduce the appropriations for it by 5 percent or 10 percent, or some such percentage.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee, whether the \$8,000,000,000 to which he has referred, which he has stated the Corps of Engineers has spent during the past 128 years, includes all expenditures for all the fine coastal harbors of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. It does.

Mr. McCLELLAN. For their construction, as well as their maintenance.

Mr. McKELLAR. It does. The figure stated includes the harbors of New York, Boston, and all the other ports along the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And also the ports on the Pacific Coast.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and also all the ports on the Gulf Coast and all the ports or harbors on the Great Lakes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to emphasize the point that of the \$8,000,000,000 which the Senator from Tennessee has stated has been spent during a period of 128 years, most of the money has been spent for facilities which are vital and absolutely indispensable to our great commerce.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and 75 percent of that money has been spent for construction. Only 25 percent has been spent for all other purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yet a cry is always made about "pork barrel." I wish to emphasize the statement the Senator from Tennessee has made, namely, that

75 percent of the \$8,000,000,000 has been spent for construction, and the remaining 25 percent has been spent, I assume, for maintenance.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; for maintenance, salaries of officers, and similar items.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly.

In the case of the 75 percent which has been spent for construction, the great majority of it has been spent for the construction of facilities which have helped make America what she is today.

Mr. McKELLAR. Those facilities are vitally necessary to the prosperity and happiness of the American people.

Mr. President, I wish to say as one Senator—and I believe the majority of the Members of this body feel just as I do about this matter—that we should continue to build up these projects which have meant so much for the advancement and wealth and happiness of the United States.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We are expected to appropriate for overseas spending for military assistance about \$5,000,000,000, as shown by the present budget. We say that is in the interest of our own defense; that it is in the interest of the mutual defense of the Atlantic Pact nations, including the United States, to make our potential allies and friends strong militarily in the event of another war. But when we undertake to spend money at home in order to strengthen America there are those who do not want to regard that as having any impact upon American strength in time of danger. But every dollar, or substantially every dollar, proposed to be appropriated by the pending bill will actually go toward building the economic strength and military power of America in order that we may be prepared in the event of another war.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to cite a few examples of what has been done. Consider what has been done on the Mississippi River, on the Columbia River, on the Colorado River, on the Missouri River, and on all our other great rivers, as well as upon some of the smaller rivers in the West and in the South, and on the Ohio River in the Middle West. Consider what we have done in regard to the harbors of this country, to make it possible for great ships to bring into those harbors cargoes from all the world. No matter how large a ship may be, it can enter New York harbor and the other great harbors along our coast. Why? Because in the past we have made appropriations to improve our great harbors for the benefit of our commerce with all the rest of the world.

In elaboration of what I have stated, I desire to say very frankly that I am opposed, utterly opposed, and I may say viciously opposed, to the elimination of funds to be used in planning for the future. I think such appropriations should be continued. Consider the great dams of the West, in Oregon, Washington, California, Idaho, and Missouri, and elsewhere. I want to say to my good friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Ferguson], who sits be-



fore me, that we have from time to time appropriated money for the development of the harbors of the Great Lakes. I think that work ought to be continued. So, I do not believe we should discontinue the appropriation of money to be used for planning. Nor do I believe that we should discontinue the appropriation of money to be used in the construction of great projects in our own country, while we at the same time give limitless millions of dollars to foreign countries, from whom we do not expect to get one dollar back in the future.

Merely as an illustration, Mr. President, several years ago we loaned \$12,000,000,000 to Russia, an enemy of the United States. Russia has never paid back a cent of it. Does any Senator believe that Russia ever will pay back a dollar of it? I do not. She owes \$12,000,000,000 and interest, and has owed it for a number of years. So I am appealing to Senators to build up American enterprise to develop American resources, rather than stop the planning which the Corps of Engineers has so well done in days gone by.

Mr. President, to proceed a little further, I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate because of the very restricted budget policy on public works which has existed for the past few years with respect to new starts. It is apparent that this policy applies only to projects in this country.

I cannot agree to such a policy. I favor the development of our own natural resources. I believe that we must proceed with the construction of navigation, flood control, and power developments. Let us remember what has happened in the West only during the past year. Millions of dollars worth of property was destroyed as the result of failure to provide adequate dams and reservoirs to control devastating floods. These projects should be recognized as the great national assets they are.

There are four major differences between the bill as passed the House on April 2, 1952, and the bill as reported to the Senate.

#### 1. APPROPRIATED STRUCTURE

In the past, appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control, general and flood control Mississippi River and tributaries have been carried in the bill as three lump-sum items. In formulating the 1953 bill the House Committee broke these lump sums down into their major component parts: namely, first, examination, surveys, planning and other study programs; second, construction; third, maintenance; and fourth, administration. The flexibility provided in the appropriation structure used in the past is considered necessary to meet changing conditions which arise during the year. The bill as reported to the Senate is based on the appropriation structure which has served so well in the past.

#### 2. PLANNING MONEY

The bill as passed the House provided no appropriation for the planning of river and harbor and flood-control projects. The budget estimate for this function was \$2,300,000, the Senate Commit-

tee recommends \$2,285,000 for this function.

The committee feels very strongly that planning funds should be provided. Certainly planning will be continued on water-resource development projects in foreign countries with American dollars. But in America, according to the House, planning money is excluded.

#### 3. PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Mr. President, let me for a moment speak of projects now under construction. In my own State there is a project which is called Cheatham Dam, named in honor of Benjamin F. Cheatham, the celebrated general. Cheatham Dam is in Cheatham County, Tenn., near the Kentucky line. The dam is about half completed, and the House has stricken out the appropriation for it. We have spent \$6,000,000 on Cheatham Dam. If work were stopped on the dam, it has been estimated that it would result in a loss of at least one-third of the amount which has been spent on the dam up to this time. Should work be stopped on Cheatham Dam? I say it should not be stopped. Numerous other projects could be mentioned, some in the State of New Mexico, some in the State of Arkansas, and some in the State of Texas, that are in exactly the same status. There are similar projects in the State of Michigan and in the State of Idaho. There are some in California. I want to say that I think New England, New York, and Ohio ought to be treated in the same way as the rest of the country.

Mr. TOBEY. I say so, too.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have consistently voted for a light and power project at Niagara Falls. I think it should be built.

Mr. TOBEY. How about the St. Lawrence seaway?

Mr. McKELLAR. I voted for the St. Lawrence seaway because it seemed to me that New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio should be treated in the same way California, Washington, and Oregon have been treated. I frankly admit that the Senate has been very generous in its treatment of the Tennessee project, and I thank the Senate with all my heart. The same policy should be followed in the northeastern section of our country.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Only last year there was a terrific flood in Kansas. This year there was a terrific flood in Missouri. Speaking about unfinished dams, I notice in the bill items with respect to the Garrison Reservoir and Fort Randall Reservoir. If the dams in connection with those reservoirs had been completed, 2,000,000 acres of the best farm land in America would have been saved. But because they were not completed, Omaha, Sioux City, Council Bluffs, and other places had to suffer and 2,000,000 acres of the finest land went to perdition.

Mr. McKELLAR. I consider it highly patriotic to construct such projects.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If German Reservoir and Fort Randall Reservoir had been completed, billions of dollars would have been saved to America.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe the Senator has omitted to mention the terrible

flood at Kansas City. General Pick, the Chief of Engineers, and one of the best and most efficient men in any department of the Government, testified on the day before that flood occurred that if a great reservoir had been constructed at Kettle Creek, Kansas City would be safe from the ravages of floods.

We have grown up with these projects, so to speak; why should we stop them at this time and yet contribute lavishly to foreign projects? I think we should be generous to our neighbors, yes, and I am willing to help them so far as we can properly do so; but I do not think we ought to do it at the expense of the American situation as we find it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The point I am trying to make with respect to this particular bill is that if there is one bill that is nonpolitical, it is this one.

Mr. McKELLAR. We tried our best to make it that way.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Floods cause damage, drown people, and destroy property in Republican Kansas, Republican North Dakota, and Republican South Dakota, as they do in Democratic Mississippi. This is a bill that involves constructive projects for the American people. It means that creation of wealth, the saving of lives and property; it means everything that is good for America.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his remarks.

Mr. President, to stop the construction of the projects which are under construction would be very costly and very unwise. I can remember when it was argued in the Senate that electricity could not be produced from water power. But look at the great projects which have been built. By the way, the Federal Government owns the dams. They constitute one of the great assets of the American people. Not only that, but the consumer of light and power gets cheaper rates because of the building of Government dams in all parts of the Nation. I am one of those who believe that that policy should be continued.

I digress long enough to express the hope that there will be no filibustering in connection with this bill. It should be passed. The time is growing short.

Mr. WATKINS rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I can answer the Senator's question before he puts it. We have tried to treat Utah in the same way we have treated every other section. Has the Senator from Utah an objection to the bill?

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I am not making any objection; but I should like to ask some questions. The Senator says that Utah has been treated the same as every other State.

Mr. McKELLAR. If we have not treated Utah the same as we have treated every other State I am in favor of so treating it.

Mr. WATKINS. There have been some very bad floods in Utah.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. WATKINS. And much property has been destroyed. The Army engineers have made surveys and planned a number of projects, but they say they

cannot go ahead with them because there is no money in the fund for projects of that kind.

Mr. McKELLAR. What kind of projects are they?

Mr. WATKINS. They are not dams. They are levees, and the deepening of river channels so that they will not overflow the farm lands, highways, and city and town areas.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think I can answer the Senator's question, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe the item in the bill in which the Senator is interested is the one providing for investigations.

Mr. WATKINS. The projects I have in mind have gone further than that stage. I am interested in appropriations for actual construction work on flood-preventative measures on streams.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As the Senator from Utah well knows, the only place where, at this particular moment, he can get any help in connection with the condition which I know exists, and has been described by the Senator from Utah, is with reference to some of the projects which are multiple-purpose projects. In an appropriation bill which is now being considered by the Committee on Appropriations, some of the items which the Senator from Utah has in mind will be approved.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to invite attention to some of the other items which are included in the bill. On page 32 of the report the Senator will find reference to an item of \$800,000 for snagging and clearing, and also an item of \$900,000 for the construction of smaller dams. I do not know whether the attention of the Senator from Utah has been called to that matter. Did the Senator appear before the committee?

Mr. WATKINS. No. Word came to me only 2 or 3 days ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not think anyone from Utah had appeared before the committee. I assure the Senator that so long as I am chairman of the committee, or a member of the committee, I shall treat Utah exactly as Tennessee, New York, or any other State is treated.

Mr. WATKINS. The projects to which I am inviting attention have already been surveyed and investigated by the Army engineers and have been recommended for construction. They are not large.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a fund of \$1,700,000 which can be used. The Senator would have to see the Chief of Engineers or the Assistant Chief of Engineers, General Chorpene, as to how he can get a portion of the money for such projects. We have had no evidence from Utah, as I recall.

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Army Engineers themselves probably would or should have included in their report or their budgetary requirements sums to take care of particular streams.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That might be possible. I may say to the Senator from Utah that the Army Engineers could have requested the Budget Bureau to in-

clude an estimate for the project. It is possible that the Budget Bureau turned down the Army Engineers. But so far as the committee was concerned, there was no one who referred to any particular flood-control project, which is the only type of project that can be considered in this bill.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator understands that the big flood-control projects in the West have been combined with reclamation projects. I am not now speaking of that kind of multiple-purpose project; I am speaking now only of the clearing of rivers or streams, the building of levees, and other work that can be done in the stream itself, without actually impounding or storing water.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from New Mexico will permit me, I may say to the Senator from Utah that there are three projects for Utah provided in the bill: One at Magna, Utah, another at Salt Lake City, and another at Spanish Fork, on the Spanish Fork River.

Mr. WATKINS. The last is one of those I am talking about.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are authorized projects.

Mr. WATKINS. They have been authorized for some time.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will come before the committee and produce the proper evidence, he certainly will receive consideration on the part of the committee. So far as I am concerned, I think I may safely say that I believe such projects ought to be constructed, and I will do everything I can to have them provided for.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator. I wanted to be sure there was sufficient money in the fund. I should like to know if the fund authorized in the bill this year carries an increase over what has been previously authorized; or is it less?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is less than the budget estimate, but more than is included in the House bill. The amount provided for small projects is increased over the amount provided by the House.

Mr. WATKINS. It is an increase over the House figure?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator believe the amount is ample to take care of other small streams?

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe so. I suggest that if the Senator from Utah will communicate with General Chorpene, one of the most efficient men in the Corps of Army Engineers, I believe the Senator will have no trouble about receiving consideration.

Mr. WATKINS. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that the reason why I am mentioning the matter now is that I have just received communications from my State with reference to those streams. They had not previously been called to my attention as projects which would be for flood control independent of reclamation.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator's attention should have been called to them before.

Mr. WATKINS. I realize that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee would have taken testimony with re-

spect to the streams and would have been glad to take up the matter with the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. I understood there was to be a general increase in the fund to take care of cases of this kind, so they might possibly be covered. I shall check with the Army engineers to see if such streams are included in the general funds provided. If they are not, I shall come before the Senate with an amendment. I hope the Senate will not finish consideration of the bill too quickly. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. The next difference between the Senate bill and the House bill is under the heading "New starts."

The bill as reported provides \$33,250,000 for the initiation of 17 new projects under rivers and harbors and flood control, general, for which there are budget estimates, and \$1,722,000 for the initiation of 5 new projects for which there are no budget estimates.

In closing I should like to make two observations:

Private enterprise, once having determined to make a capital outlay for the expansion of its facilities, provides funds as rapidly as the contractor can use them, in order that benefits from the outlay of funds may be realized as soon as possible. That is exactly what the committee bill proposes.

For example, the House cut \$108,100,000 on 18 power projects. If we do not go ahead with these projects and do not have the power on the line at the dates now scheduled, the value of power lost to the Government will be in the neighborhood of \$89,000,000. Interest charges on the work which is partially completed on these multiple-purpose projects will be about \$25,000,000 a year.

Not only that, but any Senator who has had experience as a member of the Appropriations Committee knows how difficult it is to have projects reinstated after they are once stopped. I certainly hope the Senate will agree with the majority of the committee that the projects ought to be continued.

Finally, the average annual flood damage in this country between 1924 and 1948 was \$110,811,975. Very conservatively, one-fourth of this yearly loss is a direct loss to the Federal Treasury through income-tax deductions.

In recommending approval of the bill as reported to the Senate, I submit that there are two ways to balance the budget: First, by reducing expenditures; second, by increasing revenues. The bill before the Senate today will accomplish an increase in revenues. For that reason, the bill should be passed.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate consider the first committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which has been stated.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. 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 (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], I feel constrained to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment, while I make an explanation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are four amendments to the bill lying on the desk. After a lengthy conference with the acting minority leader [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the author of the four amendments, we drafted a unanimous-consent request, which was submitted to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who approved it, to the acting minority leader [Mr. WELKER], who approved it, and to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who approved it. I assured them that before we proposed the agreement we would have a quorum call, because of the possibility that one or two Members on the other side might object to such a request being proposed without a quorum call. The Senators to whom I have referred have passed on the unanimous-consent request, and it is agreeable to all the Senators involved. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] told me that he proposed to make a motion to recommit the bill with instructions, and assured me that 45 minutes would be all that he would require for the discussion of that motion. In accordance with his request, we included that time in the unanimous-consent proposal. The Senator from Texas would like to propose such a request at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no personal bias in the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the Senator from Illinois that I have cleared the proposed agreement with all Senators who are interested.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If that is the case, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, proceedings under the quorum call are suspended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit the following unanimous-consent request:

That during the further consideration of H. R. 7258, the Army Civil Functions Appropriation bill for 1953, debate be limited as follows: (1) 1½ hours on a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations; (2) 1½ hours each on amendments D and E intended to be proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and 30 minutes each on motions by the Senator from Illinois to suspend the rule to propose amendments B and C to the said bill; (3) 30 minutes on any other amendment or motion (including appeals); and (4) 1 hour on the passage of the bill: *Provided*, That the time in all cases shall be equally divided and controlled, in the case of committee amendments, and the passage of the bill, by the

Senator from Tennessee, [Mr. McKellar] and the minority leader [Mr. BRIDGES] or some one designated by him; and in the case of any other amendment or motion, by the mover of any such amendment or motion, and the Senator from Tennessee: *Provided*, however, that in the event the Senator from Tennessee is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some one designated by him.

As I previously explained, this request was presented to the ranking minority Member of the committee [Mr. FERGUSON], to the acting minority leader [Mr. WELKER], and to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I was informed that the terms of the agreement would be satisfactory to them. There are only four amendments at the desk, and the time set for for those four amendments was suggested by the author of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] I move to recommit the so-called civil functions bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions that the committee report back a bill amounting to not in excess of \$600,097,230. It is a 10-percent cut from the amount as reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I submit the motion on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself.

Mr. President, I am perfectly aware that in submitting this motion to the Senate I am somewhat in the position of being between the devil and the deep blue sea. But I am faced with the conclusion that the drastic discrepancy between the totals of the bill as it passed the House and the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee is completely at variance with the spirit with which we have faced other appropriations bills during this session. Until we were faced with the bill for civil functions of the Department of the Army we have maintained a reasonable difference between the House figures and our own.

As I say, I am somewhat in the middle with this motion because in trying to bring this individual appropriation bill in line with the other bills we have approved, there would seem to be only two methods left open for action. The first is, of course, the meat ax approach and we all avoid that except as the last resort. Should we suggest a flat 10 percent across-the-board cut, I feel sure many worthwhile projects which should be completed in fiscal 1953 will be hurt or unnecessarily delayed while many projects which could well do without

some of the funds contained in this bill will receive more than absolutely necessary at a time when we are trying to save money.

The second approach would be for the Senate to consider each of these projects individually and attempt to determine the full value of each with an eye toward cutting or even eliminating. Without any doubt this would get us into a wrangle and we might do irreparable damage to the civil-functions program.

I suppose objection may be heard against curtailment of any part of the civil functions programs. I myself have heard the remark passed that, in view of all the money we are sending abroad to rehabilitate foreign lands, we should have no compunctions about spending any amount under the civil-functions programs.

I point out that we have reduced the foreign-aid program. I also point out that the Senator from New Hampshire voted for and was prepared to support further reductions in the foreign-aid program because he felt it could be done without any material damage to the program. The Senator from New Hampshire has always favored a sound international program, but he realizes that there are many duplications and much waste in the foreign-aid program. He can well understand how we could make further cuts in it without any impairment of the general objectives of the foreign-aid program. Therefore, I would eliminate that excuse as any reason for not cutting this bill.

I understand that I will not be very popular for approaching the pending bill with the suggestion of cutting it. I realize that the committee, headed by the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Tennessee, has worked hard and sincerely on the bill. I realize that the committee has spent long hours and long days on it, and I pay tribute to the subcommittee and to the full committee. The Committee on Appropriations operates under very decided handicaps, with a lack of a sufficient staff and a lack of opportunity for proper investigation. They heard the evidence and they submitted a report which in their judgment is an excellent one.

The Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Michigan, as well as some other members of the subcommittee, opposed the appropriation in the full committee and we offered various amendments. One of the amendments would have had the effect which would be accomplished by the adoption of my motion to recommit.

We offered other amendments. All of them were rejected by the Committee on Appropriations. So we proceeded logically. First we tried to make the cuts in committee. Now, we come to the floor of the Senate and offer the Senate the same opportunity of opposing what we opposed in the full committee.

I believe very sincerely that we must economize. We must economize all along the line. I believe I have been very consistent in that regard. I do not believe I have varied my view at all. I have been in favor of practically every

economy move that has been made. I hope I shall continue to be so. If there are some moves made on the floor which I do not think are practical or sound, I shall not hesitate to oppose them. However, to date I have been consistent along the line of economy.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that the bill should be recommitted to the committee which has made the studies, with instruction from the Senate that the bill be cut back to not over \$600,097,230, which I think is certainly an adequate amount to appropriate in these times of world stress and while we are straining our own economy.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I should like to address a question to the able Senator from New Hampshire. Do his figures contemplate a 10-percent cut in the bill as reported by the committee or a 10-percent cut in the budget estimates?

Mr. BRIDGES. The motion I am making, I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, would provide for a 10-percent cut in the bill as reported by the committee.

An amendment of that nature was offered in the Committee on Appropriations. When that amendment was defeated we offered an amendment to cut 5 percent from the bill as reported by the subcommittee. When that amendment was defeated we finally offered an amendment to cut the bill 10 percent below the budget estimates. Since the total figure in the bill was already under the budget figure, it would have made an additional reduction of 3.4 percent. We went from 10 to 5 to 3.4, which would have brought the bill to 10 percent under the budget figure. We were defeated on all the amendments we offered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it has been the position of the junior Senator from South Dakota that if the bill were cut in the same proportion as other bills were cut there would be no basis for complaint on the ground of unfair treatment. However, when the Senator from New Hampshire compares the proposed cut in the pending bill with the cut made in the foreign aid authorization, the comparison breaks down a bit, if the cut is made on the amount reported by the committee and no credit is given for the cuts already made which bring the bill under the budget estimates.

Mr. BRIDGES. I point out to the Senator from South Dakota—and I know he is very sincere in his approach—that of course the Senate has not yet completed action on the foreign-aid bill. It must still be considered by the Committee on Appropriations. I also point out that on the pending bill we have kept in line with the House version of the bill. The Senator from South Dakota has been a very able Member of the House of Representatives, and while serving in the House he was a Member of the Committee on Appropriations. I know he has stood up and fought for the House figures many times when he served in that body. The bill as reported shows an increase of 35.4 percent over the House figure, which is far in excess

of any increase over House figures which we have voted on other bills. We reduced some of the bills under the House figures.

The amount I have suggested will permit an increase of \$107,662,330 over the amount voted by the House of Representatives. The approach we are making in this matter is a rather generous and sound one. Of course, the question is one of judgment as between Senators, but it is important that we give most serious consideration to this matter.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I appreciate the generous references the Senator from New Hampshire has made to me personally. In my experience I have found, at times, that when the Members of the House anticipated that the Senate would, by its action, be a little generous, the House Members have been inclined to make cuts somewhat more severe than the ones they expected would finally be carried in the bill as enacted—doing so for the sake of what some Members of the House termed "trading stock."

The Senator from New Hampshire has participated in a great many conferences; and he will understand, I am sure, the use of the term "trading stock."

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from South Dakota has divulged a secret in respect to the action taken on occasion by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, in making the motion I am not singling out the civil-functions appropriations as the subject of any special cut in appropriations. This motion is a part of a general movement to maintain the fiscal solvency of our country. When the Senate agrees to allow appropriations in the total amount voted by the House of Representatives, plus an additional \$107,000,000, I believe the Senate will be very generous.

On the other hand, if the Senate were to increase the total by more than \$174,000,000, or an increase of more than 35 percent, I believe the Senate would be departing somewhat from a sound approach.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, let me say that no Member of the Senate has greater respect than I have for the able work the Senator from New Hampshire does in endeavoring to prevent the ringing of excessive appropriations. He can justly say that he has been consistent, for, so far as I have been able to observe both since I have been in the Senate and before I served here, the Senator from New Hampshire has consistently worked in an endeavor to hold down the total amount of Federal expenditures.

However, it occurs to me to suggest that a reduction of 10 percent in budget items totalling \$712,000,000 would amount to approximately \$71,000,000. The bill as reported to the Senate is already \$45,853,000 under the budget estimates.

If the proposal of the Senator from New Hampshire were to have the total amount provided by the bill constitute a reduction of 10 percent in the amount of the budget items, thereby giving credit for the \$45,000,000 reduction made thus far, and calling for an additional reduction of approximately \$26,000,000, the total reduction would then amount to 10

percent, I would feel obliged to support such an approach, on the basis of statements I have made heretofore.

On the other hand, I find it very difficult to support a reduction of 10 percent over and above the cut or reduction of \$45,000,000 which already has been made.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I appreciate the feeling of the Senator from South Dakota.

Nevertheless, the motion has been made. So far as I am concerned, I believe the issue is clear. The matter has been very simply stated. I have no reason to prolong the debate, and I am perfectly willing to have it brought to a conclusion whenever the distinguished chairman of the committee desires to have that done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire recalls, I know, the great amount of work which has been done on this bill. We have worked on it since January, I believe—off and on, but most of the time on. A great many witnesses have appeared before the committee, and we have undertaken to be fair to all of them and also to all parts of the Nation.

We have voted to reduce the appropriations carried by the bill by \$45,000,000 under the budget estimates. The amount voted by the committee is larger than the amount voted by the House of Representatives, it is true; but the House of Representatives voted to eliminate all appropriations for planning and a great many of the appropriations for construction, and the House voted to stop the building of a great many projects.

The Senator from New Hampshire has been chairman of this committee—one of the best chairmen the committee has ever had. He is a splendid, able man; he is a careful and prudent man; he is a great legislator. I take off my hat to him. He has done a wonderful work, both as a member of this committee and as chairman of the committee. I appeal to him not to overturn the hard work which has been done by the members of the committee in an earnest endeavor to arrive at a reasonable and proper bill.

If the Senator from New Hampshire will give this matter a little more consideration, I believe he will reach the same conclusion that a majority of the members of the committee have reached, namely, that the bill is fair, equitable, and sound.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I appreciate the plea of the Senator from Tennessee, and I certainly appreciate his words of commendation of me.

As I have said, it has been a pleasure to work with him, and I know how hard and how sincerely he works on these bills.

Mr. President, there is a difference of opinion between us. Of course, a difference of opinion is what makes horse races. I felt a major concern about this matter because of the very peculiar and serious financial status of our country. I simply am not willing to have the Senate increase by 35.4 percent, or \$174,000,000, the appropriation items voted by the House of Representatives.



The 10 percent cut which the motion to recommit carries with it—thus allowing the committee that has studied the bill to make the reductions at the points where it believes it would be most constructive to make them—would still leave the total amount of the bill \$107,000,000 above the amount voted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on the motion.

I appreciate the work the distinguished chairman of the committee has done on this appropriation bill. At one time I served on the subcommittee which has reported the bill, and I know the number of hours of work required to be done by the committee on a bill of this kind. The total amount of work required is enormous.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have had witnesses from all over the country.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. President, I realize that if we can spend such great amounts of money abroad, we should be able to spend adequate amounts of money here at home. I simply am fearful that if we are not careful we shall regard the money we are spending abroad—some of it being spent for our common defense—as an excuse and a reason for not trying to do our level best to economize here at home.

Of course we should appropriate sufficient funds for the things we need. The pending motion is not a motion against flood control or a motion against rivers and harbors. The motion would simply provide that we act in accordance with our capacity.

This bill contains appropriation items for 52 new projects or new modifications of existing projects. The bill contains only 15 appropriation items for projects which will be completed as a result of the appropriations carried in the bill. That is why we are asking that the cuts not be made on the floor of the Senate, for we realize that no matter how skillful the surgeon may be, he cannot "operate" well on the floor of the Senate. Such action would be similar to that of a surgeon who attempted to perform a major operation on a street corner, rather than in the surgical room of a good hospital, where he would have the proper instruments and facilities.

We have confidence in the subcommittee and in the full committee, but I believe that the committee should take figures which I believe the Senate should consider to be the amount we can afford to spend this year, and that, if the committee were to reconsider the matter, applying their skill and their wisdom, and exercise their right of consultation with the department, they could perform this delicate operation. If the Senate should make an over-all reduction of 10 percent in each item, or should take 20 percent from one project and 10 percent from another, lacking the necessary skill on our part, we could do great harm to this bill.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The difficulty is that the committee has already done

that very thing. It has carefully considered every item of the bill. It has studied each item with the greatest of care. The committee has already done exactly what the Senator from Michigan now proposes to have done, except that we are now asked to make an over-all cut, or a lump-sum reduction.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that the committee did that, and the House did it also. But some Senators believe that Members of the House sometimes feel that they can safely make a reduction, because of their belief that the Senate will increase the appropriations. I have heard Representatives say that the reason for calling the Senate the "upper House" is because we are always "upping" appropriations. Members of the House know we can do that.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan whether it is not true that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has still kept considerably below the budget estimate? While the amount recommended by the Senate committee may be much higher than the amount provided by the House, is it not also true that there is such a disparity between the action of the House and the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee, that this bill must inevitably go to conference, and that many adjustments could be made in conference more readily than on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. FERGUSON. One of the greatest fallacies in the thinking on the part of Members of Congress is the idea that figures, rather than language, should at times be worked out in conference. I know that at times amounts are tentatively placed in bills, either in the House or in the Senate, with the thought that they can be taken to conference and some sort of compromise reached. In my opinion, we should not proceed in that manner at this time.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a member of the subcommittee which conducted hearings on this bill, as the able Senator from Tennessee has indicated, over a period of several months, with hundreds of witnesses appearing before us, I should like to say that I think any member of that committee would be the last person to say that this is a perfect piece of legislation. But I do say, in line with the remarks of the Senator from Kansas, that obviously it will be necessary that this bill go to conference. Obviously, the figure finally agreed upon will be considerably below the Senate figure. I think the action taken by the Senate committee can be amply justified. In the Senate Appropriations Committee, both in the full committee and in the subcommittee, I had made a motion or a suggestion along the line of that of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], that the amount of reduction be 10 percent under the budget. That motion did not pre-

vail. But I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I do not believe we can rewrite this bill very effectively on the floor of the Senate, and that if it should be the judgment of the Senate—I think it would be a mistake—that the bill should be recommitment to the Appropriations Committee, we might as well forget about adjourning on July 3. I do not think we would be able to do it. If the bill is recommitment, the Appropriations Committee will have to go through the whole bill, item by item. In my judgment that would considerably delay any prospect of adjournment.

Hearings have not been completed on the foreign-aid bill, and several other appropriation bills have not yet been reported by the committee. The members of the Appropriations Committee are all serving on more than one subcommittee, as the distinguished and able Senator from Michigan well realizes.

Therefore I think that the Senate should at least give some weight to the fact that the Appropriations Committee has held prolonged hearings on the bill, and should consider what the general tactical situation would be were we to start recommitting appropriation bills to the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I may interrupt the Senator from California at that point, I may say it took a week to mark up this bill after numerous hearings had been held. I have the volume of hearings in my hand, which shows how much testimony was taken on this one single bill. Were it to be recommitment, it would take a week to mark up the bill again, since it would be necessary to go over every item of it. In that event, as the Senator from California has said so well, we might as well give up hope of adjournment on July 3. I sincerely hope that the Senate will not recommit the bill. We have done the very best we could. We have tried to be fair to every witness, to every interest, and to every State of the Union in the preparation of this bill. I am sure that both the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New Hampshire will agree that that has been done. Let us not recommit the bill. Let us vote it up or vote it down, and let it go at that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it the purpose of the distinguished Senator from Michigan to propose a 10-percent cut below the budget estimates? Is that the objective he seeks before the ultimate passage of this bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. The desire now is to reduce the figure of \$666,000,000 by 10 percent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that were done, what would be the cut percentage below the budget estimates?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall endeavor to figure that.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would be slightly more than 10 percent; would it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall have to determine the percentage it would be below the budget estimates.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If I may ask the Senator a further question, does he entertain any doubt whatever that, when the bill is reported from conference, with the reductions already made by the Senate below the budget figures, there will be a 10-percent reduction below the budget when the bill is finally passed?

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope that will be true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does not the Senator feel confident that in conference the other 3-percent reduction would be made?

Mr. FERGUSON. That would only be a reduction of 3.6 percent below the present figure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, if in conference we were to lose 3.6 percent of the amount now in the bill, that would effect a 10-percent reduction below the budget; would it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. These projects and improvements are so vital that if we arrive at a figure 10 percent below the budget estimates in our final action upon this bill, we shall certainly have practiced economy in the face of the need for and the urgency of the construction of many of these improvements.

Mr. FERGUSON. The figure about which the Senator inquiries would be approximately 15 percent under the budget.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The reduction would be 15 percent?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, instead of 10 percent. We are asking to start at 10 percent below the amount recommended by the committee, and begin on that basis to negotiate with the House.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does not the Senator from Michigan realize that if we reduce it 15 percent, the reduction has got to come between what the House appropriated and the 15 percent, and we will finally wind up with a reduction under the budget of around 20 percent instead of the 15 percent now proposed?

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, we who advocate the motion think that would be a good thing.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Some Senators may think so.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. After the committee itself reduced the amount more than 6 percent below the budget figures, why did not the Senator from Michigan undertake in the committee to cut the amount 10 percent?

Mr. FERGUSON. We tried that in the committee, but we failed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator, who knows more than the other members of the committee, would cut it 10 percent more?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; the Senator from Michigan does not claim to know more than the other members of the committee. He is submitting the question to the Senate. We know how unpopular it is to try to cut anything from

any appropriation bill. No Senator can come to the Senate floor and get any pleasure out of opposing his committee or advocating the cutting of any of the appropriations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is the Senator from Michigan willing now to have cut from the bill the amount which was appropriated to take care of the Great Lakes?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe there is anything in the bill to take care of the Great Lakes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; there is something in the bill about it.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is an item under planning.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is in connection with States which border on the Great Lakes, for a survey as to controlling the level of the Great Lakes. It would amount to approximately \$350,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think it is a good idea.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now state upon the floor that I should be glad if the item could be cut the same amount or more than the cut in other items. The survey is essential for all the States which border on the Great Lakes, but the appropriation is \$350,000 out of a total of \$666,774,699, with a planning fund, alone, of \$2,285,000. So the State of Michigan, together with the other States in the Great Lakes region, would have in this bill an item of \$350,000 out of a possible planning fund of \$2,285,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think I understand—

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator asked me about the cut.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only difference between the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Michigan is that the Senator from Michigan is looking at it from the standpoint of cutting a certain percentage from the total item, and the Senator from New Mexico thinks that the Great Lakes project is so important that the committee did not allow half enough to do the work that should be done in the State of Michigan.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will take at least twice that amount, and it will require a 2-year period for the purpose of making the investigation. I think it should be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in the light of the present economic conditions in the United States, and in connection with our over-all preparedness program, I think we would be doing the right thing if we took 10 percent from appropriations recommended by the committee, which would make the total about 15 percent below the budget figure, and make that a starting point in the negotiation with the House conferees. If we started at 15 percent we would arrive at a just figure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not desire to speak any further. If there is any Senator on our side who wants to speak I shall be glad to yield. If not, I suggest the absence of a quorum, so that we may vote on the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum may be withdrawn, that the order for the call of the roll may be rescinded, 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 motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

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

I announce further that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURLER] is absent because of the death of his brother.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senators from Ohio [Mr. TAFT and Mr. BRICKER] are necessarily absent.

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

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator



from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 50, as follows:

## YEAS—27

Alken	Ferguson	O'Connor
Bennett	Flanders	Robertson
Brewster	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Martin	Watkins
Douglas	Millikin	Welker
Dworshak	Moody	Wiley
Ecton	Morse	Williams

## NAYS—50

Anderson	Hoey	McKellar
Capehart	Holland	Monroney
Case	Humphrey	Mundt
Chavez	Hunt	Murray
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Nixon
Duff	Kem	Pastore
Eastland	Kerr	Schoeppel
Ellender	Kilgore	Seaton
Frear	Knowland	Smathers
Fulbright	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
George	Long	Sparkman
Gillette	Magnuson	Stennis
Green	Malone	Thye
Hayden	McCarran	Tobey
Hennings	McCarthy	Underwood
Hill	McClellan	

## NOT VOTING—19

Benton	Jenner	McMahon
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Kefauver	Russell
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Cain	Lodge	Young
Carlson	Maybank	
Connally	McFarland	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 658) to further amend the Communications Act of 1934, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PRIEST, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WOLVERTON, and Mr. HINSHAW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

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 House to the bill (S. 677) to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The message further 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. 5990) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes

of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. HEDRICK, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CANNON, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HORAN, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

# AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO EFFECTIVE DATES OF AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO WITH STATES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 6291) to amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act with respect to effective dates of agreements entered into with States before January 1, 1954, and I submit a report (No. 1792) thereon.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to explain the bill. It simply amends a provision of the Social Security Act of 1950 which relates to the effective dates of Federal-State agreements with regard to old-age and survivors insurance coverage of State and local government employees, so as to extend the time from January 1953 to January 1954. That is all the bill does. It is unanimously reported from the Committee on Finance. The purpose is to prevent States which do not have a session of their legislatures between this time and January 1, 1953, from being compelled to call an extraordinary session of their legislatures.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not think I shall object—I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. As I understand, the purpose of the bill is to permit States whose legislatures are not now in session to receive the benefits of the changes in the social-security law, without the necessity of calling a special session of their legislatures.

Mr. GEORGE. That is exactly true. There are a few States whose legislatures do not meet prior to January 1, next. The bill merely extends for 1 year the time in which they may act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So their citizens will receive the benefits in the meantime. Assuming that a State does not act at the time set, what happens?

Mr. GEORGE. Its employees would not be covered. Under the Social Security Act of 1950, as amended, about 1,400,000 employees and citizens of the States who were not covered under any retirement system were given this privilege. However, a State must act affirmatively. This merely gives to a State the privilege of asking or not asking for the benefits, as it sees fit. The only purpose of the bill is to accommodate the States and meet their convenience, avoiding unnecessary expenses in the States whose legislative sessions do not take place until after next January 1st.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the benefits go to the citizens of a State before the time when the State acts.

Mr. GEORGE. Provided the State affirmatively acts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If it acts negatively at that time—which presumably it would not do—what happens to the benefits which have been received in the meantime? Does the Federal Government bear the entire expense?

Mr. GEORGE. There would be no expense. If a State does not affirmatively act, its employees are not brought under the act, and we do not receive any benefits.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the bill is unanimously reported from the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. The bill is unanimously reported from the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

# PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF THE MARINE CORPS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 677) to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

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

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 677) to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 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 disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the first sentence of section 206 (c) of the National Security Act of 1947 is hereby amended to read as follows: 'The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall be so organized as to include not less than three combat divisions and three air wings, and such other land combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic therein, and except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress the personnel strength of the Regular Marine Corps shall be maintained at not more than four hundred thousand.'

"Sec. 2. Section 211 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 505), as

amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Commandant of the Marine Corps shall indicate to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff any matter scheduled for consideration by the Joint Chiefs of Staff which directly concerns the United States Marine Corps. Unless the Secretary of Defense, upon request from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for a determination, determines that such matter does not concern the United States Marine Corps, the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall meet with the Joint Chiefs of Staff when such matter is under consideration by them and on such occasion and with respect to such matter the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall have co-equal status with the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

"Sec. 3. Section 2 (b) of the Act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92) is hereby repealed."

And the House agree to the same.

ESTES KEFAUVER,  
JOHN C. STENNIS,  
RUSSELL LONG,  
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
RALPH E. FLANDERS,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

CARL VINSON,  
OVERTON BROOKS,  
CARL T. DURHAM,  
DEWEY SHORT,  
LESLIE C. ARENDS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

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

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, from the Senate point of view, I believe this was a successful conference. The Senate version of the bill provided that the United States Marine Corps should have four divisions and that the strength should be not more than 400,000. It also provided that the Commandant of the Marine Corps should be a consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that he should have a voice in all matters concerning the Marine Corps.

The House version of the bill provided that the Commandant of the Marine Corps should be a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that the strength of the Marine Corps should be three divisions and three air wings, and not less than 220,000 men.

It seemed to the Senate conferees that a floor of 220,000 men would be too great, because in time of greater security this Nation might not need such a large force. Therefore, the Senate conferees insisted on striking the floor of 220,000. We accepted the provision that there should be three divisions and three air wings in the Marine Corps, and that the Commandant of the Marine Corps should meet with the Joint Chiefs of Staff on all matters involving the Marine Corps; also that when there was a difference of opinion as to whether or not the Marine Corps was involved, the Secretary of Defense should determine whether or not a particular matter involved the Marine Corps. I believe this is somewhat less, even, than the Senate bill initially provided, and I hope there will be no objection to the conference report.

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

Mr. LONG. Certainly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, since the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is present, and this affects a statement which he made before a committee, which statement gave me some disturbance, and because I supported the original bill, I should like to ask whether anything contained in the conference report or in the bill constitutes the Marine Corps as a force which the President could use at his whim or discretion at any spot in the world and under any circumstances if he should so desire.

The reason I ask the question is, with all courtesy to the Senator from Illinois, that as I understood his statement before one of the committees, it was to the effect that if the bill were passed it would give the President a force to use anywhere in the world and under such circumstances as he saw fit, if he so desired.

I want to clear up that point, because I would not support either the bill or the conference report if it created any authority in the President to throw the marines into conflicts all over the world at his whim.

I should like to have the Senator from Louisiana make completely clear that particular point in the bill.

Mr. LONG. The bill does not add anything to the existing authority of the President to use the Marine Corps or any other armed force of our Government. I suspect that the rather loose language in the House report might have caused some apprehension. Some of the language could be interpreted to mean that the bill would create a strong force capable of occupying advanced bases and going to the scene of trouble anywhere in the world. If it did what the Senator from Iowa apparently fears I would not support the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to make clear that I do not want to curtail or cut down the proper and legitimate strength of our military forces needed to protect, in the traditional form, worthy American interests which need protection, as we understand the term "protection."

However, I did not want a provision of the bill to enlarge the theory of the President's powers whimsically to assign and deploy troops in foreign ventures under all circumstances, as he may see fit. I want to make that point fully clear.

Mr. LONG. I agree with the Senator from Iowa, and I assure him that so far as we have been able to determine, there is nothing contained in the bill which would in any way broaden the authority of the President.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to go a step further. It is not so much that there may be something in the bill which might broaden the authority of the President. Does it in any way, standing alone and without any other previous authority, create or place any such authority in the President?

Mr. LONG. No; it does not.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With that assurance, I have no objection to the conference report.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to join the Senator from Louisiana in assuring the Senator from Iowa, and other Senators who may feel as he does on the question he has raised, that that subject, to the best of my knowledge, did not come up in the hearings or in any of the executive discussions concerning the bill. As a member of the conference committee, I may say to the Senator from Iowa that we worked very hard to get the bill in such form that it would not increase, or put a floor under, any of the Armed Forces. I believe the bill is in much better form today than it was when it passed the Senate, and certainly it is 100 percent better than the bill that passed the House.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on the point raised by the Senator from Iowa, which I think is a very important point, as one of the conferees I would say that such a concept is entirely foreign to the intent and purpose of the bill. The whole substance of the bill is directed to the end of giving certain assured power and strength to the Marine Corps as a part of the fighting forces of our armed services. That is the extent of it, and no other concept is involved.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, Senators will recall that, so far as the Korean situation is concerned, it was not the Marine Corps but certain divisions of the Army which first went to the scene. What we wish to do is to make certain that there will be a Marine Corps and that it will not be whittled down to such insignificant size that it would be incapable of materially assisting our Nation in defending itself and in meeting serious emergencies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as one of the original sponsors of the bill, I wish to congratulate the committee, particularly the members of the subcommittee, for their excellent work on the measure. They have worked very hard and with great care. They have tried to reconcile the different views and opinions on the bill, and I believe they have done a magnificent job. As one of the sponsors of the bill—and I feel I can speak for many of its other sponsors also—I wish to thank the committee.

The bill does two very important things. It prevents the elimination of the Marine Corps as a combat organization by any action of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is a well-known fact that in the past many leaders of our Armed Forces, particularly those attached to the Army and Air Force, have wished to subordinate the Marine Corps as a combat organization and to confine its work to the beaches and to ship-to-shore movements. It is also well known that the Commandant has not been consulted in matters relating to the Marine Corps. The bill creates three divisions and three air wings. It provides that the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall meet with the Joint Chiefs of Staff unless forbidden to do so by the Secretary of Defense. I believe the conference report is a very happy reconciliation of the two bills, and I again congratulate the committee.



The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the report.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The comment made by the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], himself a distinguished member of the Marine Corps, has answered some questions which I had in mind. I should like to ask one or two questions of the Senator from Louisiana. Will the Senator state what the bill does with regard to the Marine Corps as of the present day? Does it augment or decrease the Marine Corps as it stands today?

Mr. LONG. It would keep it about as it is.

Mr. CASE. Does it protect it in that position?

Mr. LONG. It is conceivable that as a part of general policy, the Navy, the Army, and the Marine Corps might at some future date be reduced in strength and that some divisions might be maintained at less than full strength. If that were the case, the Marine Corps could be maintained on the same proportionate basis as other forces.

Mr. CASE. The proportion would be protected and maintained?

Mr. LONG. Yes. The Marine Corps would be assured that no policy, if recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for example, reducing the strength of the Marine Corps would be undertaken without at least having the Commandant consulted and giving him an opportunity to present his views.

Mr. CASE. Does it protect the functioning of the Marine Corps in its ability to operate as an independent unit?

Mr. LONG. I believe it does. In all matters affecting the Marine Corps, it assures Congress and the Nation that the Commandant of the Marine Corps will be present on the Joint Chiefs of Staff with equal force as other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I believe the RECORD should show that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who is not in the Chamber, was the chairman of the subcommittee which conducted hearings on the bill and was also chairman of the managers of the conference on the part of the Senate.

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

The report was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with reference to the announcement of the Chair on the Senate's agreeing to the conference report, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show that the conference report was adopted unanimously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for

the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, on page 3, line 2.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have an objection to the committee amendment on pages 6 and 7, but not to this committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is advised that the Senate is considering the first committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is on page 3, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On page 3, line 2.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the first committee amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Corps of Engineers," on page 3, after line 17, to strike out:

For carrying out the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers as provided in the various flood-control and rivers and harbors acts and other acts applicable to that agency, as follows:

#### And insert:

##### RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

The following appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control may be used for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; purchase not to exceed 200 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only in the current fiscal year and hire of passenger motor vehicles and purchase of one motorboat (to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable) and the maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft: *Provided further*, That the reservoir formed by the Blakely Mountain Dam, Ark., shall hereafter be designated as "Lake Ouachita," and the reservoir formed by the Narrows Dam, Ark., shall hereafter be designated as "Lake Greeson": *Provided further*, That the project known as "Burr Oak Dam, Ohio," shall hereafter be designated as the "Tom Jenkins Dam, Ohio."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois desire to be recognized in connection with this committee amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have no objection to this committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Rivers and harbors," on page 4, after line 16, to strike out:

##### EXAMINATIONS, SURVEYS, PLANNING AND OTHER STUDY PROGRAMS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed rivers and harbors projects; including preliminary examinations and surveys; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized rivers and harbors projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as many be

printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; to remain available until expended, \$2,635,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys and plans and specifications shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation not to exceed \$2,000,000 shall be available for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure for the purposes of and in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 8, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 756) and the act of August 14, 1946.

#### CONSTRUCTION

For construction of authorized rivers and harbors projects or parts thereof and for other related activities as may be authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$117,710,000.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For the preservation, operation and maintenance of existing rivers and harbors projects or parts thereof and of other related activities, as authorized by law; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent water of New York City; for removing sunken vessels or craft obstructing or endangering navigation as authorized by law; for surveys of northern and northwestern lakes and other boundary and connecting waters as heretofore authorized, including the preparations, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins, and the investigation of lake levels; \$67,105,000.

#### And in lieu thereof to insert:

Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: For expenses necessary for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interest of commerce and navigation; for surveys of northern and northwestern lakes and other boundary and connecting waters as heretofore authorized, including the preparation, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins, and the investigation of lake levels; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City; for expenses of the California Debris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act approved March 1, 1893, as amended (33 U. S. C. 661, 678, and 683); for removing sunken vessels or craft obstructing or endangering navigation as authorized by law; for operating and maintaining, keeping in repair, and continuing in use without interruption any lock, canal (except the Panama Canal), canalized river, or other public works for the use and benefit of navigation belonging to the United States; for examination, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors; for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore authorized; for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; \$277,135,600, of which amount \$75,000 shall be available only for cooperative beach erosion studies as authorized in Public Law 520, Seventy-first Congress, approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented, and \$350,000 for construction of emergency shore protection work necessary to prevent erosion and loss of properties at Seal Beach and Surfside, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for

any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation the Secretary of the Army may, in his discretion and on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers based on the recommendation by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in the review of a report or reports authorized by law, expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency outside of harbor lines and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation, such work to be subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report or reports thereon: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation and for the payment of the expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meeting of the Congresses and of the Commission: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation not to exceed \$3,870,000 shall be available for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure for the purposes of and in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 8, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 756), and the act of August 14, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 661-756; 33 U. S. C. 1, 5, 414-415, 441, 451, 540, 541; Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1952).

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer my amendment designated "6-18-52-E," to the committee amendment on page 7, line 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 9, in the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out the figures "\$277,135,600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$177,135,600."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it may seem somewhat strange to propose a cut of \$100,000,000 in this section of the bill, when this body has just rejected a cut of some \$66,000,000 on the bill as a whole. I must confess that I was astounded at the moderation of the Senator from Michigan in proposing a cut of only \$66,000,000. I voted for that cut because it was the only motion before this body. In my judgment, it was not sufficient.

I should like again, if I may, to explain very briefly the situation which we face. As we are all aware, the budget which the administration submitted in January was \$14,000,000,000 out of balance, with projected expenditures slightly in excess of \$85,000,000,000, and expected revenues \$71,000,000,000. Since then it has become clear that the administration will have to ask for more money than the \$85,000,000,000 which it requested early this year. In the budget estimates of January the continuing costs of the Korean war after the first of July were not included. It is now apparent that these costs will continue, and if they continue at the rate at which they have run in the past there will be a further expenditure of about \$5,000,000,000 for that item alone.

#### HUGE IMPENDING DEFICITS

It is furthermore apparent that a supplementary request will be made to Congress for added appropriations for the Air Force and for air base con-

struction, as well as for certain other items. So that, if we are to prevent inflation and are even to approximate a balanced budget, we shall have to make very great reductions in the total budget which is submitted to us.

A few minutes ago I looked at the ticker in the anteroom and I saw that the governmental deficit for the current year as of the 17th of June was \$7,500,000,000. This, I take it, included the large receipts on the 15th and 16th of June. We will therefore face this year a deficit of approximately \$8,000,000,000, and unless we use the pruning knife it looks as though we will have a deficit for the coming year of from fifteen to twenty billion dollars.

On various occasions in this body I have tried to outline what a deficit of this magnitude means. It means inevitably that the Government will be forced to borrow money from the banks. The banks will buy bonds, thus creating additional credit, against which the Government will draw for the payment of labor and material. These payments by the Government will pass out of the accounts of the Government in the banks into the accounts of individuals from whom the labor and material are procured. They will constitute a permanent addition to the circulating medium of the country, and the ratio of money and credit to goods will increase. The result will be inflation—an inflation of great magnitude—with all the domestic difficulties which it creates, an inflation which may do as much damage to us internally as communistic threatened aggression could do to us from the outside.

#### RIGOROUS ECONOMY NECESSARY

Mr. President, we should approach each appropriation bill with a sense of the urgency of the financial situation confronting the Government. We should realize that we must make cuts and that the cuts must average at least 10 percent of each appropriation bill which is submitted. We must also realize that there are certain governmental operating costs which are fixed. For example, there is the interest cost of \$6,000,000,000, which is a fixed item. We cannot reduce that item. Then there are veterans' benefits, which are largely fixed items. Similar fixed items are funds for old-age assistance. Therefore the portion of the budget which we can reduce is probably not more than sixty or sixty-five billion dollars. Out of that we shall have to make cuts amounting to from seven and a half to ten billion dollars.

Mr. President, in the case of the bill which is now before the Senate, the House of Representatives did quite well. They cut the total figure submitted to them by the Bureau of the Budget by \$188,000,000. In other words, they made a cut of approximately 30 percent. I congratulate the House of Representatives for the general program of economy they have carried into effect. Perhaps here and there they may have eliminated a project which was worthy, and in some cases I believe they included projects which were not particularly worthy; but, on the whole the House of

Representatives has done an extremely good job in making a reduction of nearly \$190,000,000 in this bill.

I hold the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate in high esteem and I hold its Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Army in high esteem. What I have to say is in no sense intended as personal criticism of the members of the committee or subcommittee. I should like to point out, however, that they have increased the House figures by \$174,000,000. They have restored the total to approximately the initial amount submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. If the committee's program is adopted, no savings will be effected on the items in the pending appropriation bill. Judging by the vote of this body a few minutes ago, it looks to me that the much vaunted economy, which is taken so seriously in cold December, tends to disappear in the hot weather of June and July.

I think it was the late Jimmy Walker who wrote:

Will you love me in December as you do in May?

Certainly it is true of Members of Congress that they love economy more in January than they do in June or July. But appropriation bills, Mr. President, must be voted on in June and July. The good resolutions of the first of the year are unavailing if they are not backed up by action in reducing specific appropriation bills.

#### FOUR AMENDMENTS WOULD SAVE \$280,000,000

Mr. President, this is the gist of two amendments which I shall submit. The first one concerns the rivers and harbors section of the bill, and it calls for a reduction of \$100,000,000. The second amendment calls for a reduction of \$50,000,000 in the so-called flood control features of the bill. The two amendments together would effect combined economies of \$150,000,000. When we have disposed of those two amendments I have two other amendments which I shall offer. They would bring in \$50,000,000 in revenue by applying user charges and special assessments. The total savings if all four amendments were to be adopted would be \$200,000,000. But enough of that for the moment.

Mr. President, apparently this is an annual performance. Every time I rise on this floor and propose a cut in appropriations my very able opponents try to put me between Scylla and Charybdis, or whip-saw me in good fashion. When I propose a general reduction, they say, "What specific complaint do you have? What specific items in the bill are padded?"

Then, when I propose separate amendments on specific items, I am told, "Those specific items are most necessary for the safety and defense of this Nation and for its economic growth."

The amendment which I offer now, in its initial form, merely calls for a reduction of \$100,000,000. It would give to the Army engineers the power of making reductions where they thought it would be most advisable to make them.

To indicate that I am not merely talking through my hat and that the figure



of \$100,000,000 is not picked out of the air, I shall, even though it is somewhat dangerous from a parliamentary standpoint, descend into the lowlands and name some specific projects which I think should be eliminated. The way in which I would recommend the \$100,000,000 reduction be made is set forth on pages 7454-7456 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 18.

I want to sound off by taking a project in my own State of Illinois, because it is very easy to cut projects in other States, but to think that your own projects are extremely important.

#### EVEN GOOD PROGRAMS MUST BE REDUCED

I should like to call attention to the dam and locks which extend between Keokuk, Iowa, and Hamilton, Ill. It is called the Keokuk Dam, but it might equally well be termed the Hamilton Dam, because Keokuk is just opposite Hancock County in my State.

I think probably this is one of the best projects in the bill. The river traffic on the Mississippi is large. As I recall, 4,000,000 tons of traffic a year go through the lock. The lock was originally built in 1913. The concrete is deteriorating, and it is said that the lock is not adequate for the longer boats which are coming on the Mississippi.

Yet the House omitted an appropriation for this purpose. The ultimate cost of the new lock is \$18,000,000, and the initial estimate for the coming year is \$2,500,000 of the \$18,000,000.

The Senate committee voted to restore the \$2,500,000 Budget estimate.

In view of the many projects of an extremely doubtful nature which the committee voted to include in the bill, if that is the committee's standard of comparison and if certain other projects are to be included, I believe the Keokuk-Hamilton Lock certainly should be included.

But I do not believe the other projects should be included. Since one should be willing to take for himself the medicine he dishes out for others, I am going to suggest that the item for this lock and dam be omitted from the bill for the coming year, or that we make a cut in the amount of \$2,500,000. In other words, I make a vote offering to the other Senators, as I proceed to urge cuts in the appropriations for projects in their States, I want them to know that first I urge the making of a cut in the appropriations for projects in my own State, and I am perfectly willing to have my own State treated just as rigorously as is any other State.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. How much will Illinois get after the appropriation for this project is eliminated?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not figured that up. I have not made a computation in terms of specific States.

Mr. WATKINS. Will Illinois receive any appropriation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, yes. There will be a moderate amount of about a million dollars for rivers-and-harbors work.

Mr. WATKINS. Then the Senator from Illinois should move to strike out

all other appropriations which Illinois will get, because this bill does not carry one dollar of appropriation for Utah.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had not thought there were any great rivers running through Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. We have some that go on rampage and do tremendous damage. The Senator from Illinois should have been there this spring when I was there, and should have seen the homes and the farms which were washed out by the floods.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the State of Utah will have its turn when the reclamation bill and the flood-control features of this bill come before the Senate and when we deal with the waters running off the Wasatch Mountains into the Great Salt Lake. However, the items carried in this section of the bill deal with communications by waterway to the sea, and I had never thought that Utah had water communications with either the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean.

Mr. WATKINS. The Government regards one of the rivers in Utah as a navigable river. The Government has taken the position that if a stream is usable by any type of boat, the stream is a navigable one, and thus comes within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe my good friend, the Senator from Utah, is building up his case for the Wasatch project, which is included in the reclamation bill, under the Department of the Interior.

Mr. WATKINS. No. Let me say that I have voted with the Senator from Illinois for the cuts he has proposed, and I voted to recommit the bill, and I have voted with the Senator from Illinois at other times.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. WATKINS. But I have never seen the Senator from Illinois vote with us when it came to cutting the appropriations for reclamation projects in Europe or Africa or other foreign lands.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator to wait a minute, please; the memory of my good friend is not so good as it should be. If he will examine the record for this year he will find that I voted for a cut of \$1,500,000,000 in foreign aid, although that proposal was defeated; and I then voted for a cut of \$1,400,000,000; and I also voted for the successful cut of \$1,200,000,000.

Mr. WATKINS. I am glad the Senator from Illinois did so this year. I may have had in mind the other years when we tried to have such cuts made, but had not yet converted him. He seemed to have established a line of conduct on foreign-project appropriations which it is difficult for me to forget. I am glad to know of his conversion, and I appreciate his efforts to remove from these bills any of the fat that should be removed.

Recently I made an investigation, from which I found that under the Marshall plan, the ECA, and the various other foreign relief and aid programs for overseas areas we have authorized or have spent \$1,800,000,000 on reclamation and power projects in Europe, Asia, and Africa. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to that fact.

Apparently the administration is not willing to do anything much about reclamation in Utah. We cannot even get from the administration an estimate for a simple project calling for \$1,350,000, even though that project is in a defense area.

For the upper Colorado storage and related projects, we could not even get the Secretary of the Interior to send the report of the Reclamation Bureau to Congress, as is provided for under the reclamation law. Even if that project were authorized today, it might be 10 years before its construction would be begun.

So I join with the Senator from Illinois in his desire to achieve economy; but if he wishes to put Illinois on the same basis as other States, including Utah, it will be necessary to cut the items in the bill much more than the Senator from Illinois is attempting to cut them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think the Senator will find that I have favored foreign-aid reductions in previous years, also.

I know something about the history of the Colorado River. I believe that in the old days the boats used to go to what is now Yuma, but I never heard of boats going up through the Grand Canyon or beyond the Grand Canyon. Only seven have gone up and only a few canoes have been able to come down through the rapids. The upper Colorado River certainly is not navigable, whereas the rivers in Illinois are navigable; and, as is said in our State song, they are "gently flowing," and they certainly do not have the rapidity of flow the upper Colorado River has.

Mr. President, I submit this initial recommendation simply to show my good faith. I have made a rough computation, and it shows that the effect of this proposal, if it is adopted, will mean a much larger cut, percentagewise, for Illinois than would be made for the country as a whole by the cuts which I shall propose.

#### INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FLA.

I am very glad to see in the Chamber my good and amiable friend the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], because I should like to discuss the intracoastal waterway running between Jacksonville and Miami, the estimated total cost of which is \$26,000,000, to provide a channel 125 feet wide and 12 feet deep between those two cities.

There is already in existence a channel 100 feet wide and 8 feet deep which runs between those cities. The allotment to date has been \$10,000,000. The 1953 budget estimate was \$2,200,000. The House cut that item to \$2,000,000. The Senate committee has recommended that the amount voted by the House be retained.

I would suggest that this item be eliminated entirely. My reason for suggesting its entire elimination is that there already is an 8-foot channel to Miami, and there is a 12-foot channel from Jacksonville to New Smyrna. Now it is proposed that this further appropriation be made to continue the 12-foot channel to Cocoa and Banana.

Mr. President, I have examined the figures in regard to the traffic on this magnificent coastal highway. According to the figures of the Army engineers, which will be found at pages 65-68 of the House hearings, the traffic on this intracoastal waterway has been diminishing. From 1900 to 1945 it was approximately 400,000 tons a year—which is not a large figure—one-tenth of the traffic carried through the Keokuk Lake. In 1949 and in 1950 it fell to a little more than 200,000 tons a year, or virtually half what it had been theretofore.

Deepening to 12 feet the channel from Jacksonville to Miami is not necessary for the Air Force at Canaveral Harbor, because the harbor there, according to the Army engineers, is only 8 feet deep, and no requests have been made to deepen it. In short, the result of the inclusion of this item in the bill would be that there would be a 12-foot channel with an 8-foot harbor. On the other hand, perhaps the 12-foot channel would simply be a come-on for a future request for a 12-foot harbor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield. I hasten to state that I did not realize that the senior Senator from Florida was also present, or I would have included him in the tribute I paid to the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his tribute, which I did not hear; but I am sure it was a warm one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I referred to the junior Senator from Florida as "my amiable friend, the junior Senator from Florida." I now expand that tribute by including the senior Senator from Florida, to whom I refer at this time as my very amiable friend.

Mr. HOLLAND. The reason for my interruption, for which I apologize—

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I am delighted to have the Senator from Florida do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. The reason for my interruption is that the Senator from Illinois was about to fall into very grievous error in stating that the depth of the Canaveral Harbor is only 8 feet. The engineers have just completed deepening it to 27 feet, with connection into the Atlantic Ocean at that depth; and I would not want the Senator's statement in error to go unchallenged.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall hunt up the authority for the figures I gave. I shall cite it in a moment.

Let me say that in 1948, of the 35,000 motor vessels using the intracoastal waterway, 32,000 of them drew less than 4 feet. Of the 2,200 barges which used the waterway, less than 10 percent of them, or only about 200, drew more than 6 feet.

So the waterway is already sufficiently deep to take care of the overwhelming proportion of the traffic there.

The senior Senator from Florida has just said there is a 27-foot harbor at Canaveral. I now read from the hearings this year before the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the House Appropriations Committee, at page 68:

Mr. Ford. Last year it was brought out that you wanted a 12-foot depth to Cocoa

and you only had an 8-foot depth at Canaveral Harbor. Has there been any effort made to try and get a deepening of the Canaveral Harbor?

General CHORPENING. Well, as I recall it, last year there was a request made for some work at Canaveral. It was in the budget, but it was not allowed by the House. There were certain conditions of local cooperation which we learned after testifying here, would not be complied with, so we did not ask for restoration of the funds.

Mr. Ford. And the needs for Canaveral were not included last year nor in this current budget?

General CHORPENING. That is correct.

Mr. Ford. You are not asking for funds for Canaveral Harbor this year?

General CHORPENING. That is correct.

So that if I did fall into a grievous error, it was an error shared by General Chorpene of the Army Engineers when they were testifying, as late as the winter of this year.

Furthermore, navigation facilities are already available. The proposal would merely permit bigger barges to move on an existing waterway. Mr. President, that is merely an indication of how this waterway could be deferred. It could easily be postponed.

#### DEMOPOLIS LOCK AND DAM, ALA.

There is another project which might be postponed, namely, the Demopolis lock and dam, in Alabama, the cost of which will be approximately \$21,000,000. The allotment to date has been \$7,400,000. The 1953 budget estimate is \$5,500,000. That was cut by the House to \$5,000,000, and by the Senate, to \$4,500,000. I think it might very well be entirely omitted.

This is a project to improve an already existing waterway. The channel is now in use and 2,600,000 tons were shipped over it in 1950. The benefit-cost ratio is not stated in House hearings, but General Chorpene agreed that it was low.

Since navigation facilities are already available, further improvement of this project can easily be postponed. The new locks, which are to be covered in the appropriation bill, are in the planning stage, so that work already in place will not be hurt by postponement.

#### MISSOURI RIVER NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. President, another project where we could make economies is that for bank stabilization and channel rectification of the river banks of the upper Missouri River, from Kansas City to Sioux City, Iowa. The total cost of this project is \$179,000,000. There has been allotted to date approximately \$107,000,000. The 1953 budget estimate is \$5,000,000, which the House cut to \$4,250,000, and which the Senate committee raised to \$5,000,000. I think we could postpone this project.

This Missouri River navigation project is going to be an example of throwing money down a drain pipe. It cost the Government \$116,000,000 to construct the 9-foot channel from St. Louis to Kansas City. Four lines of railway could have been built between St. Louis and Kansas City for the same amount, and the freight could have been carried free for the cost of this waterway. In the last year of which I have record, there was moved only approximately 800,000 tons of freight, of which more than half was sand and gravel used by the Govern-

ment in the repair of the river and in the construction of the works along the river. This is like the island in the Orkneys, whose inhabitants were said to make a very respectable living by taking in each other's washing. The chief business on the Missouri River consists of the boats of the Army engineers, carrying sand and gravel for their work.

On the upper Missouri the conditions are even worse. I have before me the figures for the calendar year 1950. Total traffic from Kansas City to Sioux City was 869,000 tons, 181,000 tons of which was commercial traffic and 688,000 tons Government traffic. Eighty percent of the traffic therefore was the traffic of the Army engineers themselves. When the work of construction is over, there will not be many barges moving up and down the Missouri River.

Mr. President, yesterday the St. Lawrence project was rejected by the votes of many Senators who are keen for improvements on the Missouri and on the Arkansas and on the Mississippi. It was rejected although it would have paid for itself; it would have been self-liquidating. But no; it was not thought to be a sufficiently meritorious project. Yet we can spend hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of Government money to construct 9-foot channels and 12-foot channels for traffic which will never move and from which the Federal Government will never collect a dollar of revenue.

Mr. President, this is a complete error as to what is worth while for the Government to undertake. Not a cent for the St. Lawrence, not a cent for a project which would be self-liquidating, but hundreds of millions of dollars to try to construct 9-foot channels—and it is dubious whether the amount of water is sufficient to float craft even in the 9-foot channels—for transportation and traffic which will never move.

The appropriation, specifically before the Senate, is apparently a bank-stabilization project. But it is tied up with the navigation project. It is intended to restore the channels of navigation. It is not a flood-control item; it is for navigation, the feasibility of which is highly questionable. It has previously been postponed in periods of financial stress, and it can again be postponed.

Let me now return to the lower Missouri River, from Kansas City to the mouth of the river at St. Louis. To date there has been allotted to this project \$91,400,000. The 1953 budget estimate was \$3,500,000. That was a cut of 30 percent in the House, but restored to \$3,500,000 by the Senate committee. In my judgment it should be omitted. This is also a navigation project. According to General Chorpene, it has nothing to do with flood control. No work was done on this project during World War II. In 1950, over half of the tonnage shipped consisted of material for the construction of rivers and harbors.

#### ARKANSAS RIVER

Mr. President, I now turn to Arkansas, and I hope that my good friend, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] will be here when I speak about this. I know the Arkansas River project is



dear to the hearts of some of my colleagues.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let the Record show that the Senator from Arkansas is present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I understand. I wanted to notify the Senator from Arkansas who was leaving the chamber of what I was about to say, so that I would not be speaking in his absence.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate that, but I did want the Record to show that I was present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Arkansas River project, for which authorization has been made, will ultimately entail the expenditure of \$800,000,000, at a minimum. Even the Army engineers, who are most liberal in their estimates of benefits, who always tend to overestimate benefits and to pad the figures of indirect benefits, and who always underestimate costs—even the Army engineers have a ratio of benefit to cost of only 1.05.

I submit that before the Arkansas project is completed it will cost infinitely more than the benefit derived from it.

I know we always take a great deal of pride in our native rivers. Running water has a great fascination for us. The prospective toot of the steamboat whistle has a tendency to capture our imagination. We are proud of our streams in Illinois, the Illinois River, the Rock River, the Fox River, and so on. Therefore, I hope my friend from Arkansas will not think I am indulging in sectionalism if I mention the depth of the Arkansas River.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. First let me introduce a brief statement. I should like to read from page 63 of the House hearings. Speaking of the depth of the Arkansas River from the mouth of the river to Fort Smith, 373 miles, it is stated as follows:

Three feet or more for 4 months and less than 3 feet for 8 months.

Mr. President, it is no disparagement either of the State of Arkansas or of the Arkansas River if I say that for two-thirds of the year the depth of the river is less than 3 feet. Are we going to make a great artery of commerce and navigation out of the Arkansas River? Are we going to have steamboats going up and down that river when for two-thirds of the year there is a depth of less than 3 feet of water in the river? It has not been my privilege to have walked across the Arkansas River, but friends have testified to me, and I think they are truthful people, that they have waded across the Arkansas River at certain periods of the year without getting their knees wet.

I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In the first place, I am sure the Senator from Illinois wants to be fair, and, in the second place, I know that if the Senator had studied the project he must be aware that while it is classified as a navigation project, there are many elements of flood control involved. While the work is listed under rivers and harbors and as a navigation

project, the money provided for in this item is money to stabilize banks, so that if the day ever comes when it is advisable to build an over-all navigation project, there will be that much permanent work done.

The Senator from Illinois has referred to some one wading across the Arkansas River. I would not question any statement which may have been made to him by some one in whom he has great confidence, but I will say to the Senator that the same person would tell him there are other times when it takes a steamship or an airplane to get across the river, because there are times when tremendous floods occur and great damage done when they occur. There are marvelous fertile lands in the valley, and they are being eroded by floods and being carried away and forever lost. The project is not only to protect investments already made by local interests, and by the Federal Government, in levees, so as to protect the fertile lands, the industries, the pipelines and gas lines that cross the river to feed eastern industry, but these are emergency funds which are absolutely necessary now—not day after tomorrow, but now—if we are going to protect the investment, the wealth, the values placed there by nature; and the industries and improvements made by private enterprise and by the Federal Government itself.

Mr. President, it is all right to talk about a great navigation project which we hope some day may be fully realized, but not a dollar of these funds are primarily for the purpose of a navigation project, but they are for the purpose of doing the prudent thing, the thing that is a moral obligation upon the part of the Government, since it has taken over those levees, to strengthen them and to protect them. There are already breaches in the levees. The Government is authorized to set back levees and throw more fertile lands into the river. What we are trying to do is to save the land, to save the levees, so that we shall not spend money uselessly and lose more of our natural resources—but will be able to preserve them and make them more productive.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say in reply to my good friend from Arkansas, for whom I have great admiration, that I should like to quote from General Chorpene, on page 64 of the House hearings. First, I quote a statement made by Mr. Ford:

This emergency bank stabilization can be allocated benefitwise to what part of the valuation?

General CHORPENING. It would have benefits of general bank stabilization. It would have benefits eventually in the savings in transportation charges because, certainly, if we can stabilize some portion of the channel now it will be helpful at such time as we go ahead with the navigation project.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, it is obvious that the Army engineers thought—

Mr. McCLELLAN. The expenditure of the money actually fits in with the long-range program. A levee is broken and the damage is done, because of the caving of the banks. Two of them are now

in that condition. What are we going to do about it? Allow more land to be lost forever, or are we going to act on the basis of its being a permanent project, on which money can be spent for a permanent purpose and without waste?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the total budget estimates for this project were \$4,000,000. The House provided \$2,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Oh, no. Let us correct that. The Bureau of the Budget submitted an original estimate of only \$2,000,000, and the House granted that amount. The \$2,000,000 was for projects started last year which are now in process of construction. The Bureau of the Budget submitted an estimate of \$2,000,000 to continue those projects only. Subsequently, the Bureau of the Budget submitted an estimate for another \$2,000,000 for other projects. The last figure was not before the House when it considered the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was coming to that. Certainly it is true that the Senate committee increased the House figure by \$5,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And the budget figure by \$3,000,000. I challenge any Senator to read the record and not agree that it is one of the strongest cases ever made out before a flood-control committee or an Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to my amiable and well-beloved colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Illinois made a statement a while ago which I think he would want to correct. He said that many of us from "down South" had voted against the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I give the Senator from Tennessee credit for voting in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. There were several other Senators from the South who voted in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank them very much, and I only wish that their virtue were more widespread and more contagious amongst their geographic neighbors.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator would not want to make a mistake of that kind.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to my friend, the expert "needler" from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator from Illinois think that if he wants to give something to the Senator from Tennessee, it should be other than what he has just referred to? Because in view of the fact the Senator from Tennessee voted for that project, would he not, as a matter of right, be entitled to that credit?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, certainly.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from Illinois desired to be generous in giving something, it would have to be something else.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true, but I am not pretending to be generous. It is very hard for a Scotchman to be generous, but he can be just.

Mr. KERR. When he is just, would he call the attention of the Senate to it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We will let Senators find that out for themselves.

JIM WOODRUFF DAM, FLA.

Mr. President, I am afraid I must return to the subject which concerns my friend, the Senator from Florida, and take up the Jim Woodruff Dam. Sometimes this project is justified on the basis of navigation; sometimes it is justified on the basis of power. Its flood control benefits are negligible. The cost is going to be quite large. The ultimate cost is estimated as \$46,000,000. The allotment to date is \$21,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget estimated \$11,300,000 for 1953. The House cut that amount to \$11,000,000. I desire to congratulate the Senate committee on cutting the figure to \$10,300,000. But, in my judgment, the whole sum could be omitted entirely.

Mr. President, an examination of the House hearings discloses that apparently this lock dam taken by itself is not of great value. It is a part of a four-dam system, including Buford Dam, in Georgia, Fort Benning Dam, and one other dam. If we consider the system as a whole, the Army engineers have a benefit-to-cost ratio of only 1.12—one and one-eighth.

As the Senate well knows, the Army engineers always estimate benefits very high. They tend to overstate the indirect benefits. The over-all costs are invariably greater than the original estimates of costs. Yet, with their most liberal estimates, the engineers have come forward with a combined ratio of one and one-eighth to one. That is for the four dams taken as a whole.

At page 70 of the House hearings, part I, there appears the following:

Mr. RABAUT. Is the Jim Woodruff lock and dam economically self-sufficient?

General CHORPENING. Jim Woodruff Dam is part of the comprehensive plan on the Chattahoochee River, and it requires all four dams to make it fully effective. The answer is that the Jim Woodruff Dam by itself is not economically justified because there will be only partial benefits from the navigation features and only direct navigation up to that point. It takes the remainder of the dams to get the maximum benefits.

In other words, the project is not economically justified. What about the power features? The initial production of power will be 10,000 kilowatts, as I understand, or the initial installation will provide 10,000 kilowatts. I think it will be found that the unit cost for installation will be extremely high, much higher than the national average in capital investment per kilowatt. The capacity of the Jim Woodruff Dam would be less than 1 percent of the present installed electrical capacity of Georgia, Alabama, and Florida, according to a statement furnished in the House hearings, at page 75.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I could continue in some detail. However, if Senators will look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, they will find the other justifications which I have advanced. I merely give these to indicate that a cut of \$100,000,000 would be perfectly feasible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not use 45 minutes. I merely wish to say that a few minutes ago the Senate rejected a proposal to cut \$66,000,000 from the whole bill. The Senator from Illinois proposes a cut of \$100,000,000 on rivers and harbors only, just a portion of the bill. Surely the Senate, having voted against a cut of \$66,000,000 with respect to the whole bill, would not vote for a cut of \$100,000,000 on the rivers and harbors section of the bill.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McKELLAR. How much time does the Senator from Florida request?

Mr. HOLLAND. Six minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly for my colleague and myself about the two Florida items that have been mentioned. I am sorry that time will not permit my presenting the facts as to some other items, but I do happen to know about the two Florida items, and should like to make a brief statement as to them.

First, with reference to the item of deepening the intracoastal waterway from Jacksonville down to Cocoa or the Banana River guided-missile base, one of the great military installations of the Nation, the Senator from Illinois described that particular project at some length, but he failed to say that all the way through the justifications, from the time the project was begun 2 years ago, it has been predicated entirely upon defense.

For instance, at page 65 of the House hearings this year, General Chorpene, testifying about this project, stated:

General CHORPENING. This project calls for the widening and deepening of the Intracoastal Waterway all the way to Miami. At this time we are only proposing to extend the waterway to Cocoa, Fla., and it is being asked for and being done as a defense measure at the request of the Air Force which has a guided-missile base at Cape Canaveral, Fla. The funds we are asking for this year will complete the work of deepening and widening the channel to Cocoa, Fla.

The Senator from Illinois did not state that the appropriations of the last 2 years would have been completely idle

unless this year's appropriation were made available for completion of the effort begun 2 years ago, and begun solely at the request of the Air Force, and under certification by the President that it was essential in the national defense.

I have here the justification submitted by the Department of the Army at the Senate and the House hearings. It ends with the words, and the Senator may see them—

The President has certified this improvement as being important to the national defense, and the matter is predicated wholly upon that purpose and its fulfillment.

Before leaving that project, I wish to remind the Senate that Canaveral Harbor has been recently completed to a depth of 27 feet, and \$1,100,000 of local money was added to Federal money for that purpose. Regardless of the good intentions of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, apparently he has not been advised that such is the case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was General Chorpene in error?

Mr. HOLLAND. General Chorpene was in error, because the harbor has been built to a depth of 27 feet. I have seen it, and I know a great deal about this harbor which I am sure the distinguished Senator from Illinois does not know.

If it is necessary to unload 12-foot barges on the Cocoa side, the cargoes can still reach the guided-missile base simply by being transported a few miles across the peninsula on a very fine highway. So the completion of the project to Cocoa does fulfill the defense purpose, certified as such 2 years ago. What is now provided for is the last link of that particular purpose and its fulfillment.

Mr. President, with respect to the Jim Woodruff Dam, the Senator from Illinois is correct in saying that in comparison with great projects elsewhere in the Nation this may not be a great project from the standpoint of the amount of electrical energy which it will supply. It will supply only 30,000 kilowatts. However, as we view it in our part of the country, that is a large project. This stream happens to be about the only interstate stream flowing through Florida which is susceptible of hydroelectric development. It is the first of several projects in this basin which vitally affect not only our own State, but also Georgia and Alabama. It is now nearing completion. I have before me the justification of the engineers, which shows that the project as a whole is 46 percent completed now, and that so far as the construction and the building of machinery is concerned, it is much more than half completed, because a large part of the appropriation for this year and for next year will be for the clearing of the area to be covered by the waters which will be impounded.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield if I may have a couple of minutes more.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very glad to have the Senator yield on my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield.



Mr. DOUGLAS. Were the Army engineers correct in stating, on page 75 of part 1 of the House hearings, that the capacity of the Jim Woodruff Dam is about eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total capacity presently installed in the surrounding States of Georgia, Alabama, and Florida?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of their statement, but the 30,000 kilowatts made available in that area have a tremendous meaning to the 10 or 12 rural electric cooperatives which are eagerly awaiting the day when they can obtain that electric power. Thirty thousand kilowatts are not to be sneezed at, even in this day and time, particularly when our investment is more than half made, and when the date of cloture is the first of October next year, which will be possible of fulfillment even with the reduced appropriation.

Perhaps it is difficult for the Senator from Illinois to understand, but we have repeatedly made it clear that we do not wish to go further with these projects than is necessary to fulfill the demands of the Armed Forces. So far as the Cocoa project is concerned, the Budget submitted a request for \$2,200,000. The House cut it to \$2,000,000. I read from page 635 of the Senate hearings:

Senator HOLLAND. Are you able to say for the record at this time whether the additional \$200,000 which was cut off by the House is needed to complete the project?

General CHORPENING. It will not be needed, sir. We have checked that very carefully, and the \$2,000,000 will complete this work.

Senator HOLLAND. I stand by my statement. On the strength of the statement made by the engineers that they can complete the work to the guided-missiles base for \$2,000,000, we will not ask for the restoration of the \$200,000 I referred to.

In the case of the Jim Woodruff project we stood for a reduction of \$1,000,000, because the engineers stated at the hearing before the Senate committee that they would be able to close by October of next year even with the reduced funds. Completion of the project requires clearing of the right-of-way for the great lake which will be impounded and the reduced funds were to be applied on that part of the work.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield me one more minute?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield the Senator one more minute.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish the Senator from Illinois could have attended the hearings of the House committee and the Senate committee. He would have seen the willingness on the part of the Senators and Representatives from Florida, and the desire on the part of the engineers and of the committee members as a whole, to try to keep these projects at a minimum. They are vital defense projects of great importance.

So far as the intracoastal waterway is concerned, it completes the construction of the needed 12-foot depth, which

will allow material to be brought all the way from Newark, N. J., down to the guided-missile base. At present it must be transhipped somewhere up the line, and loaded on smaller barges.

I am sorry that the Senator from Illinois attacks the only two river-and-harbor projects which the State of Florida has in the bill. Both of them are defense projects, and with respect to both of them he undoubtedly has not taken occasion to inform himself, or he would not have made this attack upon them.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for the purpose of submitting certain amendments?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. On behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] I am sending to the desk two amendments intended to be proposed by the Senator from Michigan for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 7, line 9. Upon this question the yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

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

I announce further that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

I announce also that if present and voting the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of the death of his brother.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senators from Ohio [Mr. TAFT and Mr. BRICKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from North Da-

kota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 56, as follows:

## YEAS—22

Aiken	Hunt	Smith, Maine
Brewster	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Jenner	Tobey
Douglas	Martin	Welker
Dworshak	Moody	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Connor	Williams
Flanders	Robertson	
Frear	Saltontall	

## NAYS—56

Anderson	Hickenlooper	McKellar
Bennett	Hill	Millikin
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Monroney
Capehart	Holland	Morse
Case	Humphrey	Mundt
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Nixon
Cordon	Kem	Pastore
Eastland	Kerr	Schoeppel
Eaton	Kilgore	Seaton
Ellender	Knowland	Smathers
Fulbright	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
George	Long	Sparkman
Gillette	Magnuson	Stennis
Green	Malone	Thye
Hayden	McCarran	Underwood
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Watkins
Hennings	McClellan	

## NOT VOTING—18

Benton	Dirksen	McFarland
Bricker	Duff	McMahon
Butler, Nebr.	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Langer	Russell
Cain	Lodge	Taft
Carlson	Maybank	Young

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment to the committee amendment on page 7, line 9, was rejected.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment to the same committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 9, it is proposed to strike out the figures "\$277,135,600" and substitute the figures "\$285,135,600."

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, with reference to this amendment I should like to say that it is an unusual amendment and that I do not enjoy offering an amendment which increases an appropriation. However, a very unusual situation is involved on the Missouri River at Decatur, Nebr., where a bridge has been constructed, and where, because of a change in the channel of the river the bridge is not useful. Millions of dollars have been expended on the construction of the bridge, and it is not useful, because there are no approaches to the bridge and no channel under it. The appropriation recommended by the committee does not include an amount of money with which to continue the work on the Decatur Bridge. The chairman of the committee is familiar with the facts, and I am hopeful that he will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me some time?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is agreed to I should like to know whether a further amendment to the item on page 7, line 9, to strike out \$277,135,600 and to insert in lieu thereof \$264,307,500, would be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that it would not be in order unless the vote were reconsidered.

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as my colleague has pointed out the item for this necessary and completely sensible construction work was omitted by the committee when it reported the bill to the Senate. A presentation was made to the committee on behalf of the item, and I believe there was considerable sentiment in the committee in favor of including it.

The circumstances are that the natural, proper, and eventual channel of the Missouri River runs in a certain contour at or near the town of Decatur, Nebr. Some years ago, based upon the plans of the Army engineers and on all the facts available a bridge was built over the spot to which the Missouri River must eventually return if there is to be any kind of adequate or proper control of the Missouri River at this point. It is a part of the integrated plan for the control of the Missouri River.

This bridge is rather unique in that it is built over dry land, and at the present time the bridge is not of use at all in crossing the river. So the bridge stands there unused, simply because the program upon which construction of the bridge was based some years ago has not been carried out.

The work must be done at this point on the river; it is just a question of time when it will be done. The river must be returned to its natural, normal channel before the river can be properly controlled.

I merely wish to join in urging the chairman of the committee and the entire committee to support this amendment in conference, because the present situation at the bridge is utterly silly. A bridge costing several million dollars stands there, inaccessible and entirely unused, although important trade areas on both sides of the river need to be able to use the bridge. The work must be done, and should be done now.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe I understand this matter. I wish to ask whether the money required for this purpose will come out of the funds provided in the bill to help local communities or States to rehabilitate their highway systems. Is the proposed appropriation to be an outright one, or is it to be based on a matching arrangement?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I understand it is to be an outright appropriation in connection with river development. This item is not in connection with highway development, although highway development is an important incident to it. The river itself must be returned to its normal, natural channel.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill provides funds for the rehabilitation of highways which have been destroyed by disastrous floods.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understand, this item has nothing to do with the rehabilitation of highways. It relates solely to river construction work in that area. Among other things, this item will be used to put the river back into its natural channel, with the result that then the river will go under this bridge. The regular highway construction by the State government and the Federal Government will automatically go on thereafter.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield additional time to me?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield to my colleague whatever additional time he may require, provided it is within the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GILLETTE. Then I yield to my colleague 5 minutes, as as much thereof as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, let me inquire how much the amendment would add to the appropriations carried by the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This amendment will increase the appropriations by \$8,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will that amount be sufficient to complete the job, or will it be only partially sufficient?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The \$8,000,000 will be devoted to work on a particular section of the river.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the Senator from Iowa that I am somewhat familiar with this matter. I now inquire whether the Senator from Iowa expects to have the full amount provided in this year's appropriation bill, in order to have the entire project completed, or whether the amount to be provided in the appropriation bill this year will be sufficient to take care of only a part of the project?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The amount now requested is probably more than sufficient simply to return the river to its channel; in fact, I believe far less of an appropriation than this would be required for that purpose. On the other hand, it will be necessary to do other work, up and down the river, in order to control the river and to prevent it from washing out; and all that work is included in the entire project.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The result would be to make it possible for the highway project to be constructed, with the result

that the bridge could be used; is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. This work is not to be confined to only one particular part of the river, but applies to this entire section of the river.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, the reason for that is that the entire section of the river must be worked on, in order to get the river back into its channel.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. The point I make is that the entire section must be treated in that way in order to return the river to its channel and to make the bridge usable.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Was this project necessitated by a flood?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, in the long run—floods of some years ago. The river left its normal, proper channel some years ago. The Government has always contemplated returning the river to its proper channel, as a necessary part of controlling the river. Based upon that program, this bridge was built.

Mr. CASE. Have the engineers submitted this item to the Congress in the form of an engineering report?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Has the project been authorized?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, it has been authorized. I believe I am correct in that.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] to the committee amendment on page 7, in line 9. (Putting the question.)

The "ayes" seem to have it.

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

The Senate proceeded to divide.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. KNOWLAND asked for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Evidently there is a sufficient number to second the request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE. Has any understanding been had as to whether adoption of this amendment to the committee amendment will preclude the consideration of a further amendment to the committee amendment at this point? A while ago the Senator from Michigan asked that question. I understand that if the amount carried at this point in the committee amendment is now amended, it will be impossible to amend it further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Adoption of this amendment to the committee amendment would preclude the offering of a further amendment to the committee amendment at this point.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, a further amendment to the original item?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

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



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

Mr. FERGUSON. Instead of being able to reduce this figure in the amount of \$12,829,100, as proposed by an amendment which now is at the desk, the pending amendment to the committee amendment, if adopted, would increase this item by approximately \$8,000,000; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the pending amendment to the committee amendment is adopted, that will be correct.

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

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has the Chair stated that the yeas and nays have been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stated that apparently there was a sufficient second of the request for the yeas and nays.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of the death of his brother.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senators from Ohio [Mr. TAFT and Mr. BRICKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 48, as follows:

#### YEAS—24

Alken	Hickenlooper	Long
Capehart	Hill	Malone
Clements	Humphrey	McCarran
Eastland	Hunt	Mundt
Eaton	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
George	Kerr	Seaton
Gillette	Lehman	Smith, N. C.

#### NAYS—48

Anderson	Hennings	Nixon
Bennett	Hoey	O'Connor
Brewster	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Ives	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Saltonstall
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cordon	Kem	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Ferguson	Magnuson	Thye
Flanders	McCarthy	Tobey
Frear	McClellan	Underwood
Fulbright	Millikin	Watkins
Green	Monroney	Welker
Hayden	Moody	Wiley
Hendrickson	Morse	Williams

#### NOT VOTING—24

Benton	Dirksen	McKellar
Bricker	Duff	McMahon
Butler, Nebr.	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Langer	Russell
Cain	Lodge	Schoeppel
Carlson	Martin	Sparkman
Chavez	Maybank	Taft
Connally	McFarland	Young

So Mr. GILLETTE's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

### ELIMINATION OF AUTHORITY OF INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE FROM DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT—AMENDMENT TO H. R. 8210

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have just been informed that the House, through the Sadlak—Republican, Connecticut—amendment has eliminated the authority of the International Materials Conference from the Defense Production Act by a vote of 162 to 102, and I want to congratulate the House on its commonsense action.

#### RECOGNIZING INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE

The Fulbright—Democrat, Arkansas—amendment to the Senate Defense Production Act recognized the International Materials Conference—a creature of the State Department—as the official body to divide the available markets and production between the nations of the world on the basis of need.

#### DIVIDE OUR MARKETS AND PRODUCTION

The objective of distributing the production and employment of this Nation among the countries of the world on the basis of need is accomplished through the simple expedient of allocating or withholding the necessary materials for manufacturing and processing to the individuals, companies, or corporations in this Nation.

#### HOUSE AMENDMENT

The amendment offered by Mr. SADLAK and adopted by the House to section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

When all requirements for the national defense, for the stockpiling of critical and strategic materials, and for military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress have been met through allocations and priorities it shall be the policy of the United States to encourage the maximum supply of raw materials for the civilian economy, including small business, thus increasing employment opportunities and minimizing inflationary pressures. No authority granted under this act may be used to limit the domestic consumption of any material in order to restrict total United States consumption to an amount fixed by the International Materials Conference.

#### ESSENCE OF AMENDMENT

Sadlak, of Connecticut, amendment—adopted by a teller vote of 162 to 102—denies authority to limit the domestic consumption of any material in order to restrict total United States consumption to an amount fixed by the International Materials Conference after meeting requirements of national defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to foreign nations.

#### A SADISTIC BRAINSTORM OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. President, the International Materials Conference—a sadistic brainstorm of the State Department—designed to take the place of the ill-fated International Trade Organization to distribute the markets and production of this Nation with the low living standard countries of the world.

#### THREE-PART, 19-YEAR-OLD PROGRAM

The administration's 3-part, 19-year-old program to destroy the workingman and investors through the division of the markets and production of this Nation moved a step nearer realization through Senate approval of the International Materials Conference, the third part of the program.

#### HOUSE TO BE COMMENDED

The House is to be commended for their refusal to put into the hands of the low wage living standard nations of Europe and Asia the power to arbitrarily control the production and to divide the markets of this Nation.

The first two parts of the 19-year program to destroy the American workingman and investors are the 1934 Reciprocal Trades Act—free trade—and the continued foreign aid starting with lend-lease and UNRRA to the Marshall plan, ECA, point 4, and mutual security, to make up the trade balance deficits until such time as our markets can be divided with the nations of the world.

#### CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call up an amendment which I offer on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself, on page 7, line 9, of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New Hampshire.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$277,135,600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$264,307,500."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the reason why I am offering this particular amendment is that we understand the reduction could be imposed by the Corps of Engineers. While the figure involved is a small one, the total figure for rivers and harbors in the budget estimate is \$293,675,000. If we reduce the item 10 percent, \$29,367,500, it leaves an item of \$264,307,500.

The committee has recommended for this particular item \$277,135,600. If we take away 10 percent of the budget estimate, there would be a reduction of \$12,828,100.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. As I understand, there is a companion amendment which will be offered later to the section of the bill dealing with flood control.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. What the two amendments would do would be to accomplish a 10-percent reduction in this item of the bill—

Mr. FERGUSON. The next amendment will cover flood control.

Mr. CASE. The reduction proposed at this time, plus the reduction to be proposed with reference to flood control, will accomplish approximately a 10-percent reduction in the total bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. It is 10 percent below the budget estimate.

Mr. CASE. There are two essential differences between this amendment and the amendment heretofore offered by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New Hampshire. The other amendment which has already been voted down would not have taken into account the \$45,000,000 by which the bill is already below the budget estimate.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. But it would have added an additional 10-percent cut?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Instead of recommitting the bill to the committee and asking the committee to wrestle with making reductions, we leave it in the hands of the engineers to apply the amount provided for the project program by the committee, making the application of the reduction as they see fit.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. In effect, it amounts to a 5-percent reduction below the committee's figures, and it would be the duty of the Engineers to reduce the items they believe can be reduced. In other words, they would be the experts to apply the reductions.

Mr. CASE. In that case, they would take into consideration the unobligated balance on any particular project, or the state of its progress, or the necessity of applying the funds where a contractor

had his equipment in place, or whatever the consideration might be.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. If a certain amount of money would complete the project, they could complete the project. They would be the judge. The amount involved is so small that it can be done without harming the projects, but in the total it amounts to a considerable sum.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that if a further reduction is desired above the approximately 5-percent reduction already accomplished, this is a better way to do it than it would be to throw the bill back into the hands of the committee, particularly in view of the crowded schedule the committee has.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we sent the bill back to the committee we could not get away from Washington in the early part of July.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I desire to make it perfectly clear, in line with the questions asked by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], that what it is now proposed to do is to transfer the responsibility from the Senate Committee on Appropriations to the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is precisely what is being done.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. On the committee we exercised our best judgment and passed upon the items, after careful consideration and careful hearings. Now we are asked to brush all that aside and say that the Corps of Engineers shall exercise its judgment regardless of what the committee has done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have very little to say except that I think the amendment should be rejected. There has been two efforts to cut the appropriation.

This is the same amendment which was before the committee, and the committee, after taking testimony of several hundred witnesses, passed upon it. Now, as the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] so well stated a moment ago, to turn over authority to the Engineers to apply the proposed reduction, is something that is inconceivable, to me. Why should we give to the Corps of Engineers—a very splendid body of men, by the way—the right to legislate? That is what we shall be doing if the Senate agrees to this amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. It is a fact, however, is it not, that in the full committee, the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to reduce the appropriation was lost by a tie vote?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my recollection. It was a close vote. But that does not reach the real question. The real question is: Shall the Senate turn down its own committee and turn over the power which has been exercised by the committee to the Corps of Engineers, giving them the right to legislate? I do not think there is any reason for that. We voted down amendments to cut the

appropriation, and I think we should stick by our action.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. It is true, is it not, that while the committee does exercise its independent judgment—and I am happy to say it does—the net result is that more than 98 percent of the items set forth in the report are furnished to the committee by the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a very large percentage, of course. We take the testimony of the Corps of Engineers, and, after taking it, the committee exercises its own judgment, just as I am asking the Senate now to exercise its own judgment and vote down this pending amendment. I think it should be voted down.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I frankly think this would amount to a 3.6 percent cut on the whole bill.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senate wishes to make a cut of that character, let us make it clear across the board, and not abdicate our judgment or responsibility as to where public funds shall be spent. Let us make it a percentage cut clear across the board on every project if we are to make a further reduction in this bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. The reason for not doing so is that there are included in the bill some projects which could be completed with the specified amounts of money. An across-the-board cut would prevent completion by a minor sum of money, and economic losses would result.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly, and the committee has exercised its best judgment on those projects and has recommended appropriations in specific amounts.

I am unwilling now to start a procedure of turning the matter back to the Corps of Engineers and saying, "Take the money and do as you wish with it."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 4 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I call attention to the fact that the only criticism made here is that the cut is in the nature of a blanket reduction. I remind the Senate that the only material reductions which have been made in appropriations by Congress in the last 10 years have been by blanket cuts. That is the only way we have ever made reductions. I call attention to the fact that in the last 2 years, since Korea, the only reductions have been made by blanket cuts.

The proposed reduction is only the small amount of \$12,000,000 out of \$277,000,000, with respect to which there is any discretion at all placed in the Corps



of Engineers; and the Corps of Engineers has for its guidance a list of projects which the committee in its report has recommended to the Senate. If that is not guidance enough, where in the name of common sense could it be found? I hope some reduction will be made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Following the line of reasoning of the Senator from Oregon, we might as well turn over the full amount to the Corps of Engineers and tell them to allocate it according to their best judgment. If the Senate proposes to have \$12,000,000 allocated in that way, why not let the whole \$600,000,000 be allocated in similar fashion? I do not see the force of the Senator's reasoning on that point.

Be that as it may, following the suggestion would likely result in upsetting all the committee has done. We do not know where the Corps of Engineers would make cuts. They might eliminate a project in—I almost said Rhode Island, but I do not think Rhode Island is included.

Mr. GREEN. The committee did not give Rhode Island a red cent.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Corps of Engineers might eliminate projects in Louisiana, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, or some other State. They might eliminate a project such as the one at Keokuk, Iowa, as to which a splendid showing for relief was made, and the committee granted funds for that purpose. Someone on the Corps of Engineers might think, "We ought to take the money away from Iowa and Illinois"—both of which States are concerned—"and put it somewhere else."

Mr. President, that course should not be followed, and I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, have I any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I call attention again to the fact that nowhere in the bill at this time is there an allocation of any of the money in this item. A single figure has been set up for the guidance of the Corps of Engineers, and there is an itemized list. The Engineers are not bound by it. There is no legal requirement that they follow it. It is simply for their guidance, and it will remain for their guidance. If the Senate takes the step proposed, it will mean that \$12,000,000 will be available which will not have to be applied as we have requested if the Engineers may think otherwise.

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

Mr. CORDON. I am sorry; I have only half a minute.

The fact is there is no difference between a situation which might arise if the amendment were adopted and a situation which might exist if it were not adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and

the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

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

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of the death of his brother.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senators from Ohio [Mr. TAFT and Mr. BRICKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 30, as follows:

## YEAS—37

Aiken	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Nixon
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Hunt	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Ives	Seaton
Capehart	Jenner	Smathers
Case	Kem	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Martin	Welker
Dworshak	McCarthy	Wiley
Ecton	Millikin	Williams
Ferguson	Moody	
Frear	Morse	

## NAYS—38

Chavez	Ellender	Green
Clements	Fulbright	Hayden
Connally	George	Hennings
Eastland	Gillette	Hill

Holland	Magnuson	Schoeppel
Humphrey	Malone	Smith, N. C.
Johnson, Colo.	McCarran	Sparkman
Johnson, Tex.	McClellan	Stennis
Johnston, S. C.	McKellar	Thye
Kerr	Monroney	Tobey
Kilgore	Murray	Underwood
Lehman	Neely	Watkins
Long	Pastore	

## NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Dirksen	McFarland
Benton	Duff	McMahon
Bricker	Flanders	O'Connor
Butler, Nebr.	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Langer	Russell
Cain	Lodge	Taft
Carlson	Maybank	Young

So the amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON for himself and Mr. BRIDGES to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood control," on page 8, after line 18, to strike out:

## EXAMINATION, SURVEY, PLANNING, AND OTHER STUDY PROGRAMS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed flood-control projects, including preliminary examinations and surveys; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized flood-control projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; to remain available until expended \$1,215,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys and plans and specifications shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project.

## CONSTRUCTION

For construction of authorized flood-control projects or parts thereof and for other related activities as may be authorized by law, to remain available until expended \$206,017,400.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of existing flood-control projects or parts thereof and of other related activities, as authorized by law, \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for flood-control work on the Salmon River, Alaska, as authorized by law.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Flood control, general: For expenses necessary for the construction and maintenance of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented, including preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies in connection with flood control, \$294,077,200: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for flood-control work on the Salmon River, Alaska, as authorized by law: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein may be used to execute detailed surveys and prepare plans and specifications necessary for the construction of flood-control projects heretofore or

hereafter authorized or for flood-control projects considered for selection in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, and section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 638): *Provided further*, That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project: *Provided further*, That \$125,000 of the funds appropriated herein may be used for providing a suitable access road and bridge from the town of Blum, Tex., to the Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railroad station, relocated in connection with the construction of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$250,000 of the funds appropriated herein may be expended for providing a suitable access road from United States Highway 70 north to the bridge built upon and across the Center Hill Dam in DeKalb County, Tenn.: *Provided further*, That not more than \$40,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for expenditure, in addition to funds heretofore made available for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, to pay to lawful occupants of properties within the towns of Elbowoods, Sanish, and Van Hook, N. Dak., for their improvements which will be rendered useless by the construction of the project, but for which compensation may not be made under existing law because of the occupants' limited right of occupancy: *Provided further*, That payment in each case shall be limited to the fair value of the improvements, or the cost of moving such improvements to the site of the new combined town whichever is less, as determined by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated shall not be expended for the payment of business losses or other losses incident to the acquisition of lands for this project.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 10, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$294,077,200" and insert "\$294,777,200."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the amendment seeks to restore \$700,000 to the appropriation for flood control, general, and would provide \$500,000 for the Louisville flood wall and \$200,000 for the Maysville flood wall. This additional sum would provide the full budget estimate for construction, which was \$4,500,000 for the Louisville project and \$1,000,000 for the Maysville project.

The pumping facilities have been authorized and they will have to be installed. The only question is whether their installation should be put off for 6 months. It would simply retard construction for which other funds have already been appropriated.

I should like very much to have the chairman of the committee take to conference this amendment to the committee amendment, and see whether he can have this item restored, for its elimination would not save a dime; it would simply delay for 6 months the construction of the pumping facilities which are needed at once.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Kentucky will be willing to withhold for a moment his amendment to the commit-

tee amendment, for the reason that under the ruling of the Chair, since we are now dealing with the committee amendment, if any alteration is made to increase the figure, subsequent amendments to reduce the total amount of the figure would not be in order.

I should like to submit to the committee amendment an amendment to reduce the appropriation by \$20,000,000. Judging by the votes which have been had in the Senate this afternoon, I do not expect the amendment to the committee amendment to be adopted; but at least I should like to have an opportunity to offer it.

Thereafter, regardless of the action taken on my amendment to the committee amendment, the amendment of the eminent junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the committee amendment would still be in order.

So I wonder whether the Senator from Kentucky will withhold his amendment to the committee amendment until I can submit mine.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Before doing so, I should like to inquire of the Chair whether the statement of the parliamentary situation which has been made by the Senator from Illinois is in accordance with the Chair's understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator from Illinois has correctly stated the parliamentary situation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I did not question in any way the accuracy of the Senator from Illinois, but I did not know exactly what would be the situation of the various amendments in connection with this committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, to use an analogy which I am sure the Senator from Kentucky will appreciate, let me say that in obtaining information on such points, it is always wise to get it "out of the horse's mouth." [Laughter.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has, in connection with the same item, an amendment calling for a reduction of \$11,976,700. I wonder whether I may persuade the Senator from Illinois to join us in submitting that amendment to the committee amendment. By his reference to the way the votes have been going he has indicated that we should try to have this amendment to the committee amendment adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I should like to try to have the Senate adopt to the committee amendment an amendment calling for a reduction of \$20,000,000. If that amendment to the committee amendment should be rejected, then perhaps we should attempt to have the Senate agree to make a cut in the amount of \$11,000,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if I withhold for the time being my amendment to the committee amendment, in order to permit other Senators to submit amendments calling for reductions in the amount proposed to be

appropriated, could we agree to a limitation regarding the number of such amendments which would be called up before my amendment to the committee amendment was reached? In other words, I do not wish to have to wait all afternoon to submit my amendment to the committee amendment.

So, Mr. President, let me inquire whether by means of obtaining unanimous consent to that effect, my amendment to the committee amendment could be accepted by the chairman of the committee, without precluding the offering of the other amendments to the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection. However, I do not commit myself at all as to what will be done in conference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thank the chairman of the committee very much.

Mr. President, can my amendment to the committee amendment be accepted now, by unanimous consent, without affecting the right of other Senators to submit, to the committee amendment, amendments proposing curtailments in the amounts proposed to be appropriated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that if the Senator from Kentucky will withhold his amendment to the committee amendment until the Senate has disposed of amendments by which reductions are sought to be made in the amount carried by the committee amendment, then the chairman of the committee will be able to do what he has indicated he will do, namely, accept the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky to the committee amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. President, I withhold my amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at this time I wish to offer to the committee amendment on page 10, in line 5, an amendment to strike out "\$294,077,200" and to substitute for that amount "274,077,200," proposing in effect, a reduction of \$20,000,000. However, in view of the reception which has been accorded in the Senate this afternoon to previous attempts to have cuts made in the appropriation items, I shall now withdraw that amendment to the committee amendment, and join the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], in the amendment they propose to the committee amendment, although their amendment would make a smaller reduction in the appropriation than would my amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleagues, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and myself, I now call up the amendment to the committee amendment, on page 10, in line 5.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 10, in line 5,



It is proposed to strike out "\$294,077,200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$282,100,500."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall not debate extensively this amendment to the committee amendment. It relates to the flood-control item which previously has been discussed. A total sum for flood control is carried at this point in the committee amendment, and the report contains a list of items by which the engineers are to be guided.

The amount of the budget estimate for all these flood-control items, less the amount for an emergency item—our amendment to the committee amendment does not affect or touch the emergency item—is \$313,445,000. Ten percent of that amount would be \$31,344,500, leaving a total of \$282,100,500, which is the amount which would be included at this point in the committee amendment as a result of the cut we are proposing.

The committee's recommendation was \$294,077,200, and the amount which would be appropriated as the result of the making of the cut we propose would be \$282,100,500. In other words, the cut we propose would result in making an additional reduction, beyond that made by the committee, of \$11,976,700 which is about 4 1/4 percent below the committee's recommendation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a similar amendment was offered in the case of the rivers and harbors appropriation item.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, but it lost by one vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it lost by one vote.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope that at least one Member of the Senate will change his vote in this case, so that this amendment to the committee amendment will be adopted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then let us vote now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], on behalf of himself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 10, line 5.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

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

I announce further that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If present

and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

I announce also that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of the death of his brother.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senators from Ohio [Mr. TAFT and Mr. BRICKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 44, as follows:

## YEAS—30

Aiken	Hendrickson	O'Connor
Bennett	Hoey	Robertson
Brewster	Ives	Saltonstall
Capehart	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Martin	Tobey
Dworshak	Millikin	Watkins
Ecton	Moody	Welker
Ferguson	Morse	Wiley
Frear	Nixon	Williams

## NAYS—44

Anderson	Holland	McKellar
Case	Hunt	Monroney
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Eastland	Kem	Pastore
Ellender	Kerr	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Kilgore	Seaton
George	Lehman	Smathers
Gillette	Long	Smith, N. C.
Green	Magnuson	Sparkman
Hayden	Malone	Stennis
Hennings	McCarran	Thye
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	Underwood
Hill	McClellan	

## NOT VOTING—22

Benton	Butler, Nebr.	Dirksen
Bricker	Byrd	Duff
Bridges	Cain	Flanders
Butler, Md.	Carlson	Humphrey

Kefauver	McFarland	Taft
Langer	McMahon	Young
Lodge	O'Mahoney	
Maybank	Russell	

So the amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. DOUGLAS, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, in connection with my amendment. I should like to renew my request that the chairman take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky will be restated, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 10, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$294,077,200" and insert "\$294,777,200."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I renew my request.

Mr. McKELLAR. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to take the amendment to conference, with the understanding that we do not thereby commit ourselves in any way.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This amendment proposes to restore the \$500,000 which was cut from the appropriation for the Louisville flood wall, and to restore the \$200,000 for the Maysville flood wall. Nineteen million dollars has already been spent on the Louisville flood wall, and \$4,500,000 has been provided in this bill for the flood wall. However, the money for the pump and the pumping installation, which is absolutely necessary and which was authorized, was eliminated. It was explained at the time action was taken, that the reduction in the appropriation would only postpone installation of the pumps for 6 months. It would not represent a permanent saving, since the pumps are an absolutely necessary part of a project upon which \$23,000,000 has already been spent. It would merely postpone the installation of the pumps. The pumps are absolutely necessary at this time.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I personally am not going to ask for the yeas and nays, nor am I going to vote against this amendment, but I do want to suggest to the chairman that I hope the conference will be able to find and to take from other appropriations in the bill \$500,000 to cover this item, in order that the bill may not be increased by this amount.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do I correctly understand that this is for pumps to be installed inside the project, for the purpose of pumping the water over when the gates are closed?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is correct; and the pumps are absolutely necessary.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, it would be impossible to have a levee without such an arrangement. Is that correct?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator is entirely correct. It is absolutely essential.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, since we are on the flood-control section of the bill, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is in charge of the bill, a question. The report, insofar as it pertains to the \$10,000,000 item I have in mind, has this notation on page 21:

An appropriation of \$10,000,000 is recommended for flood-control works in connection with the Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Big Blue River, Kans., with the understanding that the dam will be operated as a dry dam, without either power or recreational features.

I want to say to the able Senator from Tennessee that I thoroughly agree with the statement in the report, but I want to make doubly sure that there will be no conservation pool back of the dam or a head of water that will be used for navigation. There has been some controversy about the extent of inundation of lands back of the reservoir. If the statement set forth in the report is adhered to, it will meet practically all the objections which have been manifested in that area. I want to be doubly sure that there is to be no conservation pool or head of water to be utilized for navigation purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. We were assured that it would be used purely for a pool to catch the waters and let them out when it is dry below, and keep the waters high only when there is a wet spell.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. If I correctly understand the able Senator—

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know that I have stated it properly, but it is nothing but a pool; it is not for navigation and not for power. It is purely to catch the waters, as I have stated.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. The type of construction was to be such that it could be constructed as quickly as possible, consistent with the capacity of the river below the dam when the water impounded there was to be let out.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think I have the same understanding as the Senator has, that the primary purpose of the dam was to take the peak off the flood so it could not do damage to the lands below the dam; but the channel below was to be kept full of water continuously. The idea was to take the peak of the flood off and let the water down as quickly as possible after that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 19, to strike out:

#### EMERGENCIES

For rescue work and for repair, restoration, or maintenance of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood in accordance with section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (33 U. S. C. 701n), \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Flood control, general, emergencies: For rescue work and for repair, restoration, or maintenance of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood in accordance with section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (Public Law 516, approved May 17, 1950, 33 U. S. C. 701n), \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 6, to strike out:

#### ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers; for expenses of the California Débris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act approved March 1, 1893, as amended (33 U. S. C. 661, 678, and 683); for expenses of the Board of Engineers for rivers and harbors; for expenses of the Beach Erosion Board; for miscellaneous inspections, issuance of permits, harbor lines, commercial statistics and contingencies, \$3,008,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$1,665,000 shall be available for the services of such civilian personnel as the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary to be employed in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, to carry into effect the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control, surveys, and preparation for and the consideration of river and harbor and flood-control estimates and bills: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation and for the payment of the expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meeting of the Congresses and of the Commission.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Corps of Engineers shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 200 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only in the current fiscal year and hire of passenger motor vehicles and purchase of one motor boat (to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable) and the maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft; the various appropriations for the Corps of Engineers may be used for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; not to exceed \$150,000 shall be available for the employment of consultants as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 55a, Public Law 516, 81st Cong.); the reservoir formed by the Blakely Mountain Dam, Ark., shall hereafter be designated as "Lake Ouachita," and the reservoir formed by the Narrows Dam, Ark., shall hereafter be designated as "Lake Greeson."

#### FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

##### CONSTRUCTION

For construction of flood-control works or parts thereof and for other related activities in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved May 15, 1928, as amended (33 U. S. C. 702a), \$44,335,000.

#### MAINTENANCE

For expenses necessary for maintenance of flood-control works or parts thereof and other related activities in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved May 15, 1928, as amended (33 U. S. C. 702a), \$14,827,000.

#### EMERGENCIES

For rescue work and for repair or maintenance of any flood-control work on any tributaries of the Mississippi River threatened or destroyed by flood, in accordance with section 9 of the Flood Control Act, approved June 15, 1936 (33 U. S. C. 702g-1), \$250,000.

#### ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, \$193,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries: For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved May 15, 1928, as amended (33 U. S. C. 702a), \$62,020,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 23, to insert:

Flood control on tributaries of Mississippi River, emergencies: For rescue work and for repair or maintenance of any flood-control work on any tributaries of the Mississippi River threatened or destroyed by flood, in accordance with section 9 of the Flood Control Act, approved June 15, 1936 (33 U. S. C. 702g-1), \$500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 4, to strike out:

#### SACRAMENTO RIVER, CALIF.

For prosecuting work of flood control, Sacramento River, Calif., in accordance with the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1917, as amended (33 U. S. C. 703, 704; 50 Stat. 849; 55 Stat. 638-651), \$1,000,000.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

Flood control, Sacramento River, Calif.: For prosecuting work of flood control, Sacramento River, Calif., in accordance with the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1917, as amended (33 U. S. C. 703, 704; 50 Stat. 849; 55 Stat. 638-651), \$1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the clerk's desk, which I wish to call up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

Two percent of the funds appropriated herein for flood control shall be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture for use in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented, on authorized projects for construction of flood-prevention works in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would say to the Senator from Oklahoma that his amendment is not at the moment in order.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it is in the nature of an amendment to the committee amendment on page 15,



Would it not be in order to amend the next committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from Oklahoma that the amendment is not at this time in order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to have the next committee amendment stated.

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

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 14, to insert:

NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT REMEDIAL WORKS  
INVESTIGATION

For engineering and economic investigations, pending authorization for construction, of projects for development and utilization of the waters of the Niagara River, \$900,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am opposed to this committee amendment. The amendment refers to engineering and economic investigations, pending authorization for construction, of projects for development and utilization of the waters of the Niagara River, \$900,000, to remain available until expended.

There are three bills pending before the Committee on Public Works with reference to this project. One bill provides for turning it over, 100 percent, to the Federal Government. Another bill provides that the State of New York shall have jurisdiction. The third bill provides that the power shall be developed by private industry. Private industry is perfectly capable of doing it, and it wants to do it. There are already some power projects there. I see no reason for expending \$900,000 at the moment, particularly when the amendment provides for the money remaining available until expended, until the Congress decides whether it wants the State of New York to handle the project or the Federal Government to handle it or private industry to handle it. The House turned it down. Here is a case where a Senate committee, in its wisdom, has added \$900,000, to which the House did not agree.

I think the Senate should reject this amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether he knows whether this particular activity, which is proposed in the language he seeks to delete, is necessary as a prerequisite to any of the undertakings proposed in the three bills to which he has referred.

Mr. CAPEHART. I question whether it is or not. For example, the purpose for which the money can be expended is the design of structures and power facilities.

Mr. IVES. The reason why I raise the point, Mr. President, is that 2 years ago, as I recall, some of us were very anxious to have this kind of an appropriation provided in order that a survey could be made in that particular area. It was my understanding that the survey was absolutely indispensable as a prerequisite to the undertaking itself.

Mr. CAPEHART. I refer to the language of the amendment:

For engineering and economic investigations, pending authorization for construction, of projects for development and utilization of the waters of the Niagara River, \$900,000, to remain available until expended.

If I understand it correctly, the money cannot be spent until there has been an authorization for construction. Therefore, why handle it at all?

Mr. IVES. I do not know; that is what I am trying to ascertain.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 15 minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 291 of the Senate hearings, this testimony, referring to the plans, appears:

Regardless of which one of those is finally authorized, the present engineering work covered by this estimate should proceed under governmental auspices to make sure that the project is developed in the very best possible way.

That is, there would have to be a decision whether the project should be handled under private ownership, Canadian ownership, State ownership, or United States Federal Government ownership.

Mr. CAPEHART. I again return to the wording of the amendment, which is "pending authorization for construction." If I read that language correctly, the \$900,000 could not be spent until there had been an authorization by Congress for construction.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, but I hope that later the Senator will yield to me, because we are operating under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe the wording of the amendment was unhappy. The only purpose of the appropriation in this bill was to provide for a survey to determine the feasibility of the project, and the estimated cost of the survey was \$900,000. I do not believe the wording, "For engineering and economic investigation, pending authorization for construction," was at all necessary. All the committee intended, based upon the testimony presented, was to have an engineering investigation made to determine the feasibility of doing something along the Niagara River.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the justification, which I hold in my hand, says, "surveys," for which \$150,000 would be provided; \$600,000 is for design of structures and power facilities; \$150,000 is for subsurface investigations or surveys; \$100,000 is for model studies.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. Since the Senate is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement, I will yield in the Senator's time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] controls the time.

Mr. CAPEHART. My point is that until Congress settles the matter, why should the money be spent for the purpose stated in the wording of the amendment? I call attention to the fact that the wording is, "pending authorization for construction." Congress is asked to appropriate \$900,000, which would remain available until expended. That is point No. 1. The second point, if I read the amendment correctly, is that the money cannot be spent until authorization is made for construction.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in my time?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield in the Senator's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico should understand that he does not have any time. The Senator from Tennessee is in control of the time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield time.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee will be fair. I know he will yield time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There cannot be an authorization under the law until the Army engineers determine and report to Congress that the project is feasible. That is why I believe the wording of the amendment is unhappy, because unless there is a report upon feasibility, there cannot be an authorization.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Army engineers have already spent some \$400,000 over a period of years. Now there is a request in the bill for \$900,000 in 1 year. Yet it is not known at the moment, and will not be known until Congress acts, whether the State of New York or the Federal Government will handle the matter, or private industry will be permitted to handle it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly what is desired to be ascertained. Investigations of various projects are made because money is appropriated for that purpose. Investigations come first. Between \$2,000,000 and \$3,000,000 is provided for that purpose.

Mr. CAPEHART. Just what is being proposed? In 1951 Congress appropriated, and the taxpayers paid, \$277,000 for making surveys. How much money is it necessary to pay out for the making of surveys?

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for a question.

Mr. WELKER. I am interested in the suggestion that this development be made by private enterprise. Does the Senator assume for a moment that private enterprise would require the expenditure of \$900,000 for the drawing of plans to tell private enterprise how to build this power plant?

Mr. CAPEHART. I would not think so, but in 1951, \$277,000 was spent, and in 1952, \$172,000 was spent, for the purpose of making the surveys we are talking about. Now there is a request for \$900,000 more. I repeat, the House allowed nothing. The House said it did not want to appropriate any money at all for this purpose. Yet the item is included in the pending bill. I hope the

Senate will reject it, because I think it is necessary, first, that the Committee on Public Works consider the question whether the State of New York, the Federal Government or private industry should handle the matter. Private industry is already developing power, it has money, and is perfectly willing to go forward just as soon as Congress tells private industry what is wanted.

The reason why Congress must pass upon the matter is that there is a treaty between this Nation and Canada, and the proposed project is for development of the Niagara River, which connects Lake Erie with Lake Ontario, and runs over Niagara Falls.

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

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I appeared before the Committee on Appropriations in behalf of this item. I asked for a million dollars, and the amount was reduced to \$900,000. Last year, the Senate may recall, an appropriation for a million dollars was added to the appropriation bill on the floor of the Senate. It was not agreed to in conference, and therefore was eliminated from the bill.

The undertaking at Niagara is one of the most important power developments in the country. It will develop at least as much power as will be developed on the St. Lawrence. It will develop as much power, substantially—

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator mean, then, that we will not need the St. Lawrence project developed?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I do not agree to that for an instant. We need both of them badly. The Niagara project will develop as much power as has been developed at Bonneville and Grand Coulee dams.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield additional time to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sure the able Senator from Tennessee will yield 3 minutes to me, since I was interrupted by other Senators.

Mr. LEHMAN. If we do not finish at the expiration of 15 minutes, I shall offer a minor amendment to enable us to have more time for debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for an additional 6 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think this matter is vitally important to the economy and welfare not only of the State of New York, but of States adjacent to New York, and to the economy of the country as a whole. It is a tremendous undertaking, involving many hundreds of millions of dollars. Canada is already developing power. The project is not exclusively an undertaking for the development of power, but it is also an undertaking to safeguard the scenic beauties of Niagara Falls, a great asset to the entire country.

Under our treaty with Canada, surplus water that flows down the Niagara River is allocated evenly to Canada and to the United States. Under the treaty,

each country would receive 65,000 cubic second-feet of water. Canada has already developed far greater water power than this country has developed. However, the treaty equalizes the use of water, and will equalize between Canada and the United States the production of power from the flow of water. Canada can go ahead under our treaty and use every cubic foot of water unless we develop it ourselves.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. May I just finish my thought?

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to make the point of order that this item is legislation on an appropriation bill. Perhaps after the Senator yields—

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to finish my thought. The time belongs to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

These works are being built today. Every drop of that water can be used to develop power. The works are being developed, and they will continue to be developed either by us or by Canada. Our great resource is going to waste because we refuse to develop it.

Mr. President, it does not make any difference whether this power resource is developed by the State of New York, by the Federal Government, or by private capital. Surveys, investigations, and studies must proceed before anything can be done. The water must be harnessed and coordinated with the protection of the scenic beauty of the falls.

Yesterday we witnessed on the floor of the Senate a successful effort to prevent the development of water power on the St. Lawrence, and the building of a seaway. I believe that what we did yesterday was a tragic mistake. I believe that it is a mistake which we shall live to rue in a very short time, and we will never be able to justify to future generations our tragic, our inexcusable, failure.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. If we stop the development of the water power on the Niagara, we shall be sacrificing a great natural resource which belongs to the people of the United States. New York is willing to repay the Federal Government for the entire cost of development. It will not cost the Federal Government a single cent, but it will make possible the use of cheap power for the benefit of all the people of New York State and for the people of Ohio and Pennsylvania, and I hope of some of the New England States within economical transmission distance.

I cannot understand how anyone can possibly object to this appropriation, or object to the undertaking of this highly important and essential development.

Mr. CASE and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to yield, if I have any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 1 minute remaining. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

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

Mr. LEHMAN. If I yield at all, I must yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. AIKEN. Why does the Senator from New York have to yield to him?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I make the point of order against this amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield for the purpose of a point of order being made?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have not yielded for that purpose. I do not know whether I have the right to stop the raising of a point of order.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor. The Chair cannot recognize the Senator from Minnesota for a parliamentary inquiry unless the Senator from New York yields.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for that purpose.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] yielded 6 minutes to the Senator from New York, and he was informed by the Chair that there was an additional 3 minutes, which he yielded to the Senator from Indiana. That was the understanding under which we were proceeding on this side.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] may have 3 minutes. I certainly want the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to have 5 minutes. I therefore ask that the Senator from Indiana may have 3 minutes and the Senator from Vermont may have 5 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I make the point of order—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I make the point of order against this amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that under a previous ruling the point of order made by the Senator from Indiana is not now in order, and will not be in order until the time has expired on the pending amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. At that time, I shall make the point of order.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, 4 years ago I made the prediction on this floor that the Niagara-Hudson Power Co.,



now the Niagara-Mohawk Power Co., would undertake to steal Niagara Falls. My prediction has come true to an alarming degree. The power interests have spent not \$900,000, but more than \$9,000,000 in propagandizing the country, trying to get the Congress to be a party to taking Niagara Falls away from the State of New York and giving it to the private power companies. They have invaded every club they can. They infiltrate farm and labor and business organizations as far as possible. They have gone to them with false propaganda. They have sought to prejudice the minds of the public in every way. They have been to every chamber of commerce in the northeastern part of the country. They have carried full-page advertisements in magazines and newspapers all over the country. They have spent God knows how much money, but possibly 20 times \$900,000, in an attempt to put enough pressure on the Congress to get the Congress to turn over to them this great natural resource, one of the greatest natural resources we have, which properly belongs to the people of the country.

Yesterday in defeating the St. Lawrence development the power companies of the United States won one of the greatest victories of all time on this floor—something that the Congress will regret in years to come.

Why do we let the power companies take over everything? Why do we let them spend \$9,000,000, \$10,000,000, \$15,000,000, or \$20,000,000 in propagandizing the country and charging the cost to the electric power users; and then try to block the expenditure of \$900,000 for the defense and welfare and interest of the public? Are the power companies going to run the Congress? Are they going to run the Government as a whole? They are working desperately in that direction. I say that this is the time to stop them. If we think anything of our country at all, we will not let them get away with this. If this \$900,000 is to be spent in defense of the natural resources which belong to the people of the country, let us spend it—or \$900,000,000, if we have to, but do not let history record that this Congress agreed to dissipate the resources that properly belong to the public.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 3 minutes to reply to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEHMAN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEHMAN. I object, pending the offering of an additional amendment. I want more time to discuss this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York does not have the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may offer an amendment, may I not?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. May I offer an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the time for debate on the pending

amendment has been exhausted, the Chair will recognize the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understand that the time has been exhausted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has 6 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I regret that I must reply to the able Senator from Vermont. I do not know why he became so excited. It is easy for a Senator, or for an individual, to make statements such as he has made. It is very simple. I could stand here and make the statement that he represents certain interests which I do not like, although I do not know that he does.

Mr. AIKEN. I might make the same statement with respect to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the able Senator please remain in his seat?

I am not representing the power companies—

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not representing the power companies in this instance. I am representing private industry in America. If the able Senator from Vermont or any other Senator wants to attach any odium to me for being for private industry in America, for being for the American system, I shall accept it.

Again I say that talk is cheap. It is easy to make such charges. It is easy to charge that the power companies have spent millions and millions of dollars. I do not know whether they have or not. I have not the slightest idea. I know that this is a free country; and I know that if a man is against something he has the right to say so. If he is for something he has the right to say so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. CAPEHART. Why the able Senator from Vermont should rise and attack the power companies, and attack those of us who are fighting for and believe in the American system of government, I do not understand. I do not know what his object is; but if he gets any satisfaction whatsoever out of blaming others, and assaulting the intentions of others, by inference or otherwise, it is perfectly agreeable to me.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. Not at this time. If the Senator from Vermont gets any satisfaction out of impugning the motives of his fellow Senators, if he thinks it will get him to heaven, if he thinks he will be loved more by his family, or if he thinks he will be loved more by his friends, he has a perfect right to do what he has done.

I presented my argument in a businesslike way, without any emotion. I was honest and sincere in what I said. If the Senator from Vermont wishes to connect me with the power companies and millions and millions of dollars, if he thinks it will get him to heaven, if he thinks it will make a bigger man out of him, or if he thinks that he can assault my character and accuse me and other Senators of having some motives

different from his own, it is perfectly agreeable to me, and I have no objection whatever.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I am against the amendment. I think it is wrong. All I want the Congress to do is to settle the question of whether private industry will develop the waters in question, whether the State of New York will do it, or whether the Federal Government will do it. Once Congress decides that question, no one will hear me crying "Sour grapes."

I shall be governed by the decision of Congress. I have noticed Senators, in effect, cheering when another Senator makes a statement which is against the rules of the Senate. If Senators get any satisfaction out of it they can go right ahead and enjoy it. It is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. President, I now make a point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall use 2 minutes. Mr. President, from an examination of the committee amendment, I am afraid that it contains some words which make it subject to a point of order. Therefore, I offer an amendment, on page 15, line 20, to strike out the words "to remain available until expended."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 15, line 17, after the word "investigations" to insert the words "and surveys."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 15, line 15, as amended.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 15, line 15, as amended.

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Chair state the question before the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Chair state the question before the Senate? As I understand, it is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 15, line 15, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. The clerk will state the committee amendment as amended.

The CHIEF CLERK. The committee amendment on page 15, beginning on line 15, as amended, reads as follows:

NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT REMEDIAL WORKS  
INVESTIGATION

For engineering and economic investigations and surveys, pending authorization for construction, of projects for development and utilization of waters of the Niagara River, \$900,000.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senate now voting on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is about to vote on the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. CAPEHART. A "yea" vote is in favor of the committee amendment and in favor of the appropriation of \$900,000; a "nay" vote is against the appropriation of \$900,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

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

I announce further that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of the death of his brother.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senators from Ohio [Mr. TAFT and Mr. BRICKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from North

Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—45

Alken	Hunt	Moody
Anderson	Ives	Morse
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kerr	Pastore
Douglas	Kilgore	Seaton
Eastland	Knowland	Smathers
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Fulbright	Magnuson	Sparkman
Green	McCarran	Stennis
Hayden	McClellan	Thye
Hennings	McKellar	Tobey
Hill	Millikin	Underwood
Holland	Monroney	Wiley

NAYS—25

Bennett	Hendrickson	Mundt
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Capehart	Hoey	Schoeppel
Case	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kem	Watkins
Ecton	Long	Welker
Ferguson	Malone	Williams
Frear	Martin	
George	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—26

Benton	Duff	McMahon
Bricker	Flinders	Nixon
Bridges	Gillette	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Kefauver	Russell
Byrd	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Cain	Lodge	Taft
Carlson	Maybank	Young
Dirksen	McFarland	

So the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

The next amendment was, under the heading "Canal Zone government," on page 17, line 3, after the word "transfusions", to strike out "\$16,139,500" and insert "\$18,822,549."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Have all the committee amendments been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been.

Mr. MONRONEY. Are amendments from the floor now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They are.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, and I now call it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

Two percent of the funds appropriated herein for flood control shall be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture for use in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented, on authorized projects for construction of flood-prevention works in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield for a question to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I notice that the Senator from Oklahoma has offered his amendment to be inserted after the period at that point in the bill. Is the Senator from Oklahoma proposing that the 2-percent reduction be made in the funds appropriated for work on the Sacramento River, and that funds to that extent be taken for use by the Department of Agriculture; or would this amendment apply to the entire appropriation?

Mr. MONRONEY. Two percent of the entire flood-control appropriation contained in this bill would be transferred for upstream soil-conservation work, as now authorized by Congress and now being carried forward at a snail's pace by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma sure that would be the effect of his amendment, if it is adopted to the bill at the point at which his amendment is offered? Or would his amendment merely provide that 2 percent of the funds appropriated for flood control on the Sacramento River would be set aside for the purpose stated in his amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. I advise the Senator from California that that would not be the effect of my amendment; and I make that statement on the advice of legislative counsel who carefully prepared the amendment and suggested that it be offered at this point in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would not the amendment be proper to be offered to an agricultural bill or a deficiency bill? I do not think the amendment is proper in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Perhaps as I develop the case for the amendment I may



be able to answer the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that a change be made in the page and line of the bill to which the amendment is offered, in order to remove any doubt on the part of the Senator from California. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be inserted on page 11, after line 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield for a question; I do not wish to yield at this time for a point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall not make the point of order until later, but at this time I inform the Senator from Oklahoma that I shall make a point of order against the amendment. I do not think the amendment is at all proper to this bill; adoption of the amendment would confuse the entire situation in the case of this appropriation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Tennessee in withholding the point of order.

At this time I wish to develop the case for the amendment.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I understand that there are either 10 or 11 projects—

Mr. MONRONEY. There are 11 authorized, approved flood-control projects which are under way at only a snail's pace, under present appropriations.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to ask this question: If the amendment is adopted and if the bill as thus amended is passed by both Houses of Congress and is signed by the President, will the amount of money to which the amendment relates be limited to only the 11 projects?

Mr. MONRONEY. It would be limited to the 11 projects which heretofore have been authorized by Congress. If we attempted to do otherwise, we would be making an appropriation for projects which the Congress has not authorized. For that reason, the amendment is specifically restricted to the 11 projects which now are under way.

Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is very simple. It is offered to a bill which proposes to appropriate a vast sum of money—a total of \$365,500,000—largely for one type of flood control, namely, main-stem dams. This amendment is offered in an effort to channel only 2 cents out of every dollar into upstream flood control, in an effort to try to hold the water where the water falls, in an effort to prevent the inundation of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of acres of our most valuable bottom lands, and in an effort to get on with a task which Congress has authorized, but for which Congress has appropriated at a very niggardly rate.

I believe the amendment is fully in line with the other appropriations made in this bill for the purpose of controlling floods.

I should be glad to have the chairman of the committee test whether the amendment is germane.

But surely, Mr. President, in passing a bill carrying appropriations of \$365,500,000 for main-stem dams, we should not ignore the fact that there must be at least some means by which we may appropriate a few dollars in order to proceed with work of the type I have just mentioned, as well.

As I have said, the bill carries appropriations of \$365,500,000 for the huge, gigantic main-stem dams, whereas my amendment will add only \$7,000,000 for 11 authorized projects which now are proceeding at a snail's pace.

The amendment would provide on an average only \$460,000 additional for each of these 11 projects, work upon which was authorized by the Congress many years ago. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a list of the projects, showing the estimated number of years required for completion, and the estimated number of years required for completion under present appropriations.

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

Name of project	Proposed years to complete	Years to complete under present appropriations rate <sup>1</sup>
Buffalo Creek, N. Y.	18	23
Colorado, Middle, Tex.	20	24
Coosa, Ga. and Tenn.	20	22
Little Sioux, Iowa and Minn.	15	12
Little Tallahatchie, Miss.	20	14
Los Angeles, Calif.	10	31
Potomac, Md., Va., Pa., W. Va.	24	13
Santa Ynez, Calif.	16	6
Trinity, Tex.	15	54
Washita, Okla.	15	29
Yazoo, Miss.	20	49

<sup>1</sup> Based on total estimated Federal costs for 1949 and 1952 appropriations figures.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Congress studied, approved, and placed its stamp on the value of upstream flood control. This was not done haphazardly. It was not done without adequate study; and yet we appropriated but \$7,000,000 in the agricultural bill for this purpose. I plead with Senators to consider, as we appropriate \$365,000,000 for main-stem dams, to do a little bit for the farmers who are trying to hold their bottom land, seeking a way to control floods where the water falls, and before it reaches the main stem of the channel. Can we not afford 2 cents out of every dollar in order to give the upstream flood-control program a chance to be tried out and to be completed without waiting 50 years? There are but 11 projects, of which the total cost to complete will be only \$152,000,000. Yet we are appropriating only \$7,000,000 a year. My amendment proposes that 2 percent of the funds appropriated for the gigantic projects be used for these upstream flood-control projects.

This has to do with gully streams, check dams, the soil-conservation treatment of watersheds, and so forth, in places where it would be possible to control floods and prevent the washing away of the soil into the stream channel and seal off the multimillion dollar dams which we are building in such great abundance throughout the country.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma whether it is not his intention in proposing this amendment to build up a fund, in order to accelerate effectively the upstream development, which he feels—and I agree with him—has been sadly neglected?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Kansas is entirely correct. It is the purpose of the Senator from Oklahoma to try to accelerate this program, and to take some action to obviate the necessity of waiting 50 years for the completion of this program. The project is only one-sixth finished, and we apparently shall have to wait for 50 years, and then later build one-sixth of a dam. It is only one-sixth of the way across the stream, and we cannot hope to control floods through this upstream program if we do one-sixth of the work and then let the work rest for 20 or 30 years.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I want to say to the able Senator from Oklahoma that I am heartily in accord with his position, and that I sympathize with what he is attempting to do. Whether it should be done in connection with the pending bill, I do not know, but I think the Senator has made a most able presentation of the problem.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

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

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

Mr. SEATON. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma whether the 2 percent would apply, on page 10, line 5, to the \$294,077,200.

Mr. MONRONEY. It would be 2 percent of the \$365,000,000 carried in this bill for flood control. It would represent a total of \$7,300,000, which would double the appropriations now being made for this very valuable work of upstream flood control. This covers all of the 11 projects.

Mr. SEATON. I should like to say that I am in complete sympathy with the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not true that money for this item should properly come from the funds of the Department of Agriculture, and that, in fact, there is this year an item of \$6,372,800 in the agricultural bill for this very purpose?

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say to the distinguished chairman that when the

agricultural bill was before the Senate, the junior Senator from Oklahoma made an effort to add funds to that appropriation. We were told at that time that it would increase the agricultural appropriation above the budget figure. So at that time, as the big flood-control bill appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars for flood control was presently coming before the Senate, we were persuaded to wait. Now that this flood-control measure is being considered, since the Army engineers have no exclusive omnipotence in the matter of flood control, we think it logical and reasonable to ask that 2 cents out of every dollar be spent on upstream flood control.

The Senator from Oklahoma at this time is seeking a test in the United States Senate to determine whether this body is interested in upstream flood control, and whether Senators are willing to earmark 2 cents of every dollar now being spent for gigantic dams for use in holding the water where it falls, before it reaches the main channels of our rivers.

Mr. McKELLAR. The purpose of the Senator's amendment is clear, but the Senator did not come before the committee. We had no evidence about this matter at all. There is nothing in the hearings about it, as I recall. I am quite sure the Senator from Oklahoma did not come before the committee. We would have been glad to hear him. I remember extending an invitation to every Senator having any matter pertaining to this bill to come before the committee. We had no proof on this matter, and there has already been an appropriation of \$6,372,800 to the Department of Agriculture for this very purpose. Under those circumstances, it would seem that the Senator should wait until the next time. I am inclined to sympathize with his purpose, but I think he is pursuing the wrong course in attempting to achieve it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the comments and the sympathy of the distinguished chairman, but the farmers of this country want action. They do not want to wait for 50 years to get this program started. The junior Senator from Oklahoma went before the Appropriations Subcommittee of the Department of Agriculture, where we seemed to have made a good case. The result was, however, that our item was cut \$750,000, because an effort was being made to reduce the amount that would be spent for flood control. The distinguished subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], informed the Senator from Oklahoma that he did not think flood control belonged in the agricultural bill, and hinted that it might be wise to seek it as a part of the general flood-control bill. That is where we are today.

Mr. McKELLAR. What I am saying is that the Senator from Oklahoma should have come before the Committee on Appropriations, to consult members of the committee, before proposing his amendment on the floor of the Senate. I do not know what the facts are. I do not know whether the matter has been fully investigated. I think there should be upstream flood control, of course, al-

though I do not think we have sufficient evidence before us upon which to accept such an amendment as this.

Mr. MONRONEY. The committee must have had evidence, because Congress years ago authorized these projects. We have been appropriating for them at a snail's pace in the agricultural bill. I do not think the farmers are going to accept as a reason for not getting the projects under way at a decent pace the fact that there is a great degree of departmentation between two committees. We should set a precedent that flood-control funds, both upstream and downstream, belong in the Civil Functions appropriation bill.

I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote when the point of order is made, to see whether the Senate wants to get busy on this program. It has been fully investigated and authorized; it has been appropriated for, in a niggardly way, in the agricultural bill. We talk of billions of dollars. Let us drop a few crumbs from our table for the benefit of the farmers in aid of the most valuable asset this country has.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I make a point of order against this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained on the ground that the amendment would add legislation to an appropriation bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on the point of germaneness—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No one has raised the question of germaneness.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Chair has already ruled.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

On this question the yeas and nays have been requested, but the request is not sufficiently seconded. [Putting the question.] The decision of the Chair is sustained.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "6-18-52-C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 105. (a) To the end that inland waterway improvements in aid of navigation heretofore or hereafter made at the expense of the United States may be rendered self-supporting and, so far as practicable, self-liquidating, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress (1) to impose reasonable user charges for the use of the improved inland waterways of the United States by means of vessels operated for commercial purposes, and (2) to discontinue further Federal expenditures in the maintenance and operation of any improved inland waterway which, after a reasonable development pe-

riod, proves to be incapable of yielding revenues from user charges sufficient to meet the costs of its maintenance and operation. The term "improved inland waterway" as used in this section includes any inland or coastal canal and any natural inland waterway and the connecting channels thereof, constructed or improved in aid of navigation at the expense of the United States, except that the term does not include the Great Lakes and their connecting channels or such portion of any improved inland waterway as is used regularly and to a substantial extent by oceangoing vessels engaged in foreign commerce.

(b) The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby authorized and directed to prescribe and promulgate on or before September 1, 1952, user charges which, on and after January 1, 1953, shall be imposed by the United States for the use of each improved inland waterway by means of vessels operated for commercial purposes.

(c) The user charges to be prescribed by the Commission hereunder for the use for commercial transportation purposes of each improved inland waterway shall be at a rate or rates calculated to cover, as nearly as practicable, all costs of providing, maintaining, and operating the improvements made thereon in aid of navigation, including reasonable allowances for interest on the investment and amortization thereof over such reasonable period as may be determined by the Commission: *Provided*, That in determining the level of user charges to be prescribed for any such waterway the Commission shall take into consideration not only the present, but also the reasonably prospective, use thereof for commercial transportation, and the Commission may divide the waterway into different sections and prescribe different user charges for the use of different sections, and shall also have authority to change from time to time the level of user charges for any such waterway or section thereof and to rearrange any section division thereof which it may have made: *And provided further*, That, upon application and after affording opportunity to all interested parties for a hearing, the Commission shall exempt any user of any such waterway from the payment of user charges for any use thereof which it finds to be of such nature as not to be facilitated or benefited by the improvements on account of which the user charges are imposed.

(d) Before prescribing or changing the user charges to be imposed for the use for commercial transportation purposes of any such waterway or section thereof, or dividing or redividing any such waterway into sections for the purpose of prescribing user charges therefor, the Commission shall hold a public hearing for the purpose of determining the just and reasonable user charges to be prescribed. It shall give notice of the nature and scope of each such hearing at least 30 days in advance thereof by publishing a notice thereof in the Federal Register and by serving a copy of said notice upon each carrier subject to its jurisdiction operating on the waterway or waterways involved and upon all other carriers which in its opinion might be interested in the proceeding, and shall give such further notice of said hearing as to it appears advisable.

At any such hearing, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Army, upon request of the Commission, to make available to the Commission all information in his possession with respect to the expenditures made by the United States in the construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of the waterway or waterways under consideration, the nature and volume of the traffic moved thereover, and any other matter pertinent to the purpose of the hearing.



(e) After user charges shall have been prescribed by the Commission for any inland waterway and shall have become effective, the owner or operator of any vessel (including any government, State or Federal, and any corporation or instrumentality owned or controlled thereby) who shall use such waterway for commercial transportation purposes shall, unless exempted therefrom by the Commission, pay to the United States the prescribed and effective user charges. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to collect such user charges and to prescribe reasonable rules and regulations relating to the payment and collection thereof.

(f) Any person or corporation who shall fail or refuse to pay the user charges prescribed in accordance with the provisions of this section or to comply with the regulations which shall be promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury relating to the payment and collection thereof shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof in any court of competent jurisdiction shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$100 and not more than \$2,000, and every failure of any such person to pay such user charges or to comply with said regulations shall be deemed a new and separate offense and subject such person to additional penalties therefor. In addition to the criminal action provided for in this section and in addition to all other civil remedies which may be possessed by the United States of America, the United States of America shall have a lien for the user charges upon any vessel for the movement of which user charges are not paid as provided for in this section.

(g) This section shall not apply to naval or other noncommercial vessels of the United States, and no user charges shall be imposed under the authority of this section on account of the use of any of the navigable inland waterways which form boundaries between the United States and any foreign nation, except such as may be permitted by treaties.

Page 21, line 11, strike out "SEC. 105" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 106."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I gave notice yesterday, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that I would ask for a suspension of the rule. There is one change which I should like to make, but, first, let me make an explanatory statement.

When the St. Lawrence project was before the Senate yesterday it provided that the cost would be met out of tolls and power rates. In other words, there were to be no costs to the Government except an initial advance of money, and the users of the service provided by the waterway would pay for the cost of the waterway. Those of us who believed in that project were very glad to make that point clear and definite. In connection with our inland waterways the Government spends hundreds of millions of dollars in improving rivers, and then they are used completely free by ship and barge owners.

A proposal similar to mine has been offered in the form of a bill by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] providing that the users of waterways must pay charges which would meet not only operating costs but interest on investment and amortization.

My amendment is not so stringent since, in the setting of rates, reasonable allowances for interest on the investment

and its amortization over a reasonable period are not required. But my amendment would require the setting of rates to reflect costs of operation and maintenance.

The user charges would be based on operation costs. These would net possibly \$35,000,000 a year to the Federal Government and would put the use of our waterways on a basis similar to that we were recommending in the case of the St. Lawrence seaway except that we would be less stringent.

The change I desire to make in my amendment is on page 2, line 23, after the word "navigation" to strike out the comma and the words "including reasonable allowances for interest on the investment and amortization thereof over such reasonable period as may be determined by the Commission."

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Did not the Senator inform us in the course of the debate on the submerged lands bill that these streams belonged to the States and not to the Federal Government?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The land underneath the inland waterways belongs to the States. We were willing to make it statutory by the O'Mahoney amendment. We are simply saying that the Federal Government should have some return on the money which it has expended.

Mr. LONG. Take a case where the Government has spent no money, for instance, where a ship plies Long Island Sound, traveling over an area where the Federal Government has spent no money on the improvement of the channel. Does the Senator feel that in such a case charges should be made for the use of the waterway?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If my good friend will look at page 2 he will see that charges are to be imposed simply for the use of each improved inland waterway. The rates are to be established by the Interstate Commerce Commission and collected by the Treasury Department.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator admits that his amendment is subject to a point of order. What is the Senator's plan?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That the rule be suspended.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move that paragraph 4 of rule XVI be suspended in order that the amendment may be proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois. He has 15 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am firmly convinced that this is an issue which we must face. The question is whether we shall spend hundreds of millions of dollars as a subsidy to those who use waterways, and at the same time re-

fuse to appropriate any money for a project which can be financed by tolls and charges.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If I read the Senator's amendment correctly, the question is whether we are willing to fix tolls for every waterway except the Great Lakes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Great Lakes are international in character.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. If the Senate had approved the St. Lawrence seaway, would not tolls have been fixed in the same way?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is exactly correct. We are saying that if it was a good principle for the St. Lawrence seaway, we believe it is a good principle for the improved inland waterways of the country.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator tell me whether the St. Lawrence seaway would be an international waterway?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; the St. Lawrence River is an international waterway.

Mr. LONG. The Senator proposes that it charge tolls, and that every other waterway, except the Great Lakes, should do the same. I wonder why the Senator excepts the Great Lakes. Inasmuch as he believes other waterways and internal improvements should be charged for, we might try it on the Great Lakes first and see how the program works.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Great Lakes have not been improved. Certain harbors on the Great Lakes have been improved. The operating cost of those harbors probably should be charged against the traffic.

Mr. LONG. I read from page 2 of the Senator's amendment:

The term "improved inland waterway" as used in this section includes any inland or coastal canal and any natural inland waterway and the connecting channels thereof, constructed or improved in aid of navigation at the expense of the United States, except that the term does not include the Great Lakes and their connecting channels.

I wonder why the Senator excludes the Great Lakes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There was some question about the Soo Canal.

Mr. LONG. It would seem to me that the Senator might experiment with the Great Lakes first.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why not experiment on the Mississippi River?

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana is not proposing it; inasmuch as the Senator from Illinois is proposing it, it would seem appropriate to apply the proposal first to areas with which he is very familiar.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I am interested in the Senator's amendment, and I hope the

Senate will suspend the rule in order to permit it to be offered and debated. The genial and brilliant Senator from Louisiana has asked a question about the Great Lakes, but he has not advanced any reason why the proposal should not be applied to other waterways. If there is any reason why the amendment should be rejected, I should like to hear it stated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In order to make my proposal perfectly clear, I am willing to strike out, on page 2, line 8, all after the words "United States" through the end of line 11.

Included in the part to be eliminated is the clause, "except that the term does not include the Great Lakes and their connecting channels."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Illinois that at this time, a point of order having been made against his amendment, he is not permitted to strike out that language. The question now is on the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the motion is agreed to, then before the bill is finally passed, I shall move to strike out the words I have indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to suspend the rule.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to strike out those words.

Mr. LONG. I object. I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute to offer to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, is any time available? If so, who is in control of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes are available, and the time is controlled by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois poses an entirely new approach to the problem dealing with waterways and authorizations for them. The amendment is clearly legislation. It runs through 6 pages, and would involve an entire change in the method of authorization of projects. It is certainly a subject that should not be considered at this time of the evening, under a limitation of debate of 15 minutes. Also, the Senator from New York advises me that the temperature outside is 92 degrees. I do not know whether that is a suggestion that we ought to continue in session or not.

In any event, there should be hearings on a matter of such importance as this, and the country as a whole should be placed on notice. The Committee on Public Works should consider proposed legislation of this sort, and the rule should not be suspended at 6 o'clock in the evening in order to consider something that is as clearly legislative as is the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to suspend the rule. A two-thirds vote in the affirma-

tive is required for the motion to prevail. [Putting the question.] The Chair is of the opinion that the "noes" are in the majority, so the motion to suspend the rule is rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, let me congratulate the Chair on the accuracy of his ruling that a vote of two-thirds in the affirmative was not obtained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment B is at the desk.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state amendment B of the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

The Secretary of the Army shall not commence or proceed with any feature of any flood-control or drainage project if he determines that such feature will be of direct and substantial benefit to any lands or area definable with reasonable certainty, unless the owners of such lands or a State, municipality, conservancy district, or other responsible party shall, by contract with the Secretary, have agreed to repay or to advance to the Secretary one-half of the cost of constructing such feature. All moneys received from such contracts shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI in order that I may offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my amendment is a proposal that at least half of the cost of levee and drainage projects shall be assessed against adjoining real estate which is directly and substantially benefited. I believe it would eliminate a big vacuum in our public-works policy.

As Senators know, appropriations for public-power projects are reimbursed not only for capital but also for current interest payments. I think that is a wise provision. Irrigation projects, which put water on land, are reimbursed, so far as principal is concerned, but interest is not paid. There is an increasing tendency, which I regard as dangerous, to charge a large portion of the cost of irrigation projects to the power features of multiple-purpose projects where power as well as irrigation is involved.

When a levee is built, the alluvial swampland, which is almost worthless, is transformed into highly valuable real estate. One of the motives behind river improvements, including the narrowing of river channels, is that alluvial swamplands on private property can be improved and enormously increased in value at public expense. I think it may be said that the Army engineers reclaim as much land as does the Bureau of Reclamation, except that theirs is a reclamation of land by taking water off the land, whereas the Bureau of Reclamation re-

claims land by putting water on the land.

So far as irrigation is concerned, while the principal, at least, is returned, the cost of levee projects in general—and I emphasize "in general"—is not reimbursed.

I know that prior to 1928 localities did provide most of the funds for the levees which were constructed, and I am well aware of the fact that it is quite probable that here and there localities now make contributions. Even these, however, usually consist of easement, rights-of-way, and moving utilities where necessary; not actual construction costs.

Certainly, so far as general policy is concerned, the cash capital outlay is made by the Federal Government itself, but benefits are not confined to the Federal Government. They also go to adjoining landowners, by reason of improvement in value of the land. There are instances in which uncleared land is worth \$5 or \$10 an acre, the cost of clearing the land will be \$25 an acre, and the land will be worth well over \$100 an acre once it has been cleared.

It is an accepted policy of local city finance that costs of sewers, sidewalks, and sometimes of roads, will be assessed against the adjoining property which is benefited. One of the first examples of that was the laying out of Riverside Drive in New York, and that project was carried out.

I am trying to see if we can establish a principle of charging half the cost of levees against the land which is to be benefited, rather than throwing the entire burden upon the shoulders of the taxpayers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to suspend the rule. [Putting the question.] In the opinion of the Chair, the "noes" are in the majority, and the motion is rejected.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, 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 (H. R. 7268) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. THYE conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7216, making appropriations for the govern-



ment of the District of Columbia and other activities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7216) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District 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 Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the pending bill, as reported from the Senate Committee on Appropriations, provides appropriations of \$135,117,089 for the fiscal year 1953. The total recommendation is less than the 1952 appropriations by \$9,552,311, or 6.6 percent under the appropriations for the present fiscal year.

The bill is under the 1953 estimates by \$1,411,011. It increases the House allowances by approximately \$4,000,000, or approximately 3 percent. The major items making up the increase are: \$500,000 additional for the Police Department; some \$400,000 for 80 additional teachers for the Negro schools; approximately \$240,000 for the Health Department, out of which there is \$75,000 for medical charities; \$682,000 for streets and bridges to provide connections with the Baltimore and Annapolis Highway, to connect with the East Capitol Street Bridge.

I may say that since the bill passed the House of Representatives, the Senate and the House have both passed, and the President has signed, a bill increasing the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia by 1 cent. Those funds are earmarked for highway purposes, and it is out of those funds that the \$682,000 will come.

If the bill before the Senate becomes law there will be a surplus on June 30, 1953, of \$6,479,634. This includes, of course, the 1-cent gasoline-tax revenue to which I have just referred, which amounts to some \$1,250,000.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to say something about the language in line 8, on page 1. The House placed the share of the United States Government at \$8,600,000. The Senate committee has raised it to \$11,000,000. That is the full budget estimate. I feel that that was a thing which should not have been done, for this reason: It is apparent that the District of Columbia will have a \$6,000,000 surplus from the funds which it collects. The Federal Government must raise the sum it provides for the District by taxes. For that reason I voted against the increase in the committee. If the question comes to a vote on the floor of the Senate, I shall vote against it here. If I am on the conference com-

mittee, I shall urge that the House figure, which I think is the proper amount, be adopted.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say just a word, and then I shall ask that all the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc. If any Senator wishes to ask for a reconsideration of any amendment, he may do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not asking for it.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, with the understanding that any Senator may have the right to ask for the reconsideration of any amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a question with respect to the item of \$86,000 for the Industrial Home School for Colored Girls.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that that project is provided for.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that that is a very urgent project.

Mr. HILL. The subcommittee agrees thoroughly with the idea of the Senator from South Dakota that it is an urgent project. Provision is made in the bill for an appropriation of \$86,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, line 8, after the word "and", to strike out "\$8,600,000" and insert "\$11,000,000."

Under the heading "General administration," on page 3, line 21, after the word "investigations", to strike out "\$316,000" and insert "\$327,540."

On page 4, line 1, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$10,000."

On page 4, line 11, after the name "Columbia", to strike out "\$340,000" and insert "\$356,000."

On page 4, line 13, after the word "Division", to strike out "\$134,000" and insert "\$136,750."

On page 4, line 15, after the word "Appeals", to strike out "\$23,000" and insert "\$23,700."

Under the heading "Fiscal service," on page 4, line 19, after the word "Office", to strike out "\$1,972,000" and insert "\$2,012,000"; and in line 20, after the word "which", to strike out "\$28,000" and insert "\$28,300."

Under the heading "Regulatory agencies," on page 6, line 21, after the word "samples", to strike out "\$111,000" and insert "\$117,200."

On page 6, line 22, after the word "Parole", to strike out "\$81,000" and insert "\$86,200."

On page 6, line 24, after the word "morgue", to strike out "\$64,000" and insert "\$64,800."

On page 6, line 25, after the word "Insurance", to strike out "\$83,000" and insert "\$90,500."

On page 7, line 6, after the word "only", to strike out "\$175,000" and insert "\$183,000."

On page 7, line 7, after the word "Bureau", to strike out "\$85,000" and insert "\$87,100."

On page 7, line 9, after the word "Board", to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$82,100."

On page 7, line 11, after the word "guards", to strike out "\$249,000" and insert "\$257,000."

On page 7, line 13, after the word "catchers", to strike out "\$45,000" and insert "\$49,000."

On page 7, line 14, after the word "Commission", to strike out "\$147,000" and insert "\$148,400."

On page 7, line 15, after the word "Commission", to strike out "\$37,000" and insert "\$39,200."

Under the heading "Public schools—Operating expenses," on page 7, line 24, after the word "athletic", to strike out "clothing and equipment" and insert "apparel and accessories"; and on page 8, line 14, after the word "Agriculture", to strike out "\$18,915,000" and insert "\$19,315,000."

On page 9, line 3, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$247,000" and insert "\$262,324."

On page 9, line 10, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$4,840,000" and insert "\$4,900,000."

Under the heading "Public Library," on page 11, line 4, after the numerals "1945", to strike out "\$1,440,000" and insert "\$1,515,000."

Under the heading "Recreation Department," on page 11, line 9, after the name "Columbia", to strike out "\$1,550,000" and insert "\$1,562,500."

Under the heading "Metropolitan Police," on page 13, line 9, after the word "otherwise", to strike out "\$9,750,000" and insert "\$10,250,000"; and in line 10, after the word "amount", to strike out "\$1,230,000" and insert "\$1,360,000."

Under the heading "Fire Department," on page 14, line 15, after the word "grounds", to strike out "\$5,150,000" and insert "\$5,277,000."

Under the heading "Veterans' services," on page 14, line 23, after the word "veterans", to strike out "\$80,000" and insert "\$120,000."

Under the heading "Courts," on page 15, line 7, after the word "prisoners", to strike out "\$1,100,000" and insert "\$1,164,300."

Under the heading "Health Department," on page 16 line 24, after the word "automobile", to strike out "\$2,675,000" and insert "\$2,915,000."

On page 17, line 15, after the word "grounds", to strike out "\$2,450,000" and insert "\$2,521,000."

On page 17, line 19, after the word "grounds", to strike out "\$5,400,000" and insert "\$5,532,000."

On page 18, line 6, after the word "Incurables", to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$676,875"; and in line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$9" and insert "\$10."

Under the heading "Department of Corrections," on page 19, line 13, after the word "sentence", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$4,125,000."

On page 19, line 21, after the word "property", to strike out "\$65,000" and insert "\$85,000."

Under the heading "Public welfare," on page 20, line 13, after the word "services", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$109,000."

On page 21, line 22, after the word "building", to strike out "\$4,560,000" and insert "\$4,615,000."

On page 23, line 9, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$3,040,000" and insert "\$3,236,000."

On page 23, line 15, after the figures "\$810,000", to insert a semicolon and "and for plans and specifications for an Industrial Home School for Colored Girls to replace the National Training School for Girls, \$86,000; in all, \$896,000."

Under the heading "Public works," on page 24, line 2, after the word "Incorporated", to strike out "\$78,000" and insert "\$81,400."

On page 24, line 4, after the word "Architect", to strike out "\$110,000" and insert "\$118,500."

On page 25, line 19, after the word "board", to strike out "\$800,000" and insert "\$879,600."

On page 26, line 9, after the word "thereto", to strike out "\$1,675,000" and insert "\$1,755,000."

On page 26, line 17, after the word "kinds", to strike out "\$78,000" and insert "\$143,000."

On page 26, line 20, after the word "busses", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$110,100."

On page 26, line 25, after the word "roads", to strike out "and cleaning snow and ice from streets, sidewalks, cross walks, and gutters, in the discretion of the Commissioners"; and on page 27, line 6, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$2,620,000" and insert "\$2,722,000."

On page 28, line 17, after the word "Commissioners", to strike out "\$4,374,000" and insert "\$5,056,000"; and on page 31, line 12, after the word "expense", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That this appropriation and the appropriation 'Operating expenses, Street and Bridge Divisions,' shall be available for advance payments to Federal agencies for work to be performed, when ordered by the Commissioners, subject to subsequent adjustment."

On page 32, line 2, after the word "examiners", to strike out "\$1,175,000" and insert "\$1,265,000."

On page 33, line 8, after the word "fund", to strike out "\$325,000" and insert "\$366,800."

On page 33, line 10, after the word "fund", to strike out "\$90,000" and insert "\$120,000."

On page 33, line 16, after the word "dumps", to strike out "\$4,475,000" and insert "\$4,538,000"; in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "\$95,000" and insert "\$100,000"; and in line 17, after the word "fund", to insert "for cleaning snow and ice from streets, sidewalks, crosswalks, and gutters, and for marking electric-light poles incidental to traffic control during periods of ice and snow, in the discretion of the Commissioners."

On page 34, line 19, after the word "Basin", to strike out "\$1,492,000" and insert "\$1,582,000."

On page 35, line 25, after the word "taxes", to strike out "\$2,365,000" and insert "\$2,480,000."

Under the heading "Washington Aqueduct," on page 36, line 25, after the word "water", to strike out "\$1,930,000" and insert "\$1,953,000."

Under the heading "National Guard," on page 39, line 5, after the word "purposes", to strike out "\$105,000" and insert "\$115,000."

Under the heading "National Capital Parks," on page 40, line 6, after the word "wagons", to strike out "\$1,975,000" and insert "\$2,092,000."

Under the heading "National Capital Park and Planning Commission," on page 41, line 4, after the word "matters", to strike out "\$90,000" and insert "\$108,200."

Under the heading "General provisions," on page 44, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$55,000" and insert "\$59,000."

On page 45, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$17,000."

On page 45, line 24, after the word "limitations", to insert "and hereafter the salary of the Budget Officer of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of grade GS-16 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is 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 (H. R. 7216) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HILL. 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. HILL, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. HUNT, conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### EXERCISE OF THE VOTING FRANCHISE BY FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1605, Senate bill 3061.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by its title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3061) to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I reported this bill from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which it was referred. The report of the committee was unanimous, recommending passage. There were two minor amendments which I do not think need to be drawn to the attention of the Senate. They involve only phraseology.

There are 2,500,000 men and women who are eligible to vote in their respective States, many of whom will not be able to vote unless the law is changed, either by their States or by the Congress.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.  
Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the bill leave it up to the States to decide how the voting shall be done, in cases in which the States have laws, or does the bill interpose a Federal method of procedure?

Mr. GREEN. The committee emphasized the fact that it was very desirable that the voting be done so far as possible under State laws, in cases in which the State laws make it possible to vote. In such cases the laws of the State prevail. In other cases there should be a Federal ballot, simply for Presidential electors and Senators and Representatives.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the State laws prevail, will the members of the armed services be permitted to vote for governor?

Mr. GREEN. Certainly; also for other State officers, if the State laws prevail.

The bill carries a long series of recommendations which it was hoped the officials of the States would follow. Some

of the States have followed the recommendations, and some have not. A little less than half of the States have made entirely satisfactory provisions.

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

The first amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, on page 9, line 17, after the word "provide", to strike out "as part of the established information and education programs in their respective departments information" and insert "instructions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 4, in the third line of the instructions, after the word "complete", to insert "military."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question about the bill. I am unable to obtain a copy of it at the moment.

Does the bill prescribe the type and kind of ballot? Is it a universal ballot, or what is the provision?

Mr. GREEN. In the first instance, the Secretary of Defense must receive word from the States as to what their provisions are; and in those States in which there are no practical provisions, or in which the time allowed in the State law is not sufficient for members of the armed services to obtain ballots and return them—which it is estimated would require 45 days—then the Federal Government will provide a ballot, the form of which is prescribed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What is the form of the ballot? The reason I ask the question is that during World War II it was proposed and seriously urged—and the proposal was almost adopted—that a ballot be sent to members of the Armed Forces permitting them to vote for the office of President, the ballot merely asking the question, "Who is your choice for President?" without listing the names of candidates, or anything of the kind. That was a most offensive situation. I wonder whether the ballot which is to be sent out in this instance is to be a prescribed form, listing all the candidates for President, as well as all the candidates for the offices for which members of the Armed Forces are permitted to vote.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, does the Senator have before him a copy of the bill?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator will find the official Federal ballot on page 15 of the bill. I may state that the person concerned may use the State ballot, and that, if he should have both ballots, the State ballot would prevail.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that I had no idea that this bill would be considered before tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader made an announcement last evening with respect to the pending bill, and the acting majority leader made an announcement with respect to it this morning. The Senator from Iowa has had notice of the fact that the bill would be considered today.



Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I must have missed notice of it, and I was informed that the bill was to be taken up tomorrow, instead of today. We are confronted with the fact that it is almost 6:30 o'clock in the evening. I invite attention to the fact that the official and legal ballot lists places for the writing in of a serviceman's choice for President, Senator, and Representatives. There is no provision in the ballot for giving service personnel a list of the candidates of the various parties.

Of course, the manifest benefit of a ballot like this is always to the incumbent in office because he is the only one that service people in far distant places read about. That was the objection to the same type of procedure which was attempted to be followed during World War II. I believe Members of the Senate had better take a long look at the ballot form before they vote on the bill. I want to give the men and women in the service the right to vote, but I want them to have a ballot which lists the candidates of their respective parties, not a ballot which merely gives them an opportunity to write in their choice.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator from Rhode Island that I do not doubt that the bill is acceptable. I have been reading very hastily through the bill to find a provision which would authenticate the State ballot when such a ballot is permitted.

I went through an experience when I was Governor of Massachusetts, just as the Senator from Iowa did when he was Governor of his State, with respect to a similar situation. We had a considerable difference of opinion with the Federal Government at the time, which was worked out through the secretaries of state of the States and the Government. It was worked out very carefully to make certain that the State ballot was the ballot which prevailed, provided the State took advantage of the Federal law and adapted its own provisions to the Federal law. I should like to make certain, as would the Senator from Iowa, whether the State ballot would be considered the valid ballot. I hope that the acting majority leader will let us look at the bill overnight.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I have no objection. I want the Senator from Massachusetts to be entirely satisfied as to the whole question. There is a distinct provision that where both ballots are cast—perhaps in an unusual case—that the State ballot shall prevail and the Federal ballot shall have no validity whatever.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should think that in such an instance the Federal ballot—speaking very hastily—should not have been sent to the man in the first instance. If I were a boy in Korea, and I received two ballots, one from the State and one from the Federal Government, it would be very difficult to decide which one to use.

Mr. GREEN. Both ballots would not be sent in instances where the State laws applied. It would be only in the other cases where the Federal ballot would

be sent. Full information would be given in a circular prepared by the Secretary of Defense, stating what a service person's rights are under the ballot and how to use the ballot.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the spirit in which the Senator from Rhode Island is speaking. Probably I shall agree with him and offer no objection to the bill when it is considered tomorrow. I hope that consideration of an important bill of this kind, which concerns the fundamental rights of American citizenship, will be postponed overnight, so that we may examine it more carefully.

Mr. GREEN. I would not wish to take advantage of the lack of information which the Senator from Massachusetts feels there is at this time.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I notice that in one place the bill provides that persons associated with the Government of the United States in a civilian capacity may use the ballot. Does that provision extend a new privilege to civilian employees of the Government?

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from South Dakota realize that there are 175,000 such persons in foreign lands?

Mr. CASE. Does the provision apply to persons in foreign lands, or does it apply to civilian employees in the United States who are away from their homes?

Mr. FERGUSON. What does the ballot provide?

Mr. CASE. The ballot, under the oath of the elector, states:

I am associated with the Government of the United States in a civilian capacity.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I have the Senator's assurance that he will give us an opportunity to study the bill overnight?

Mr. GREEN. I am willing and I am very glad to do it, although I am sorry to have to do it, because we are eager to have the bill passed. I assume it will remain the unfinished business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not know how the Senator from Iowa could have gained the impression that assurance had been given that the bill would not be considered until tomorrow.

I invite his attention to the announcement which the majority leader made yesterday. It appears at page 7529 of the Record. I make this statement not for the purpose of pressing the consideration of the bill at this time, but so that Senators will not say they have not been informed of what will be considered. The majority leader made his announcement with respect to the pending bill, and the announcement was repeated by me at the beginning of the session today. I should like to read the announcement made by the majority leader to the Members of the Senate who were present yesterday. I suggest that Senators who were not present take notice of the announcement, because tomorrow we shall consider two or three other bills fol-

lowing action on the bill now under consideration. The majority leader said:

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not know how long consideration of the civil functions bill will require, but there are two or three little bills with respect to which I should like to give notice, so that Senators may be informed as to our intention to have them considered.

The first is Senate bill 3061, Calendar 1605, a bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, regardless of State laws.

Another is Senate Joint Resolution 151, Calendar 1651, a joint resolution approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952.

Another is House bill 7496, Calendar 1654, to extend to June 30, 1957, the authorization period for appropriations to establish a hospital center in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, at the time the announcement was made I conferred with the then acting minority leader, and I understood that it was agreeable to him, in view of the fact that a unanimous report had been made on the bill by the committee, to proceed with its consideration as soon as the appropriation bills had been disposed of.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I was not raising any particular complaint or taking any umbrage on that point. I said I did not know about it. Undoubtedly it is my fault for not reading the Record. I am not objecting to the general spirit of the bill. I am in favor of providing the fairest way possible for servicemen and their wives and others in the service to vote.

However, I do object to attempting to pass the bill tonight at 6:30, when it contains some objectionable features, as I see them now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas is not insisting that we proceed with the consideration of the bill, but he is insisting that the Senator from Iowa has no right to say that he was given assurance that the bill would not be taken up until Friday. I want Senators on the other side of the aisle to be aware of the bills which we have cleared with the minority leader for consideration, so that they will not say tomorrow evening, "We had no idea that the bill would be taken up today. Let us have another day or two before it is considered."

By the time we get around to all 96 Senators, we shall not have the calendar cleared up before it is time to adjourn.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield again, let me say that another element is involved. We have spent all day today on the appropriation bill for civil functions of the Department of the Army. I do not know that any Senator was notified that there would be a night session tonight or that the session would continue past 5 or 5:30 p. m. The result is that by this time a number of Members of the Senate have left the Chamber and have left Capitol Hill, for they have been under the impression that the session would not continue into the night.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, every Member has been informed of the intention to have the Senate proceed to consider the bill which now is before the Senate.

In view of the request which has been made by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Iowa, I shall now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. However, I wish the RECORD to show that no one gave the Senate any assurance that this bill would not be taken up before Friday.

The RECORD should also show that not only shall we proceed with the consideration of this bill tomorrow; but if we are able to pass this bill tomorrow, we plan to take up, on tomorrow, two other bills.

I wish to repeat that statement, so that all Senators will be informed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask the Senator's pardon if he feels offended by anything I have said.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No one feels offended. I simply wish to make sure that all Senators have this information.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator from Texas expect to have the Senate pass bills after 6 o'clock tomorrow night?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not attempting to have the Senate pass bills either tonight or tomorrow night. We shall endeavor to have the Senate proceed to a reasonable hour tomorrow. We hope we can dispose of these bills in a short time, since there have been unanimous reports on them from the committees, and since due notice has been given, and since neither the leaders nor any other Members have voiced objection.

It may very well be that all day tomorrow will be taken by the consideration of these bills, in which case we shall go over until Saturday, when the calendar will be called. Following the call of the calendar on Saturday, these bills, if they have not previously been disposed of, may be taken up then—on Saturday.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Iowa will find the answer to his question on page 2 of the bill, in section 103, which reads as follows:

Sec. 103. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to restrict the right of any person to vote in accordance with the law of the State of his residence.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I understand that, because if the State permits its residents who are serving in the Armed Forces to vote by absentee ballot, each of them will receive from his State an absentee ballot, and then the ballot provided for in this measure will not be valid.

Mr. GREEN. That is correct. The ballot provided for in this bill will not even be sent to the residents of any State which has such provisions of law.

I believe that 24 or 25 of the States would not qualify under the provisions of this measure, and therefore the absentee servicemen from those States would be sent these ballots.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am thankful to the Senator from Texas for agreeing to let the further consideration of this measure go over until tomorrow.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 84) authorizing the holding of ceremonies in the rotunda of the Capitol for the acceptance of a bronze replica of the Declaration of Independence.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5990) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, and it was signed by the Vice President.

#### RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 20, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of June 10), 1952:

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, Eighty-second Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

##### To be majors, USAF (medical)

Jack F. Burnett, AO303009.  
George R. Steinkamp, AO483774.

##### To be captains, USAF (medical)

Benjamin R. Baker, AO1906890.  
Kenneth H. Burdick, AO1907000.  
Frank W. Chandler, AO1906679.  
Robert G. Dawson, AO2212597.  
Charles E. Gibbs, AO1906848.  
Herman S. Parish, Jr., AO1735284.  
Charles M. VanDuyne.  
Donald J. Warren, AO1907262.  
John R. Woodyard.

##### To be captains, USAF (dental)

Alphonse E. Carrino, AO1716754.  
Richard A. Grzeczowski, AO959917.  
Arthur L. Hayden, AO1716543.  
James T. Jackson, AO938971.  
Howard W. Zellers, Jr., AO2212882.

##### To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (medical)

Joe W. Boyd, AO926800.  
John E. Coles, AO434642.  
Edward H. Currie, AO2032339.  
James A. Cutter, AO2238746.  
James S. Denning, AO2056918.  
John A. McChesney, AO971619.  
Hugh P. McGrade, AO864678.  
Walter W. Melvin, Jr., AO975899.  
Perry B. Miller, AO2239833.  
Lawrence T. Odland, AO2238749.  
Charles R. Rosewall, AO733468.  
William W. Thompson, AO799098.  
William R. Turpin, AO669637.  
Otis L. Vaden, AO1912462.

James F. VanPelt, Jr., AO390421.  
William E. Wallace, AO544484.  
Homer E. Woosley, Jr., AO2238735.  
Ernie A. Young, AO1906322.

##### To be first lieutenant, United States Air Force (dental)

Robert N. Weaver, AO659424.

The following-named distinguished officer candidates for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

##### To be second lieutenants

Thomas L. Hair, Jr., AO2218910.  
Robert E. Lambert, AO2218955.  
Charles C. McGehee, Jr., AO2218970.  
Edwin T. Naden, Jr., AO2218988.

The following-named distinguished officer candidate for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); and section 301, Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

##### To be second lieutenant

Arlene Adler, AL2218831.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

##### To be second lieutenants

Joseph C. Beck	Miles C. McDonnell
Robert V. Carlson	Donald L. Monchil
Clarence M. Davis	James H. Norman
Carlos V. del Mercado	John R. Pizzi, Jr.
George F. Duborg, Jr.	Mason L. Ripp
Michael Fatuik, Jr.	Paul E. Shortall, Jr.
Richard G. Hamilton	Robert B. Smith
James J. Kasperek	Glen E. Wampler
Robert L. Kirk	John A. Ward III
Michael Krak, Jr.	Nelson N. Williams, Jr.
Harley W. R. Lake, Jr.	John D. Winters
James A. McDivitt	

Subject to physical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following-named distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

Harvey B. Bennett, Jr.	Billy J. Mills
Richard E. Bertrand	Warren E. Montgomery
Robert L. Blackmon, Jr.	David J. Novick
Charles C. Blanton	Charles F. Parr
Donald L. Bouquet	Andrew F. P. Pearson
Norman Braslau,	Lincoln A. Perry
AO2216344	Philip C. Peterson
David C. Brotemarkle	Robert B. Riddle
Edward P. Callaway	Vernon R. Sage
Robert T. Carpenter	James W. Sherrod
Robert J. Chambers	Charles B. Shive, Jr.
Harold T. Chandler	Joseph W. Steede, Jr.
Clarence S. Davis, Jr.	Robertand L. Tate
Richard A. DeLong	Lloyd E. Thomas
William J. Donohue, Jr.	John A. Thurman
Milton Evans, Jr.	Edward L. Tixier
Oliver W. Fix	Allen L. Trott, Jr.
Robert A. Harrington	Ray K. Troutman
Donald M. Hartman	Troy N. Washburn
Richard D. Hawk	William B. Weaver
Albert R. Hughes	Floyd C. Williams
Howard W. Jackson	Jonathan W. Wilson
Anders P. Larson	Noel E. Wilson, Jr.
Michael D. Lubin	Robert J. Wilson
Charles W. McComb	Walter M. Wondrack
	Albert H. Wuerz, Jr.



## IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel:

Raymond B. Hurst	Richard D. Hughes
Robert E. Cushman, Jr.	Charles O. Bierman
Robert A. Black	Frederick A. Ramsey, Jr.
Gordon E. Hendricks	William N. McGill
Charles W. Shelburne	Kenneth D. Kerby
Richard G. Weede	Carl A. Laster

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

William A. Wood	Ralph H. Currin
William H. Atkinson	Arthur H. Haake
John S. Dewey	Oscar F. Peatross
John D. Bradbury	Frank E. Garretson
Robert A. Churley	Norman R. Nickerson
William H. Junghans, Jr.	George A. Rickert
Harvey M. Miller	Norman Pozinsky
John R. Barreiro, Jr.	Fraser E. West
William McReynolds	Stanley S. Nicolay
John E. Sundholm	Darrell D. Irwin
Robert W. Glickert	James K. Dill
John L. Hopkins	Stephen J. Zsiga
Henry W. Seeley, Jr.	Vernice S. Calvert
Henry G. Lawrence, Jr.	Robert E. A. Lillie
James G. Kelly	Anthony J. Dowdle
William C. Ward, Jr.	Granville Mitchell
John T. Bradshaw	Paul B. McNicol
Robert E. Collier	Charles C. Campbell
Alexander A. Elder	George C. Axtell, Jr.
Ward K. Schaub	Harold B. Penne
Maurice L. Appleton, Jr.	Walter J. Carr, Jr.
Alvis H. Allen	Charles Kimak
Robert K. McClelland	Wallace G. Fleissner
Clifford F. Quilici	Robert H. Gray
Rufus D. Sams, Jr.	Erugene V. Boro
Thomas M. Burton	Louie N. Casey
Victor R. Bisceglia	John N. Wade, Jr.
James H. Tatsch	Karl N. Smith
Robert Y. Stratton	Horace C. Parks
Nathaniel Morgenthal	Bernard W. McLean
Louis G. Ditta	Olin W. Jones, Jr.
Gerald F. Russell	John L. Frothingham
John T. O'Neill	Chester L. Christenson
Tom N. Hasperis	Horace E. Knapp, Jr.
Ernest L. Medford, Jr.	Stephen C. Munson, Jr.
Frederick J. Mix, Jr.	Edwin B. Wheeler

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

James F. Coady	Clarence F. Zingheim
William R. Watson, Jr.	Donald L. Mallory

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Charles W. Boggs, Jr.	Clarence F. Zingheim
Richard F. DeLamar III	Donald L. Mallory
John B. Bristow	Thomas J. Branighan
Martin J. Sexton	Fred A. Steele
Coburn Marston	Christopher M. Spurlock
Frederick J. Cramer	James J. Bott
William L. Sims	Louis P. Penney
Ellsworth T. Nobles	Tillman E. Bishop
John A. Creamer	Gilbert N. Powell
Daniel M. Manfull	Elmer L. Starr
Leola L. Patrow	George W. Doney
Alex H. Sawyer	Andrew J. Strohmenger
George K. Parker	Fletcher R. Wycoff
Richard J. Buckley	Dudley F. McGeehan
James P. O'Laughlin	Donald L. Herrick
Robert J. Fairfield	Milton A. Hull
Philip N. Pierce	Julian Willcox
Bernard G. Thobe	Robert A. Thompson
Richard R. Bucher	James K. Linnam
Augustine B. Reynolds, Jr.	James C. Norris, Jr.
David Foss, Jr.	Ross T. Dwyer, Jr.
Robert G. Willard	James F. McInteer, Jr.
Clifford J. Robichaud, Jr.	Samuel Jaskilka
Jake B. Hill	John A. Lindsay
Remmel H. Dudley	Franklin L. Smith
Albert Wood	Robert M. Jenkins
	David H. Lewis

Gildo S. Codispoti	Laurence A. Ballinger
Paul M. Moriarty	Walter R. Miller
Kenneth J. Houghton	Cyril D. Jeffcoat
Raymond F. Garraty, Jr.	Marion J. Griffin
Roy I. Wood, Jr.	Herman H. Jones
Albert B. Atkinson	Gerald E. Goss
John R. Fields	John H. McGuire
Justin B. Johnson, Jr.	Paul F. McLellan
Charles D. Garber	Albert J. Gunther
"K" "K" Bigelow	Aaron M. Rottenberg
Warren P. Nichols	Thomas B. Wood
Charles E. Call	Louis H. Steman
Patrick Harrison	Alfred T. Moret, Jr.
Edward C. Kicklighter	Homer L. Daniel
Wendell O. Livesay	Paul A. LeMaire, Jr.
Stanley N. McLeod	"H" Leverett Jacobi
Albert J. Sinuc	William H. Irvin, Jr.
George R. Burke	Richard Morton
Russell Hamlet	Harold P. Williamson
Raymond L. Valente	Anthony R. Epplin
Wesley C. Noren	Tom S. Parker
Lawrence L. Graham	Maurice E. Flynn
Donald D. Pomerleau	Paul L. Allen
Henry W. Stankus	John D. McLaughlin
Richard C. Kuhn	George J. Kovich, Jr.
Hudson G. Birmingham	Richard M. Remington
Glenn E. Ferguson	Hector G. Risigari-Gai, Jr.
William D. Porter	John J. O'Donnell
Ralph E. June	Michael D. Benda
Armand G. Daddazio	Bernard M. Boress
Lawrence H. Bosshard	Richard M. Hunt
George K. Reid	Robert B. Jeter
Carl L. Sitter	Raymond H. Spuhler
Richard E. Roach	Warren A. Leitner
George C. Westover	Lawrence E. Kindred
Keigler E. Flake	Junius M. Lowder, Jr.
Ralph L. Widner	John F. Mentzer

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major for limited duty:

Hubert G. Bozarth
Paul R. Paquin
Howard C. Frazer

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Jack A. Miller	Roland B. Heilman
Kenneth G. Flegener	Henry J. Jadrich
Donald A. Panska	William L. Atwater, Jr.
Charles C. Angle	Walter E. Daniel
Guy "M" Washburn	Daniel P. Githens, Jr.
Lenhew E. Lovette	Forrest "I" Townsend
Richard J. Sullivan	William H. Bortz, Jr.
Robert F. Warren	Harry G. C. Henneberger
Roderick J. Munro	William Whitehill
Henry G. Holmes, Jr.	Earl A. Trager, Jr.
Ruel H. Corley, Jr.	Williams P. Brown
Harry F. Painter	Robert "J" Zitnik
John M. McLaurin, Jr.	Arnold W. Barden
Urban A. Lees	William H. Roley
William Bradford	Don G. Derryberry
Clarence H. Schmid	Crawford B. Malone
Bernard J. Stender	John J. Hill III
Charles D. Dawkins, Jr.	George Mottl
Lewis E. Bolts	Joseph B. DeHaven
Donald F. Milesen	Dan C. Holland
Oliver J. Koester	Sylvester F. Leis
Ward L. Hooper	James E. Meehan
Robert B. Robinson	William R. Lucas
Alexander Wilson	Robert E. McCarville
Robert D. Green	Walter N. Roark, Jr.
Dwain L. Redalen	John O. Kaylor
Jefferson A. Davis, Jr.	Richard H. Peacock
Robert J. Wright	Thomas E. Mulvihill
Harold G. McRay	Otis R. Waldrop
Kenneth L. Anstock	Clark Ashton
Russell G. Patterson, Jr.	Thomas H. Hughes
Richard B. Newport	Casimir C. Kyscowski
Harvey E. Wendt	William J. Peter, Jr.
Harry O. Taylor	Donald S. McClellan
Robert J. Graham	Joseph F. Kirby, Jr.
Varge G. Frisbie	Elmer F. Koehler
John F. McMahon, Jr.	John L. Greene
Jack H. Hagler	Dall D. Fine
James W. Ferris	Kenneth L. Fellows
Robert King, Jr.	Judson J. Bradley
	Raymond H. W. Pett

Herbert N. Rapson	Grover S. Stewart, Jr.
Joseph Northrup	George M. Dauphine
William J. Kopas	Herschel G. Connell
George H. Elias	Curtis D. Jernigan
James Sharp II	Harry B. Stuckey
Myron P. Wiczorek	Rex A. Deasy
John B. Marshall, Jr.	Robert N. Welch
Gustave F. Lueddeke, Jr.	Dean Caswell
Dwaine Wise	Harold R. Foltz
Charles C. Ward	John B. Mason
Robert Wade	Clifford A. Allison
William A. Lutnick	Danny "W" Johnson
Owen V. Gallentine	Murray V. Harlan, Jr.
Ernest L. Engelkes	William H. Mulvey
Ernest R. Doyle, Jr.	Robert S. Robertson
Nicholas M. Seminoff	Louis E. Dunning
Robert H. Cook	John H. Cavalero
Robert J. Craig	Walter Panchison
Cloyd V. Hines	Marshall S. Austin
Elmer A. Krieg	Chester J. Poppa
John C. Boulware	Lewis C. Street III
James W. Luther	Leo J. Corboy, Jr.
Arthur S. Tarkington	Glenn L. Ferguson, Jr.
Marshall S. Campbell	William J. Long
Victor E. Johnson, Jr.	Lawrence J. Hofmeister
Dewey F. Durnford, Jr.	Joe "B" Henson

Noble L. Beck	Theodore R. Moore
Leroy V. Corbett	Thomas J. Jones
Clyde P. Guy	James R. Weaver
Henry A. Checklout	Clarence H. Pritchett
Leslie L. Davenport	William L. Walker
Gene Robertson	Thomas O. Weghorst
James P. Bruce	Floyd H. Butler, Jr.
Clyde B. Shropshire	Richard H. Bushnell
John D. Cotton	Douglas D. Petty, Jr.
Taylor H. Wagner	Wayne H. Hoereth
Robert W. Minick	James H. Berge, Jr.
Anthony Edwards	James M. Weidner
Lud R. Tucker	Thomas L. Sullivan
William H. Kellogg	Daniel Greene
Robert C. Evans	Thomas R. Egan
Marion H. Deckard	Charles E. Street, Jr.
Charles H. Ludden	Donald H. Foss
Lawrence McGlade	Cecil B. LaFayette
John P. Flynn, Jr.	Kerwin W. Jacobs
Duane A. Swinford	George D. Kew
Edgar A. Monroe	Don M. Perkins
William N. Gustafson	James T. Cronin
Stanley B. Voth	Lawrence C. Norton
John Padach, Jr.	Poul F. Pedersen
Thomas G. Elder	Harold L. Haley
Harold V. Deering	George H. Green, Jr.
Anthony R. DiGiovanni	Thirl D. Johnson
Eugene T. Card	Russell A. Davidson
Hugh D. Argo	Stuart V. Schuyler
Calvin Wall	Ernest E. Poor
Donald M. Winters	James L. Dumas
Charles A. Broudy	Coleman C. Jones
Martin Capages	Roger C. Lawson
Beryl B. Sessions	Harry F. Abbott
William W. Bryant	Jack H. Adam
Allen L. Phillips	John V. Hanes
	James R. Coltrane

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ernest B. Altekruze	Kelly J. Davis, Jr.
Tilton A. Anderson	Harold L. Dawe, Jr.
Maurice C. Ashley, Jr.	Thomas J. Deen, Jr.
Raymond L. Barrie, Jr.	Robert D. Dern
Robert J. Barton	Lewis H. Devine
William D. Bassett, Jr.	John R. Dickson
Wendell O. Beard	Thomas E. Driscoll
John G. Belden	John L. Eareckson
James J. Boley	Richard C. Ebel
Thomas G. Borden	Samuel E. Englehart
Kenneth A. Bott	Clyde L. Eyer
Philip C. Brannon	Charles D. Fay
Derrell C. Briden	Matthew C. Fenton, III
Ralph H. Brown	Richard H. Francis
William J. Budge	Walter A. Gagne, Jr.
Ivil L. Carver	Samuel P. Gardner
Henry A. Commisky, Sr.	James R. Gober
James J. Connors, Jr.	John C. Gordy, Jr.
John F. Conroy	Francis A. Gore, Jr.
Andrew B. Cook	Fred Grabowsky
Robert H. Corbet	George H. Grimes

Thomas I. Gunning  
 John W. Haggerty, III  
 Arthur J. Hale  
 Wayne L. Hall  
 Robert T. Hardeman  
 Allen S. Harris  
 Robert P. Harris  
 Harold A. Hatch  
 George A. P. Haynes  
 George E. Hayward  
 Richard G. Heinsohn  
 Thomas P. Hensler, Jr.  
 Hans W. Henzel  
 John R. Heppert  
 Carlton H. Hershner  
 Irven A. Hissom  
 Miles "M" Hoover, Jr.  
 Henry Hoppe III  
 Robert G. Hunt, Jr.  
 Mallett C. Jackson, Jr.  
 Charles V. Jarman  
 John M. Johnson, Jr.  
 Charles M. C. Jones, Jr.  
 Nick J. Kapetan  
 David S. Karukin  
 MacLean Kelley  
 Charles R. Kennington, Jr.  
 Calhoun J. Killeen  
 Robert H. Krider  
 Randlett T. Lawrence  
 Alan M. Lindell  
 Robert L. Lockhart  
 Bernard S. MacCabe  
 James H. MacLean  
 Byron L. Magness  
 Robert F. Malden  
 David G. Martinez  
 Charles P. McCallum, Jr.  
 John F. McCarthy, Jr.  
 Richard S. McCutchen  
 Francis E. McDonald  
 Robert L. McElroy  
 John F. Meehan  
 Willard D. Merrill  
 Max A. Merritt  
 John H. Miller  
 Richard R. Miller  
 William Morse, Jr.  
 Edgar F. Musgrove  
 Robert C. Needham  
 Harry J. Nolan  
 Edward J. O'Connell, Jr.  
 Lawrence G. O'Connell, Jr.  
 Charles H. Opfar, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant for limited duty:

Henry T. Dawes	William M. Dwiggin
Calvin C. Miles III	Harry N. McCutcheon
Roger D. Buckley	Herbert G. Cantrell
James M. Riley, Jr.	Henry S. Jozwicki
Robert E. Boze	John L. Self
Ewing B. Harvey	Herbert E. McNabb
Harold Bartlett	Derilas A. Moore

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Eleanor M. Russell	Essie M. Lucas
Doris V. Kleberger	Betty J. Preston

Tom D. Parsons  
 Raymond C. Paulson  
 Roger W. Peard, Jr.  
 Willard S. Peterson  
 Charles R. Petty  
 Richard L. Prave  
 Raymond R. Rall, Jr.  
 Thomas C. Redfern, Jr.  
 Pierre D. Reissner, Jr.  
 Theophil P. Riegert  
 Thomas E. Ringwood, Jr.  
 Archie R. Ruggieri, Jr.  
 "S" "E" Sansing  
 William F. Saunders, Jr.  
 Kenneth W. Schiweck  
 Merlin F. Schneider, Jr.

Robert L. Scruggs  
 Richard W. Sheppe  
 Warren C. Sherman  
 Warren J. Skvaril  
 Albert C. Smith, Jr.  
 Charles S. Smith  
 Thomas G. Snipes  
 William F. Sparks  
 Eugene O. Speckart  
 William A. Speer  
 Robert G. Staffney  
 James W. Stanhouse  
 Kenneth R. Steele  
 James C. Stephens  
 Paul F. Stephenson  
 Allan M. Stewart  
 Charles B. Sturgell  
 Leonard C. Taft  
 Joseph Z. Taylor  
 Robert W. Taylor  
 Jack E. Townsend  
 Luther G. Troen  
 Henry W. Tubbs, Jr.  
 Kenneth E. Turner  
 Thomas W. Turner  
 Dan C. Walker, Jr.  
 Theodore R. Wall  
 Littleton W. T. Waller  
 II  
 William Wentworth  
 Richard "H" West  
 Robert H. White  
 Thomas B. White, Jr.  
 Henry M. Whitesides  
 Charles S. Whiting  
 James S. Wilson  
 John O. Wolcott  
 James F. Wolfe, Jr.  
 Harry D. Woods

tude of prayer, we are beseeching Thee to lead us to the deep inner springs of wisdom and power.

Grant that we may enter upon each new day with faith and courage, confident that the glorious vision of a better world can never be eclipsed and that Thy righteous purposes can never be defeated.

We pray that we may inspire and encourage men and nations to cultivate those finer feelings of good will and co-operation upon which the hope of humanity depends.

Show us how we may bring the members of the human family into a closer and more brotherly fellowship. May they see that the things which they have in common are far more wonderful and precious than the things which divide and separate them.

Hear us in Christ's name. 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, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7960. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution authorizing the holding of ceremonies in the rotunda of the Capitol for the acceptance of a bronze replica of the Declaration of Independence.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 658) entitled "An act to further amend the Communication Act of 1934"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. CAPEHART to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1539) entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide extra compensation for overtime service performed by immigrant inspectors and other employees of the Immigration Service', approved March 2, 1931"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, 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 Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, HEDRICK, MARSHALL, CANNON, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HORAN, and TABER.

#### AMENDMENT TO COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 658) to further amend the Communications Act of 1934, with House amendment thereto, insist upon the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PRIEST, HARRIS, THORNBERRY, WOLVERTON, and HINSHAW.

#### AMENDMENT TO CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5990) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950.

The Clerk read the conference report. The conference report and statement are as follows:

##### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2197)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5990) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, 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 and agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,  
 CARL T. DURHAM,  
 DEWEY SHORT,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

LESTER C. HUNT,  
 JOHN C. STENNIS,  
 RUSSELL B. LONG,  
 STYLES BRIDGES,  
 RALPH E. FLANDERS,

*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. 5990) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

##### LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

The bill passed the House on May 5, 1952. It passed the Senate in amended form on

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, as we turn our thoughts toward Thee in the sacred atti-