

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. 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. HEBERT:

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 unfalteringly 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-wise 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. SCHOEPPLE] 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.
Dworschak	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 4¼ 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 ¹
Buffalo Creek, N. Y.	18	23
Colorado, Middle, Tex.	20	24
Cosco, 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

¹ 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.	Eugene V. Boro
Thomas M. Burton	Louie N. Casey
Victor R. Bisceglia	John J. 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	William R. Watson, Jr.
----------------	------------------------

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. Stroh-menger
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 Panchision
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 R. Jones
Clyde P. Guy	James R. Weaver
Henry A. Checkloui	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-

May 12, 1952. The House disagreed with the Senate amendments and asked for a conference.

The House bill provides authority for the Federal Civil Defense Administration to lease real estate. Heretofore, subsections 201 (e) and (h), Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, have restricted the Administrator from acquiring any land or buildings or any interest therein without specific authorization of Congress.

The Senate amended the bill by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting the following language:

"That, in accordance with the provisions of subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1249; 50 U. S. C. App. 2281), the Federal Civil Defense Administrator is hereby authorized to acquire by lease or license, for civil defense purposes, not to exceed a total of three hundred and fourteen thousand gross square feet of warehouse space situated in or near the following places: Sikeston, Missouri; Zanesville, Ohio; Downingtown, Pennsylvania; and Paw Paw, West Virginia."

The Senate amendment would have granted authority to lease only four specific warehouses and in the future the Civil Defense Administration, when desirous of leasing space, would have been required to obtain specific congressional authority for each transaction.

The Senate conferees agreed that the Senate language was too restrictive and that the House bill should prevail. The Senate recedes.

The Senate also amended the title of the bill to conform with the Senate amending language. As amended by the Senate, the title would read:

"A bill to authorize the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to acquire, by lease or license, warehouse space for civil defense purposes at Sikeston, Missouri; Zanesville, Ohio; Downingtown, Pennsylvania; and Paw Paw, West Virginia, respectively."

Inasmuch as the Senate agreed to accept the House version of the bill, there no longer existed any necessity for a change in the title of the bill as it passed the House. The Senate recedes.

CARL VINSON,
CARL T. DURHAM,
DEWEY SHORT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIXING THE PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Mr. VINSON submitted the following conference report and statement on 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:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2199)

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.

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

Managers on the Part of the House.

ESTES KEFAUVER,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
RUSSELL LONG,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
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 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, 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

S. 677, a bill 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, was passed by the Senate on May 4, 1951.

Subsequently, the House Committee on Armed Services, after detailed hearings, struck all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and inserted substantially different provisions governing the personnel strength of the Marine Corps and the status of the Commandant with reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Section 1 of the Senate bill provided that the United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, would include four full-strength combat divisions, four full-strength air wings and the required supporting units organic thereto and placed a personnel ceiling of not more than 400,000 on the personnel strength of the regular Marine Corps.

As amended by the House, section 1 provided that the United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, should include not less than three full-strength combat divisions, three full-strength air wings and supporting units which were organic thereto. The House version further provided a personnel floor of 220,000 regular enlisted personnel and prescribed that the authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the regular Marine Corps should be not more than 400,000, such ceiling to be suspended during time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress.

The House version further prescribed the formula for computing the commissioned strength of the active list of the regular Marine Corps and provided that such strength would be attained not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of the legislation. Obviously there were substantial differences in the two versions of section 1 of the bill.

The agreement reached by the conferees on the different provisions governing Marine Corps personnel provides that the 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 thereto, 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 400,000. The net result of this action is that the three Marine Corps divisions and three air wings are to be combat divisions and air wings but the "full strength" requirement of the House version has been deleted. The numerical floor of 220,000 regular enlisted personnel has likewise been deleted. However, the section states that there will be not less than three combat divisions and three air wings and while the numerical floor of 220,000 has been deleted, it is the obvious intent of the language that the minimum divisions and wings prescribed in the section will be maintained at whatever strength the Congress may determine through the appropriations which it grants in support of Marine Corps personnel.

Heretofore the United States Marine Corps has had no statutory organization in the normally accepted sense of the word. Marine Corps proponents have consistently expressed the fear that they would be reduced to and maintained as regimental combat teams or even units of less size and importance. When it is recognized that the Marine Corps personnel had decreased to a total of approximately 70,000 at the time of the outbreak of the Korean war, their fears are understandable. As a result of the conference agreement the Marine Corps is assured, for the first time in its history, of a division organizational structure. The 400,000 personnel ceiling which appeared in the original provisions of both the Senate and House bills and remains in the conference agreement is to insure that there is no intention of converting the Marine Corps into a second land army. The managers on the part of the House are cognizant of the outstanding combat accomplishments of the United States Marine Corps but would be remiss if they failed to point out their conviction that this outstanding record is largely attributable to the fact that the Marine Corps has heretofore largely been maintained on a voluntary basis. It necessarily follows that if the Marine Corps should be established and maintained at a size which could not be supported by voluntary enlistments that the high morale and the accomplishments of the Marine Corps would be adversely affected.

Section 2 of the Senate bill provided that the Commandant of the Marine Corps would be a consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on all problems before the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And provided that on matters in

which the Marine Corps was concerned the Commandant would be permitted to be heard and file a supporting memorandum for consideration by the Secretary of Defense and the President.

The House version amended the National Security Act of 1947 and provided that the Commandant of the United States Marine Corps would be a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

With reference to the Senate version, it seemed to the House conferees that there was no justification for making the Commandant a consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on all problems before the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That provision appeared to require the Commandant to attend all meetings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, whether or not the matter under discussion concerned the Marine Corps. It also appeared to the House conferees that the Senate version, in providing that the Commandant would be heard and could file a supporting memorandum for consideration by the Secretary of Defense and the President, on matters concerning the Marine Corps, gave the Commandant of the Marine Corps a latitude which was not even permitted to the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who must submit supporting memorandums to the Secretary of Defense and the President through the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The conference agreement provides that "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 members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

This conference agreement recognizes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps, by virtue of his broad experience in land, sea, and air warfare, is best able to present matters of direct concern to the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And it is the clear intent of the language that on those occasions when matters directly concerning the Marine Corps are before the Joint Chiefs of Staff for consideration that the Commandant shall appear, not as a consultant, but with status co-equal to that of members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, except for membership in the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

While there may be a fine line between co-equal status and membership, the House conferees recognize the difference. It simply means that when the Commandant of the Marine Corps meets with the Joint Chiefs of Staff on a matter of direct concern to the Marine Corps which is under consideration by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that the Commandant shall sit as a co-equal with the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he shall have the right to be fully heard and, if a vote is taken, to vote in the same manner as members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Congress has been repeatedly told that members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff do not vote. Whatever they may do in reaching a decision, it is the intent that the Commandant of the Marine Corps enjoy those same prerogatives when meeting with members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on a matter of direct concern to the Marine Corps. By the same token it is fully intended that he shall be bound in the same manner as the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in presenting his appeal to an adverse decision through the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of

Staff to the Secretary of Defense and the President.

It is obvious that it will be necessary for the Commandant of the Marine Corps to receive a copy of the agenda of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Otherwise he would be in a position of being unable to know whether or not a matter directly concerning the Marine Corps was under consideration by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It should also be noted in this connection that numerous items on the agenda of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are defined at lower levels by the other three services, such as the Joint Strategic Survey Committee, the Joint Strategic Plans Committee, etc. The House conferees do not attempt to precisely define or indicate the exact staff levels and agencies, complementary to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to which the Commandant of the Marine Corps should have staff representation. But it is clear beyond all doubt that the Commandant will be in a most difficult position to determine whether or not matters directly concern the Marine Corps unless he is accorded a reasonable staff representation at appropriate supporting echelons of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It is important to note in the conference agreement on this section that the initial decision as to whether or not a matter is of direct concern to the United States Marine Corps lies with the Commandant. There may be those who fear an abuse of this authority. However, the following provisions of the section provide that after the Commandant has indicated to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that a matter scheduled for hearing by the Joint Chiefs of Staff directly concerns the Marine Corps, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff may refer that request on the part of the Commandant to the Secretary of Defense for a decision as to whether or not the matter in question does in his opinion directly concern the Marine Corps. And so the provision as drawn provides a system of checks and balances as between the Commandant on the one hand, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the other which, in the opinion of the House conferees, will insure that each will adhere to the principles enumerated and exercise the greatest of caution to insure that neither shall abuse the prerogatives of the other. In the final analysis the Congress is making an attempt to insure that matters of national defense at the level of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be decided on the basis of the broadest military experience available. Failure to implement this intent would produce most unfortunate results. The House conferees are confident that such results will not occur.

Section 3 of the conference agreement was an original provision in the House version but was absent in the Senate version. It merely repeals existing law which relates the strength of the Marine Corps to a percentage strength of the Navy. Having established the strength of the Marine Corps in section 1 of the conference agreement, there is no longer a necessity to relate the strength of the Marine Corps to the strength of the Navy. Therefore, the House and Senate conferees were in full agreement that the conference agreement should include the House provision in this respect.

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

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on 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 SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the agreement that was reached on the important parts of this bill?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, no doubt the House is very interested in the decision which was reached by the conferees, I will briefly explain it to the House.

First. The United States Marine Corps within the Department of the Navy will be so organized as to include not less than three combat divisions and air wings and supporting units. The actual size of these units will be determined by the Congress through its appropriations for Marine Corps personnel.

Second. The numerical floor which was in the original House bill has been deleted.

Third. The ceiling of 400,000, which was in both the House and Senate bills, remains in the conference agreement, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, when it would automatically be suspended.

Fourth. The result of the conference agreement will establish for the first time a statutory division organizational structure for the Marine Corps.

With reference to the status of the Commandant and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the conference agreement provides:

First. That the Commandant will indicate to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff when a matter before the Joint Chiefs of Staff directly concerns the Marine Corps.

Second. That when such a matter is under discussion by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commandant, unless overruled by the Secretary of Defense, will attend such meeting and present his case, at which time he will have coequal status with members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff except for membership on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Third. This means that the Commandant must receive a copy of the agenda of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; that he must have staff representation in appropriate numbers and appropriate levels of the Joint Chiefs of Staff supporting organizations; and that he will not attend any meetings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff except on matters directly concerning the Marine Corps, and that his decision that a matter directly concerns the Marine Corps may be overruled by the Secretary of Defense, in which event he would not attend. It is obvious that the Joint Chiefs of Staff may ask the advice of the Commandant on other matters, in which event the Commandant would attend the meeting for the sole purpose of giving his advice and not participating in the deliberations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as the House well knows, I have long been keenly interested in the enactment of legislation which would fix the size and the status of the Marine Corps in our

national defense structure. Many of us have worked long and hard to bring this about, not because we have any particular interest in the Marine Corps as such but because we so earnestly believe that such legislation is a primary defense need.

The conference report now before us is the culmination of these efforts. I am pleased to have been able to contribute, as a member of the Armed Services Committee and one of the conferees, to the final agreement. In reaching this agreement I have been obliged to yield on some very definite convictions I have as to what should be the status of the Marine Corps. But this legislation is better than none at all, and I believe is an improvement over the bill passed by the other body.

You will recall that the bill passed by the House provided that the Marine Corps Commandant shall be a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I still hold to that opinion. The Senate bill, on the other hand, provided that he shall be a consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Under the Senate version the Commandant would, to all intents and purposes be in virtually the same status he now is. He may or may not be consulted.

The important thing is to make certain that the Marine Corps Commandant has a definite voice in all matters which affect or concern the Marine Corps. To accomplish this the Commandant must have opportunity to determine for himself whether a matter being considered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff does or does not affect or concern the Marine Corps.

The language agreed upon by the conference committee does not give the Commandant any official status as a regular or associate member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but it has the merit of making certain that he is advised of every matter to be considered by them and that he has the opportunity to express his views on it where he feels that the Marine Corps is concerned.

This is indeed a distinct improvement over the existing situation. And, as set forth in the statement on the part of the House managers, it is understood by all of us that in carrying out this law the Marine Corps Commandant will have representation on the subordinate echelons of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Unless he has such representation the Marine Corps Commandant cannot possibly have a real voice in the considerations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Not infrequently decisions are made in the lower echelons, such as by the Joint Strategic Survey Committee, the Joint Strategic Plans Committee, and so forth, which do not become part of the Joint Chiefs of Staff official agenda. And yet these decisions may very vitally concern the Marine Corps.

We fully expect that in carrying out this law the services will make certain that the Marine Corps has a voice in all stages of the Joint Chiefs of Staff deliberations, and that the Marine Corps itself have complete opportunity to determine for itself whether it is affected or concerned in any way. As an individual member of the Armed Services

Committee, and I am sure this is the attitude of the entire committee, I intend to do what I can to see that this intent is carried out.

Just a word as to the size of the Marine Corps. By this legislation we are seeking to guarantee that we have a highly integrated, mobile striking force in readiness for any emergency that may arise. The Senate bill provided for four full-strength divisions and four full-strength air wings, with a ceiling of 400,000. The House bill provided for three full-strength divisions and three full-strength air wings, with both a numerical floor and ceiling. The House bill had the protective advantage of definitely fixing a floor.

That is the important feature retained in the conference report agreement. While it sets the size at three combat divisions and three air wings, it does not stipulate the strength numerically except as to the ceiling. But it does stipulate a floor of not less than three combat divisions and three air wings.

While this conference report may not be what we want or would like to have, it is nonetheless a distinct improvement over the existing situation. I believe it will add materially to our national defense. It being the primary responsibility of the Congress to determine the kind, type, and nature of defense we shall have, by this legislation we are making such a determination, and I believe the President should approve it. If the President should for any reason veto this bill, he will be arrogating to himself a constitutional prerogative of the Congress.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, under the outline as now given by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, does the Marine member now have a right to vote under the conference report?

Mr. VINSON. The Commandant of the Marine Corps will have whatever rights the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have, whether it is voting or anything else, with coequal status, when matters of direct concern to the Marine Corps are before the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is that any different than the set-up today?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes; entirely different. Today he is not on coequal status; he does not attend the meetings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff unless he is invited to express his opinion or give advice.

Mr. KEARNEY. Unless he is invited, Mr. VINSON. Unless he is invited.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, my understanding of the agreement reached in conference is that in addition to establishing a maximum strength, that a statutory floor has also been placed under the agreement.

Mr. VINSON. No numerical floor is in it. It is left entirely to the Congress to maintain the three-combat-division strength, three combat air wings and other units set out in the conference report, at such strength as it may deem advisable.

Mr. JACKSON of California. But the House bill said it should not be less than three full strength combat divisions and three full strength air wings; is that not correct?

Mr. VINSON. The actual size of the units will be determined by the Congress through its appropriations. While the conference agreement leaves it to the Congress to determine by the appropriations it makes what strength of the Marine Corps shall be, it cannot exceed 400,000. But we have said that the Marine Corps shall be so organized as to include not less than three combat divisions, three air wings and other units. As to whether or not they will be maintained at full strength it will be entirely up to the Congress when the Marine Corps appropriations are considered.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I think this conference report falls far short of the intent of the House.

Mr. VINSON. It may be true, but I will say, Mr. Speaker, it takes the agreement of both bodies to get a bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to object, I am very much dissatisfied with this bill, although I recognize the fact that you have had quite a time getting what you did get out of the conference.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. MANSFIELD. However, for the record I want to make sure that it is the intent of the Congress that the floor shall be three combat divisions and three air wings?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. The statement of House managers goes into details and states the intent of the House conferees, so that there will be no doubt as to what the House conferees intended.

Mr. ARENDS. There will be no misunderstanding as to what the Congress is thinking about.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the statement of the managers on the part of the House is very lengthy and has already been printed in the Record, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

METHOD OF COMPUTING PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman explain this bill and just what it does.

Mr. COOLEY. I shall be very glad to do so, Mr. Speaker.

The bill continues the existing method of computing parity for basic agricultural commodities for a period of 2 years. It has another provision which continues the 90-percent price support program for two additional years on the basic agricultural commodities, when the producers of such commodities have not disapproved the marketing quotas.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Has the Senate passed a similar bill?

Mr. COOLEY. The Senate committee has reported favorably a bill containing one of the provisions contained in this bill, the one which deals with new and old parity formula which is in the act of 1949. The House Committee on Agriculture gave very careful consideration to this measure and had extended hearings. My recollection is that the bill was unanimously reported, and it is considered urgent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In view of the urgency of this legislation, I will not object at this time to the consideration of the bill, but I think for the future it would be advisable to have more discussion on a measure of this importance so that the Members can understand it, and also so that those on the outside who might be interested will have the benefit of the real purpose and intent of the legislation.

I withdraw my reservation of the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to object at this time, and I want to serve notice to that effect on the chairman of the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman withhold his objection?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from New York is going to object, it would appear there is nothing to gain by further discussion.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the objection at this time, but I will reserve the right to object in order to get an explanation of the measure.

Mr. COOLEY. It may be that some member of the committee can clarify the situation, and give the gentleman from New York such information as he may desire concerning this measure. It is considered very important. Prices are now being supported at 90 percent of parity, and this is actually not going to materially change the situation for the current year.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, that is entirely up to the Speaker as to whether the Speaker will afford time for adequate discussion. It seems to me this is a basic change in agricultural policy, which is the law, and therefore I shall be constrained to object unless the Speaker will afford adequate time for a complete explanation.

Mr. COOLEY. I will give you a complete explanation. The gentleman stated that this constituted a drastic

change. It is not a drastic change. It is a continuation of the policy now in operation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman from New York that this is merely a continuation of the present 90 percent program and prevents supports on our basics from going down possibly to 75 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If it were not for this, our prices may go down materially due to the sliding scale as provided by law.

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly right. If the gentleman from New York will only stop to realize that all his Republican colleagues on the committee are utterly in favor of the measure, and thoroughly understand it. There is nothing complicated about it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will not object.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question, if I may, to the chairman of the committee. Personally, I do not think the measure now before us goes far enough. As the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture knows, I have introduced a bill calling for 100 percent parity. The chairman will recall that he has promised me he will hold hearings on my measure as soon as feasible. As I understand the present bill, it will continue for a 2-year period—90 percent of parity on certain selected agricultural products whereas if the gentleman from New York objects, it means there is a good possibility we will go back to the sliding scale which will reduce parity payments on these products below the present 90 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. That bill, of course, will be considered at the proper time, but it will not be affected in any way by this bill because this is a continuation of the 90-percent program which is in effect.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope the gentleman from New York will withdraw his objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the chairman of the committee? Is it not a fact that if this bill is not passed, then the law will be in effect as to a sliding parity from 75 to 90 percent, and if this bill is passed, for the next 2 years, it is fixed at 90 percent? Is that not a fact?

Mr. COOLEY. The situation is that unless we pass this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture could put into operation the sliding scale. I can say to the gentleman from New York that frankly I have no fear that the Secretary of Agriculture would use the sliding scale at this particular time, when the Nation is making such unprecedented demands on the farmers of this Nation to step up production.

Mr. JAVITS. This does change the law in that regard?

Mr. COOLEY. It only extends the 90-percent program two additional years.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

EXTENDING VOTING RIGHTS TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 513)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON, June 19, 1952.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: 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 service men 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 H. R. 7571 by Representative McCORMACK in the House and as S. 3061 by Senator GREEN in the Senate.

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, 1952, which I transmitted to the House Committee on 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 were not bright.

There is another important reason why 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 these 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 H. R. 7571 and S. 3061, 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 which all citizens possess.

In addition to enunciating the basic rights of our service people to vote, H. R. 7571 makes a series of recommendations for State action; prescribes certain steps for Federal agencies to follow, particularly with respect to postcard 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.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE ON SOCIAL SECURITY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to clear up, for the benefit of my colleagues and anyone else interested, any questions as to why I did not vote for the bill H. R. 7800. In the first place, Members of the House must realize that by the time my name was called on the record vote, the bill had carried with an overwhelming majority; therefore my vote, which was merely a protest, could not keep the beneficiaries of the social-security system from reaping the meager benefits which the bill provided.

I have no desire to criticize the members of the Ways and Means Committee, who undoubtedly did their best under the circumstances. However, from my own constituents who are directly affected I have received many complaints, and in responding to them I have promised the quickest possible remedial action.

I was very much disappointed that in programing H. R. 7800 there was only 40 minutes allowed for debate and no opportunity was given for amendments. I wanted to make clear the feelings of my people in regard to some of the features of the law. The increase provided is very meager indeed. It might provide a bare existence if the beneficiary could hold some kind of a job in order to draw the amount necessary to keep body and soul together. In some cases the \$70 limit provided by the bill might do it. In many others it cannot. Since the beneficiaries have contributed to their own social-security fund, I see no reason why they should not be permitted to employ themselves gainfully either without any limit or at least to the extent of \$100. I believe the House should consider under certain circumstances lowering the retirement age to 60 for men and 55 for women, with suitable adjustments in benefits.

I have many complaints from women as to the inequities and the differences in payments to a widow and to a widower.

I have found in my district, which is largely agricultural, that there is a great deal of confusion as to just who is and who is not covered. It would be much the best for the farm workers if language in connection with the agriculture coverage could be clarified and any doubt eliminated as to whether there would be benefits eventually returned to the employee.

The objection of housewives to collection of taxes covering domestics may, to some, seem a trivial matter. However, I believe that it is by no means trivial, and the constant nagging of this thorn in the flesh could be eliminated to the advantage of the entire social-security program.

I voted with regret not to suspend the rules to pass the bill as it now stands. If it could be liberalized, or if we could at least air our opinions and state the cases for our constituents, I would feel very differently about it. Under the present circumstances, I cannot give them their day in court.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER POWER

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record a short letter to the President.

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

There was no objection.
(The letter is as follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1952.
The PRESIDENT,
The White House.
MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was greatly disappointed, as I know you were, with the

vote in the Senate recommitting the St. Lawrence seaway bill. This means that this great project is dead for this year.

As you know, in 1948 New York State applied to the Federal Power Commission for a license to develop the power jointly with the Province of Ontario.

Now, it seems to me that the logical thing to do is to allow New York State and the Province of Ontario to jointly develop this power. This would not cost the Federal taxpayer a penny. It would give New York State and New England much needed power which is now going to waste. As I understand the situation, it needs the approval of the Federal Power Commission and the International Joint Commission. It would not need action by the Congress. The Province of Ontario and the State of New York can then construct the dam jointly and develop the power. New York State is ready to go ahead and the Province of Ontario has already given its approval.

I respectfully urge, sir, that you use your Executive power and influence with these two commissions to have this project approved immediately so that New York State and the Province of Ontario can proceed. I might add that New York State will charge enough for the power so that the project will be self-liquidating.

Respectfully yours,

CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
Member of Congress.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S HAND IN OUR AIR POWER REDUCTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in 1946 the air power of the United States covered the globe and supported our world policy. But from this time until the Korean war began in 1950 our military air strength was steadily and tragically reduced. On its own responsibility and against the best advice of military men the Democrat administration under the banner of economy imposed one cut after another on our air forces.

Of course, everybody was for economy. If the air strength of the United States could be cut safely—and the President said it could—most people favored the cuts.

Acting for the President, Secretary of Defense Johnson claimed that he was merely cutting "fat" off the military and that the muscle was left unharmed. Military units were disbanded, orders were canceled, and badly needed military equipment was denied the men who should have been training to use it. Many flying officers were grounded, many Reserve officers were sent home from active duty, and skilled technicians of many years of service were fired from the military installations where their services were so badly needed.

All of these things were done under the pretense that only luxuries were being eliminated.

But the luxuries continued. The bureaucrats, the five percenters, the activities to curry favor of local communities flourished without interruption.

Meanwhile the happy economizers chopped away at the bone and sinew of our military strength in order to have more money to spare in the budget for New Deal schemes and other socialistic projects designed to keep the administration in power.

Today, when our best jet fighters are outnumbered 5 to 1 in Korea, it seems incredible that men who carried so heavy a responsibility would be so positive in their assurances that adequate air power was being provided. In order to make sure that their actions would not be criticized, the strictest gag rule was placed upon military men of all branches. It was made quite clear to the top military men that their appointment to higher position would be far more likely if they backed the administration's views on false economy. Military expenditures gave way to spending for socialistic schemes. It was the tempo of the time.

MILITARY LEADERS SERVED AS STALKING HORSES

Military leaders, who had long served as a stalking horse for the State Department whenever it wished to announce some new scheme for foreign aid, now became an advocate of budget slicing. General Bradley helped to influence the Congress against voting more funds for air power than the administration would approve. He stated that a defense budget of more than \$14,000,000,000 would bankrupt the country and reassured everyone that the Communists were not likely to cause us any immediate trouble. He did this despite the fact that a few months previously he had signed a document informing the Secretary of Defense that if the budget were cut below \$18,000,000,000 the United States would be in no military position to carry out its world-wide commitments.

While false assurances were fairly convincing to the general public, they did not fool Members of Congress who were wise in the ways of New Deal-ish politicians. Against these false assurances and false economies recommended in the defense budget by the administration, the Eightieth Congress authorized an Air Force of 70 groups and provided funds for these groups only to hear the President and his military advisers say a 48-group Air Force was enough and then refused to use the money Congress had provided for that purpose. The Eightieth Congress authorized an expanded Naval air program, including a super aircraft carrier upon which work had begun and then ordered stopped at a dead loss of twenty million. Also, the Eightieth Congress fixed the size of our Armed Forces at 2,040,000 men and provided ample funds to support those forces. The Eightieth Congress was far ahead of the President and his advisers in preparing for the national defense.

GENERAL EISENHOWER CALLED IN TO BACK DEFENSE CUTS

In an effort to allay the fears and suspicions of Members of Congress that great risks were being taken in cutting our military strength, and particularly the air power, it was necessary to use the prestige of top military men to back up these cuts. General Eisenhower was

called in from his post at Columbia University to help effect an agreement among the services on a heavily cut budget in 1949.

In his typical role as a "welder," Eisenhower simply tried to keep everybody happy regardless of consequences. In order to get agreement on the budget he presided over the Joint Chiefs of Staff while the allocations were split almost equally among the three services. For this he gave the prestige of his name and record to the emasculated budget which he and all conscientious military men knew could not provide adequate defense.

On June 17, 1949, he passed the word to the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the military budget would be limited to \$14,000,000,000 to be divided among the three services. The strength of the Air Force, he told them, was set at 57 groups, and the Navy carrier strength was reduced from 8 to 6. The services replied within a few days that these forces could not be provided under the monetary ceiling he had given.

Consequently, on June 21, Eisenhower sent a memorandum to the Chairman of the Budget Advisory Committee directing the Committee to restudy the figures and reduce the strength of the military services to bring them within the budget ceiling he had previously given. General Eisenhower's memorandum contained the following sentence:

You may attempt jointly to agree upon a revised recommendation for reduced sums for aircraft procurement.

The same memorandum stated that the annual flying hours should be reduced by each service just as low as it could be reduced without causing an increased number of accidents, and also that pilot training should be cut down.

The first proposal was called Eisenhower plan No. 1.

The second proposal for cutting the Air Force and the Naval Air arm was officially referred to as Eisenhower plan No. 2. It cut the Air Force from the 57 groups to 50 groups, and cut the Navy from 6 carriers to 4.

These terrific cuts in the Nation's air strength, just a year before the Korean war began, were sold to the Congress as the Eisenhower budget. They were accepted, to a large extent, because they carried the then magic Eisenhower name with them. General Eisenhower had lent his name and his professional reputation to the project of slashing the Nation's air strength at a time when Communist air strength was being increased by leaps and bounds. But this was not all the damage done by Eisenhower, who stoutly protests he is a friend of air power.

One year later the administration again needed Eisenhower's help to put over its gamble with the the security of the Nation.

GENERAL EISENHOWER SAID 48 GROUP SAFE MINIMUM

In March of 1950—on March 29 to be exact—General Eisenhower was called before a congressional committee and questioned about the adequacy of the 48-group Air Force under a budget which

had already been reduced to \$13,600,000,000 for all military activities. He told the committee: "In the world situation, 48 well-equipped regular groups, and some dozen in the National Guard, would probably be a safe minimum."

The world situation at that time was that which immediately preceded the Korean war. After 5 months of combat in this war, General MacArthur did not have sufficient planes at his disposal to risk bombing Manchuria, according to the testimony of General Vandenberg, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

Yet this was the same Air Force that General Eisenhower had declared adequate.

Thus, the administration was able to employ General Eisenhower to cover up its fatal gambling with our security. The public, and to a large extent even the Congress, had been fooled. How could a man who undoubtedly knew what the Communists were building against us say that so small a force was adequate, even for a very small war, much less for a big war that might even yet lead to the devastation of our country?

The answer is easy. The general is famed among his military associates as a great diplomat—as a man who is able to please everybody at once—regardless of the issues. He is known as the great welder. General Eisenhower as Chief of Staff solved the budget problem not by any great strategy or even by any great influence but simply by splitting the budget equally among the three services and thereby getting an agreement. As a result, largely on Eisenhower's advice, the United States now finds, its Armed Forces in pitiful shape to fight the Korean war. The statements I have made are not mere hearsay or conjecture. They are well documented and are part of the graphic history of this country in those months prior to the Korean war when a few of our top military men—notably General Eisenhower—were willing to sell themselves to the administration in order to give popular and pleasant assurances to the American people that their defenses were ready for any attack.

THE GENERAL'S ROLE IN DEFENSE DRAMA

The blast of public indignation that followed the exposure of our military weakness in the Korean war blew the Secretary of Defense out of office and will remove the administration responsible in the elections in November. The essential part played by General Eisenhower in this tragic drama has largely been overlooked. He was rewarded for his backing of the untimely cuts that wrecked our defense and our air strength by the job in Europe that kept him in the public eye.

But when we listen today to his assurances about future \$40,000,000,000 cuts in the budget and his great optimism concerning how he can bring peace to the world and settle all our problems so cheaply, let us remember that just 3 years ago his great strategy was simply to split the budget three ways and that just 2 years ago he was assuring the Congress and the public that 48

air groups were sufficient for the present world situation.

Two years later we have 91 air groups but still we do not have enough to dare to cross the Yalu River even though Americans are being killed almost every day by planes coming from the other side of that river. General Eisenhower has never been a politician and certainly he has never been a statesman. His prestige is based largely upon his success as a military man in World War II. But it is world war III which may have already begun that concerns us now and before we select the great general to keep us out of war, this time, let us reexamine the record of his advice and his influence in the weakening of our strength which led to the Korean war and which after 2 years of struggle leaves us still unable to win that war.

Possibly more than those of any other one man, Eisenhower's views are reflected in our present Defense Establishment.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 hour, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 108]

Aandahl	Evins	Powell
Abernethy	Fenton	Prouty
Albert	Frazier	Reed, III.
Allen, La.	Gore	Richards
Anfuso	Hébert	Sabath
Bates, Ky.	Heffernan	Sasser
Beall	Herter	Scott,
Beckworth	Hope	Hugh D., Jr.
Bender	Kilday	Shafer
Buckley	McVey	Stanley
Burdick	Mack, III.	Steed
Butler	Morris	Stigler
Carlyle	Murdock	Sutton
Carnahan	Murphy	Tackett
Celler	Norblad	Thomas
Chatham	Patman	Welch
Clemente	Patten	Wickersham
Cole, N. Y.	Phillips	Wigglesworth
Dawson	Pickett	Wilson, Ind.
Dingell	Poulson	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8210) to amend and extend the Defense Produc-

tion Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8210, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read the first section of the bill. If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time so that I might ask the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee a question. On page 28 of the committee report on House bill H. R. 8210, there is a paragraph under the caption "Certain technical violations," which reads as follows:

Your committee has received several complaints concerning the general ceiling price regulation affecting lumber distributors in southern areas with respect to which your committee believes relief must be afforded. The general ceiling price regulation was issued in January 1951 shortly after the general price freeze. The provisions of the regulation as it affected such distributors was ambiguous in many respects, and attempts were immediately made to bring this to the attention of the agency. However, a period of a year elapsed before a new regulation was issued correcting and clarifying the matters complained of. During this period it is the understanding of your committee there were some technical violations of the general ceiling price regulation of a nonwillful character. Such technical violations would not be violations of the order now in effect and but for the long period of time it took to issue the current order would probably never have occurred. It is not the intention of your committee to condone willful violations of any price regulation or order in this instance or any other. But in view of the circumstances of these cases it is the opinion of your committee that there should be no prosecution of technical violations, which were nonwillful, and which would not constitute any violation of the order currently in effect.

This paragraph points out that the provision of the regulation as it affected such distributors—and the paragraph mentions lumber distributors—was ambiguous in many respects, and that attempts were immediately made to bring this to the attention of the agency. It further points out that a period of a year elapsed before a new regulation was issued correcting and clarifying the matters complained of, and that during that period the committee understands that there was some technical violations of the general ceiling price regulation, which were not violations of a willful character. Such technical violations would not now be violations of the order subsequently issued, and the committee points out that except for the long period of time it took to issue the current order, such technical violations probably never would have occurred. The committee recommends under the circumstances that there should be no prosecution of such technical violations, which were nonwillful, and which would not consti-

tute any violation of the order currently in effect.

While this paragraph does not mention the wood treating and preserving industry, it seems to me that the wood treating and preserving industry should be included in this paragraph of the committee report, along with lumber distributors. The wood treating and preserving industry is in the same situation in practically every respect with reference to this question as the lumber distributors or wood forest products distributors. The lumber distributors buy wood forest products, that is, timber, and the wood treating and preserving industry buys timber, which they convert to finished products such as poles, cross ties, cross arms, and so forth. That industry buys all of its raw materials. It does not produce any of it. With reference to the prices they were charging during their base period, the wood treating and preserving industry accumulated that inventory anywhere from 5 months to a year prior to that time, from the raw materials. It therefore does not reflect at all the cost of raw materials now being used. That industry is in the same position substantially as the wood forest products distributors or wholesalers, in that they had to replace inventory during the base period for deliveries a few months thereafter at much higher prices.

The agency has not as yet, I understand, promulgated the regulation yet for the wood treating and preserving industry. They have been working on it, trying to get it pushed through. It has been prepared, but not yet promulgated. In view of the similarity in the situation of these two industries, the lumber distributors and wood treating and preserving industry, I would like to ask the chairman if he does not think that this industry, namely wood preservers selling pressure and nonpressure treated forest products, should also be included in this paragraph along with lumber distributors?

Mr. SPENCE. I believe the wood treating and preserving industry is within the spirit of that direction and that they will not be subject to the penalties imposed. If, because of the obscurity or indefiniteness of the act, they were not able to know their rights and they were violated without any intention, I think they are exempt. I think they come within the spirit of that law, and would be exempt.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman. I simply wanted to ask that question for the purpose of getting it into the RECORD.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman of Georgia has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

SEC. 101. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Nor shall any restriction or other limitation be established or maintained upon the species, type, or grade of livestock killed by any slaughterer, nor upon the types of slaughtering operations, including religious rituals, employed

by any slaughterer; nor shall any requirements or regulations be established or maintained relating to the allocation or distribution of meat or meat products unless, and for the period for which, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have determined and certified to the President that the over-all supply of meat and meat products is inadequate to meet the civilian or military needs therefor: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the President from requiring the grading and grade marking of meat and meat products."

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SADLAK: 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."

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, the Sadlak amendment revised from its original presentation incorporated in H. R. 7517 and just read by the Clerk is presented for consideration at this time in order to resolve a parliamentary situation which has arisen due to the conflict in the so-called Ferguson-Fulbright amendments presently integral parts of the Senate Defense Production Act passed last Thursday.

The purport of the Ferguson amendment introduced as S. 2873 was completely misunderstood even though debated within the limits of the procedure of the other body and passed by a vote of 43 to 40. And because, apparently, it was not made clear that the provisions in no way affect the CMP, or Controlled Materials Plan, the inevitable conclusion was that the Senate believed that the CMP was placed in jeopardy. Consequently to avert what appeared to be a threat to the CMP, Senator FULBRIGHT presented his amendment calling for the appointment of a representative to the International Materials Conference appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate; and in the second part of his amendment, which I will read from the RECORD of June 11, at page 7033—the second part of the Fulbright amendment read as follows, and I point that out because it had been put in here specifically to protect the Controlled Materials Plan which I say again was not in any way affected by the Ferguson amendment. The Fulbright amendment to which I alluded continues as follows:

(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, nothing contained in this act shall impair the authority of the President under this act to exercise allocation and priorities control over materials both domestically produced and imported, and facilities to the Controlled Materials Plan or other methods of allocation.

After the usual debate this proposal was adopted by a vote of 46 to 31.

Mr. Chairman, Senator FERGUSON wished to bring to the attention of the Senate the effects of the IMC, or the International Materials Conference, indicates its origin, its illegal existence and operation, showing that it had no United States constitutional or statutory authority, its entitlements for consumption, which become the limits of our allocations, and put a stop to this super cartel. During general debate on yesterday I tried to explain the same organization and acquaint the members with its activities; I also referred to the parliamentary situation that has arisen in the Senate version of the new DPA. The Senate, I mentioned, had passed the Ferguson amendment on June 4; and the debate, as far as I am concerned, clearly shows that its purpose was to prevent the use of the Defense Production Act to implement the decisions of the International Materials Conference.

In the debate on June 11 in the other body many arguments were advanced that the Ferguson amendment could be construed in such manner as to limit the authority of the Defense Production Administration to operate the Controlled Materials Plan. This was debated by the Senate on June 4, and I am sure Senator FERGUSON believed that it could not have this effect.

The Ferguson-Fulbright amendments have grown to very controversial stature and I have, therefore, during long hours of the past few days endeavored to produce an amendment that would not only reconcile and resolve the difficulty but could be accepted in lieu thereof. My amendment is recommended and I shall gratefully appreciate your attention to my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, referring to the dilemma in which the Senate found itself with respect to these amendments, I want to read what Senator FULBRIGHT said about his amendment, and this is taken from pages 7023-7024 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Our attention was focused upon the International Materials Conference, and it was thought that the principal effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan would be in regard to the International Materials Conference. I did not realize in the course of that debate that it would have the effect of destroying the controlled materials plan. I do not believe the Senate and the Congress really desire to destroy the controlled materials plan. I leave only this thought, that if the Senate should adopt my amendment, it would not automatically nullify the Ferguson amendment. The only effect would be that there would be in the bill two inconsistent amendments which would have to be reconciled, and an acceptable result obtained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired (By unanimous consent Mr. SADLAK was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, reading further from the statement by Senator FULBRIGHT:

That will have to be done. It could be done by the House, or, more likely, in conference.

Reading further from the statement of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas:

If, after such a process of deliberation I should be proved to be wrong, and the matter could not otherwise be straightened out, my amendment could be eliminated, because it would be in conflict with the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. But I think we at least owe that much difference to the leading and responsible members of this administration, who are trying to administer the defense production program. So I submit that even for those who think that I may not be entirely correct, they still are justified in voting for my amendment, in order that the question involved may be given further study.

What I have just read, Mr. Chairman, clearly indicates that the Senate did not nullify the Ferguson amendment on June 11. It wanted to protect the controlled materials plan.

As I said on yesterday, my amendment in no ways affects the CMP. The controlled materials plan is not affected, and I specifically say so in this amendment. As concerns small business, the Sadlak amendment in no way affects the operations of the CMP or distribution within the United States of any material as between big business and little business. All of the powers of allocation within the act at present are left unchanged.

My amendment merely states that these powers cannot be used for the sole purpose of restricting the total United States consumption of any material to a figure fixed by the IMC. You cannot help little business by keeping the materials out of the country.

As concerns oil, the Sadlak amendment in no way interferes with CMP. It also in no way interferes with the domestic allocation of imported fuel oil by the PAD within the United States. I in no way intend to interfere with PAD. Our problem is to bring the oil into the country, oil which otherwise would be lost. Disposition, or dividing the product, rests solely with DPA. The purpose of this amendment is to bring the oil into the country.

Will the elimination of the International Materials Conference ruin our mobilization effort? The answer is "No," and this answer I give you from page 7022 of the RECORD of June 11, at which point Senator FULBRIGHT read a letter written by the former Administrator of Defense Production, Mr. Fleischmann.

This is what Senator FULBRIGHT quoted from the letter of Mr. Fleischmann written on June 10:

I reiterate what I said as to the International Materials Conference—that its elimination, insofar as this country is concerned, although in my opinion most unfortunate, would not result in a collapse of our mobilization effort. At the same time I concur fully with Mr. Fowler's statement that the effect of this amendment would be to make the operation of the Controlled Materials Plan impossible, and that, I believe, would have disastrous effects on our mobilization program.

I think I have already touched on the CMP matter therein referred to.

One other thing, Mr. Chairman. The IMC has seriously affected our stockpile.

On yesterday I read from the release of June 17 by Mr. Fowler, of the Defense Production Administration. On page 4 of that release it reads as follows:

To help maintain even this low level it became necessary in the third quarter of 1951 to suspend the stockpiling.

I am anxious, Mr. Chairman, to have the maximum freedom of enterprise to obtain materials which might not otherwise be available so as to keep the United States economically strong. In my opinion, we can do away with the International Materials Conference because, as I have stated, not once but many times, as has been brought out in statements and in testimony given by Mr. FERGUSON, myself, and many others, it is an organization which has no statutory authority; and if they say that it is vital and necessary to our defense production, then I say they should come in here before the proper committees of the Congress, lay their cards on the table, instead of doing things under the table.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. Did I hear the gentleman correctly when he said that there is not use for the IMC? Did the gentleman say that?

Mr. SADLAK. I say to the gentleman, as I have said repeatedly, that the International Materials Conference has no statutory authority.

Mr. CELLER. Well, does the gentleman think we need the IMC to control disposition of these strategic materials throughout the world?

Mr. SADLAK. I say emphatically "No," but I will add to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SADLAK was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. SADLAK. I say in addition that if the authorities who are administering our defense production will come before the Congress of the United States, which I feel sure has the authority, and will lay their cards on the table, whether it be the House Committee on Foreign Affairs or the House Committee on Armed Services, because stockpiling of strategic materials is affected, if they will come before the proper committees with full and open hearings and conferences that this has to be done and there is no alternative and our proper committee or committees of the Congress agree, then I shall be for it.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman will realize that unless these strategic materials, like lead and cobalt, and so forth, are controlled in some way by international agreement, then the Soviet authorities, by secret agents, will be enabled, if there is no control, to grab up all these strategic materials to our own serious disadvantage and to the disadvantage of our own stockpiling plans. An adequate stockpile of these highly important metals is manifestly essential for our security and defense. Thus, IMC is essential for our security and defense.

Mr. SADLAK. In reply I will say to the gentleman, from my study of the International Materials Conference, that there are only seven committees dealing with materials. There are some 38 strategic materials which we need, and I would leave that to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], who is well qualified, to answer that. But there are only seven or eight materials which come within the purview of the International Materials Conference.

Mr. CELLER. But it is essential to do something now and not wait until we can get authority in the way that the gentleman speaks of. There is, however, plenty of authorization for IMC imbedded in basic statute, and the defense authorities have gone ahead and made these arrangements with various countries primarily to enable us to get a stockpile and, secondly, to prevent Russia from getting these materials which we desperately need.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(On request of Mr. SPENCE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment as I believe it would confuse and damage, if not destroy, the operation of the controlled materials plan under the Defense Production Act we now have under consideration.

As a member of the House Small Business Committee I have had opportunity to examine the operations of CMP and have seen it bring order out of chaos and secure a fair distribution of scarce materials for civilian needs after caring for defense requirements.

If this amendment should be adopted I do not see how CMP could be administered effectively.

Take copper for instance, in which I believe our good friend from Connecticut is particularly interested. Two-thirds of our requirements come from domestic production—one-third imported. How could an equitable distribution be attained unless we have effective control of the imported one-third? It is my guess small, nonintegrated business would again suffer as they did before the establishment of CMP.

While I entered this debate in defense of equitable distribution of scarce materials to small as well as large firms we find ourselves involved in the deep water of international agreement.

We have subscribed to the North Atlantic Pact and the Mutual Security Act. How can we properly support these projects unless we undertake some plan, such as IMC, for orderly distribution of strategic materials in short supply and basic to the common effort.

If we decline to share with the free nations the materials of which we are the principal producer we cannot expect them to share such vital items as nickel and cobalt used throughout our defense production program and particularly vital for use in jet engines.

The most serious effect of this amendment would be the repudiation of an agreement with our teammates, whereas we must promote cordial cooperation with the free nations.

It would put us in open competition with our associates which would result in inflated world prices with no increase in supply, not to mention the complete disorganization of an orderly supply system, and we must bear in mind that most of these materials are being dealt in dollars.

If we disrupt defense plans of the free nations we imperil our own defense.

As to authority, and that question was raised yesterday, the Defense Production Act, title I, gives the President authority to make priorities and allocations in the interest of national defense.

This is the same authority as given by the Second Powers Act, title I, under which the President entered into agreement with Great Britain and Canada for the operation of the combined boards allocating raw materials, finished products, shipping space, and food supplies in World War II.

If authority be lacking we had better provide the necessary authority, as apparently is the thought of the other body when it passed the Fulbright amendment June 11.

As a practical matter we should not go into unorganized competition with the free nations for these materials needed for defense and we do not want to disrupt world markets in a manner that may enable unfriendly governments to obtain these materials.

Copper is in short supply. We have not been getting our full allotment through no fault of IMC but because OPS ceiling has been below world market. I suspect this is probably the most important reason for this amendment being presented. This has been belatedly corrected and I believe we will get our full quota without endangering friendly relations and upsetting international markets as I believe this amendment would do.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that this amendment will be defeated in our own self-interest as well as that of the free nations of the world, as we have a common interest.

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Am I correct in stating that if this amendment prevails, it will militate against our acquisition of appropriate strategic materials for the purposes of stockpiling, and, secondly, would it not enable Russia through its secret agents who roam throughout the world, if there are no controls through this central authority, to get as much of these strategic materials as she wishes; and she can reach out her long arm with vast sums of money and bid against everybody else and successfully corral most of this material?

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

Mr. BURTON. I have yielded to the gentleman from New York, and I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana next.

Mr. HALLECK. Has the gentleman from New York concluded?

Mr. CELLER. I have concluded.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I would like to get an answer to my question.

Mr. HALLECK. May I interpose my answer to that statement? In the first place, my opinion is that if this amendment passes, this bill will get more of the materials that we need and should have. Secondly, in respect of whether or not it will make it permissible or possible for Russia to reach out and get these materials, let me say only in reference to that that the nations involved in this arrangement are supposed to be free, democratic, friendly nations. Certainly there is some responsibility upon them to see to it that Russia and our enemies do not get the materials that we should have; and certainly if they want to do this by way of this arrangement, it is not going to make any difference. Now, will the gentleman answer my question.

Mr. BURTON. I will say to both gentlemen that it is a matter of opinion as to just what will result, but in my opinion it will disrupt the orderly and planned arrangement under which we get a liberal share of these much-needed materials, for which in turn we agree to supply these necessary materials to those who are cooperating with us. To what extent that will open these materials to the Russians or allied countries, I would not know. But if you disrupt a plan to which you have agreed, I should say that would certainly not make a favorable impression upon our friends and would tend to open markets to the iron-curtain countries.

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

Mr. BURTON. I will gladly do so.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman speaks of agreeing to a plan and he used the word "you." Maybe he meant that for all of us, but so far as I am concerned, I never agreed to this plan and I do not think the Congress of the United States ever agreed to it. As a matter of fact, the committees of the Congress held hearings on the whole matter and consistently refused to report any legislation sanctioning it. I think the record discloses instead of approving it, the Congress constantly disapproved it.

Mr. BURTON. Pardon me if I misinterpreted the gentleman's position.

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Did we not have plenty of evidence before the committee that some of these foreign countries were sending in these articles composed of copper and brass and other things much to the harm of our local, small business, particularly let me say in the State of Connecticut?

Mr. BURTON. I am afraid I did not quite get the gentleman's question.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I asked if there were not plenty of people who appeared before our committee who testified that they were getting brass and copper in foreign countries and sending them here,

competing against us; and that they were able to get these materials which are in short supply.

Mr. BURTON. I would say in answer that as regarding copper, it is not a matter of competition because our domestic supply amounts to only approximately two-thirds of our needs and we must import the additional one-third. We have not been getting our full allotment under the IMC agreements. This is not due to IMC restriction but to the fact that we have had a domestic ceiling price which has made importation unprofitable. We do not have the domestic production, and we must import copper. We have not been importing copper because it has been unprofitable to the importers.

I am not defending this situation. I think it is most unfortunate. It is being corrected, and I think being corrected in the proper manner. I do not believe this amendment is the proper solution.

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. I have two brief questions. Does the gentleman say that the International Metals Conference has been legally established?

Mr. BURTON. I say it is established under the same authority that prevailed in World War II when, under the Second War Powers Act, title I, the President entered into agreements with Great Britain and Canada for the operation of the Combined Boards, which allocated raw materials, finished products, shipping space, and food supplies.

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

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

Mr. MULTER. In further answer as to the legislative authority for IMC, I think the gentleman has already covered it, but to emphasize the point, in the declaration of policy it says in so many words, and this is broader language than was used in the second War Powers Act in World War II. There has been no attempt to change this.

It is the intention of the Congress that the President shall use the powers conferred by this act to promote the national defense, to meet properly the requirements of the military program in support of our national security and the foreign policy objectives.

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

(On request of Mr. SADLAK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. BURTON. I will answer further to that question that satisfies me as to the authority. But if it does not already exist we should provide the necessary authority for an orderly agreement among friendly and free nations, that we may have equitable distribution.

Mr. SADLAK. I am in entire accord with the remarks the gentleman has made, that we should have orderly procedure. Therefore, I say they should come before the Congress and show us that they have to have IMC.

Let me ask one further question: Does the gentleman agree that the Defense Production Act, with which we are now working, is the vehicle by which IMC is being implemented?

Mr. BURTON. The legal question you have asked I am going to refer to the chairman.

Mr. SADLAK. The gentleman said he was so interested in this he ought to know whether the answer should be yes or no.

Mr. BURTON. My approach to this was through CMP. As chairman of committee No. 3 of the Small Business Committee, I had an opportunity to examine the operations of CMP and find that they have brought order out of chaos, and that enables your small businesses throughout the Connecticut Valley to work when they were unable to work before the operation of CMP. I believe your amendment would destroy that operation.

Mr. SADLAK. I in no way disagree with CMP.

Mr. BURTON. In your original amendment as placed before the Committee on Banking and Currency, this would have seriously embarrassed New England in the importation of these materials.

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. The Fulbright amendment in the Senate provided for the appointment of members to the IMC, and provided that appointment should be confirmed by the Senate. Will the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] be in favor of that bill?

Mr. SADLAK. Indeed not. I stand on my amendment. That is bringing in IMC.

Mr. SPENCE. Then the gentleman is not interested in legalizing it, and that seems to be the argument.

Mr. SADLAK. Not in this manner, I will say to the affable gentleman.

Mr. BURTON. Does that answer the gentleman's question? I will say this in further answer, that had the committee passed the original amendment as submitted by you to the Banking and Currency Committee it would have greatly embarrassed New England in the importation of oil and gasoline, it would have disrupted distribution to small business, it would have served largely to nullify anything that might be done for butter and cheese under the Andresen amendment.

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

(On request of Mr. MCCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman knows of my high regard for him; he and I served on the Small Business Committee together. The gentleman recognizes, of course, that the gentleman's amendment as here presented is not what he talked about before the

committee; it is not the Ferguson amendment.

The reason it has been changed is to make it completely positive so that the operations of the controlled-materials plan, which is a part of our domestic policy, be not interfered with. His present amendment was drafted to avoid that very criticism, and I think it completely avoids it and is the sole question that now remains having regard to our international situation, of course, the inherent part which is supposed to be contained in that just might be subject to question as to its implementation, but the primary purpose is to bring more materials to this country that we need in order that the small businesses primarily in which the gentleman and I are interested may have more of the materials they need. The controlled-materials plan would still operate to see to it here on the domestic front that once we get the materials they are allocated in such manner as to protect the interests of small business.

Mr. BURTON. While I generally see things with my friend, I may say that, although I am fully aware of the change in this amendment—which, by the way, was only presented to us this morning—I do not see it as the gentleman does. I believe it will disrupt the operation of CMP, which I think is exceedingly important; and if it is important that we have orderly distribution of these important defense materials domestically, is it not the more important that we have an orderly plan for their distribution among the free nations?

While I entered this from the CMP angle, yet we have the IMC involved, and although I am no authority on international matters, I am convinced that we will make a very serious mistake if we adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I am going to quote from Defense Production Administrator Manly Fleischmann, whom I believe to be one of the most outstanding men in America in his line. Here is what he says:

The fact of the matter is that this amendment dealing with priorities and allocations will not prevent American participation in the International Materials Conference, but it will effectively destroy the operation of the Controlled Materials Plan, without which the successful conduct of the mobilization effort in the current supply situation becomes impossible.

In addition, the second sentence of the amendment will effectively tie the Nation's hands in the international competition for strategic materials without which no nation can survive in the modern armaments race.

I am quoting from a man who is an expert.

This is a bad amendment. I ask you to vote against this amendment.

Mr. BURTON. I also have a report from a rather distinguished citizen, General Eisenhower, which I think supports my viewpoint.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, the Sadlak amendment, under pretext of striking at the International Materials Conference, would kill the controls under which the mobilization program is operating and would strike a crippling blow at American industry, particularly small business. As a Rhode Island Representative in Congress, I am conscious of the staggering effect the amendment would have in my State. Inasmuch as only two-thirds of our copper supply is produced domestically the amendment would free the one-third which we import from allocation controls. Thus the small firms in the jewelry industry which is centered in my State would have their supply of copper cut off while such an industrial colossus as General Motors would be able to corner the foreign copper supply. Rhode Island is already suffering from unemployment to the point where it has been declared a distress area. Let us not legislate to make this situation worse.

Likewise the hundreds of other small fabricators in New England would face disaster in this time of scarcity, while selfish giants bought up the foreign supply.

Great emphasis has been laid on the copper situation. Let us be mindful that it probably applies likewise to petroleum products. Aviation gas production controls might have to be abandoned. Residential and industrial users of residual fuel, now receiving substantial quantities of residual fuel oil from the Venezuela area might well go without supplies.

I am mindful that in times of scarcities and inconveniences it is popular to strike at anything which has the word "international" in its title. This amendment, capitalizing on this device, would in one stroke make it impossible for us to get the cadmium, columbium, nickel, tungsten, and cobalt which we must import if we are to make jet engines, and simultaneously would cripple small businesses and all industries except the most gigantic combinations.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have as much information about this particular amendment as my colleague from Virginia, because he served on the committee that studied the matter. However, I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and we heard several witnesses with reference to it.

I have here a letter I want to read which is addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. SPENCE. The letter is dated June 19 and is from the Munitions Board, signed by J. D. Small, Chairman. It reads as follows:

MUNITIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1952.

HON. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Banking and Currency
Committee, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPENCE: I have been informed that there will be proposed an amendment to section 101 of H. R. 8210, as amended,

containing the following sentence: "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 an international materials conference."

The current military program is consuming large quantities of such materials as nickel and cobalt particularly for the jet engine, ammunition and tank programs. Supplies of these materials are almost exclusively from foreign sources and are allocated by the International Materials Conference. In addition, it is of the utmost importance to increase the strategic stockpile of these materials as rapidly as possible in order to support the tremendous demands which would be faced under full mobilization.

The operations of the International Materials Conference have been effective in assuring the availability of these materials for the military programs. Should the effectiveness of the Conference be destroyed, the reliability of our sources of supply would be seriously jeopardized. The amount of these materials which might disappear into undesirable channels with the breakdown of the presently operating system could very easily result in serious deficits which would have to be absorbed by the Department of Defense current production and stockpiling programs since the civilian economy is presently under maximum restrictions.

Sincerely yours,

J. D. SMALL,
Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to be an expert on this but it seems to me that to completely strike out and remove the International Materials Conference would result in two things. I believe I know the reason for this amendment. It would take away from small-business men the copper they need and give it to big business. That is the object in plain English. Small business throughout the country, would have to compete with the buying power of the great corporations. This amendment has in it the great danger of crippling the military program.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me to be very unwise at this particular time to adopt this amendment in light of all the facts and in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] be permitted to speak for 10 additional minutes.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, here is extension after extension after extension of time and I do not know how the time will ultimately be allocated. I shall not object at this time but unless they shift it a little bit I am going to object to the next request.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for asking for an extra 10 minutes for me to try to explain this problem we face.

I cannot go fully into the matter in that length of time, but I think we should examine the question closely. The Defense Production Act we set up in 1950 gives allocation and priority, also price control. Under the act, also, of course, we gave authority to Defense Production people to initiate programs to secure more of these materials here in America. To date they have not done a very good job. We have made some effort and taken some steps to up the production of quite a number of programs for securing different types of materials. This part of the act is highly important to the American people.

I doubt whether any Member of the House has read one of their reports fully. If not, you should read it and see what we are getting into. It is set up with 28 countries participating in it throughout the world, and it just does not apply only to strategic and critical materials but could be applied under present procedure to any material. The Congress should not, in my opinion, write out a policy if we are to have one of this kind. I find myself in agreement with the objective but not on the basis on which they are proceeding today.

Congress laid down a policy in this country from a national-defense standpoint. We adopted the Stockpiling Act. We appropriated \$5,000,000,000 or more since 1946 for this program. Now what has happened to it? We have unobligated \$648,000,000 and we have expended in that fund \$2,654,000,000, over \$3,000,000,000 that we have been unable to put into the stockpile materials which the national security of our Nation depends upon. We get letters every day, and I have got one here in my pocket that I received yesterday from a boy in Korea because of the fact that they do not have mortar shells. We all know why that is. We are the ones that have to manufacture all this material. You cannot do it in Africa; you cannot do it in other countries under this agreement. They do not have the manufacturing capacity. Now we should go out and set this thing up with a sensible plan, not the plan that it is operating under today, with full authority to do anything they desire to do. According to the report, they make no report to anybody, either the Congress or anybody else. I would like to have more time to go into this matter because it is so far-reaching, but let me show you how this thing is set up.

Mr. Chairman, it is probable that few Members of this House have ever heard of the International Materials Conference. There is good reason for this. It is an organization which was not set up by Congress, has no basis in law, and has only rarely come to the attention of Members of this body. We should not, however, allow ourselves to believe, because of the little attention the IMC has received, that its importance is small. Indeed, exactly the opposite is true. It may be that the shortages of critical and strategic materials in the United States arises for the most part out of the operations of this nebulously constituted body. It is time, indeed it is well past the time, that Congress should take cognizance of the existence of the IMC in order that

the military effort of this country, together with the maintenance of a reasonable level of civilian production, be no longer impaired by its operations.

They have taken over the Defense Production Act; they have taken over all authority over our stockpile program and said: "We are going to allocate these materials; we are going to set up priorities, we are going to fix prices, we have import and export authority, and we will control it."

This is how the International Materials Conference came into being.

In 1944, the State Department issued its proposals to the United Nations for an International Trade Organization. These proposals contained provisions for intergovernmental commodity agreements. Various drafts of the proposals were made from 1944 through 1947.

In 1947, the Senate Finance Committee held hearings on the proposed International Trade Organization. Senator MILLIKIN, the Chairman, specifically asked whether any such agreements, if consummated, would be submitted to Congress for approval. The present Secretary of State, who was then Acting Secretary, in a letter to the committee said:

Insofar as such commodity agreements impose any obligations on the United States requiring legislative implementation in any way, it is the intention of the Department that they should be submitted to the Congress.

In 1948, the nations met at Habana and a charter for the International Trade Organization was the result of their deliberation. Chapter 6 of this charter dealt with intergovernmental commodity agreements. The charter was submitted for approval and hearings were held before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, during the Eighty-first Congress, to approve the charter. The hearings closed on May 12 and the committee never reported any action to the House. In December, the Department announced that no further efforts would be made to secure approval for the ITO. Between May and December Congress passed the Defense Production Act of 1950 which granted allocation and price-control powers. In January of 1951, following Prime Minister Attlee's visit to the United States, the governments of United Kingdom, France and the United States announced that an International Materials Conference would be formed to deal with the allocation of scarce commodities, not just critical materials.

This was the birth of the International Materials Conference. There was never any legislative sanction for its activities, and none exist today.

The Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. McFall, in a letter to Representative BUDGE on January 24 of this year said:

There is no specific statutory authority for the participation of the United States in this Conference as it is one of the many activities carried out in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States.

I want to say that I am one of the Members of this House that has supported the foreign policy down the line

almost completely until this present operation.

I know what we face on many of the strategic and critical materials. Most of them are basic elements and are becoming scarcer all the time. I took the floor in support of the wheat to India bill in order that we might secure some of these materials and have supported all mutual aid to these countries.

This conference consists of governmental representatives from 28 nations who are determining the distribution of the world's materials not only for defense but for civilian usage as well. It is obvious that any group having this power has the power to determine the living standards in each of the countries of the world, their military potential, their national income, and the level of employment in their respective countries. Up to this time, the International Materials Conference has dealt with only seven groups of commodities. However, it is free at any time in accordance with its own statements to establish new groups to deal with such additional commodities as in its judgment require consideration. While the Congress of the United States has never sanctioned our participation in the International Materials Conference, this organization describes its powers in the following words in its report on operations for 1951 and 1952:

The committees were created as autonomous bodies in the interest of expediting action and allowing the countries which were primarily concerned with the commodities in question to deal with the problems involved without being subject to review by any other body.

This is rather sweeping language and it implies that these commodity groups are not subject to review by the Congress. The only possible excuse for the existence of such groups in a period such as we are going through would be that they furthered our defense effort.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Does the gentleman mean to imply that the International Materials Conference sets the price on materials?

Mr. DURHAM. It can do it. It has done it.

Mr. SPENCE. It could only do it by agreement.

Mr. DURHAM. It can do it because you give them price-control authority in this bill, and that is what we are acting on today.

Mr. SPENCE. They cannot even allocate without the consent of this Government. It is purely a voluntary agreement.

Mr. DURHAM. They have been doing it.

Mr. SPENCE. They cannot fix any price or even allocate materials.

Mr. DURHAM. They have already done it on materials, as shown in their report.

Mr. SPENCE. They cannot do it unless the Government of the United States agrees to it.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I want to read just a paragraph of their report. The gentleman says we have not read this. I have read it. Here is the plan of organization and operation of this committee:

The committees were created as autonomous bodies in the interest of expediting action and allowing the countries which were principally concerned with the commodities in question to deal with the problems involved without being subject to review by any other body.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct. That is what they say in the report. If you will refer to page 24 of their report you will find that they have suggested none of this material go into the stockpile. Where is the \$3,000,000,000 that we have got down here going to be used for national security of our country if such a policy is continued and they have done very little in trying to up production here at home and the record for past 2 years now under the Defense Production Act proves very little has been accomplished.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. COX. I have asked that the gentleman yield in order that I might emphasize the importance of the members following the discussion which the gentleman is now engaged in because he is making a very important argument on a very important subject, which is now before the House.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman.

However, an examination of their reports shows that these groups have actually suspended the stockpile program authorized by Public Law 520 without any authority whatsoever to do so. Their report on operations contains the following amazing statements with reference to the United States stockpile program.

Your stockpile today in the last 30 days' report shows that it is not 35 percent completed under the authorization of this Congress, and there are billions of dollars down there today unexpended. The gentleman who just spoke, who preceded me, ought to read the report on manganese here. You do not have enough manganese in the stockpile of this country today to run the steel mills to produce steel for the next 12 months, and the gentleman knows it.

In developing plans of distribution for the metals it was necessary for the committees to consider what policy should be followed in allowing materials for stockpiling purposes during a period of scarcity. The problem was discussed in several of the commodity committees and many differences of opinion were expressed as to whether stockpiling should continue to be pursued under existing circumstances. The Copper-Zinc-Lead Committee and the Manganese-Nickel-Cobalt Committee decided, in connection with their fourth quarter allocations, to recognize, in principle, the requirements for strategic stockpile purposes; but, in view of the tight supply, they recommended a special allowance for such requirements in the plans for copper, zinc, and cobalt only to the extent of a small percentage of consumption during a given base period.

That is their recommendation in their report.

In the case of commodities where the shortage was more acute (nickel, tungsten, and molybdenum), the committees were unable to recommend any special allowance for stockpiling.

That only affects stockpiling, but it affects every manufacturing plant in this country, and every laboring man in the United States.

In the allocation plans for the first quarter of 1952, the copper-zinc-lead and the manganese-nickel-cobalt committees found it inadvisable to provide any special allowance for stockpile purposes—

This is an English magazine. It is in this report. It contained the following statement—

but maintained the principle of making such provisions in connection with further allocations when the supplies were sufficient to permit it.

An article in the magazine *Freedom and Union* last April referred to the stockpile program and contained the following statement:

When the IMC came into being and it began planning allocations on the basis of data made available on the needs and supplies of both producers and consumers, the committee members were confronted with the fact that there just did not exist sufficient quantity of the commodities under consideration to satisfy all needs, however justified. Further stockpiling, whether by the United States or by any other country, threatened to bring about an economic crisis. By common agreement, certain commodities were taken off the stockpile list, to be followed by others whenever the situation required such a measure. The last to be thus temporarily taken off the list is copper, and no provisions for the stockpiling of this commodity were made on the allocations for 1952's first quarter.

The President of the United States has already issued, I believe, three orders taking copper out of the stockpile of this country, which today is far short of the objective for today and if not increased, in case of all out war, it would be a calamity.

The effect of these decisions has been to force the diversion of material under contract of the stockpile to domestic interest as the allocations given to this country by the IMC were insufficient to permit stockpiling or military production and acceptable levels of civilian employment.

Only this week, the office of Defense Production Authority announced new policies for the pricing and allocation of copper which would make possible foreign purchases up to the limit of IMC entitlements.

I have said that many, many times on the floor of this House over the last 4 or 5 or 6 years.

Mr. Fowler, however, closes his six-page release with the statement that—

I wish to emphasize that, unfortunately, even with the anticipated increase in imports, both stockpiling and civilian use will be at a low level.

If there were no IMC entitlement limits, this would not necessarily be the case.

The IMC have allocated about the same proportion of copper to the United

States today as we received prior to Korea.

It is obvious that this country is doing the greatest part of the world's military production. If the United States receives the same amount of copper as it did prior to Korea and the other nations of the world receive what they were getting prior to Korea, the result must be to reduce our civilian economy more drastically than the civilian economy of the other nations of the world. If we are not willing to take the consequences of such a drastic reduction, then we obviously are going to stop stockpiling.

This is precisely what is happening. Unless the United States is freed from the unauthorized restrictions of the International Materials Conference, it will have to stop its stockpiling program or reduce its production of civilian goods more drastically than any other country in the world. If such decisions are to be made, they should be made by the Congress and not by a group who are described by Mr. Standley, its press officer and an employee of our State Department, as a rather loose set-up; IMC can hardly be called an organization in the usual sense of the word, since it has no charter, no binding treaties, and no machinery for the enforcement of its recommendations—just a "gentlemen's agreement."

The proponents of IMC maintain that international allocations are necessary so that this country may receive the many critical and strategic materials which we do not produce and which must be imported from overseas. Mr. Fleischmann, in his testimony before the Senate Banking Committee, said we needed 38 materials which were strategic and critical from other countries. Only eight of these materials are under IMC jurisdiction. The IMC does nothing to insure our receiving any of the remaining 38 materials. It merely sets limits on our consumption of the materials with which it is interested. It is significant that the *London Economist*, in a very friendly article last December discussing the work of the IMC, said that the IMC member countries are, in fact, "on their own."

As I stated above, it is time, and well past the proper time, for Congress to take appropriate action for the elimination of the authority of this organization or, in the alternative, to investigate its functions and if they are found to be necessary to pass legislation giving the IMC a legislative basis and confer on it such authorities or impose such limitations as Congress feels are proper.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. May I say we have not taken our allocation of copper. We have allocated 133,000 tons a month, and we have only been taking 106,000 tons for the last 3 months. I am with you, I want to see the stockpiling. The question is: How will we help our stockpiling, by a disorderly operation or an orderly operation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. There could not be any way more disorderly for building and preparing for an emergency stockpile than the present procedure under IMC. I ask that we adopt this amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor to call attention to the fact that you have just heard a discussion here by a Member of this House who really knows this subject and who has known it from the beginning of our program of stockpiling strategic and critical materials. I know that personally, and I know that he knows what he is talking about when it comes to strategic and critical material stockpiling for national defense. If we keep national defense as our No. 1 objective, we will not ride roughshod over his recommendations in this legislation.

I have not had an opportunity in recent years to keep up as carefully and as much in detail on stockpiling as I could during the years I spent on the Committee on Military Affairs with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], but I do have tremendous respect for his continuing that work and his bringing to us his analysis of the situation confronting us. His warning to the House today that we are on thin ice, in dangerous territory, when we have as a Nation discontinued all stockpiling, that we have only 35 percent of the stockpile objective that was set up in Public Law 520 in 1946, when we contemplated then getting 100 percent of that stockpile in 5 years' time is a dire warning indeed. If you are still willing to dally along with inadequate protection through stoppage of stockpiling to meet our needs, I say you should stop and think. This International Metals Conference has ridden over some of the policies of the Stockpiling Act. They have subordinated American needs to the international picture, and I cannot go along with that at all. We wrote and enacted Public Law 520 in the Seventy-ninth Congress and we really meant to set up an adequate American defense. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has been the main guardian of that program and is guarding it today. Anyone who advocates running roughshod over that program, should bear in mind that we have only 35 percent of that stockpile objective; that we have over \$3,000,000 down here, unable to spend it for further acquisition of strategic and critical materials. It is unused, although it is there waiting to be used. I think Mr. Small, head of the Munitions Board, had better sit up and take notice and reexamine the law under which he is functioning. I do not appreciate for 1 minute his sending letters to Congress saying what he said in the letter read by the gentleman from Alabama. Mr. Small had better reexamine his own responsibility. He knows I do not think he has accomplished the mission that he was given to do by the Congress. He had better get the stockpile together and preserve it, instead of gutting it. Who authorized him to go in there and take out copper from the meager supply we have? He will tell you that President Truman told him.

But they bypassed Congress and all of our objective of an adequate stockpile. They cannot lawfully distribute to foreign countries these materials that should be added to our stockpile, as long as men like CARL DURHAM stand guard. If you are inclined to go along easily and knock down American self-sufficiency, then you had better reexamine your own appraisal of things that are first in the matter of national defense.

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

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this amendment brings before this body one of the most important subjects which can confront us in connection with the bill now before the committee. I wonder how many of us realize that our Department of State is the agency of Government which has created this International Materials Control, and that in creating it they did so to accomplish a foreign-policy objective of our country. To say the least, this objective is uncertain and I believe is unknown to any of us. In creating the International Materials Conference they have given our country one vote, one vote only out of 28, thereby making certain that any 14 or 15 out of those 28 countries can be sure that if there is to be unemployment in the world it will not be in another country; it will be in the United States.

This very day materials are being taken from our country, shipped abroad for use over and beyond quantities they have had in the past to the detriment of the workingmen in Michigan, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and a number of other States. It is not right to say that it is being done to help in the war effort, for that is not true. It is being done to carry out what was attempted in the foreign-policy commitments or objectives of our State Department. What those are, I repeat, are uncertain. It is an example parallel to the International Trade Organization in connection with which our Government spent many hundreds of thousands of dollars. Setting up an organization which it was planned to have the Congress of the United States approve at the behest of the State Department, and creating an International Trade Organization to handle in detail the question of imports and exports for our country and other countries of the world.

Well, Mr. Chairman, you know how the Congress rose up and emphatically defeated that proposal in advance of its submission here, for to date the International Trade Organization has not been brought before us. The Department of State knows that we would defeat it, that this body believes in the preservation of jobs for American workingmen that we put that over and above these international foreign-policy commitments which have been made by Mr. Acheson and others who seem to be more interested in helping people abroad than they are in protecting what we have here.

All this amendment does is to say—and it is the last sentence which is the most important—that no authority granted under this act may be used to limit the domestic consumption of any material or restrict total United States consumption to an amount fixed by the International Materials Conference.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. In just a moment.

What I say is that we should never put our country in the noose of an International Materials Conference where the vote is 28 to 1, and which would permit a group of majority votes to take from us any strategic material we have, and to send it somewhere else in the world.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, without some plan, some arrangement with these other countries what would you do for cobalt, nickel, and other materials that they produce and we do not?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I will answer the gentleman by saying that we have always got them in the past before we got into the International Materials Conference, and we will get them in the future. What I am afraid of is that we may not get it through this International Materials Conference, for 14 out of 28 could impose limitations, restriction, and demands to the detriment of our own people.

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

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The International Trade Organization has never been approved by this House for one reason, because legislation submitted to the Foreign Affairs Committee seeking approval of it never was submitted to a vote of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for a preliminary poll showed that the legislation could not get out of that committee. But I understand the principles involved there not connected merely with strategic materials are inserted in this International Materials Conference.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Certainly that great committee of the House would not have approved it, nor would any other committee if we had a vote on the issue itself.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:30 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:30 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Mr. Gross was given to Mr. SHAFER.)

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the Sadlak amendment. In my opinion, it must be adopted if we are going to defend our stockpiling program under the public laws which we have placed on the statute books.

The International Materials Conference has been justified by its proponents as a device to further our defense program. It is supposed to make it easier for this country to secure materials for our defense which of necessity must include our stockpiling.

Other Members have examined the workings of IMC so far as it affects our civilian economy and employment opportunities within the United States. I have examined the IMC from the standpoint of our military security. I am speaking today as a member of the Armed Services Committee, and I intend to give the House the facts which my research has uncovered and which I find most disturbing.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I want to add for the information of the Members that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] rendered a very distinguished service as chairman of the subcommittee in the Eightieth Congress when the Republicans had that responsibility.

Mr. SHAFER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman performed an outstanding service.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, the Munitions Board, under authority of Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress, is charged with the determination of the materials which are to be classified as strategic and critical under this law. In its most recent report to the Congress, dated January 23, 1952, the Board shows that cobalt, copper, lead, manganese, molybdenum, nickel, tungsten, wool, and zinc are on the strategic list and are to be acquired for the stockpile pursuant to section 3A of Public Law 520. These materials are also among the commodities under consideration by the International Materials Conference. The Board showed that while obligations totaled \$3,900,000,000, as of last December expenditures totaled only \$1,800,000,000 and unliquidated obligations totaled \$2,000,000,000. In other words, Mr. Chairman, although Congress has appropriated the money, and contracts were made for delivery of materials to the stockpile, more than \$2,000,000,000 worth of ordered material remained undelivered. The Board advised the Congress in its report of last January that it was directed by the Defense Production Administration to divert to industry scheduled deliveries of a number of materials covered by stockpile contracts.

On page 9 of its report, it said:

Materials affected by such directives include 45,000 short tons of aluminum, 100,000 pounds of columbite, 163,500 short tons of copper, 8,000 short tons of acid grade fluor-spar, 6,000 short tons of lead, 9,900 long tons of metallurgical manganese ore, 2,200,000 pounds of nickel, 1,778,000 pounds of tungsten, and 26,900 short tons of zinc. This represents a loss of more than \$120,000,000

worth of materials to the stockpile. The shortage of some materials became so acute that quantities already in the stockpile were released for allocation to industry pursuant to Presidential orders recommended by DPA and the Office of Defense Mobilization (ODM). Such releases included 10,000 short tons of aluminum, 55,000 short tons of copper and 30,000 short tons of lead, having a total value in excess of \$40,000,000.

While the Munitions Board is charged with the basic responsibility of our stockpiling program, they cannot be blamed for failure of the program to reach its objectives. The Board in its report to Congress stated:

The actions necessary to accomplish the stockpile objectives extend far beyond the basic Munitions Board authority. International and domestic allocation of available supplies, as well as supply expansion programs, are not the immediate responsibility of the Munitions Board but have a direct bearing on the accomplishment of the objectives of the Stockpiling Act. These programs of other agencies are reported here only insofar as they directly affect the stockpiling activity.

I was curious as to who was responsible for the international allocation of available supplies and I found that the IMC was the group which placed a ceiling upon this country's share of the world's materials in spite of our defense program. I need not remind the Congress that the details of our stockpile program are supposed to be a closely guarded secret. Apparently our program has been discussed with the other countries in the International Materials Conference. Some of them are declared neutrals in the present struggle against communism.

The April issue of Freedom and Union, a magazine published by the "one-worlders," contained an article on the IMC, and I want to read what it said about the stockpile:

When the IMC came into being and it began planning allocations on the basis of data made available on the needs and supplies of both producers and consumers, the committee members were confronted with the fact that there just did not exist a sufficient quantity of the commodities under consideration to satisfy all the needs, however justified. Further stockpiling, whether by the United States or by any other country, threatened to bring about an economic crisis. By common agreement certain commodities were taken off the stockpile list, to be followed by others whenever the situation required such a measure. The last to be thus temporarily taken off the list is copper, and no provisions for the stockpiling of this commodity were made in the allocations for 1952's first quarter.

When the IMC published its own official report last month, it confirmed these statements in their entirety.

Last March Mr. Ticoulat, then our principal representative on IMC, filed a statement with the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency with reference to our allocations from the IMC. The statement in reference to copper contained the following:

The method back of the IMC distribution plan was a priority for direct defense requirements, provision for minimum strategic stockpiles, and the distribution of the remaining supply for civilian requirements on the basis of consumption in 1950. In the first quarter of 1952, owing to the acute

shortage, no specific provision was made for stockpiling (p. 1504).

Mr. Chairman, imagine the IMC deciding that no provisions shall be made for stockpiling copper in the United States. I want to close with just one specific example as to how the IMC has actually operated to keep material away from the United States and out of the stockpile.

On September 28, 1951, the IMC announced its allocations for the fourth quarter for zinc. Its release stated:

The allocations for each participating country are in the form of a total "entitlement for consumption"—the amount of primary metal which may be processed or consumed by the country concerned, either from domestic production or imports."

The release continued:

In accepting the plan governments assume the responsibility for seeing that their allocations are not exceeded.

How did the United States go about doing this? Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you we deliberately set ceiling prices on zinc below the world price. On Sunday, September 30, just 2 days after the IMC acted, the Office of Defense Mobilization announced price ceilings on zinc imports. The release contained the following statements:

The establishment of a ceiling which is somewhat below current world prices involves the calculated risk of some decrease in imports. This action will thus tend to reduce the pressure of United States demand on free world supplies, ease the problems of friendly consuming countries, and make any international allocation arrangements more effective.

Mr. Chairman, on February 1, just 4 months to the day from the time we announced we were going to take a calculated risk of some decrease in imports, the New York Times carried a news story on zinc. Let me read from this story:

Some 29,000 tons of zinc will be withdrawn from the stockpile to be diverted to defense production in the next 6 months, the Office of Defense Mobilization disclosed today. Failure of zinc imports to reach normal volume was given by C. E. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, as the reason for the diversion of the metal. Withdrawals from the stockpile require Presidential approval which was obtained by Mr. Wilson before he made today's announcement.

There was no doubt how the calculated risk would turn out.

Mr. Chairman, the International Materials Conference has not aided the United States in preparing itself to meet communistic aggression. On the contrary, it has drained away vital materials for the civilian economies of other nations. To carry out the real purpose of the Defense Production Act, we should adopt the Sadlak amendment so that no unauthorized international group of bureaucrats may usurp the powers which the Congress has specifically conferred by law on our own Military Establishment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

(Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. Bow.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the International Materials Conference evolved from a meeting in December 1950 between President Truman and Clement Attlee, then Socialist Prime Minister of Great Britain. It is now a formal worldwide body with 28 non-Communist nations as members. The IMC functions through a headquarters organization called the central group and seven standing committees. The committees are: copper, zinc, and lead; sulfur; tungsten and molybdenum; manganese, nickel, and cobalt; cotton and cotton linters; wool; pulp and paper.

The committees have placed the following basic materials under allocation—sulfur, tungsten, molybdenum, copper, zinc, nickel, and cobalt. Zinc allocations were dropped on May 29, 1952, but the others are still in effect. In addition, so-called emergency allocations of newsprint have been made to a number of individual nations.

The effect of establishing allocation systems is to tell the United States and other nations—member and nonmember—the amount of each material it may consume. Thus, IMC is in control of a considerable portion of the resources and activities of the non-Communist world.

THE LEGAL ISSUE

From the standpoint of IMC's legality, there are two main issues:

First. Is there any legal standing, under American law, for United States participation in IMC?

Second. Are the powers conferred on the President by the Defense Production Act being misused by him in implementing domestically the global decisions being made by IMC?

NO AUTHORITY FOR IMC

The first question about IMC from a legal viewpoint is simply this: Was it ever authorized by the Congress?

The answer was stated in a letter dated January 24, 1952, from Assistant Secretary of State Jack K. McFall, to Representative HAMER H. BUDGE, of Idaho:

There is no specific statutory authority for the participation of the United States in this conference (IMC), as it is one of the many activities carried out in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States.

What Mr. McFall is saying in effect is that the President has unlimited authority to do as he pleases so long as he is dealing with foreign nations.

The President has indeed stretched the concept of his powers to extreme lengths. It was only a few weeks ago that the Supreme Court of the United States rejected the theory that the President possesses inherent powers beyond the Constitution and declared that the President has only the powers that are granted to him by the Constitution and the Congress. Yet, in the case of the International Materials Conference, the President has taken a leading part in organizing a body that was never authorized by the Congress, and his administration has participated in all of the activities of that body.

When Manly Fleischmann, then Defense Production Administrator, ap-

peared before the Senate Banking Committee on May 15, 1952, he was asked:

Under what authority does the IMC, so far as American participation is concerned, operate?

Mr. Fleischmann replied:

It operates first under the authority of the Defense Production Act, and secondly under the authority of the President to conduct foreign affairs.

Then Mr. Fleischmann was asked:

The second one has nothing to do with the Defense Production Act. If you had no Defense Production Act, could you have operated the IMC as you did?

Mr. Fleischmann replied:

No, sir; it could not be made effective.

First, it is seen that Mr. Fleischmann's answer was considerably different from Mr. McFall's.

Second, the Congress never intended that the powers conferred on the President by the Defense Production Act should be used to carry out the orders of IMC. Such a use of the Defense Production Act was not mentioned in the debate regarding the bill and was never foreseen by the Congress. The powers conferred on the President were intended to serve an entirely different purpose, and those powers have been misappropriated by the President.

Legally, then, IMC boils down to this:

First. IMC is, from the standpoint of the United States, an extra-legal organization.

Second. United States participation, through the device of the Defense Production Act, is a shocking misappropriation of Presidential powers.

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. May I cite in corroboration of that point that the report of the operation of the IMC states:

The committees were created as autonomous bodies in the interest of expediting action and allowing the countries which were principally concerned with the commodities in question to deal with the problems involved without being subject to review by any other body.

In other words, not even the Congress of the United States could review the determinations made.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is correct.

IS IMC VOLUNTARY?

A frequent answer to criticism of United States participation in the International Materials Conference is that IMC actions are purely voluntary. This, I submit, is just the opposite of the truth.

As far as the Truman administration is concerned, IMC pronouncements have the force of law. In fact, they are obeyed much more literally than many of the statutes that have been enacted by the United States Congress.

We need only look at the IMC release of December 20, 1951, announcing copper allocations. This release speaks of "entitlements for consumption" and defines an "entitlement" as follows:

The amount of metal which may be processed or consumed by the country concerned, either from domestic production or imports.

That language is crystal clear. If additional proof is needed, it is another sentence in the same release, which reads:

In accepting the distribution plans, governments assume the responsibility for seeing that their allocations are not exceeded.

There is nothing voluntary about that—especially to the many thousands of American men and women who have been thrown out of jobs because of IMC. This was made plain in testimony before the House Newsprint Subcommittee on February 8, 1951, by Theodore L. Sweet. Mr. Sweet bore the titles of Chief of the Combined Materials Branch of ECA and United States representative on the sulphur committee of IMC. He was asked by Representative JAMES I. DOLLIVER of Iowa:

Your particular group—

The IMC's sulphur committee—

does not undertake to say what shall be done; you merely suggest what should be done?

Mr. Sweet replied:

They make recommendations to the governments. Naturally, since the governments have representatives on the committees, the representatives are not supposed to make recommendations which they do not think the governments will accept.

The IMC, too, has inadvertently exploded the argument that its allocations are voluntary. Its report on operations, covering the period February 26, 1951–March 1, 1952, says:

Each country is entitled to 1 vote, a majority of the members of a committee constituting a quorum.

If all these doings are voluntary, why the necessity for voting, except to determine whether there is unanimity?

The IMC report goes on:

Formal recommendations are made to member governments in writing by unanimous consent of the members of the committees. If unanimity cannot be reached on a point, a majority recommendation or report may be made, accompanied, if so requested, by an adequate presentation of minority views.

Again, if all this is voluntary, how can there be a majority and a minority?

An article in the London Economist, December 29, 1951, that was highly friendly to IMC, cites two instances of IMC actions that were anything but voluntary to some of the countries concerned. One of the examples:

The significant point about the tungsten allocation was that a recommendation was passed by a majority vote instead of being unanimous. For the allocations in the last 3 months of this year, the [IMC allocation] committee recommended that the price formula should be retained. Bolivia, a tungsten producer, objected, but the objection was defeated on a vote.

The assertion that IMC decisions are voluntary is a false and unscrupulous piece of propaganda that will fool no one who looks into its operations.

A SUPERCARTEL WITH UNLIMITED POWER

The powers which the IMC has bestowed upon itself are staggering. For example, the article in the London Economist states:

Both in membership and in territorial extent, the IMC is larger than such organs of

cooperation as the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Its organization is as loose and flexible as that of the British Commonwealth and its constitution almost as unwritten. It relied, not on legal formulas but on the will to cooperate.

The IMC's report on operations puts it even more explicitly with the statement that the IMC's seven commodity committees "were created as autonomous bodies, without being subject to review by any other body."

Thus, it is seen that the IMC is literally a power unto itself and that any legal formulas that might place some restraint on its actions are regarded as quaint relics of the past.

The IMC report on operations continues:

The seven commodity committees are responsible for considering methods of establishing a better balance between supply and demand of certain strategic materials and recommending to the governments concerned the specific action which should be taken in the case of each commodity, in order to expand production, increase availability, conserve supplies, and assure the most effective distribution and utilization of supplies of materials among the consuming countries. Within this framework they may consider any aspect of existing shortage problems for the commodities under their review.

What this means, in so many words, is that IMC may do as it pleases regarding the essential materials under its control. With this power the IMC is in a position to be the absolute czar over the economies, the national income, and the living standards of the non-Communist countries.

Does this make IMC a cartel of far greater magnitude than any in previous history? Of course it does. When Mr. Fleischmann appeared before the Senate Banking Committee on March 21, 1952, he denied the IMC is a cartel. But then he went on to give the following definition of a cartel:

As I understand cartels in the legal sense, they refer to agreements among both producers and consumers as to what they will do.

The above quotations from the IMC report prove this is precisely what IMC does. Some IMC agreements go far beyond questions of allocation. For instance, IMC has attempted to impose direct controls on the price of tungsten. The IMC report on operations states that in imposing an allocation plans for the third quarter of 1951, "an arrangement was introduced whereby the spot-purchase price of tungsten was to be not less than \$55 f. o. b. per short ton unit and not higher than \$65."

It is ironic that each time the question of price control comes before the United States Congress, there is prolonged, wide-open debate before a decision is reached. But IMC has imposed world-wide price control by holding secret meetings and telling the public nothing of its deliberations.

If a group of private individuals or companies in the United States ever had the temerity to engage, even on a small scale, in the kind of market-splitting, price-fixing, and other monopolistic practices of the IMC kind, they would promptly be subject to criminal prosecution for violation of the antitrust laws.

But those practices, when conducted by IMC, are vociferously defended and ardently blessed by the Truman administration.

It is clear to me that the IMC is repugnant to American tradition and the spirit of American law, and that the countries who have prompted cartels in the past are the countries now mired in economic stagnation. Let us learn from their experience and recognize the IMC supercartel for the sure death it is to our system.

SIMILAR PROGRAM REJECTED TWICE BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The IMC is the brainchild of the United States State Department.

Back in 1947 the Senate Finance Committee was holding hearings on a charter for the proposed International Trade Organization. As Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, has pointed out, this body was to have a program remarkably similar to the present program of the IMC, with so-called intergovernmental commodity arrangements filling the role now played by the IMC's entitlements for consumption.

One of the witnesses before the Senate committee was William Taylor Phillips, Acting Chief of the International Resources Division of the State Department. Testifying on the origin of the intergovernmental commodity arrangements, Mr. Phillips was asked whether they were a definite part of the State Department policy. He replied:

Yes, sir. It is not only the Department's policy, but, as you know, it has been approved by the other Government agencies that were engaged in compiling it, getting it together, thinking it out. It has gradually merged over a period of years. This particular chapter first appeared in the proposals; then in the United States suggested charter; then in the London draft; and more recently in the New York draft—with, I think, the important provisions unchanged, or relatively unchanged.

Shortly after, Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN, of Colorado, committee chairman, requested reassurance from the State Department on the question of congressional approval of such international agreements. Dean Acheson, then Acting Secretary of State and now Secretary of State, replied as follows on April 15, 1947:

Insofar as such commodity agreements impose any obligations on the United States requiring legislative implementation in any way, it is the intention of the Department that they should be submitted to the Congress.

United States participation in IMC does require legislative implementation—by the Defense Production Act—yet the IMC's commodity agreements have never been submitted to Congress. Nor was any approving legislation reported following the Senate committee hearings.

In 1950, the House Foreign Affairs Committee took up the final draft of the ITO charter, which had been written in Habana. This committee too declined to recommend approval of the ITO charter.

Yet today, despite the refusal of two congressional committees to accept the ITO charter and despite Mr. Acheson's

promise, the very intergovernmental cartels proposed by ITO have come into being through the IMC.

THE ROLE OF THE U. N.

The United Nations, like the State Department, has been busily promoting the idea of supercartels. As Senator FERGUSON has shown, the U. N. established in 1947 an Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements to lay the groundwork for this pet project. To give an idea of the kind of thinking represented on this U. N. committee, Senator Ferguson quoted the following from its 1951 report in regard to tea:

The present tea agreement covers the four producing countries of Ceylon, India, Indonesia, and Pakistan. The agreement regulates the acreage to be devoted to tea and prohibits the export of tea-planting material to countries not party to the agreement.

This quotation shows that U. N.-sponsored cartels are the same as any other cartel—they are devoted to restricting production and freezing the status quo.

Various U. N. bodies have taken additional actions in behalf of international commodity deals, but it is sufficient here to quote from a booklet titled "Measures for International Economic Stability," published by the U. N. Department of Economic Affairs in 1951. The authors are stated to be a group of experts appointed by the Secretary General.

The report recommends a series of commodity arrangements of various types as a means of keeping short-term movements of primary product prices, both upward and downward, within reasonable bounds, and of helping to stabilize the international flow of currencies.

Among the main types of possible arrangements mentioned in the report are agreements covering maximum production quotas, maximum export quotas, maximum import quotas, minimum and maximum prices, and buffer stock schemes.

How would such an all-embracing cartel be set up? Very simply; it is already in existence. The report says:

We do not believe that any new international agency to administer a comprehensive scheme for a range of different commodities is necessary or practicable. The arrangements needed differ from commodity to commodity, and must be worked out and put into effect by the countries mainly concerned in each case. Coordination of general structure and policy amongst the various schemes is important, but international bodies—such as the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangement and the International Materials Conference—already exist and can be used for this purpose.

With such clear-cut evidence, who can doubt that the IMC is intended to fit into a much larger pattern for turning over gigantic powers to world-wide organizations who will be responsible only to themselves? Could this be the pattern for world socialism?

THE ROLE OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

I have shown above that the State Department is primarily responsible for taking the United States into IMC. The State Department's avid interest in IMC continues down to this moment. IMC's

offices in Washington were in a State Department building for a time. IMC's telephone number in Washington, Republic 5600, is the number of the State Department. The first important speech defending IMC was the one made by Edmund Getzin, Office of Materials Policy, of the State Department, in New York on February 19, 1952.

When Mr. Sweet appeared before the House Newsprint Subcommittee on February 8, 1951, he was asked whether the IMC allocation committees had been set up by ECA. He replied:

No. They were set up by the United States Government through the State Department. They report now to a central group—that is, the individual members report to DPA, which is the Defense Production Administration. DPA acts only in an advisory capacity.

All the evidence points to the fact that the State Department has been the driving force behind United States participation in IMC and that the State Department's activities in this regard are a natural result of the Department's deep-seated socialistic tendencies.

HAS IMC STABILIZED PRICES?

The best answer to this question is found in a recent publication by the International Monetary Fund comparing prices in different countries as of January 1952. Copper varied from 24.5 cents in the United States to 60.8 cents in Italy. Lead varied from 19 cents in the United States to 26.8 cents in France. Zinc varied from 21.3 cents in the United States to 30.3 cents in the Netherlands.

At first glance, it might appear that the United States was benefiting from the lower prices prevailing here. However, it must be kept in mind that a large part of the funds used by foreign countries to bid for these metals came from the United States in the form of foreign aid. From July 3, 1948, to June 30, 1951, ECA supplied \$326,000,000 to European countries for the purpose of buying copper, \$78,000,000 for zinc, and \$57,000,000 for lead. In other words, United States dollars were used by European countries to obtain the materials we needed, and the United States taxpayers who furnished the dollars in the first place were paid off in unemployment.

IMC BLOCKS STOCKPILING

A key part of our defense effort is the program for stockpiling scarce materials. Congress, in enacting this program, placed responsibility for it in the Munitions Board.

One of the most appalling aspects of IMC is that it has in effect assumed control of a substantial portion of our stockpiling program and that it has decided in a number of instances that there will be no stockpiling. This is best told in IMC's own words, on pages 24 and 25 of the report on operations:

In developing plans of distribution for the metals it was necessary for the committees to consider what policy should be followed in allowing materials for stockpiling purposes during a period of scarcity. The problem was discussed in several of the commodity committees and many differences of opinion were expressed as to whether stockpiling should continue to be pursued under existing circumstances. The Copper-Zinc-Lead Committee and the Manganese-Nickel-Cobalt Committee decided, in connec-

tion with their fourth quarter allocations, to recognize, in principle, the requirements for strategic stockpile purposes; but, in view of the tight supply, they recommended a special allowance for such requirements in the plans for copper, zinc, and cobalt, only to the extent of a small percentage of consumption during a given base period. In the case of commodities where the shortage was more acute (nickel, tungsten, and molybdenum), the committees were unable to recommend any special allowance for stockpiling. In the allocation plans for the first quarter of 1952, the Copper-Zinc-Lead and the Manganese-Nickel-Cobalt Committees found it inadvisable to provide any special allowance for stockpile purposes, but maintained the principle of making such provisions in connection with future allocations when the supplies were sufficient to permit it.

It is almost beyond belief that control of our stockpiling would be turned over to 27 foreign countries and that these countries would include not only those who have expressed an anti-Communist policy, but a number of countries as well who have made a point of being neutral.

I wish to call to the attention of the House Armed Services Committee the activities of the IMC in this regard. Our committee views the IMC's actions as a distinct and ominous threat to our military security.

UNITED STATES MAKES THE SACRIFICE

Previous reports by the three other committees of Republican Representatives have shown a number of specific instances of how the United States share of IMC materials is less than the proportionate share we consumed before the Korean war. There should be no surprise about this inasmuch as there are a host of indications that our willingness to sacrifice is not matched by many other countries. The London Economist, which, we repeat was highly friendly to the IMC, declared:

The United States set the example by making the first contribution. Britain's record in this body is unfortunately not untarnished because materials like tin and rubber, which the sterling area produces and the United States consumes, were not brought into the orbit of the conference.

It is no wonder, then, that conditions like those described in the following Associated Press story, dated November 13, 1951, have developed:

SAN FRANCISCO.—Critical materials are not as scarce in Europe as they are in this country, Stanley C. Allyn, president of National Cash Register Co. said here, and cash registers soon will be imported from England to the United States. . . . He told reporters his company's six European plants can obtain materials easier than its three North American plants. This is so, he said, because Europe is not as far advanced in its defense-production effort as is this Nation.

Another foreign publication, the Swiss Review of World Affairs, published in Zurich, Switzerland, issue of April 1951, had the following to say about France:

The general rearmament in which France participates has until now burdened her economy but lightly. After all, the new divisions now in the making will be equipped with arms supplied by the United States for the most part, and expenses like soldiers' pay and maintenance will up to a percentage also be covered by an American contribution. In other words, the French economy is not for the present required to undergo a drastic

change from peace to all-out preparedness conditions. In fact, it can continue to devote itself largely to normal civilian production. It is not surprising therefore that some see France in the role of a beneficiary of the present world situation.

The article goes on to point out the one thing missing if France was to continue to be a beneficiary of the present world situation:

The obstacle which would have to be overcome is not so much a shortage of labor . . . as a shortage of raw materials. For in this last respect France is very dependent on foreign sources, and it is due to this fact that the French Government has early begun to urge an international regulation of the distribution of raw materials.

These quotations bring out one additional important point that has been overlooked frequently—namely, that the IMC is in the business of making allocations for civilian consumption as well as for military consumption. IMC is controlling not merely rearmament programs around the world, such as they are, but living standards as well.

The IMC makes no bones about the fact that in distributing materials for civilian consumption, some countries will be favored over others. Mr. Getzin, of the United States State Department, declared in his speech:

A fixed base does not allow for new industries or expanding economies and is, therefore, usually unacceptable to certain countries undergoing rapid economic development. Usually the solution has been to adjust the base in favor of such countries upon the submission of acceptable evidence and in recognition of a genuine need.

The IMC report on operations, in discussing the copper-zinc-lead committee, stated 1950 was selected as the most representative base year. The report added that for some countries 1950 was not regarded as a typical year and that these included countries with expanding production. For these countries, adjustments were made.

For each favor bestowed by IMC on these privileged countries, some other country had to suffer deprivation. The evidence is abundant that the country selected most often has been the United States. Americans are being denied civilian goods they need and want in order that similar civilian goods may be consumed by persons of foreign countries.

United States generosity extends even to IMC's operating expenses. IMC's staff is contributed by member governments, but, according to the Report On Operations, "during the first year of operation the major portion of personnel was supplied by the United States." Furthermore, the office equipment used by IMC was contributed by the United States.

Our committee cannot understand why United States representatives on bodies like IMC choose so often to forsake their own country. We recommend some enlightened self-interest, which will redound in the long run to the benefit of other countries as well as our own.

HOW TO LOSE FRIENDS

Countries that do not belong to IMC allocation committees are completely at

the mercy of the committees because allocations are made for nonmember countries as well as member countries.

For example, when the copper allocations for the first quarter of 1952 were handed down on December 20, 1951, only 12 countries were members of the committee. But the allocations applied to no less than 39 countries. Twenty-seven countries, therefore, had no part in a decision that was of great consequence to their economies. The nonmembers included both large countries, such as Argentina, Brazil, Japan, Sweden, and Turkey, as well as smaller countries, such as Cuba, Ireland, Israel, Portugal, and others.

In our opinion, IMC's rules of procedure are a further violation of the rights of individual nations. These rules provide a country may be admitted to membership on an allocation committee only if it has a substantial interest in the production or consumption of the commodity and if two-thirds of the committee members vote for admitting the nation.

Another IMC rule is that nonmembers who wish to argue their allocations may appear in committee hearings. According to IMC's report on operations, representatives of 31 countries appeared before IMC committees of which they were not members. These rules of procedure, in our opinion, merely serve to emphasize the inferior and humiliating position to which nonmember countries are relegated by IMC.

Furthermore, the large number of countries who have felt it necessary to appear before a committee to plead their cases likewise indicates the general dissatisfaction that inevitably arises when sovereign nations are denied control over themselves.

This business of favoring one friendly nation and discriminating against another friendly nation is extremely risky for the United States. This is particularly true when there is a conflict of interest between producing countries and consuming countries.

If the United States through its actions in IMC aligns itself with consuming nations, we will be laying the groundwork for deterioration in our relations with the producing countries.

The IMC report on operations admits in a backhand way the serious consequences that follow from discrimination against one group of nations. The report says:

The fear has been expressed on the part of certain producing countries that an allocation system (for tungsten and molybdenum) might prejudice the free flow of trade and thereby weaken the bargaining positions of certain exporting countries. This is particularly feared in cases where the countries in question are themselves in urgent need of other raw materials, whether under IMC allocation or not.

The United States needs friends—many friends—among the producing nations, and it should not needlessly run the risk of losing those friends.

A PERMANENT IMC?

There is an abundance of evidence that the instigators of IMC wish to make

it permanent and are bending every effort to make their wishes come true.

As we have shown on page 6, it has been the long-standing policy of the United States State Department to do everything within its power to establish such a body, not merely for a wartime period like the present but for peacetime as well. The speech by Mr. Getzin of the State Department charts clearly the course the administration intends to follow. Discussing IMC's future, Mr. Getzin said:

If the allocation work of the committees is judged successful by participating countries, there is no reason why more ambitious programs relating to conservation, development and prices should not be considered.

Mr. Getzin ended his speech with the statement that "member governments seem to be convinced that the IMC should be retained and strengthened." The word "strengthen," when used by a bureaucrat in discussing a Government agency, always means to expand.

The U. N. booklet to which we have referred on page 7, after praising IMC as a step in the right direction, continues:

The possibility should be considered of converting these emergency schemes into permanent stabilization agreements.

Mr. Fleischmann, appearing before the Senate Banking Committee on March 21, 1952, spoke freely of his hope of bringing still more commodities under IMC allocation. Mr. Fleischmann was asked:

Is it contemplated that additional standing committees covering additional materials will be created?

His reply:

Frankly I should hope so, with some of the most vital metals like the alloying metals that we are so woefully short in.

The IMC report on operations, in discussing its remaining tasks, declares:

It appears that the shortages of several commodities will continue for at least another year and that the remaining work to be done during that period will continue to require the best efforts of the members . . . The nature and extent of future action by the committees will be dependent upon the need for action as reflected in the supply-demand position, and the desire of the participating governments for international consideration of and recommendations on supply problems.

Through this bureaucratic "bafflegab" shines IMC's determination to stay in business for many a year.

Probably the best tip-off to IMC's plans is that none of its allocation machinery has been dismantled. The Cotton-Cotton Linters Committee, the Wool Committee and the Pulp-Paper Committee never have imposed any over-all allocations, yet none of these committees has gone out of existence.

In fact, the Pulp-Paper Committee, in announcing on April 16, 1952, that no additional emergency allocations to individual countries would be made at that time, issued this warning:

All member countries have agreed to consider recommendations for the resumption of allocation plans should circumstances require.

Zinc was removed from allocation on May 29, 1952, but the New York Times,

in reporting this action on the following day, carried the following:

Officials of the IMC were quick to insist that the supply problem for zinc was exceptional and that today's move implied no early termination of the restrictions which still apply to international dealings among anti-Communist nations in copper, sulfur, tungsten, molybdenum, nickel, and cobalt.

The last sentence of the London Economist article puts the matter most succinctly:

The lesson that offers itself is that if Britain, the United States, and France can set the lead in raw material allocation, they could do the same in the wider processes of economic policy.

This sentence summarizes very well the implications in IMC. The IMC is determined to stay alive and to expand, and its supporters in this country have placed on the record their intention to do everything within their power to achieve that goal.

If this is permitted to happen the United States will find itself committed to a system of international controls that can only grow and grow until, as the Economist says, it will take in economic matters far beyond the distribution of commodities.

I submit the following conclusions:

First. United States participation in the International Materials Conference has never been authorized by the Congress, and IMC is, therefore from this country's standpoint an extra-legal organization.

Second. Use of the Defense Production Act to implement domestically the orders of IMC represents an appalling misuse of powers by the President.

Third. There is nothing voluntary about IMC decisions. As far as the Truman administration is concerned IMC pronouncements have the force of law and are obeyed.

Fourth. IMC is a supercartel responsible only to itself. It has assumed staggering powers. United States participation in such a super-cartel violates American tradition and the spirit of American law.

Fifth. No one suffers more from a cartel than working people and this has been true of IMC. Cartels are restrictive organizations that lead inevitably to economic stagnation. IMC has brought unemployment and suffering to hundreds of thousands of American men and women.

Sixth. The IMC is the brainchild of the United States State Department which has been endeavoring to establish such a socialistic organization for many years. The State Department is at present the driving force in this country behind IMC, which is a long step toward world socialism.

Seventh. Congressional committees have twice refused to approve a similar program when it was proposed in the charter of the International Trade Organization. Now, under the guise of being a wartime emergency agency, the IMC has come into being in defiance of Congress.

Eighth. U. N. agencies have also been promoting the concept of super-cartels like IMC. They now view IMC as a

ready-made agency for imposing all-embracing controls on the world's economy.

Ninth. IMC has failed to stabilize commodity prices. Stabilization was to have been one of its major goals.

Tenth. The IMC, in defiance of the United States Congress, has assumed control over a large part of our stockpiling program and has blocked that program.

Eleventh. The theory of IMC is a share-and-share-alike basis for distributing scarce commodities. But, as IMC has in fact operated, the United States has made most of the sacrifices.

Twelfth. IMC has violated the rights of small nations by denying them a voice in their own economic destiny. Furthermore, by helping the IMC to set consuming nations against producing nations, the United States is running the risk of alienating friendly producing nations—the very nations whose friendship we need.

Thirteenth. There is an abundance of evidence that the IMC is intended to be a permanent organization that will outlive the present emergency.

IMC presents a blunt challenge to the United States Congress as well as to every segment of our society—working people, business of every kind, and farmers. Is the President the law-making agency or does that responsibility belong to the Congress? If Congress is the law-making agency, do we wish to attempt to preserve freedom in the world by suppressing it, as IMC has done?

The administration claims, in effect, there is now something wrong with Americans, some reason why Americans are unfit to control their own lives. This we deny.

The place where something is wrong is in the administration—an administration which would turn the clock back to the time before the Declaration of Independence when Americans were subject to a foreign power.

As long as IMC continues to exist, a large part of our lives—jobs, income and living standards—will be under the control of foreign countries.

There is only one course open to the Congress—to order the administration to end participation in the International Materials Conference, once and for all.

This should be done immediately because the threat to our freedom and security is too ominous to be tolerated longer.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Can the gentleman tell us who is financing the work? Who pays for this IMC operation?

Mr. BOW. I understand it is being paid for out of the funds of the State Department to a great extent. There is another committee that made that examination. They have more information than I have on that. Ours is confined to the legality of the operation.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My understanding is that this organization is set up very lavishly in the new Cafritz Building downtown.

Mr. BOW. It was originally in the State Department, but they have moved to the beautiful quarters they now have in this new building.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Would not the gentleman say that the Wage Stabilization Board falls in the same category as the IMC?

Mr. BOW. In my opinion, it does.

Mr. DONDERO. Both are set up without force of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sadlak amendment.

The time has come for Congress to take action to put the International Materials Conference out of business. It has no legal standing yet it functions under the direction of the State Department. It is doing indirectly what Congress has said it should not do directly. In 1950 the House Committee on Foreign Affairs conducted hearings on what is known as the ITO, or International Trade Organization. These hearings were conducted under House Joint Resolution 236 and, notwithstanding these hearings, the Foreign Affairs Committee refused to report favorably on the International Trade Organization.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding this adverse position we find now that chapter 6 of the so-called Habana Charter has been lifted from the Charter and is today being used as the basis for the International Materials Conference. This is an affront; this is an insult to every Member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a new proposition. In 1947, the Senate Committee on Finance held open hearings on trade agreements system and the proposed International Trade Organization Charter. At this time, Senator MILLIKIN, who was the chairman of the committee suspected that the implications of the charter on intergovernmental commodities agreements should be submitted to Congress for approval. He insisted at that time on written evidence on that subject and on April 15, 1947, Dean Acheson, then Acting Secretary of State, sent him a letter and I quote in part:

Insofar as such commodity agreements impose any obligations on the United States requiring legislative implementation in any way, it is the intention of the Department that they should be submitted to the Congress.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, by a press release on January 12, 1951, the Department of State announced that the United States had agreed to the creation of a central group and a certain number of standing commodity groups subject to the increase in number as the needs of the free world would require. The collective name for all these groups was given and as it is used today, the International Materials Conference. All this, Mr. Chairman, has been done without consultation with or the approval of the Congress. With no authority, this or-

ganization has set itself up to judge the needs of the nonmember countries of the free world in the matter of allocations of strategic materials.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat again for emphasis that no legislation has passed this Congress or any action taken for our participation in the IMC, and no funds have been allocated for payment for our share of the expenses, that I can find. It would seem that there is no way of implementing the IMC decisions in the United States, but, notwithstanding, this organization is carrying on in a luxurious suite in the Cafritz Building in this city.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem that nothing is impossible for the dream-eyed planners who permeate the administrative agencies in our Government.

A brief investigation reveals that our share of the expenses, which includes the procurement of office equipment for all of the participants, is made out of contingency funds held in reserve by the Department of State. It is rumored, but I have not been able to confirm it, that our share of expenses is paid from a reserve set up to make emergency repairs should any of our embassies abroad be damaged by bombing.

Mr. Chairman, by somebody's order there has been decreed that our Defense Production Administration is responsible for our participation in the International Materials Conference and that the chief representative of the United States on the central group of that organization is the Deputy Administrator of the Defense Production Administration. The DPA domestic decisions on priority, allocations, price and wage controls are followed on International Materials Conference directives. The Defense Production Administration is a so-called temporary special agency set up by the executive branch of our Government to administer the rules and requirements of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. From all that I can discover, Mr. Chairman, the International Materials Conference, on the contrary, does not appear to be a temporary group which will disappear when the emergency conditions which followed the outburst of fighting in Korea vanish. That emergency was only the excuse for helping to bring the International Materials Conference into being.

Mr. Chairman, while Congress passed Public Law 520 in the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, charging the Munitions Board with the administration of the law, it is clear now that the International Materials Conference took over stockpiling activities and through the Defense Production Agency tells our Munitions Board what they can or cannot do. I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that the Munitions Board is unable to execute its mandate from Congress because of the interference from this international group in which participation by the United States has never been authorized.

Mr. Chairman, the International Materials Conference is not a temporary emergency organization. The global planners have their feet in the doorway and are determined that this is the time

to impose an international cartel upon not only the United States but the world. Let me submit to you some evidence that IMC is not a temporary organization:

In 1951, five experts, with an American as chairman, appointed by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, were instructed to report and make recommendations on measures for international economic stability—U. N. document E/2156, ST/ECA/13, sales No. 1951.IIA.2. They reported on November 27, 1951, and among the recommendations for permanent international economic stability was a strong plea in favor of international commodity arrangements. For the implementation of these world governmental cartels the report states—page 25:

We do not believe that any new international agency to administer a comprehensive scheme for a range of different commodities is necessary or practicable. . . . International bodies, such as the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements and the International Materials Conference, already exist and can be used for this purpose.

On February 19, 1952, a representative of the Department of State said in a speech on the subject of IMC:

If the allocation work of the committees is judged successful by participating countries, there is no reason why more ambitious programs relating to conservation, development, and prices should not be considered.

The last sentence of the summary in the first annual report on IMC issued in March 1952, reads as follows—page 3:

The need for longer range plans will depend upon the committee's evaluation of the supply situation and on member governments' decisions regarding the nature of international action that may be required by future developments.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion the Sadlak amendment should be adopted. Now is the time to deliver the lethal blow to the International Materials Conference, an unauthorized agency which controls the economic lifeblood of this country.

Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to offer a resolution to investigate the whole structure of IMC. This is a job for the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to one aspect of this matter which I have not heard mentioned in debate thus far. I refer to the enforceability of the allocations which are agreed upon by the International Materials Conference.

As we all know, under the Defense Production Act in the United States of America, we have watertight enforcement controls. Let me point out, when you control materials, you control the entire industry which is dependent upon those materials.

The other countries participating in this International Materials Conference have nothing approaching in effectiveness the controls we have in the United States of America. So what is the effect of it? It means that the allocations we are given in this country are rigidly controlled, but as to the other countries, some of them are as free as if there were

no International Materials Conference, and others are partially controlled to a greater or lesser degree.

Mr. Chairman, I have been seeking information on this matter since last March. I was given the run-around by the various departments. I asked them: Is it possible that we have entered into an International Materials Conference, and we do not know whether the other countries have the means of making their citizens observe the allocations agreed upon? They said a survey was being conducted. Just recently I received, and I hold in my hand, the survey of the control laws of other countries which are members of the International Materials Conference. I defy you to find in this survey anything like the degree of rigid control that we have in the United States of America.

I do not know why this survey was sent to me as a restricted document. Because it is marked "Restricted," I am not going to quote from it directly. But I am going to tell you that we do not have any information on the control laws of many of these other member nations in the International Materials Conference. Many of them have no direct controls, but rely upon indirect controls.

I say it is not fair for us to be bound when the other parties to the agreement are not bound in any effective way. In general, anything of this nature which controls the very life of an industry should not be set up without statutory authority. Congress ought to adopt the Sadlak amendment. I do not think it goes far enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and I hope it is adopted. I think it is one of the most important matters that will come before us. Reference has been made to some effect this amendment would have on the controlled materials plan in its operation on the domestic front, which is believed by much of small business to be helpful. It should be understood that the amendment was redrafted to meet that very objection. As it is now written and presented here, it can have no conceivable effect on the operations of the controlled materials plan here at home.

It does not affect the Government's present powers to operate the controlled materials plan, nor does it affect the distribution of materials between big business and little business within the United States.

I want to make this perfectly clear as a member of the Small Business Committee which recently, by subcommittee, made a report on the operations of the CMP and recommended its continuation until the supply position for copper and aluminum is eased.

What this amendment does is eliminate the International Materials Conference, and here is some background of the IMC.

It is known by all of us, and particularly by the people on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that for years the State Department has sought these arrangements for intergovernmental commodity

agreements. The committee has heard the arguments and then has refused to go along.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I have only 3 minutes.

Prime Minister Attlee came here. It was all right for him to come. I am glad he came. We want Britain to be strong. We want to help them. But shortly after he was here there was developed by the State Department, without any statutory authority at all, this IMC plan. I ask this, as far as the defense of the free world is concerned, do they not look to us as the bulwark of that defense? Shall we grant this conference, which has no statutory authority from this country, the right to say to us what our share of these materials shall be? I happen to know that in many countries there is no control at all over the end use of these materials. But in this country there is such control.

Let me point this out again. It has been brought out before. Once we yield to any such international group the right to say to us what raw materials we shall have, both for our defense needs, as is here contemplated, and also for our domestic needs, as is covered in this operation, then we grant to this international organization the right to establish our military potential, the right to determine our standard of living, and the right to determine the degree of unemployment that may confront us. Yes, we then grant to an international organization the right to control the very life of our economy.

I supported a lot of these international agreements that have sought to protect the free world, and I make no apology for it, but here is one that I say should never have been created. But it has been created without legislative sanction and it has worked to the detriment of the strength of the free world, in my opinion, and is operating to the detriment of our people at home in many respects.

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

The gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON] is recognized.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted to me to the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, in our own self-interest, let us put first things first. The thing that concerns all of us is an adequate supply of critical materials. If adopting this amendment would increase production in the next year or two, I would be for it. But it will not. ICM is giving us now a division far in excess of what we are able to buy. The problem is one of production, and being able to get what we need. How are we going to solve that problem? If we kick out IMC we have not solved our problem, because then we will have to go into the market and bid higher prices than we have been willing to pay. If you want to pay higher prices for these materials you can do it with this materials control plan in effect, but

we do not increase the supply of these strategic materials. If we pay more money today it is not going to increase production in the next few years. We are simply going to add more cost to our defense effort, to our taxes, and to doing business generally, and we will not have any more materials available.

We only have to turn back to 1950, when the war broke out and our own individual buyers went out independently to try to get tin. At that time, with individual buyers from the United States going out into the world markets looking for tin, we succeeded, unhappily, in boosting the price of tin from \$1.03 to \$1.92 in a matter of weeks, but we did not get any more tin. We still had the same supply of tin available but we nearly doubled the cost of tin for our own producers. If you want to do that to all these other critical materials, then adopt this amendment. You will increase the cost to the American consumer and you increase the cost of the Government, but you will not get any more critical materials. Even though you may not like the State Department, even though we may think there are many things wrong, let us put our own self-interests first. If you have told your people that you are for reducing the cost of government and for keeping taxes down, then you cannot, in good conscience, vote for this amendment, because it is going to increase the cost of our national defense effort. It is going to boost the price of a lot of critical materials in our war effort. If you have told your small-business men that you are for the continuation of small business, then you cannot vote for this amendment, because it is going to make it impossible for many small businesses to bid against big business for the procurement of these critical materials.

If you have told your American housewives that you are for a stabilized cost of living, then you cannot vote for this amendment because it is going to increase the cost of all of our durable goods that use these critical materials.

Let us face the facts and realize the problem we have before us today: That the war effort has created a larger need for critical materials than the mines are able to supply.

The only way we are going to get ourselves out of this situation is to work cooperatively and for orderly buying instead of individual competitive buying which can only have the result of boosting prices abnormally without increasing production.

When RFC took over the buying of tin we reduced the cost of tin considerably. Let us follow that example and through IMC continue on an orderly course of buying; let us defeat this amendment; let us keep down not only the cost of national defense, but also let us help our own small businesses.

If we adopt this amendment we are going to increase the cost of everything that enters into the war effort. Moreover, if we adopt this amendment we will have a chain reaction that will increase the cost of everything regardless of what the commodity is.

Let me refer to one other thing to keep the record straight, stockpiling. We discontinued stockpiling in the third quarter of 1951. We did not enter into this IMC until the fourth quarter of 1951. Therefore the IMC had nothing to do with our stockpiling program. How can you stockpile when you do not have enough materials to meet current needs? How are you going to put money into a savings account in the bank when you do not have enough money to meet your everyday needs? You cannot stockpile when you need the materials for the war in Korea and for our defense effort. This is a misleading amendment and should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized to close the debate on this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, whether or not there was adequate legal authority to create the International Materials Conference, certainly it was based upon the principles of sound common sense. There is no nation in the world that is self-sufficient and we entered into an agreement with 28 other free nations in order that we might in an orderly way acquire those materials which are necessary for our national defense and which we cannot produce.

What great principle did that violate, I wonder?

Not long ago our Government traded some steel to England for tin and aluminum. I do not know that there was any statutory authority for it, but the people directing our defense effort in order to procure materials needed by us at this time made the deal, and this agreement is based upon the same sound principle that caused the formation of the International Materials Conference. I think it not only furnishes some materials to us in an orderly manner but the constant contact with the other free nations of the world stimulates their friendship and helps us, and I think that if we were to withdraw from the International Materials Conference it would be looked upon as a not very cooperative act by those upon whom we are relying to preserve their own liberties and with them ours.

If we withdraw from the International Materials Conference, if we have a disorderly competitive market in America, who will get the things that are necessary for their businesses and for their prosperity? The financially strong and powerful will get most of these materials in the competitive market and the little man will get few of them.

I am sure from what I have heard in committee that it would be a most disastrous thing to do away with the International Materials Conference. May I say also that Mr. Charles Wilson, former Director of Defense Mobilization, is earnestly in favor of this; Mr. Manly Fleischmann, former Administrator of the National Production Authority, is in favor of it; and Mr. John Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, who has direction of the stockpile, has written a letter that he wants it continued.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the Sadlak amendment to curtail the functions of the International Materials Conference. Last September I urged the House to consider what the IMC was doing to our sulfur supply and to our newsprint supply.

The following is what I said in the House on September 18, 1951, about the International Materials Conference:

SPEECH OF HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH, OF CALIFORNIA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to another example of the incredible bureaucratic confusion in our Government, and to the serious damage it is inflicting on both our economy and our liberty.

The administration has committed the United States to a "globaloney" sulfur export plan that will seriously curtail the already critical newsprint supply and may eventually cause one small newspaper after another to go out of business in this country. The State Department, through ECA, has set up what is known as the International Materials Conference. The conference has set up a sulfur committee with representatives from 13 countries to consider the problem of how to distribute sulfur, principally produced in the United States, to the rest of the world. This superannuated, superelite, superimposed international agency of a nebulous world government which presumably does not exist has, as the House might expect, decided that if anybody must suffer a lack of sulfur it must be America.

When our State Department through ECA agreed to let the International Materials Conference allocate approximately a million tons of American sulfur for export to foreign countries, we in effect guaranteed to the world a cheap and bountiful supply of sulfur at the expense of our own economy and industry. Ironically, we also loan or give outright to many of the countries the money to buy our sulfur.

As far as I am able to determine, there is no other country which rations or controls its sulfur once it has received the sulfur from us. There are no American controls as to the ultimate use of exported sulfur. A foreign purchaser could buy sulfur for \$26 a ton, American export price, and resell it in foreign markets for \$60 a ton, Italian export price. We could not stop him.

These allocations of sulfur to foreign countries at the low American prices will only perpetuate world shortages, for as long as the rest of the world is guaranteed a cheap supply of sulfur by IMC from the United States supply, they will not reopen their own sulfur plants.

We have no stockpile of sulfur in the United States, nor is there a program of stockpiling contemplated. We have only 10 to 20 years of present production left in our known American sulfur deposits.

When I first began my investigation into sulfur shortages in the newsprint industry and traced the shortages to the International Materials Conference, I found some rather interesting facts that affect many basic materials. The International Materials Conference now has seven committees whose

recommendations control the following 13 important products and materials: Copper, zinc, lead, sulfur, cotton, tungsten, molybdenum, manganese, nickel, cobalt, wool, and paper and pulp. It is significant to note that the United States is the largest or second largest producer of these materials under international control, and in every case the United States is the largest consumer.

But it becomes even more interesting to note the vital commodities that are not controlled by this so-called international machinery to solve world shortages.

There is no international machinery set up to control the British monopoly of commercial diamonds, nor the South American monopoly of tin.

Nor is there any attempt by the International Materials Conference to touch the British-Malayan crude rubber monopoly which has been gouging United States tire manufacturers for years.

Nor has there been a committee set up for oil and petroleum. With the British and Dutch having a combined output greater than the United States, the British have felt that there was no need for such international machinery. But now that the British have lost their oil holdings in Iran, our State Department will shortly announce that the United States will soon place her petroleum production into the hands of another foreign committee.

We are in effect, through the International Materials Conference, placing the economy of the United States into the hands of a semi-world government, giving away control of basic materials vital to our American free-enterprise system.

I urge the adoption of the Sadlak amendment as a protection to our American labor and industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BURTON and Mr. SADLAK.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 169, noes 102.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSAY: Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Whenever priorities are established or allocations made under section (a) with respect to any raw material, and such priorities or allocations operate to limit the production of articles or products produced in the United States, the President shall by proclamation limit the importation, during the period such priorities or allocations are in effect, of any article or product in the manufacture or production of which such raw material is used to 100 per centum of the average annual imports of such article or product during the calendar years 1947 through 1949: *Provided*, That the Tariff Commission has reported to the President that a substantial portion of the American producers of such article or product, or an article or product competitive therewith, has requested such limitation on imports: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense has not certified to the President that the American production of such article or product is insufficient to supply the essential defense needs therefor. Upon the application

of any substantial American producer, the Tariff Commission shall publish the fact of having received such application, shall hold public hearing thereon and shall report the facts to the President within sixty days of the receipt of such application. Such report to the President shall include the article or product on which the import limitation has been requested, whether it contains any raw material which is under priority or allocation control, whether a substantial portion of the American producers thereof have requested the above-specified import limitation, the maximum quantity of imports which would comply with said import limitation and such other facts as the Tariff Commission deems appropriate. A copy of said report to the President shall be submitted to the Secretary of Defense. If said report of the Tariff Commission indicates that the above-specified conditions have been met by the applicant and the Secretary of Defense has not certified to the President that the American production of such article or product is not sufficient to meet the essential defense needs, the President shall proclaim such import limitation within thirty days of his receipt of the report from the Tariff Commission. If the Secretary of Defense has certified that the American production of such article or product is insufficient to meet the essential defense needs therefor, the President shall, by proclamation, limit the imports of such article or product to such quantity as the Secretary of Defense certifies as necessary, in excess of American production, to meet the essential defense needs. All reports of the Tariff Commission and all certifications of the Secretary of Defense made hereunder shall be made public at the time of their issuance."

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was originally the bill H. R. 6843, which is pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, and has been changed from the bill in one particular. H. R. 6343 provides a quota of 50 percent of the base period; the amendment now offered provides a quota of 100 percent of the base period. Those of us who favor this amendment do not want to injure the former market of imports. Our aim is merely to protect the pre-Korean competitive position of domestic producers vis-à-vis importers.

There is involved in my amendment the principle of the escape clause of the reciprocal trade agreements, and I do not see how any Member who supported the escape clause can fail to support my amendment.

Because of the controlled-materials program, producers of many civilian consumption items have had their output severely curtailed because the Government has diverted critical materials to defense purposes. In theory—and I believe in actual practice—the National Production Authority, in allocating scarce materials, attempts to keep the pre-Korean competitive position of domestic producers intact. The Government properly feels that its restrictions should fall, with equal force, on all producers in any given field.

NPA, however, has no means to control the production and movement of foreign goods. That can only be done by the President. The Congress, by enacting the escape clause, has provided relief from hardship resulting from trade concessions, but in the problem presented by the controlled-materials program, the Tariff Commission has held that injury

does not result, primarily, from trade concessions.

It has been argued that this is faulty reasoning on the part of the Tariff Commission, but I believe they are on firm ground. Further, withdrawal of trade concessions would not solve the problem, because the problem is not one of price competition. It is a problem of inadequate production. Our domestic producers of many items simply are not permitted by the Government to manufacture enough articles to supply the market. They are able to sell all they can make. The vacuum in the market is being filled by foreign producers.

The injury will come when we remove restrictions and our domestic producers attempt to recapture their normal markets. They will find new buying patterns and history has shown it will be very difficult to recapture that market.

The history of the domestic watch industry during World War II clearly shows this. At the order of the Government our watch industry devoted its machinery, its management know-how, and its skilled labor to production of delicate war instruments. Their market was lost to imports, and to this day the pre-Pearl Harbor competitive position has not been recaptured.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, merely attempts to keep the pre-Korean competitive position intact—as we do with domestic producers in the operation of the controlled-materials program. To do this it sets up the machinery of the escape clause. There is nothing automatic; domestic producers must prove, conclusively, that a substantial portion of any industry is losing markets because of its inability to produce.

If, prior to the Korean action, United States producers were splitting the market with foreign competition, my amendment will mean that as soon as the emergency is ended and domestic producers can obtain materials in the open market, their pre-Korean share of the market will be left intact.

This amendment is fair; it is needed. It upsets no traditions and it cannot interfere with the reciprocity program—which I have supported since 1933.

I hope Members will support my amendment.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY].

As a Member of Congress, I believe it to be my proper responsibility to protect not only the lives but also the livelihood of the people of my district. Many of the industrial workers in my district are facing a very critical situation. To help provide jobs in private industry for those who want to work is a responsibility of high priority with me.

My support of this amendment is based upon my desire to provide job opportunities for those so desperately seeking gainful employment. On May 7 of this year, Mr. Raymond Boulais, president of local union No. 947 in the plant of William Prym, Inc., CIO Textile Workers Union of America, appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee and urged

the adoption of this legislation. In a very straight-forward manner he supported this amendment in order to preserve for the long-run pull the jobs of the members of his union.

Many American producers in my own district have seen their production cut back by materials allocations. They have watched imports rush in to take up the market. When this situation is allowed to develop the American worker is the first to suffer.

It is my conviction that unless the American producer is able to protect himself from foreign imports taking over his market while his own domestic production is artificially limited, he may find himself unable to get his market—or at least a portion of it—back when the emergency is over. In this type of situation, the American worker is once again the one who suffers most.

If our defense needs require a cutback in the production of a nondefense item, certainly our allies and partners in defense should likewise cut back their own production of this nondefense item. I am not suggesting that we force any other country to adopt similar production cut-backs even though they may be needed for mutual defense. By the same token, I believe we must provide fair treatment for our own producers who are contributing so much to the defense effort. Certainly no foreign country could have any valid reason for objecting to our proportionately limiting imports to the same extent that the American production of an article is cut back by the defense requirements.

There is nothing in this amendment which would in any way limit the imports of any raw materials or the imports of any product or article made therefrom which the Secretary of Defense certifies as essential to the security and defense needs of the United States.

There is nothing in the amendment—as I read it—which automatically limits imports. It provides for a limitation only when the American production of a product is limited by raw materials allocations by NPA and then only when and if a substantial portion of the American producers of such products applies to the Tariff Commission for such limitation.

Adoption of this legislation would help provide better job opportunity and thus greater security for the many workers in both the pin and wood-screw industry in my district.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the objectives sought in the amendment proposed by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY] are the same objectives that were sought by the Congress 1 year ago when they wrote into the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the so-called peril point and escape clauses. We thought that would solve the situation. The objective of Con-

gress was to see to it that the interests of small manufacturers were properly safeguarded.

In an attempt to administer the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act with this escape clause and the peril point in it, we have carried to the United States Tariff Commission a series of cases. I was much surprised some time ago to find the Commission in one of its first opinions handed down under the escape clause saying to the people—I am talking about the manufacturers of wood screws—"Your troubles are not chargeable to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. They are chargeable to the practice of the National Production Authority in allocating certain critical materials to the defense effort and denying them to the domestic producer of civilian goods."

We are forced to take some steps at this point. Otherwise the effectiveness of your peril point and your escape clause, as written into the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, is absolutely worthless.

All this amendment proposes to do is to say to any nation who is importing goods made from critical materials: "We will go back to the pre-Korea period of 1949, 1950, and 1951, and we will take the average amount of your imports, and we will say to you that you cannot increase that average import so long as our American domestic producers are living under these freeze orders in which they cannot get critical materials."

I want to show you just how the proposition would work. I am sure that the adoption of this amendment will greatly remove the hazard that now faces particularly our small manufacturers throughout the Nation.

This proposal merely sets up machinery whereby a domestic industry, when needed, can protect and maintain its relative competitive position with imports while the domestic production of the article is being limited by NPA allocations of materials.

There is nothing in the proposal to restrict imports in such a way as to change or improve the competitive position of domestic producers. Actually it favors imports.

There is nothing in the amendment that would in any way limit the imports of any raw material or the imports of any product or article made therefrom which the Secretary of Defense certifies as essential to the security and defense needs of the United States.

There is nothing in the bill which operates automatically to limit imports. It provides for a limitation only when the American production of a product is limited by raw-materials allocations by NPA and only when and if a substantial portion of the American producers of such article or product applies to the Tariff Commission for such limitation. It is assumed that the Tariff Commission would determine the substantial portion on the basis of unit volume or dollar volume of production rather than the number of producers. Presumably, where it could be shown to the Tariff Commission that a majority of the American producers, by volume, did not de-

sire the import limitation, it would not be necessary to impose such a limitation.

The proposed amendment adopts the fair procedure and sets up machinery for operation thereof which the NPA carefully uses and administers in order to maintain the relative competitive position between different producers of a given product in a given American industry. It certainly would be unfair for NPA to prohibit one producer of X commodity from further production and at the same time permit his American competitor to continue production and take over the market. Obviously the first American producer would be unable to regain all or part of his market after the emergency is over. The same would be true if one American producer were limited more seriously in his production than another. The same fair principle should be applied to maintain the relative pre-Korea competitive relationship between an American industry and imports.

Many American producers have seen their production cut back by materials allocations and imports rush in to take up the market. Unless the American producer is able to protect himself from imports taking over his market while his production is artificially limited, he will be unable to regain all or a portion of such markets when the emergency is over. Imports should be limited to approximately the same level as is the American producers production so that they both have a fair chance at current competition and a fair chance of regaining their markets after the emergency is over.

One of the objections which will be made by the free trade opponents is that we should not deny the consumers of a product if it is available through imports. However, it is certainly fair and the American way to distribute the burden of national defense equally among all of the citizens. If our defense requirements call for a cutback in the production of a certain article, because the raw material therefor is required for defense purposes, certainly the consumers of that product should bear the burden along with, and equitably with, the producers thereof. It must be recalled that all Americans who are consumers are also producers. No person long consumes unless he also produces. It would be grossly unfair and un-American to ask any given American producer or consumer group to give up his product for the benefit of the defense effort and not ask other groups of producers and consumers to bear a proportionate burden.

If our defense needs require a cutback in the production of any given article or product, certainly our allies and partners in defense should likewise cut back their production. However this has not always been the case and frequently, even though they may cut back the production of such article, they will make an exception for its production and export to the United States in the hopes of gaining and retaining the United States market by unfair advantage. We cannot guarantee and certainly cannot force any other country to adopt similar production cutbacks even though they may

be drastically needed for mutual defense. However, it is only fair to protect our own producers who are contributing the most to national defense and mutual defense.

Certainly no foreign country, even the most friendly, could have any valid objection to our proportionately limiting imports to the same extent that the American production of an article is cut back by the defense requirements. This proposed amendment proposes to limit imports of articles made of allocated materials to only 50 percent of the pre-Korean base period imports while most American producers of nondefense articles requiring allocated materials are limited to substantially less than 50 percent.

Articles using steel are limited to 50 percent and most articles using copper and aluminum are limited to 30 percent or less, those using nickel are limited to less than 20 percent or entirely prohibited. The limitation of 50 percent on imports gives more than an even break to imports. In the case of defense items American producers usually get more than the above-mentioned percentages in order to encourage greater production and in such cases, upon the certification of the Secretary of Defense, this proposed amendment would place no limit upon imports of any article or product needed for the defense effort.

I am the sponsor of the escape clause which was written into the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act last year. The object of this escape clause was to provide that domestic producers be given an opportunity to prove to the United States Tariff Commission that their business was being injured by foreign imports. This escape clause is now section 7 of Public Law 50 of the Eighty-second Congress.

The intent of the Congress was that domestic producers suffering from too much foreign competition would be able to get relief. This was particularly true of domestic producers who were being denied the use of certain critical materials needed in the defense effort. These people were being driven out of business and their domestic market taken over by foreign-made goods because they were unable to compete due to their inability to buy these critical materials.

The domestic producers of wood screws carried their case before the United States Tariff Commission alleging injury under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and asking for relief under section 7 of Public Law 50. They were denied this relief and told by the United States Tariff Commission that their troubles were due not to the trade agreements but to the action of the National Production Authority in allocating to the defense effort certain materials which the domestic producers needed in order to carry on their business.

If the United States Tariff Commission is correct in their interpretation it is vitally necessary that a large segment of American industry needs the production afforded by this amendment in order to prevent their being driven out of business.

The best illustration of how these freeze orders in critical materials are in-

juring domestic producers is the case of the Wallace Corp. now pending before the Tariff Commission. The Wallace Corp. manufactures spring clothespins. There is a freeze order on wire-tempered steel needed in the manufacture of these pins.

Last October this company was given an allocation by the National Production Authority of 76 tons of this highly tempered steel wire. They were also given an allocation for the first quarter of 1952, an additional allocation of 76 tons. To March 1, 1952, under both allocations they had received only 23 tons of steel. They have, in the meantime, in order to keep their plant operating and supply jobs for 400 workmen, been buying highly tempered steel wire from Belgium and paying \$13.05 per hundredweight. Had they been permitted to buy this steel wire at home, the domestic price would have been only \$7.40 per hundredweight. They are on the verge of closing down their plant because their profits are not high enough to stand the losses in the price they must pay for steel.

This legislation is not a new idea. The producers of agricultural products in this country are protected by quotas which place a limitation on foreign imports of agricultural products when these imports interfere with the acreage allocation and the production procedures outlined by the Agriculture Department. This exemption for the farm people will be found in section 122 of the Agricultural Production Act.

I sincerely hope that it will be the wisdom and pleasure of this committee to accept this proposal in order that countless numbers of small producers will not be driven out of business.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there appeared before our committee a representative group of individuals on this particular point. These items would be involved: Cigarette lighters, brass-band instruments, safety pins, zippers, and flashlights.

At no time during the consideration by our committee did members on either the majority or minority side feel that these men made a case sufficiently strong to indicate that they were being injured by virtue of the type of legislation that is involved, at least no amendment was offered.

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

Mr. DEANE. In a moment.

Mr. TALLE. The gentleman made a statement that is not true, if I understood him correctly.

Mr. DEANE. The gentleman will have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. TALLE. I thought the witnesses referred to by the gentlemen did make a good case.

Mr. DEANE. I was informed by the Clerk that no such amendment was offered. So I will proceed, if I may.

For example, in the case of cigarette lighters, the total value of cigar and cigarette lighters, other than those made of gold or platinum, imported into the United States was only \$185,000. The number of lighters imported in 1951 rose slightly, but they came primarily from Japan.

In this letter before me from Secretary Sawyer, it is an indication to me that in passing this amendment we restrict the economic development of nations we are now paying millions of American dollars in economic aid. In other words we undercut the reciprocal trade agreements. Let me quote from Secretary of Commerce Sawyer's letter:

Speaking broadly, I am deeply concerned over the serious effects which this and other current proposals for restriction of imports into the United States would have upon our own welfare and that of our friendly trading countries. In the aggregate, these import restrictions would not only reduce the ability of foreign peoples to continue to buy our exportable products in large volume, but would also materially injure the economies of many important foreign countries, and render it difficult for them to make their respective contributions toward the common defense program.

Mr. Chairman, I call your special attention to what he says next:

Especially in view of our earnest efforts to persuade friendly countries to curtail exports to the Soviet bloc, it would be inconsistent for us to take measures that would at the same time curtail their markets in the United States, thereby forcing them to seek larger alternative outlets for their products.

Mr. Chairman, to pass this amendment would result in another weakening link in our effort to try to bring restoration to some of these countries and in view of the amount involved in dollars and cents, as shown by the evidence before us, there is no competitive disadvantage to the respective manufacturers in this country.

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

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

Mr. TALLE. Perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman from North Carolina, and if so, I wish to be corrected.

Mr. DEANE. I advised with the Clerk and, as I understand, there was no amendment offered. If the gentleman submitted one, I offer an apology.

Mr. TALLE. It is true that no amendment was offered, but I thought the gentleman from North Carolina stated that no Member on the majority side or the minority side thought that a case was made. As far as I am concerned, I thought a good case was made.

Mr. DEANE. I will alter it to that effect, that no amendment was offered by either the minority or the majority when this matter was before the committee. Is that not right?

Mr. TALLE. That is correct.

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

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman will have to acknowledge that there were appearances before the committee in behalf of this amendment.

Mr. DEANE. I admit that, but there was no action on the part of the committee but I feel in view of the evidence before our committee a case was not made and I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment because I think it is basically a fair proposition. What it boils down to is simply this: If an American manufacturer is prevented from manufacturing the normal amount of the output of his plant due to a restriction on materials, this then restricts the importer to 100-percent import for the 3 years prior to Korea. For instance, in the pottery industry I am informed that cobalt is restricted, which consequently restricts the pottery manufacturers in coloring their glassware. Cobalt is used in its manufacture. Now, it does not seem fair to me that an American industry and the American workingman should make all the sacrifices. We should be in this thing together, and if we are going to restrict certain vital materials as far as our manufacturers are concerned, it just simply does not make sense to me that we should allow their competitors in foreign countries to procure all of it they can in a free and open market, manufacture those products, and send them in here and take away the markets from the people we are restricting in our own country.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to take a lot of the time of this committee, but it seems to me that this is basically a fair proposition. It is only for the duration of this act, and it is to offset something that is happening to these people as a result of this act. I hope the Members will see their way clear to support this amendment.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion if ever there was an amendment before this House that deserved favorable consideration it is this amendment that is before us here today. I think everyone in our country and every industry, certainly in my district, is anxious to do that which is necessary for the national defense, but while we are spending billions abroad we do not feel that it is fair to have industries abroad take our markets away because of scarce materials. In the pottery and glass industry cobalt, and many other items essential to national defense, is necessary in its manufacture.

I want to show you just what is being done by giving you accurate statistics from the Tariff Commission received on the 10th of June this year. In 1950, 23,000,000 pieces of glassware were imported into this country. In 1951, 41,000,000 pieces of glassware were imported into this country; just double 1950. At the rate imports are coming in in 1952 more than 90,000,000 pieces of glassware will be imported into this country this year, which is four times as much as came in in 1950. That means that the glass workers in my district, in West Virginia and in Pennsylvania and all over this country are being thrown out of work because of the scarcity of materials, while the imports in 2 years have gone up four times.

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

Mr. SECREST. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I agree absolutely with what the gentleman says. He is making

a good speech, and it is good old Republican doctrine.

Mr. SECREST. It is good old American doctrine, I think.

I want to give you some more statistics on pottery. I have in my district many excellent potteries. In 1949, 22,000,000 pieces of household pottery came into this country. In 1951, 33,000,000 pieces came in. In 1952, 40,000,000 pieces of household pottery will come into this country at the present level of imports.

In 1951, 65,000,000 pieces of household chinaware came into this country, and over 100,000,000 pieces of earthenware and chinaware art and decorative articles came into this country.

Mr. Chairman, imports of pottery have multiplied three times in 2 years and imports of glassware have multiplied four times in 2 years. Over 200,000,000 pieces of pottery came into this country last year, and this year over 90,000,000 pieces of glassware will come in. That would furnish work for a long time to every pottery and glass factory in the United States.

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

Mr. SECREST. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I am in sympathy with what the gentleman is saying. Is this merchandise coming in under the reciprocal trade agreement or under some other provision of law?

Mr. SECREST. It is coming in because in the first place they can get scarce materials we cannot get, and that applies especially to the better kinds of glassware and pottery. In the second place, this country has much higher costs. In Japan, one of the large exporters of pottery, they pay about 4 cents an hour, and we pay \$1.50 an hour average in my district.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SECREST. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Does the gentleman have statistics as to how many men are being put out of work because of these imports?

Mr. SECREST. The glass factory in my district has been working about half time, or working half of the people full time. I would say that half of the work in the glass plant in my district, which employs 700 or 800 people, last year went abroad to people that export glass here in competition with us.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The same situation is true in my State.

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

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

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman have any information as to how much glassware comes from countries behind the iron curtain?

Mr. SECREST. Supposedly we shut out goods from countries behind the iron curtain, but I can tell you that the biggest exporter of glassware to this country in 1950 was Czechoslovakia, behind the iron curtain, with England second and Sweden third. In 1951 again Czechoslovakia was the largest exporter of glassware to this country, then England, and

then Sweden. Do you realize that the money Sweden gets for glass sold in this country they use in manufacturing steel that is sold to the people behind the iron curtain?

This amendment should be adopted, Mr. Chairman.

(On request of Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SECREST was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SECREST. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is my understanding correct that the purpose of the amendment now before the Committee of the Whole is to give to the glass and pottery workers the same consideration the dairy farmers receive under section 104?

Mr. SECREST. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am for it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, may I say that while I regret to have to do it, I am going to object to any extension of time from now on.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is considerable difference between the actual effect of this amendment and section 104. But, I can easily understand how those who want section 104 will also want this amendment in the bill. None of us here is desirous of curtailing American industry or American agriculture. I addressed my remarks yesterday during general debate to this very amendment, which we expected would be offered. I am not going to take time now to elaborate upon the subject, as I did yesterday. I do want to call your attention to this. Mention was made by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] to the wood screw case. Nobody appeared before the committee to attempt to make out a case for them, but when the gentleman referred to the matter of the wood screw case before the Tariff Commission—

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

Mr. MULTER. Not at the moment.

Mr. BAILEY. Then do not mention my name unless you expect to yield to me.

Mr. MULTER. I will yield to the gentleman in due time, if the gentleman will give me a chance to complete my statement. Please let me finish the sentence.

When the case was referred to in committee, I asked the gentleman who did refer to the case the following question:

In the wood screw case, they did not deny relief because of the underselling of the market.

Mr. Breckinridge who was then testifying on the subject in favor of this amendment said:

You are correct on that, sir.

Let us understand this. Everybody who has spoken in favor of this amendment has made out a good case, a good case for permanent legislation, which should go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and should be brought to the

House by that committee as a foreign affairs bill. It has no place in this temporary legislation, or in this emergency legislation. Every person who testified in behalf of industry before our committee was testifying not as to an emergency and not as to any situation brought about by an emergency, but was testifying as to a condition which existed in his trade and in his particular enterprise for a long time. Some had been before the Tariff Commission seeking relief, where they should get their relief. You should not give the relief this way. By attempting to do it this way, by emergency legislation, you are destroying at one fell swoop everything we are trying to do in our Mutual Security Program, and in our NATO program. Let me give you this quotation, please. Let us very clearly have in mind exactly what you are going to do, if you adopt this amendment. You will protect, maybe—I say, maybe—emphatically maybe—some American industry and some American enterprise, but you will destroy our joint effort with our allies to build up our defense against the Communists, and you will force them to trade with Russia. Let me read this to you, if you please, from the Deputy Director for Mutual Security, Mr. W. John Kenny, in a letter of May 17 to our distinguished chairman referring to this specific amendment, the Ramsay bill:

The bill could result in reducing these earnings of Western Europe by as much as \$561,000,000 for the same period, an amount equal to more than 30 percent of Western Europe's exports to the United States in 1951. This staggering reduction in projected dollar earnings would give the European NATO countries and the United States the choice of two undesirable alternative courses of action, to wit, a smaller NATO defense effort or increased defense support aid from the United States. Since the present NATO defense program is already at the minimum consistent with mutual security, a reduction in this program would raise serious questions with respect to the ability of the free world to defend itself against aggression. On the other hand, the granting of additional aid to fill the gap created by the proposed legislation would be in effect placing an unnecessary burden upon the taxpayers of the United States.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I appreciate the gentleman's comment, but I would like to refer back to the gentleman's thought that this should not come up at this time, but it should have gone back to the reciprocal trades agreement. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the reciprocal trades agreement being a one-way street, and that is why we in our small county have 3,000 American working men and women out of work today.

Mr. MULTER. I say to the gentleman, let us make it a two-way street. Let us correct the permanent legislation, if that is where the defect is.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I want to say in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], who says a case has been made for permanent legislation, this bill is the thing that is putting these people behind the "eight ball."

This is the particular legislation that is hurting them, and I say the place to give them relief is right on this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want to join with the gentleman in supporting this amendment, to protect the producers of this country, and I hope we will have an overwhelming majority for the amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the required number of words.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment produces a rather amusing situation. I am for the amendment, but I well recall when the foreign dole was before the House only a comparatively few days ago, there was a provision in that bill for a billion dollars of mandatory spending for products of foreign manufacture, industry, and agriculture. Offshore procurement, they called it; a perfumed title, for the buying of foreign products. I offered an amendment to strike that billion-dollar mandatory provision out of the bill and I was overridden just as though I were not in the House of Representatives. Yet you come in here today squawking to beat the band because the administration permits reckless importing of foreign products into this country. It does not make any difference whether you buy foreign products offshore or import them. It all adds up to importing foreign labor. That foreign contract provision in the foreigners' dole bill was stricken in conference, but the situation was made even worse because under the bill as it stands today, not a billion dollars but two or three billion dollars or more can be spent under the foreign-dole bill which you passed the other day.

Mr. Chairman, Congress long ago ought to have started legislating in terms of pro-American policies. I refuse to be a party to the sell-out of American industry, labor, or agriculture in this or any foreign-dole legislation. I repeat again that it is amusing to watch the parade into the well of the House today of those who voted for the foreign give-away schemes and yet who are now pleading for legislative protection against those whom only a few days ago they gave several additional billion dollars.

How inconsistent can you get?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. We need to keep our glass industry, our hand-blown glass industry, operating. They are now working less than half time. In case of war we will need this glass industry and need it badly. I hope this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a minute to say in regard to the

remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST] that I know something about the hand-made glassware situation. We have been getting a lot of this glassware from behind the iron curtain. They are cutting down on it now, but we are still getting a small amount of it.

About 2 years ago evidence came to me from a British trade journal that Czechoslovakia was selling glassware to the United States for one-quarter of what it cost to produce it. I took that evidence down to the Secretary of the Treasury and asked him to invoke the Anti-Dumping Act, which he had a perfect right to do. He promised to give me a reply after his investigators had made a report on this situation. That has been almost 2 years ago, and I have not had a report yet. We are still doing business with Czechoslovakia.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman not know that any decision the Secretary of the Treasury makes with respect to foreign governments is enunciated by the State Department? It makes no difference what the Secretary of the Treasury tells you, it is the responsibility of the State Department.

Mr. STAGGERS. Well, I do know—

Mr. RIVERS. I agree with you. I am for the amendment, but it is the State Department and not the Treasury Department.

Mr. STAGGERS. No. I do not like to disagree with the gentleman, but the Anti-Dumping Act comes under the Treasury Department.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And the dollars they are getting in Czechoslovakia are the same as providing dollars for Russia?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Because they go to Russia; and, of course, Stalin wants more dollars.

Mr. STAGGERS. He has to have more dollars.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We might as well be practical about this whether we like it or not. If we propose to give assistance to Czechoslovakia in the hope that they will turn against Russia and follow our policy—and that is certainly the objective of the State Department—anybody who agrees with that objective would certainly not disagree on buying goods from Czechoslovakia, putting dollars in the hands of those people so they could buy goods from us. I say that if that is the objective, and I do not believe that anybody will deny that that is the objective of the State Department because we are continually passing bills here to aid people behind the iron curtain—

Mr. STAGGERS. Answering the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], I may say that I am not in the State

Department and I am not in foreign diplomacy. My belief however about our foreign policy is this: I believe in the mutual aid compact and I believe in economic aid to those countries which will be a help to us in times when we may need friends. I am just saying that I do not believe in aiding any country that is behind the iron curtain so that they can get American dollars; and I think that is the question that is involved here and one that bothers me.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with that, but I will not support the State Department as to using its judgment as to when to give goods and labor away in the United States for the benefit of somebody the State Department selects.

Mr. STAGGERS. I do not agree with that philosophy; my philosophy is, that we are obligated to help our friends when they are in need. I want to congratulate the gentlemen from Ohio in their statements on this glassware business and to state that I will vote for the amendment when it comes up.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it certainly is very fine that today this great body has an opportunity to take action on a measure that we failed to take when the reciprocal-trade agreements extension was before us. Some 105 of us stood up here and voted against the reciprocal-trade agreements because we believed that the President should protect American industry. Now we have this committee coming in here and throwing mud further in the eyes of Congress by saying that we should ignore the American industry, deny Americans of their paydays, in order that we may go ahead with this foolhardy program abroad. Let us take the business of glass, pottery, and cigarette lighters; and I want to mention zippers because I have one of the largest zipper producing firms in my district—

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

Mr. KEARNS. All right; I agree, almost as large.

Mr. KEARNEY. You can also include gloves.

Mr. KEARNS. All right. We have nearly 4,500 employees at Meadville, Pa., yet today 2,800 of them are idle. When employed they get \$1.86 an hour as machine operators. Today that company cannot get copper or aluminum, yet they can go down to Mexico and get both, and for 35 cents an hour get their machine operators. They pay the 30-percent duty, ship the goods across the border, and are able to compete here against Japanese zippers, which are so inferior that they are not to be mentioned in the same breath with American zippers.

I want to congratulate those who have sponsored this amendment. It is certainly a forward step in this country when we protect American paydays and American business.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 112, noes 43.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 102. Section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 104. Import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and imports into the United States of any such commodity or product, by types or varieties, shall be limited to such quantities as the Secretary of Agriculture finds would not (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under an Government price support program: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of Agriculture after establishing import limitations, may permit additional imports of each type and variety of the commodities specified in this section, not to exceed 10 percent of the import limitation with respect to each type and variety which he may deem necessary, taking into consideration the broad effects upon international relationships and trade. The President shall exercise the authority and powers conferred by this section."

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Boggs of Louisiana: On page 2, line 12, strike out everything beginning with line 12 on page 2 and ending with line 14 on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof: "Section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby repealed."

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, in the debate of a few moments ago on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia, the real intent of the sponsors of section 104 was pretty well revealed and set forth. The gentlemen who spoke on behalf of the Ramsay amendment made the same type of presentation when we adopted year before last and the year before that the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act. The argument advanced by the gentleman from West Virginia was made at that time before we had shortages caused by the Korean war.

What you are really having here on a so-called control bill is a direct attack upon the established trade policy of the United States of America in the reciprocal trade treaty program. If carried on, this approach will wreck our foreign trade; it will have disastrous effect in New Orleans and every port in the country. I should like to address my remarks particularly to my colleagues who come from the great agricultural areas of the South and the West who are interested in cotton, wheat, tobacco, and countless other products which have become the subject of trade agreements mutually arrived at by the various countries which consume these products.

There comes to my mind an incident which happened with the chairman of

the Committee on Agriculture some years ago, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. We were traveling together in Europe. At that time there was a large surplus of tobacco in this country and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the good and able Representative that he is, spent a good bit of time negotiating on his own to secure markets for his North Carolina tobacco. We have had a similar situation with cotton and with wheat. As a matter of fact, one bale out of every four that is grown on southern farms is grown for export. You take that export market away and our cotton farmers will face the worst kind of a depression.

I say to this body, if you want to use this bill as a vehicle to repeal the reciprocal trade treaty program which has been built up over a period of years as a sound and a substantial policy, go ahead and do it, but know what you are doing when you do it. Do not do it under any fake pretense of protecting cheese, or glassware, or some other commodity. Go ahead and say that it is the intent of this body today to repeal the policy of this Government which has been in effect since that great Secretary, Mr. Hull, assumed that responsibility some years ago.

I might say this, too, as a member of the great Committee on Ways and Means: I think that this debate properly belongs before that committee. It has been the subject of study by that committee. I see my fine friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], who has traditionally taken a policy as opposed to these trade treaties, but it has been debated before men and women who have devoted a lifetime to these problems, and here we come today with a temporary piece of legislation, its very object of which is in doubt, and we propose to change a policy which is basic to this Government, as I see it.

If you fine colleagues of mine from the South want to remove our export market for cotton, if you want to cripple our export market for tobacco, if you want to throw a real gap into that \$18,000,000,000 of trade that we carry on with other countries in free enterprise, then I say go ahead and vote for these types of amendments that are being offered.

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

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I did not interfere with the gentleman. I know the gentleman's position. His position is exactly the same as my good friends over here in the Republican Party. I am well aware of it because the gentleman appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means in opposition to the reciprocal trade treaty.

Mr. BAILEY. In 1945, and I did not get anywhere.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman sure did not, because we understood what he was trying to do. The Members did not understand that here a moment ago, but that is what is involved here, and I ask the Members of this body to consider this amendment, see what is involved, and then make your decision. This amendment is sponsored by the same people who for years kept an un-

fair tax on oleo. It is a short-sighted amendment.

In 1951 the United States exported over \$4,000,000,000 of agricultural products. This figure represents four times the cash farm income received by either New York, North Carolina, Indiana, or Ohio. Foreign markets provide an outlet for an amount of American agricultural production that is considerably greater than the total production of any State.

Unlike the manufacturer producing for export, the farmer usually does not deal directly with his ultimate customer and may never know that his product is exported. Many do not, therefore, realize their important stake in the pattern of foreign trade. Yet foreign countries provided an outlet in 1951 for well over one-third of the cotton, rice, wheat, dried whole milk, and about one-fourth of the tobacco, soybeans, and lard. Almost as large a proportion of the American production of peanuts and grain sorghums was exported. Exports of cotton were valued in 1951 at \$1,000,000,000; wheat at \$1,000,000,000; leaf tobacco at \$325,000,000; fruits at \$115,000,000; dairy products at \$150,000,000; and vegetables at \$84,000,000.

The major export commodities are of great importance to farmers in practically every part of the country. The American Farm Bureau Federation in a recent statistical analysis has classified 25 agricultural commodities as being greatly dependent upon exports. In 1950 more than half of the cash income from crops of farmers in 35 different States was from these products which were especially dependent upon exports. Such commodities included tobacco, apples, peanuts, and dairy products.

These large exports also tend to strengthen the price of these commodities in the American market. Farmers get higher prices for their products because of the additional demand created by foreign purchases. It is evident, for example, that if the \$325,000,000 worth of leaf tobacco and the \$115,000,000 worth of fruit exported in 1951 had instead been offered on the domestic market a drastic decline in prices would have followed.

If United States exports are to be maintained, foreign countries must have dollars with which to buy our products. Since the end of the war the amount of dollars foreign countries have earned from our imports of goods and services has been far short of the amount necessary to pay for the exports we have sent them. Farm exports have attained their high level in part because of the dollar aid we have been granting other countries. As our aid is reduced in the years ahead our agricultural exports will, therefore, be seriously affected if we do not permit other countries to expand their dollar earnings. Foreign countries which have a shortage of dollars will be obliged to reduce imports of those commodities which they need less or which they can get from other sources. In such circumstances a foreign country would turn to other trading areas where it can buy without using dollars or it would attempt to produce the various commodities even though they be inferior

and higher priced. Exports of agricultural products are particularly vulnerable in this respect.

Legislation such as section 104 of the Defense Production Act is adversely affecting agricultural exports. Section 104 provides that there shall be no imports of butter or certain other fats and oils, cheese, other dairy products, if the Secretary of Agriculture determines such importation would have any of three named effects. The quotas imposed under section 104 have meant a decrease of some 35 percent from 1950 level of imports of cheese. Some of the affected countries, particularly those which import American agricultural products, have already indicated that they must reduce purchases of our goods because of smaller earnings from cheese sales to us. They are also seriously considering withdrawing tariff concessions granted us as a result of our withdrawal of tariff commitments made to them.

Exports of fruit have already been affected. Tobacco, vegetables, cotton, and lard may also suffer. These risks are being incurred unnecessarily, since adequate safeguards were and are already available to protect domestic producers against serious injury from imports.

Exports of poultry and eggs, would probably also be affected by a reduction in United States exports of agricultural products. In 1951 exports of eggs and poultry from the United States amounted to over \$40,000,000.

Because of its long-term effect, section 104 offers no real protection even to the interests intended to be protected and is harmful generally to American agriculture. It is interesting to note that in 1951 the value of United States exports of dairy products was over \$120,000,000 while imports were valued at only \$25,000,000. This means that in 1951 there was an export balance in dairy products of over \$95,000,000.

The adverse impact of such restrictions as required by section 104 upon United States agriculture is understood by many farm leaders and their position was ably presented by Allen B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency during the hearings on bills to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 (S. 2594 and S. 2645). His testimony said in part:

We recommend that section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, be eliminated. We firmly believe that the provisions of Public Law 50, Eighty-second Congress, together with section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, properly administered, give adequate protection to producers of agricultural commodities from excessive imports. A prosperous and expanding agriculture in America is dependent on a high volume of trade. Our exports exceed our imports. The current exports of dairy products exceed by about 2½ times the imports. We will insist that the provisions of Public Law 50 and section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act be promptly carried out by the responsible administrative agencies.

Among organizations which have expressed their opposition to section 104 are: Tobacco Associates, Inc.; American Cotton Shippers Association; the United

States Chamber of Commerce; National Cotton Council of America; General Federation of Women's Clubs; New Orleans International House.

In the present serious circumstances, our foreign trade is especially vital to the security of the United States and the rest of the free world. Our imports include many commodities necessary to enable us to meet critical national defense requirements. Our exports provide goods desperately needed by free nations to prevent economic instability. Smaller dollar earnings by these countries weaken the capacity of our allies to carry forward the program of rearmament. As has been indicated, a number of foreign governments have protested the trade restrictions imposed under section 104. We stand to lose greatly in prestige and leadership as well as in trade if section 104 is not repealed.

It cannot be too often emphasized that foreign trade is a two-way street. It is essential that the United States import if it is to continue to sell its products abroad and not give them away through the mechanism of foreign aid.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman undoubtedly misunderstood the amendment. The amendment was to strike out a section of the pending bill, and the gentleman, I am sure, is not in favor of striking out that section.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the section to which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] refers. My principal reason for arising is to reply to my distinguished friend from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] who has just left the floor. He orates here eloquently about reciprocal trade agreements. You know, if the gentleman down here in Washington that we call the Tariff Commission and the President, Mr. Truman, would do their duty we would not have to be here today trying to do what we have done with reference to glass and pottery and what we are intending to do with reference to cheese and butter and these other commodities. These gentlemen who are supposed to administer the law have not performed their duty. For instance, I know a very prominent lawyer who has practiced before the Tariff Commission for years. He has been trying to get a decision upon which he can base a case that he can appeal to the courts. They get around him without giving any reasons. He cannot get into the courts. He can get no relief of any kind. What is left for the people to do? They have to come here to Congress as the Democratic Members have done today, to get protection for glassware and other commodities in which they are interested. I voted with them and I shall vote with other Democrats if necessary in order to get justice. That is exactly what we have to do. If we want justice, we have to come to Congress. We cannot get it out of the governmental organizations that have the duty to do justice because they refuse to do what the law requires

them to do. I mean the White House and all the rest of those responsible, including the Tariff Commission.

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

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Is it not true that the agricultural interests have a far greater protection under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and is it not also true that the gentleman from Louisiana, who just addressed the House, is familiar with the fact that his State has an import limitation on the amount of Cuban sugar that can come in to protect his sugar farmers? I think his speech was entirely out of order.

Mr. JENKINS. I did not rise for the purpose of raising any personal issue, but I think the gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. Chairman, I want to impress this on the Members of this House. There is a great line of demarcation between the Republican policy and the Democratic policy with reference to the reciprocal trade agreements. This has been debated for years. The House passed the reciprocal-trade-agreement law several years ago. If we had an honest administration of the law today, it would not be necessary for us to be here asking for these amendments. The law is not fairly or honestly administered, and I have told you the reason why we are here before Congress trying to get a little bit of fair play.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I said sometime ago I was going to object to any requests for additional time, so I object.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at the attitude of the gentleman from Louisiana in offering this amendment. He has called it the cheese amendment. I can say to him that it involves much more than cheese. If his amendment succeeds, it means unlimited imports of rice, fats, and oils, peanuts, and many other products produced in his area. When I say "unlimited imports" it means exactly that, for imports will be brought into this country under a policy that will surely destroy production of essential foods in the United States.

I am very much interested in this section of the bill, which I sponsored a year ago, known as section 104. It was approved by an overwhelming majority. The amendment—section 104—contained in the committee bill is a modification of section 104 approved in 1951, to more nearly meet the situation at home and also makes possible the correction of certain inequalities that have appeared during the past 9 months in the administration of existing law.

The Senate has considered the same amendment. It was defeated in the Senate on a tie vote, 38 to 38, because of the absence of a few Senators who would have voted for the amendment.

Your committee has made the revised section 104 as a part of the bill by a majority vote of the committee. It should

be approved to protect not only the producers but the consumers in the United States.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It is my understanding that this amendment was passed by a very good-sized majority in the committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It passed, anyway. I am here to tell you that I am supporting it as it appears in the bill. I think we did right then, and I hope the members of the committee who voted for it then will vote for it now.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman very much. I am glad to hear that he is for this section of the bill. His support of section 104 as it appears in the bill will assure approval in the House and also by the conference committee. The farmers of this country owe the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brown] a debt of gratitude for his timely help to secure favorable action on this section of the bill. The consumers also owe him a sincere vote of thanks for supporting policies which will assure abundant production of vital food for them. I can also assure the gentleman that I will not forget his support of section 104.

The gentleman from Louisiana has tried to divide the House Membership into sectional groups. He states that section 104 should be stricken from the bill so that the tobacco and the cotton farmers will have a market throughout the world. No one has fought harder for the tobacco and cotton farmers than I in the many years I have been in Congress. But apparently he is willing to liquidate the peanut industry, the rice industry, and the dairy industry in this country to gain an advantage for cotton and tobacco. Unfortunately, there are too many people in this country who are ready to liquidate or injure other Americans engaged in other lines of production if they can make some money out of it. Some day the gentleman may feel different about it.

Let me show you what we have done for cotton already. Since April 1948 the taxpayers of this country have put up \$1,200,000,000 to pay for cotton to give away to many countries in the world. Tobacco has not been taking a back seat, either. The American taxpayers have put up \$455,000,000 to pay for tobacco to give away throughout the world. Tobacco and cotton farmers are in excellent financial condition. It therefore appears to me that the gentleman from Louisiana and those who support his amendment are making a terrible mistake.

This is more than a cheese amendment, I will say to my friends, because it takes in all dairy products. The repeal of section 104 would permit unlimited imports of butter, cheese, peanuts, fats and oils, rice and linseed oil, flaxseed, and many other products.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So that we do not get confused here, I ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brown] and the gentleman from Minnesota, now addressing us, do you propose that we leave in the bill the language on page 2, beginning on line 14, and extending to page 3, including line 18? Is that what you are talking about?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Beginning on line 12, at page 2, and ending on page 3, line 14.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Your proposal is that we leave that language in the bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We should leave that language in the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wanted it to be clear as to what you were talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I must object to any extension of time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me again urge the defeat of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana. His amendment proposes to strike section 104 from the committee bill. This section should be enacted into law. It is urgent and vital to our domestic economy to encourage maximum food production.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, are we not operating under a delusion in thinking we are effectively legislating for the country? When I look at the afternoon paper, the headlines of which read, "Truman says Hill cannot make him use Taft-Hartley," I wonder if the representative of the Department of Justice in presenting the views of the Department in the Steel case did not actually reflect the views of the Chief Executive when he said that the President was not bound by acts of Congress and was his own interpreter of the meaning of the Constitution.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this might well be called the "cheese" amendment beyond peradventure of doubt. Let us see what the wording of this particular section is. We have this unusual language, namely, that these quotas and controls on cheese and other products are necessary for the protection and the essential security interests and economy of the United States. That is a rather pretentious cover or facade of protection. Cheese is going to protect the internal security of the United States. Imagine cheese as one of our outer bastions. We now have a fortress of cheese to protect our security. I never heard of more nonsense than that. It is like Don Quixote tilting at windmills. Actually the proponents of section 102, which amends section 104 of the Defense Production Act are just as wrong as a 2-foot yardstick. Only some 20 blue cheese manufacturers would benefit from this provision; benefit at the expense of all other cheese manufacturers, benefit at the expense of a successful foreign policy, vis-à-vis countries like Italy, France, Denmark, and Holland. That section is the very negation of the foreign economic

policy of the United States. Some six countries have already protested that this provision violates the letter and spirit of the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade called GATT. Apparently the cheese lobby, or the dairy lobby, cares nothing for any kind or sort of international agreement.

This provision violates the plan of the Mutual Security Administration whereby we seek to build up European exports. The shipment of cheese to the United States has been strongly encouraged by ECA. So with one hand we seek to bring some imports of cheese into this country and with the other hand we say, "No. We shall keep cheese out."

Cheese is big business in little countries like Denmark, Holland, and Italy. It means much to them. Our exports of cheese are minuscule in comparison to our production of cheese and our consumption of cheese. Our imports are trifling. They are a drop in the bucket, particularly in comparison to our exports of cheese. Domestic producers are not endangered by imports. They have the protection of tariffs, as well as many other protective devices, and I shall insert in the RECORD the many provisions they can avail themselves of if they need protection; but they need no protection. There is protection under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act, and so forth. I say we export far more cheese than we import. Cheese imports during the past war years were less than they were in 1939. Think of it. We import less than 5 percent of our production. Also less than 5 percent of our entire production of cheese. It is like great giants being frightened by pygmies. All these protective acts, which I place in the RECORD, guard the domestic manufacturer against any kind of unfair competition from abroad. Apparently what these 20 blue cheese manufacturers want is no competition whatsoever. They want the Government to put all manner and kind of crutches under them to protect them in their inefficiency; to protect them in their imagined fear that there is going to be a tremendous amount of cheese coming in from these little countries whom we are trying to help, which now with this kind of legislation we effectively dam. We deprive the American consumer from buying what he wants. He has a taste for Gorgonzola, for Povero or Parmesan. He does not want imitations.

It is hardly necessary to recall that the current mutual-defense effort is based, so far as Western Europe is concerned, on the foundations built by the ECA program. In turn, the ECA programs were deeply concerned with the establishment of the freest possible flow of trade among the participating nations and throughout the free world. One of their major purposes was to make a frontal attack on the so-called international dollar gap, or dollar shortage problem on the assumption that only an expanding and well-balanced pattern of foreign trade could give stability to Europe and strengthen America's first line of defense across the ocean. Consequently, it was the declared purpose of the ECA program to

help reduce the unbalance in the world trade due to the dollar shortage stemming in turn from the chronic excess of United States exports over imports.

The ECA countries were assisted and encouraged in the organization of dollar-export drives. Steps were taken to stimulate an increasing acceptance of European imports in the United States. The Italian Government, is extremely anxious to reestablish a situation in which Italy can earn and pay its own way through the exports of products of the skill and ingenuity of its enterprise and manpower, rather than to continue to rely on assistance.

These restrictions on cheese imports militate against the Italian efforts to improve her economic situation.

There have been indications that, while the American Government continues to be fully committed to the principle of trade liberalization, renewed recourse is being made to restrictive practices, and that the inconsistencies between principle and practice, far from disappearing, are once more increasing. Should this new trend continue unchecked, a very serious situation would result. Much of the progress made through GATT and other agreements would be undone and many of the gains of the Marshall plan would be wasted. Such a prospect is naturally viewed by the Italian Government with considerable alarm, and is a matter of major concern, particularly under the current unsettled conditions of the international and European economy.

Italian exports to the United States include to a very large extent foodstuffs—such as olive oil and cheese—certain farm products—such as almonds—and a number of specialties and typical commodities. They have enjoyed in recent years a moderate expansion which, however, has hardly made a dent on the trade unbalance between Italy and the United States. In 1951 Italian imports from the United States exceeded exports to the United States by over 6 to 1, representing a total deficit of more than \$350,000,000. The hopes and prospects of further development, however, have been virtually nullified by restrictions placed by the United States Government on the import of a number of commodities which are of vital importance to Italy's economy.

The restrictions placed on Italian cheese imports seem particularly inappropriate because Italian cheeses do not compete, for the most part, with cheeses produced in the United States. Being produced from sheep's milk—pecocino and romano—or requiring many years of seasoning—parmigiano and reggiano—Italian cheeses are not competitive with their imitations which are produced in small quantity in the United States.

Now, all this has grave economic and political repercussions. Take the situation in Italy. Italy depends to a major extent upon her exports of cheese and her small amount of imports into the United States. This kind of legislation is just grist to the Communist mill; grist to the Fascist mill, particularly in Italy. You may have read to your dis-

may and to my dismay that the Fascists are making great headway in the southern part of Italy. The neo-Fascist party has elected mayors in Naples, Bari, Palermo, and so on. What do you want them to do? Do you want them to elect more mayors, because the propagandists on the Fascist side will make much of this character of legislation. They will say that the Americans do not practice what they preach.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Boggs amendment, as I consider it extremely detrimental to agriculture. Personally, I cannot see how any Member from that great Southland can support it. I am indeed much pleased to see that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] and others from the South feel that it is the wrong method of approach. I think the way the committee has written this revision of section 104 amounts to a sort of compromise. Surely the House is not going to go against the action which it took last year, when it said to agriculture throughout America, "We are going to give you a certain degree of protection against the influx into this country of a great amount of competing fats and oils which are apt to put our own farmers out of business." Whether that is making grist for the Fascist mill or not, I do not know and I do not care. Just as I supported the amendment which gave protection to pottery workers and glass workers, believing that this Congress should keep a certain degree of protection for its own people, in contravention to trying to do everything for those in other countries at this time, in the same degree I am supporting the Andersen proposal to retain this particular provision in the bill. I hope the House will reject the Boggs amendment.

I was sorry to see my colleague was shut off abruptly by the refusal of the committee chairman to agree to the extension of his time. I consider the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDERSEN] as the greatest authority on agriculture in this House, bar none—and I am proud of him, coming from the great State of Minnesota as he does. I would like to ask him to elucidate further upon the reasons as to why this Boggs amendment should be defeated and defeated roundly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDERSEN. I thank my colleague for his kind words. Mr. Chairman, it appears that the gentleman from New York who spoke just a moment ago thinks, or at least seems to believe, that you can turn on a spigot and get milk out of it instead of having cows to produce milk. He has mentioned blue cheese from Denmark in particular. I had hoped that he would not get into that, because I dislike mentioning particular countries. However, I must advise the committee that blue mold cheese imports from Denmark have

taken over nearly one-half of the production and consumption of blue cheese in the United States. During the last year 49 percent of all the blue cheese consumed in the United States was imported, and about 95 percent of it came from Denmark.

I am rather proud of the little Danish blood I have in my system, but certainly I am American enough to want to protect at least a part of our domestic economy. Under the provisions of the bill the Danes and people of other cheese-producing countries will have ample quotas to ship a very substantial portion of their cheese into the United States.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If my colleague will pardon an interruption, he stated he was proud of his Danish ancestry. I also am proud of the fact that my ancestry is 100 percent Danish; but at the same time I do not intend to give to Denmark concessions that belong by all rights to the farmers of our own country, America.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What the gentleman has said is very appropriate at this time, and I thank him for yielding to me. I would like to point out, since Denmark has been mentioned, and it is a good country, they have a good economy, they have hard money, they are thrifty people, their credit is good in the United States; but I was kind of surprised when I read that they had received a gift from the United States of \$240,000,000 since 1948, \$240,000,000 since 1948—\$240,000,000—nearly a quarter of a billion dollars. They used \$80,000,000 of that to pay off their national debt at a time when our debt was going up and our taxes were also going up. I do not blame the Danish Government for getting something from our give-away program. Other countries did much better. Let me say in the balance of the time so kindly secured for me by my able colleague from Minnesota, that we must do something to protect the production of vital foods in the United States. Dairy products, which are covered by this bill, are vital foods. We must increase our production here in order to safeguard the welfare of the American people. Unlimited imports of dairy products will seriously injure domestic production. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana to strike section 104 from the bill must be defeated.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 4:15.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sees but three gentlemen on their feet seeking recognition. That would give the gentleman 5 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 4:15? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] is recognized.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, as I proceed to speak, may I say that I do so in

the spirit of one of our greatest American leaders, Daniel Webster, who passed away a century ago. He won for himself so high a place in the hearts of the American people that some of his noble words were selected to be engraved on the panel resting high on the wall above the Speaker's rostrum in this Legislative Chamber. Lifting my eyes as I sat here yesterday, I read his immortal words:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

I trust that in our consideration of this bill, important as it is to our entire Nation, we may do something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall the discussion of last year centering around what is now current law, section 104, which was adopted in this Chamber by a good vote and enacted into law. This year the administration demanded the repeal of section 104. After careful consideration, however, the Committee on Banking and Currency adopted my amendment to continue section 104 with some modification, as specified in the pending bill. I shall point out briefly what section 104 in revised form provides. It does two things:

First. It permits the Secretary of Agriculture to relax import restrictions on certain fats, oils, peanuts, rice, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, up to an additional 10 percent of the import limitation for each type or variety.

Second. It clarifies the intent of Congress to exempt from import controls the noncompetitive types or varieties of the specified commodities, as in the case of certain types or varieties of cheese.

My amendment as contained in the pending bill will continue to give protection to domestic producers of these products but will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to modify import restrictions when advisable in the light of international conditions and trade. I urge that section 104 in this modified form be retained in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, we often speak of carrying on a great missionary enterprise. We are and can continue to be the leader of the free world, if we carry on our affairs in a sensible manner. Granted that we are carrying on a great missionary enterprise the world over, I want to say that I have never known any missionary enterprise to succeed without a strong home base. Our home base is here in the United States of America, and we must see to it that it remains strong. If we do not guard, protect and strengthen our home base—the great missionary enterprise we are engaged in throughout the world will fail. Let us retain in the bill section 104 as revised. Such action will, in my opinion, conform to the objectives so clearly and forcibly promulgated by Daniel Webster.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Due to the limitation of time we have not had

the opportunity to show here that if this amendment succeeds and this section is eliminated from the bill, the Government support program, which provides a support price for all of the commodities in the bill, may go into operation immediately, and that the Government will begin buying domestically produced butter, cheese, peanuts, fats, oils, and rice, and unlimited imports coming in here will take over the domestic market, and the cost to the American taxpayer will be at least three or four hundred million dollars or possibly more.

Mr. TALLE. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the gentlemen of the fourth estate were paying attention when the statement was made here that the established foreign policy of our country is the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act. If they were, they will recall that in 1943 a gentleman campaigning for the Presidency traveled over this country berating this Congress for passing the peril-point provision in the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act. He went into the district of the author of that peril-point provision and defeated the man in his district because he had caused unpatriotic limitations to be placed upon the Executive 4 years ago. I am particularly interested in the remark because I think it is this same subject that caused me to make my first appearance in the well of the House. I had called the State Department and wanted a copy of the last reciprocal-trade conversations in London. They told me that even though under the Constitution it is the power of the Congress, and their duty and responsibility, to fix tariffs to protect our agriculture, our industry, and our standard of living, that we had conveyed that power to the Executive, and they took the position that individual Members of Congress were not entitled to know what the conversations were.

On my first occasion in this well I pointed out that our mines in the West would close unless they were protected by tariffs to the extent of labor cost, and I tell you today they are closed. In one of my counties alone, mines that employed between five and ten thousand people that did produce copper, that did produce zinc, that did produce lead are closed. Those people are seeking work some place where they can make \$18 a day so that they can pay for the ice boxes that are made in the industrial areas that the gentleman from New York supports. Yes; they are closed, and what they produce, gentlemen, is out of the world supply. So when you talk about our manufacturers at home then you are admitting the folly of your ways 4 years ago, because we now must compete in the world market for the materials necessary to keep our industries going. We are weakened, as Webster pointed out, by the very fact that we destroyed our ability to produce. It is one thing to experiment with this in metals, but let me tell the gentlemen from the metropolitan areas, do not experiment with

the food of the Nation. Let us not destroy our ability to feed our people, and that is what this amendment does. We cannot have our standard of living unless this Congress protects it, and I say to you that the time is not far off when we are going to be protecting the standard of living of the men in your very industrial areas with tariffs. Either you are going to do it or we are not going to have that standard of living.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the committee for its consideration of this matter. This is no new matter that has just come before this body. For a number of years we had a provision in the law taking care of these imports, imposing restrictions on them. That law was fixed so that it expired every 2 years. It so happened that the last expiration date was last year. No hearings were held on that. I know I introduced a bill to extend it for 2 years. So did the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], and a number of other Members who were interested in these controls introduced similar bills, extending the law. But they were not reported out by the committee. When the Defense Production Act was here last year the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], myself, and others introduced similar amendments, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota was adopted. That amendment provided some small change and provided for tighter controls than had been in the original law. The amendment, it is true, was adopted without hearings. It was adopted by the other body, and then became the law of the land.

I realize there was some criticism of the amendment in that it was too harsh, it was too restrictive. Now our great committee has given it new study and gone into the matter and brought out a revised form of the restriction we imposed last year. This is not a Johnny-come-lately matter. It is a matter that has been enacted into law for a number of years. The provision we have now meets almost all the objections that have been raised by the State Department. It lodges great discretionary powers in the Secretary of Agriculture. It gives protection to our American farmer.

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

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. In other words, this is a compromise amendment designed to meet the worst objections to the amendment that was incorporated in the act last year?

Mr. ABBITT. That is right. I think it goes a long way in legitimately meeting those objections. We are not voting here today for the strict amendment that was passed last time, but it is one that has been given due study by the committee and I think fully meets the objections that have been raised to the law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman knows this amendment gives authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to limit imports of certain commodities, including peanuts.

Mr. ABBITT. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I ask the gentleman if he can clarify this, and he is a great expert on peanuts as well as on other products: The support price on peanuts in this country is 12 cents a pound in the support program.

Mr. ABBITT. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The average world price of peanuts today is between 4 and 5 cents a pound. I am informed by the Department of Agriculture that the moment these controls were removed on imports our country would be flooded with possibly 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 tons of peanuts from Africa and other countries that would be attracted here on account of the higher price, which would mean that the Government would buy the peanuts raised in the United States at 12 cents a pound and the foreign peanuts would come in a little under the support price and take over the market. Is not that right?

Mr. ABBITT. Yes. Last year between the time the regular law expired and this act went into effect from 4 to 10 shiploads of peanuts were brought into this country; that is, while the officials were getting ready to administer this new act. That shows you the danger we are facing.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If this provision of the bill is adopted and becomes a law and is properly administered, it will do justice to the importers and it will also give fair treatment to the American producers and consumers.

Mr. ABBITT. I agree with the gentleman. It is a compromise that has been worked out to protect our farmers, to allow us as much free trade as possible.

I hope the amendment will be voted down and the provision as reported by this great Committee on Banking and Currency will be placed in the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were ayes 25, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: On page 3, line 13, after the word "trade" insert "Provided further, however, That the provisions of this section shall be inoperative as against any import, the retail selling price of which is more than 10-percent higher in American currency than the same similar or simulated domestically produced items."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, that the amendment deals with price and is not germane to this section. This section deals exclusively with imports and authority in the hands of the Secretary of

Agriculture to limit imports under certain conditions, and it does not deal in any manner with the price of the imported commodity or its relationship to the domestic price level for competitive products in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the amendment?

Mr. MULTER. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, obviously the amendment is in order because it simply puts in as one of the provisions that the Secretary of Agriculture must consider the differential in price between the imported article and the domestic article.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] offers an amendment at page 3, line 13, to which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] makes a point of order. The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the amendment, and the language of the bill to which the amendment is made. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is germane, and overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment very simply takes at their word every Member of this House who has contended that he is not attempting to keep out of this country any import that is not in competition with a domestic item. Section 104 has been referred to as the cheese amendment because it affects cheese more than anything else. So let me tell you how it operates with reference to cheese. I have before me a schedule of retail prices on domestic and imported cheese. I will not take the time to read all of it now, but I will put it in the RECORD as part of my remarks. Let me give you some of the examples as to how it would affect the imports if this amendment of mine were adopted. If the imported article is selling at more than 10 percent of the price in American currency, and I put in American currency because yesterday the gentleman from Minnesota said the foreign currencies are devaluated and we do not want to compete with these devaluated foreign currencies, to make it certain that we are dealing with the price of the imported article here in our dollars, I say if the differential is 10 percent higher on the imported article than the domestic article, then this provision is inoperative.

Let us take some of the different types of cheese. American Cheddar sells at 79 cents a pound. Canadian at 75 cents. Therefore, the provisions would be operative as to Canadian Cheddar.

As to blue cheese, the domestic is 75 cents a pound; the imported is 79 cents a pound. It is the blue cheese more than any other that the cheese people apparently are concerned with. Therefore, the section will be operative as to blue cheese.

Take Roquefort, there is no competition with imported Roquefort cheese. So said every dairyman who has discussed the matter.

Take Italian cheese, the imported cheese sells from 89 cents to \$1.09 a

pound. Domestic variety sells at from 59 to 79 cents a pound.

Domestic Swiss cheese sells at 59 to 79 cents a pound. Imported Swiss cheese sells at \$1.19 to \$1.29 a pound.

So by this amendment we will eliminate from the operation of this section

any item that is not in competition with your domestic item.

I am sure there can be no objection to this amendment, and I urge its adoption.

The comparative prices of domestic and imported cheeses of different types are as follows:

Retail price June 19, 1952

Cheese type	A. Schur, Washington Market, New York City	Nat Drucker, Washington Market, New York City	Phil Alpert, 235 Fulton St., New York City	Karton, 131 Charles St., New York City	Composite of 3 other stores
American Cheddar.....	\$0.79	\$0.79	\$0.59		
Canadian Cheddar.....	.75	.85	.69		
Danish Blue.....	.79	.79			
Domestic Blue.....	.75	.75			
English Stilton.....		1.69			
French Roquefort.....	1.29	1.29			
Domestic Provoloni.....	.79	.79	.59	\$0.69	\$0.65-\$0.69
Imported Provoloni.....	1.09	1.09	.89	.99	1.19-1.30
Domestic Parmesano.....	.99	(1)			.75-.85
Imported Parmesano.....	\$1.49		\$1.19		1.29-1.49
Domestic Swiss.....	.69	.65	.59	.79	
Imported Swiss.....	1.29	1.29	1.19	1.25	
Italian Pecorino Romano.....		1.25	.89-1.29	.89-1.20	.95-1.19
Domestic Romano.....		(1)	4.69	(1)	
Argentine Romano.....		.99			
Domestic Swiss-type Gruyere.....		4.39			
Imported Gruyere.....		4.49			
Domestic Sardo (hard-grating Romano type).....					.72-.79
Argentine Sardo.....					.72-.79

¹ Not available.

² Italian.

³ Argentine.

⁴ When available.

⁵ Regular Romano type (domestic) not available in 10 stores contacted.

⁶ Portions.

Pursuant to leave granted to me in the House I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the following news item which appeared in today's Journal of Commerce:

DECLINES IN EXPORTS, IMPORTS LED BY AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

WASHINGTON, June 19.—A sharp drop in the value of agricultural products shipped out of this country in April was principally responsible for the drop in total exports which took place that month, the Census Bureau disclosed today.

April exports totaled \$1,321,800,000. This was \$82,700,000 below the March volume of \$1,404,500,000. During this time the drop in value of major export products amounted to \$69,700,000.

GRAIN EXPORTS

Wheat exports dropped from \$111,600,000 to \$85,800,000. Corn exports fell off from \$21,400,000 to \$15,000,000. Exports of other grains amounted to only \$20,500,000 in April as against \$27,900,000 in March.

Cotton exports meanwhile declined in value from \$94,200,000 to \$73,800,000 and tobacco exports from \$16,000,000 to \$11,100,000. Lard exports which were \$11,700,000 in March amounted to only \$6,900,000 the following month. Dairy product exports declined from \$7,200,000 to \$5,200,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MULTER) there were—ayes 30, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLLING: On page 3, line 15, insert the following section: "Sec. 103. Title II of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 202. (a) Whenever the President of the United States, acting upon the written

recommendation of the National Security Council, shall find that the national defense is endangered by a stoppage of production or a threatened stoppage of production in any one or more plants, mines, or facilities, as a result of the present management-labor dispute in the steel industry, the President is empowered and authorized to take possession of and to operate such plants, mines, or facilities (hereinafter referred to as "plants").

"(b) During the period in which the United States is in possession of any plant under this section, the duly designated representatives of the employees and the management of the plant shall be obliged to continue collective bargaining for the purpose of settling the issues in dispute between them: *Provided*, That during such period, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall continue to encourage the settlement of the dispute by the parties concerned.

"(c) Whenever an agreement concerning the terms and conditions of employment shall have been reached by representatives of the employees and the management of a plant in the possession of the United States under this section, or whenever in the judgment of the President it is no longer necessary in the interest of the national defense to continue possession and operation of any such plant, the President shall return such plant to the person lawfully entitled thereto: *Provided*, That possession by the United States shall be terminated not later than 6 months after the date upon which possession of the plant was taken initially under this section, unless the period of possession is extended by an act of Congress.

"(d) (1) When possession of any plant has been taken by the United States under this section, a compensation board of five members shall be established, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The compensation board shall determine (i) the amount to be paid as just compensation to the owner of any plant of which possession is taken and (ii) fair terms and conditions of employment of the employees in any such plant for the period of operation by the United States, other than changes relating to union shop, maintenance of membership, and similar ar-

rangements between employers and employees: *Provided*, That such terms and conditions shall be consistent with wage and price stabilization policies under this act.

"(2) The President shall make provision for such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary to enable the compensation board to perform its functions.

"(e) During the period in which the United States is in possession of any plant under this section, the President shall maintain such terms and conditions of employment with respect to the employees in the plant as may be determined from time to time by the compensation board under the authority of subsection (d), but he shall not enter into any contract governing such terms and conditions with the representatives of such employees.

"(f) Whenever any plant is in the possession of the United States under this section, it shall be the duty of the officers and employees of the plant to cooperate fully with the United States in the efficient operation of the plant, and it shall also be the duty of the officers of any labor organization whose members are employees of such plant to encourage such employees to give their full cooperation to the United States in the operation of the plant.

"(g) Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, or to deny any person whose property has been taken over by the United States under this act the right to a judicial determination of just compensation.

"(h) When the President shall have returned to its lawful owner any plant possession of which is taken under this section, he shall transmit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of all the proceedings in the case, including the events leading up to the taking of possession by the United States, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is out of order on the ground that it is not germane to this section or to this bill; that it is affirmative legislation not within the purview of the jurisdiction covered by the language of this act.

Mr. BOLLING. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. FULTON. I will be glad to reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves his point of order. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, the fact that a point of order is to be made against this amendment is but a clear indication that as the Supreme Court, or at least certain Justices of the Supreme Court, have pointed out in their decision deciding that the President did not have authority to seize the steel plants, the unwillingness of Congress to meet the situation which confronts us today when we find ourselves in a condition where our people are denied the advantages of steel production, where the whole defense effort is affected by lack of steel production; the crucial issue that confronts the Congress today is restoring production in the steel plants. Equally crucial, equally important in the consideration which the Congress should give to this subject is the manner of the

restoration of steel production; it should be the most equitable.

Until recently we have maintained steel production by various methods, methods based on the patriotism of management and labor, and on the efforts of the President of the United States. Now, after a period of more than 150 days after contract reopening we find ourselves once more without steel production. I think it is very significant that the Supreme Court took cognizance of the fact that the Congress, although having received two messages from the President, had taken no action.

I understand why so many Members are anxious to avoid affirmative action in this matter; it seems to me very clear, and I am entirely sure that the American people understand why the Congress does not desire to settle this matter affirmatively and fairly. There needs to be no explanation on the floor of this House why that is. The American people know what year this is and what month this is and what the Congress is doing. But it seems to me imperative that we now recognize that although Korea is 2 years in the past, in its beginning it is still with us, that the world situation today is no less grave than it was 2 years ago, that we must in this country, if we are to have an adequate defense for ourselves and our allies, have a continuing production of steel.

And we must do more than give lip service today in this year of our Lord, 1952, to the principle which we all know with great joy, equality of sacrifice.

We have permitted ourselves to get in a position where, in the eyes of the world and in the eyes of many American people, the Congress of the United States is acting on behalf of one side of a labor-management dispute.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order and ask unanimous consent to speak on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the point of order, which does not require unanimous consent.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may address the Chair, if he desires to do so, on the point of order.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, what was the gentleman from Missouri speaking on?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri was speaking on his amendment because the gentleman from Pennsylvania decided to reserve his point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is that the amendment is not germane to the pending bill, it involves labor legislation exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania renew the point of order?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BOLLING. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. If the gentleman wants to be heard further on the point of order the Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] offered an amendment to page 3, line 14, of the bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is not germane.

The Chair has had an opportunity to study the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] and it is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment proposes to make basic changes in our labor legislation. The amendment proposes further to amend title II of the Defense Production Act of 1950, which is the authority to requisition property. The amendment goes beyond, as the Chair understands the amendment, the mere requisition of property and, as the Chair has stated, proposes to make changes in our labor laws.

In view of the fact that it goes beyond the scope of title II of the Defense Production Act of 1950, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the question has come up here, not only on the point of order, but the reasons behind the point of order. As you all know, I come from a great industrial area and know, I think, a little about what is happening on the strike front. If I can say anything in disagreement, I say this strongly in disagreement of the statement by the previous speaker when he says that Congress should decide to settle this present dispute. Congress should stay out of the steel strike, and should not dictate the terms of settlement to either side. It is not your job and it is not my job as legislators.

The steel strike should be settled by collective bargaining, by agreement between the parties sitting at the collective-bargaining table, and the more Government stays out of collective bargaining the better it is going to be for everybody. Our current trouble is that there has been too much interference by the executive department of the Government. When a Member gets up on the floor of the House and says it is the duty of Congress to administer the law, I think he is misguided. It is the duty of the Executive to administer the laws, because this body of 435 Members cannot vote on wages and hours and prices and

conditions of employment in each case that comes up. That is for business, management, and labor to sit together and discuss. They know the steel business, and politics and Government interference will ruin it. We in Congress set the method for collective-bargaining procedures. Congress has provided ample legislation for the method for the handling of labor-management disputes, although I agree there is room for amendment in the interests of efficiency, and expediting even-handed justice.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does the public have any interest in the steel strike?

Mr. FULTON. The public certainly has an interest in the steel strike. The public has enough interest that it wants to see management and labor sit down and collectively bargain and settle the steel strike and protect and supply our men in Korea. But why should anyone try to put the burden on the Congress?

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Missouri speaks of the failure of the Congress to deal with the matter of seizure. I would point out to him that provisions for seizure have been before the Congress and they have been turned down by the Congress. Now, I, too, believe in the right of labor and management to bargain collectively. That is the cornerstone of our competitive enterprise system. These folks who prate of their great love for labor and management bargaining collectively ought to recognize that resort to seizure, as a general proposition, dealing with labor disputes, will be the death knell to collective bargaining.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana and thank him for his support. I opposed seizure strongly from the time the question of seizure came up and spoke against it in this House. I represent the great southern portion of the city of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County and, with the gentleman from Pennsylvania jointly represent the city of Clairton, a tremendous steel-producing area of this country. Seize steel and you seize the whole city. We in Pittsburgh and Clairton do not want to operate our basic industries under the Government; we do not want to nationalize the steel industry. In England they seized the basic industries one time more than they gave them back. They legislated and investigated the private owners right out of existence. The British Government investigated steel and coal and management was backed against the wall, and they interfered until there was no security for either labor or management. But the British Government did it for the best of motives to be helpful, but with disastrous results to labor, management, the private owners, as well as the whole British economy.

My policy all along has been that Congress should set the method and then say to business, industry, and labor, "You

do your own settling and make your own contracts, and stay away from the Congress." If the President and the Federal mediation agencies are not doing their job in assisting these people toward their own agreed settlement, I am very sorry that the President feels it should be turned into the lap of the Congress, because ours is a legislative job and not an executive job.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The main question is the question of the production of steel. On the question of collective bargaining, I think very few would disagree with the position taken by the gentleman. The important thing in the emergency of today that confronts our country and the world is the question of the production of steel and that is lost sight of. I would like to ask my friend this question. The Supreme Court has said that the President did not have the power to seize. Congress does have the power to pass legislation. I want to ask my friend, Does he think the President should use the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act?

Mr. FULTON. I believe this—

Mr. McCORMACK. Does he?

Mr. FULTON. I believe this—

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I will withdraw my question.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman does not need to worry about withdrawing it. Let me say that I have said before, and I say again, the President of the United States ought to use the law of the land that was worked out by the Congress after careful consideration to deal with national emergency strikes. Whether he likes the law or not, he ought to use it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman think the President should use the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act? The gentleman can say "Yes" or "No."

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to follow the statement I made earlier. I am going to object to any extension of time.

Mr. FULTON. Let it be on the record, I may say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, that I have honestly tried to answer the question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have never voted for any control legislation and I do not want to

do so now. But here we are writing a bill that will have in it something other than controls as originally intended.

There are some things which will be written in this bill in which I believe. For example, I believe that the President should use the law on the books. He took an oath that he would enforce the law, not part of the law—not part of the law. He said that after the Taft-Hartley law was adopted he would enforce it, yet he does not do it.

Then he came up here and asked the Congress to tell him what to do. Common decency, common courtesy, requires that we answer him, and I am in favor of telling him to go ahead and perform his sworn duty by using the Taft-Hartley Act. He said he would. I want by our action on this bill to assure the people and have him assure the people by his action, not words, that he is a man of veracity, a man of his word, that he will enforce the law.

We will get an amendment to this bill which will require the President, or request the President, to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act. I like that. It is a kindly respectful answer to his request, to a man in trouble. I would like to see it go through.

We will get an amendment then curtailing the powers of the Wage Stabilization Board. I like that. I would like to vote for that. The Sadlak amendment is in. I like that. I voted for it. There are three things that will be in the bill, and probably half a dozen more if the amendments go through, that I like, that I want to vote for. But I do not want to vote for controls. I hope someone during the evening or the night, and before tomorrow morning will give me a word of advice on how I can escape the dilemma in which I find myself.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] asked our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] whether he was in favor of enforcing the Taft-Hartley Act or asking the President to do so. If you ask me, my answer is, Sure I am. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] not in favor of that? Why, he ought to be. Now he is going to take 5 minutes here to give us one of those long, pleasing, and instructive political discourses.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want me to answer the question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman desires to do so.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman ask me, am I?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There you are. He is not in favor of suggesting to the Chief Executive, who ignores his sworn duty, who said that he would enforce the law but does not do it, he is not in favor of coming along and politely just requesting his President and my President to comply with his oath of office. He is welcome to take that position before the House and before the country. I want none of it. The gentleman said that what we needed is the production of steel. Why is not steel being produced now—today—why? Oh, let us be realists. There is only one reason and we all know that answer. The

President has entered into—I will not say a foul or a vile conspiracy, we will call it a holy alliance to go along with the union leaders to serve the purpose of Phil Murray. Look: Lo and behold who comes to his aid? John L. Lewis who had a judgment of the Supreme Court rendered against him personally at one time for contempt of the law. Did he not pay a fine for defying the law and the courts? He should have gone to jail. But here he is again. John says that he will contribute to those who are now refusing—refusing I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts—to produce steel which is needed to carry on the war effort, he will contribute what is it? Ten million dollars to those steelworkers to aid them in staying off the job of producing steel. Where did he get it? He got it out of the consumers of coal after the men who mined the coal had been paid their wages and John had levied his tribute on each and every pay check a miner received—that is on the wages ultimately paid by the consumers of coal.

We are not getting steel today because of this political alliance between the President of the United States and the president of the CIO, backed up by that defiler of the law, John L. Lewis, who you will remember contributed better than a half million dollars to the campaign of President Roosevelt at one time when he mistakenly thought, let it be said to the credit of President Roosevelt, that he was going to have something to say about the policies of that administration as they applied to labor.

If our Armed Forces are short of steel, if this country is short of steel, for domestic use, it is because the President of the United States has betrayed the people and has refused to go along with the law which the Congress has written, and which he said he would take and he now refuses to use. He refutes and goes back on his own solemn oath, on his promise made after the Taft-Hartley Act was passed. He refuses to do his duty to the men he has sent to Korea.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, this is a little interesting interlude which has brought a great deal of pleasure to the Members. The gentleman from Michigan has made his usual remarks about John L. Lewis. I wonder how John L. Lewis feels about being attacked by a Republican when John L. Lewis supported the Republican Party in 1940, 1944, and 1948. But that is his problem and not mine. John L. Lewis is a man with whom I have not always agreed. He is a man of strong character and I have a great deal of respect for him, because he has done much good for the mine workers and their families. I can remember in 1933, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, when I voted to report out the bill creating the Bituminous Coal Commission. The mine workers and their families are deeply indebted to the Democratic Party for that measure which saved them economically.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. In April of 1948 and in June of 1948 and in February 1950,

President Truman used the Taft-Hartley law against the coal miners and against John L. Lewis.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman answer my question now. Are you in favor of the President invoking the Taft-Hartley Act now?

Mr. FULTON. Were you in favor of the President using the Taft-Hartley law in April of 1948 against the coal miners and in June 1948, against the coal miners, and in February 1950, against the coal miners? Do you agree that the President was right on those occasions?

Mr. McCORMACK. The President exercised his authority under those conditions. There was not a 6 months' wait and a 6 months voluntary delay on the part of the leadership of the miners as there is in this case. President Truman has obtained cooperation for 6 months.

Mr. FULTON. What do you think of the current steel situation?

Mr. McCORMACK. President Truman has obtained for a period of 6 months the voluntary cooperation on the part of Phil Murray and the members of the steel workers union. Furthermore, they have not received an increase in pay since December 1950. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania deny that fact? Furthermore, if they got the increase in pay now recommended by the Wage Stabilization Board, they would not be receiving the salary that the General Electric Co. pays its employees now.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with you that the steel workers have cooperated voluntarily to keep production going, and that they should have a retroactive pay increase at this time through collective-bargaining procedures.

Mr. McCORMACK. One of the recommendations was a 12½-cent increase, retroactive to January of this year, with a 2½-cent increase starting July 1 of this year, and another 2½-cent increase starting in January, 1953. There are certain fringe benefits recommended.

How many of you realize that the steel workers do not get 1 penny for a holiday throughout the year? The General Electric workers, in their union contract, receive pay for seven holidays throughout the year. One of the fringe suggestions made was that the steel workers receive six holidays' pay throughout the year.

On March 21, the very day after the Wage Stabilization Board made its recommendations, the General Electric Co. management issued a statement to its employees and in a letter sent out stated that even with the wage increase recommended by the Wage Stabilization Board, the employees of the General Electric Co. were getting higher wages and better fringe benefits.

President Truman has urged the leaders of the steel workers not to resort to a strike. The 80 days under the Taft-Hartley Act would have transpired long ago. President Truman has more than accomplished the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act by continuing production

of steel from the steelworkers, while the Wage Stabilization Board panel was receiving evidence. Instead of being criticized, Phil Murray has shown that he is a man of outstanding ability and has cooperated in every way possible.

I do not want to get into any criticism of management. There are questions in dispute that should be adjusted around the table through collective bargaining. I recognize the question of a union shop; what kind of a union shop is a matter of collective bargaining. That was a recommendation that should be subjected to collective bargaining, but the fact remains that as far as wages are concerned, the Wage Stabilization Board never recommended a 26-cent an hour increase. They recommended 12½ cents an hour retroactive to January 1, 2½ cents further increase on July 1, and 2½ cents further increase in January 1953. In any event, let us go forward with this bill. I think it is wise that nothing involving labor one way or the other be put into this bill. Let it come out in separate legislation from the committee and let the House consider it as a separate bill.

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

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the specific purpose of giving the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] an opportunity to answer the question that he wanted to personally answer, which was put to him by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania is ready, I will yield to him to give him an opportunity to answer that question.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, when the Congress passed the Taft-Hartley law I voted for the Taft-Hartley law. I felt the President would impartially use the powers of his office in disputes between management and labor and would act impartially, but it has been aimed against certain groups. I find the President has used the Taft-Hartley law nine times; used it nine times, beginning with atomic energy in March of 1948. Then, in June 1948, he used it on the meat-packing industry. Two times he used it in 1948, and once in 1950 on the coal industry. In addition to that, he used the law in connection with the long-distance telephone lines in May of 1948.

Also on the east and west coasts and in the Great Lakes maritime industry he used the law in August of 1948. In addition to that in 1951 he used the law on the copper mine unions. Under those circumstances where the President himself has said the law was a valid instrument for assisting collective bargaining procedures and not for repressing human rights, on that basis I say the President in his discretion should use the Taft-Hartley law, except where it will cause undue hardship. That is his discretion.

It is not the duty of this Congress to say what the contract should be or to administer any law, including the Taft-Hartley law.

In the present steel industry dispute the President did not quickly move to do anything, and when he did move he moved toward an unconstitutional action, seizure. Of course, the Supreme Court struck down this seizure action. The Supreme Court, in its opinion, said the President had not yet exhausted his statutory remedies. That was correct.

I believe that when the parties in the steel dispute have cooperated for the length of time which they have in this current dispute, that the Government should take no severe action or interfere with the collective bargaining, when the parties are so near agreement. Neither the executive department of the Government nor Congress should permit the steel strike to be used as a political football in this election year. Public safety and our troops in Korea demand a prompt negotiated settlement of the steel dispute.

I might say to you what I have already said to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] so that the majority leader can see that I am impartial about this situation. I agree with the majority leader that there should be no basic labor-management legislation change in this present law. I said to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] that I likewise would raise a point of order to his amendment and if the amendment were put in would vote against it.

If the President cannot administer every law impartially, then we need a Republican President in November, and I hope the majority will agree.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Is it not a fact that in not one of the nine instances the gentleman from Pennsylvania has referred to where the Taft-Hartley Act was invoked, in not one instance has the union or the workers withheld action and withheld striking for 119 days as they did in the steel industry?

Mr. FULTON. Does not the gentleman think it is dishonest to the workers because they have been led on for these 119 days by the White House?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. MULTER. They have not been led on, but it would not be fair to them to ask them to wait another 80 days.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is abundantly evident that if the President in the beginning of the steel strike had justifiably exhausted all legislative means at his command the situation would be much different and we would be producing steel today; but because he did not, his action in seizing the steel industry was properly declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: Page 3, after line 14, add a new section as follows:

"Sec. 103. Title I of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 105. No authority is conferred under this act to participate in international allocations of commodities or materials and the provisions of this act may not be used to enforce or effectuate any such allocations."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment relates to the bill. It is a technical, drafting, perfecting amendment to carry out what I believe is the will of the House of Representatives as expressed a few minutes ago in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SAD-LAK].

Mr. Chairman, I spoke in support of the Sadlak amendment and said at that time that I did not think his amendment went far enough because it limited its application only to the International Materials Conference. The International Materials Conference has no statutory basis or foundation. It was something that was created out of the ether by the executive branch of the Government.

The Sadlak amendment would prohibit the carrying out of any allocations fixed by the International Materials Conference. But what guaranty do we have that there will not be a new commission or committee set up in the executive branch without authority of law dealing in this field of allocating materials on an international basis and using the enforcement procedures of this act to carry them out in this country, even though they may not be carried out in other countries?

My amendment would simply close the door so that there would be no authority to engage in the international allocation of commodities or materials, and would deny the enforcement provisions of this act in carrying out any such allocations. The amendment ought to be adopted by the committee as a perfecting amendment in order to fully carry out the will that the committee expressed by a vote of 169 to 102 within the last hour or hour and a half.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, with deep regard for my colleague who has proposed this amendment I believe it is too far-reaching and could hurt us. I am sure that the gentleman has no such intention, but I think that will be its effect in terms of the future of the United States and especially in terms of the defense program, and for this reason: What we do not seem to realize here, and I do not think we have decided this question—I do not think this is a perfecting amendment—is that this amendment would cut us off from international cooperation in respect to very scarce materials. What we fail to realize is that we do not control the world in this particular field; the world controls us. May I repeat that, we do not control the

world in this particular field; the world controls us.

When it comes to tin, rubber, zinc, lead, copper, and many other items, we get much of these supplies from the world. My best recollection is that 74 percent of all the strategic materials which are used in connection with the defense program come from overseas and these can be cut off from us if the world should feel we are getting too insular in our economic thinking. A good deal of them could conceivably be diverted to the Communists and in addition and what is more important these materials can cost us very much more money than they do now.

We know what happened on mercury from Spain, where the price went up astronomically once the defense emergency was upon us. We were similarly in trouble on the price of tin. We started to be in for a similar situation for a while on rubber and we could be "taken" on every other similar commodity if we blindly cut ourselves off completely from all international cooperation in respect to strategic materials.

This is a matter of the most vital importance. We must not take a short-sighted point of view because it will raise prices and raise over-all cost of defense. You can strike against what you do not like in respect to international agreement in strategic materials, and you have done that in these other amendments, but I do not believe it is in the interest of the country or in the interest of the defense program to cut ourselves off from the possibility of international economic cooperation on strategic materials. Many times we have seen amendments go through, nobody talking against them, just proposed and passed, which we thought were somewhat in line with what we did a little while ago. Then we have had a situation we did not want or contemplate. We will have just such a situation here, I believe, if this amendment passes and I would be derelict in my duty if I did not warn the Members of the House in such a situation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will not be agreed to. By legislation it ties the hands of the Government so that it cannot take the proper methods for securing to us the materials that are so essential in this time of emergency. It not only ties the hands of the Government today, for tomorrow, and for 2 years, if we extend it for a year. Now what could be more ill-considered than to say to the agencies of Government, "You cannot take the necessary steps to purchase the things that we need." We have largely nullified the International Materials Conference, and now we go further. We say that they cannot enter into these international agreements. Certainly you do not mean to do this. No one here knows how far-reaching that amendment will be or what might be its repercussions if trouble abroad came to us.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The appropriations subcommittee, of which I am a member, has before it now the question as to whether or not the Atomic Energy Program shall be expanded by \$3,900,000,000. It has been presented to our committee that almost all of the uranium needed for that program comes from countries other than our own. Who can say but what the effect of this amendment will be to cut off the supply of uranium to this country.

Mr. SPENCE. Of course it will. It will tie our hands not only to get these materials, but it will tie our hands in national defense. The bill should pass as it was presented to the House, and this amendment, if you wish to preserve our security and give the national authorities the right to take such action as may be necessary for that purpose, should be defeated. I venture to say that no Member knows how far-reaching the effect of the amendment may be.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEADER) there were—ayes 9, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago there was quite a colloquy here regarding the steel-wage-price controversy. Coming from the large iron ore area in northeastern Minnesota, we have over 16,000 very patriotic, sincere, hardworking iron ore miners. I feel constrained to make a few remarks here at this time in answer to the allegations made by the speakers on the other side of the aisle.

No. 1. It was implied that either the President or the steelworkers leadership, the great labor-statesman, Mr. Phil Murray, head of the United Steelworkers, CIO, had "led on" these workers. I want the RECORD to show here and now, and clearly that if there was any leading on by anybody it was done by the representatives of the steel industry of these United States. For over 90 days the leadership of labor, democratically elected by the organization, sat patiently by, urging representatives of the steel industry that they get around the table and engage in sound, effective collective bargaining. After a long delay during which time steel representatives refused to bargain at all, finally it was upon the invitation of representatives of the steel industry itself that the labor representatives went to New York, where they were left to cool their heels for 3 days in the hotels, waiting for collective bargaining sessions to begin—and I wish the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle would listen while the labor representatives were waiting to start negotiations in good faith, the steel industry spokesmen in the meantime were going out through the back door, contacting former Defense Mobilizer, Mr. Wilson, hoping to get a reasonable assurance that there would be a substantial increase in the price of steel before they would engage in honest negotiations with labor.

What followed is now a matter of public record—Mr. Wilson being unable to produce on any steel price hike he may have tentatively agreed to, resigned; and labor was right back where it started from way last December—trying to get the steel industry to bargain in good faith.

The distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, pointed out, and correctly so, the real facts in the whole labor situation when he quoted facts from a letter circulated by the management of General Electric. I have a photostatic copy of that letter. It is dated March 21, 1952, and entitled "Employee Relations News Letter, for Circulation Among General Electric Management."

Here GE management summarizes the steel recommendations made by the Wage Stabilization Board. They say that the pay increase is not the so-called package increase of 27½ cents but is instead a 12½ cents per hour pay increase as of January 1, 1952, with a 2½ cents per hour pay increase as of July 1, 1952, and a final 2½ cents per hour pay increase as of January 1, 1953.

Fringe benefits include, for example, six holidays with pay. The steelworkers have none at the present time. There were other minor fringe benefits.

Then the General Electric management letter goes on to compare the situation with that of their own employees, and this is what management says in its letter:

Comparison: So far as our situation is indicated in the above, the catch-up with us is after our 3.58-percent increase, and before our current offer.

It has been about 15 months since the steelworkers had an adjustment. In that time General Electric hourly employees have averaged over 15 cents pay increase allowed and another possible 2 to 3 cents offered currently.

This General Electric price increase does not include any fringe benefits. They mention the fringe benefits further, and I continue to quote from the letter:

You will note the fringe benefits—even with the new additions—are only being brought up into the neighborhood of those we have already. Our seven paid holidays, for instance, are now costing us almost 5 cents per hour.

So the head of General Electric, at that time the Defense Mobilizer, would deny to the CIO steelworkers that which he had months ago thought fair and equitable to the employees of General Electric.

This whole thing merely proves that the steelworkers' requests are modest and sincere. They are trying to catch up to the advances made in all other major segments of industry.

The President has a law called the Taft-Hartley law. It has not been made clear, even by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, when he was asked point blank to answer "yes" or "no," whether or not that law should be invoked. There were only rather general references made to it. President Truman told Congress that the Taft-Hartley law is a permissive piece of legislation which could not be effective in this situation, which is ex-

tremely critical because of the world situation.

In plain, simple, straight-forward language the President explained this whole controversy to Congress and asked for the necessary legislation to enable him to work out a solution fair to both parties and at the same time continue an uninterrupted flow of vitally needed steel. Congress neither granted the President such authority, nor did it have any alternative approach toward the settlement of this serious and critical problem—the President was merely told by the other body to invoke the Taft-Hartley law. It reminds me of a surgeon being instructed to use a clumsy meat cleaver in place of a precision scalpel with which to perform a delicate emergency operation.

Mr. FULTON. I would be glad to answer if the gentleman has time.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section, section 102, and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is that debatable, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Kentucky is not debatable.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is not the gentleman going to submit a unanimous-consent request, so that we can find out what it is all about?

Mr. SPENCE. I am perfectly willing to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, are there any further amendments pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not aware of any further amendments pending to section 102.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Would the Chair entertain a parliamentary inquiry as to whether there are any further amendments pending?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Michigan desires to submit such a parliamentary inquiry, the Chair will be glad to entertain it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Chair in turn ask the committee if there are any further amendments to section 102?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will make the statement that if there are no further amendments to section 102 the Clerk will read.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think that is the better way of handling it.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 103. The first sentence of section 302 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "and manufacture of newsprint."

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORRESTER: On page 3, after line 18, insert the following new subsection:

"Section 104, paragraph 2 of subsection D of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following

new sentence: 'No regulation or order shall be issued or remain in effect, under this title which prohibits the payment or receipt of hourly wages at a rate of \$1 per hour or less.'"

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be very glad to hear the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] on the point of order.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to a section which deals directly with wages and this amendment absolutely relates to wages.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Arkansas for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Is the gentleman's amendment to section 103 or section 104?

Mr. FORRESTER. It is a new section, which would be added at page 3, after line 18, to insert a new subsection.

Mr. HARRIS. Would the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry further, if I ask that it not be taken out of the gentleman's time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time is running against the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is offered in the wrong point in the bill, but we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Does this mean we have passed over section 103 already?

Mr. FORRESTER. They have read through section 103.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point that section 104 has not been read, if the gentleman is offering an amendment to section 104.

Mr. FORRESTER. This is a new section before you get to section 104.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to advise the gentleman from Arkansas that the gentleman from Georgia has offered an amendment at page 3, after line 18, to insert a new section. The amendment has been read and the Chair has recognized the gentleman to proceed with debate. The gentleman in turn yielded to the gentleman from Arkansas for a parliamentary inquiry. The point of order comes too late.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, is the Chair holding that we have already passed section 103?

The CHAIRMAN. It seems that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia comes at the proper place.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, we accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia may proceed. The Chair will advise the gentleman that the time consumed on the point raised by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is not being taken out of his time.

Permit the Chair to inquire of the gentleman from Arkansas if he has an amendment to section 103?

Mr. HARRIS. No, Mr. Chairman; but I did want something to say on section 103.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have the opportunity to speak on section 103.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, is this on section 104 of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not yet read section 104.

The gentleman from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given the proper 5 minutes of time, as he has not had a chance to speak one word on his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the Chair will now recognize the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, we would like very much to hear the gentleman's speech, but the committee will accept his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must advise the gentleman from Georgia that time is running against the 5 minutes for which he has been recognized.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I had reserved the right to object, simply to tell the gentleman that I think he should take his 5 minutes, with the knowledge that there is no objection to his amendment on this side.

Mr. FORRESTER. I am delighted to hear that. I am extremely grateful that the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle accept this amendment. I would like to tell you a little about the amendment. This will relieve a lot of administrative procedure on the part of your people, whatever State you come from, and give you an opportunity to increase wages up to \$1 per hour, without having to resort to the Wage Board. I believe every one of you are for it. I appreciate the fact that you are accepting the amendment on both sides of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this section?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, there are other amendments to this section, I am sure. I know of one Member who expected to offer a very important amendment at this point. Relying upon assurance which I had no right to give him, that the Committee was going to rise at 5:30 and that his amendment undoubtedly would not be reached today, he has left the floor. Inasmuch as it was the intention, as I understood it, for the Committee to rise at 5:30, to protect that situation if there are no other amendments pending, I suggest to the Chairman that the Committee do now rise.

NEWSPRINT—EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on the importance of this section and emphasize what it means to the American people. By this section 103, newsprint is included as necessary to our national defense. This extends the lending provision by Government to expansion of newsprint production. This is sorely needed. It is a reflection on our ingenuity to be so dependent on foreign supply of this necessary product.

Currently United States consumption of newsprint is about 6,000,000 tons annually. This is supplied by some 1,050,000 tons of domestic production, 4,750,000 tons imported from Canada, and 200,000 tons imported from Scandinavia. Slightly under 80 percent of total supply is derived from Canada.

Current United States newsprint manufacturing capacity is about 1,100,000 tons, while that of Canada is some 5,500,000 tons. Plants are presently running slightly over theoretical capacity.

For some few months and right at the moment there appears to be approximate balance between over-all United States supply and demand. At best, however, the situation is none too easy and there is imbalance among publishers. Consumption is estimated to be on the increase in the amount of some 600,000 tons in the next 6 years and 1,000,000 tons in the next 10 years. Canadian manufacturers estimate that principally through speed-up of older facilities they will have little difficulty in increasing capacity to meet this estimated increased demand.

A basic problem is inherent in the extent to which both present United States demand and the projected increase in demand is dependent upon Canadian sources for its meeting. At the time of the First World War most of the United States consumption was met domestically. Not only was the subsequent increase met by the building of plants in Canada, but United States mills converted to other types of paper making so that today we have less newsprint capacity than 30 years ago.

Actually, this situation, as we have seen, has been accompanied by a series of price increases by Canadian manufacturers, the latest of \$10 a ton just now going into effect, so that the total is now \$126 per ton, or twice that of 6 years ago. At the moment this country apparently has little alternative to the acceptance of such increases. Their grave effect, however, upon the ability of newspapers to continue in unfettered operation, is quite obvious.

The newsprint subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, accordingly, has explored the possibilities of expansion of United States newsprint manufacturing capacity. A major deterrent to such expansion is the present high cost of construction, estimated at two and a half to three times the installed cost of most plants now in operation.

Some assistance to would-be manufacturers is contained in the accelerated tax amortization provisions of section 124

(a) of the Internal Revenue Act, but in nearly 2 years now only 375,000 tons of new capacity has been projected by this route, although the Defense Production Administration itself has sponsored a program totaling 494,000 tons increase.

The subcommittee, therefore, is pleased to note that in the extension of the Defense Production Act, as reported, the Banking and Currency Committee has approved the inclusion of a provision in section 302 of the act which endorses the principle of a free press as essential to defense by making it possible for new newsprint manufacturers to secure financial assistance through direct Government loans for this purpose. This provision needs specific spelling out, as hitherto defense agencies have not construed their authority under this section as broad enough to cover the expansion of newsprint facilities.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In order that I may advise the membership of the House, I wish to state that when we go back into the House I shall ask unanimous consent that when we adjourn today we adjourn to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock. I wanted to make that announcement of my intention, with such a full membership.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the membership is glad to have the information and I thank the majority leader. We have all heard about the very difficult situation with regard to newsprint. I wanted to commend the Committee on Banking and Currency for including this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. I am very sure under the circumstances the committee is very appreciative of those kind words.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8210) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING JUNE 20

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include an amendment which I expect to offer in the Committee of the Whole tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am directing the attention of the membership of the House that on tomorrow when the bill, Defense Production Acts of 1952, is read for amendments, I shall offer an amendment, unless a Member secures recognition with a similar amendment before I am recognized. The proposed amendment reads as follows:

After the words "Sec. 104", insert "That section 402 (f) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: 'Provided, however, That the ceiling price of any material, which by its nature is not susceptible to speculative buying and not more than 10 percent of which is purchased with Government funds for defense purposes, shall be suspended as long as: (1) The material is selling below the ceiling price and has sold below that price for a period of 6 months; or (2) the material is in adequate or surplus supply to meet current civilian and military consumption and has been in such adequate or surplus supply for a period of 6 months, if such material requires expansion of productive facilities beyond the levels needed to meet the civilian demand as set forth in section 2 of this act. For the purpose of this proviso, a material shall be considered in adequate or surplus supply whenever such material is not being allocated for civilian use under the authority of title I of this act.'"

I take this means of calling the attention of the membership to my proposal in order that you may be familiar with its content and meaning when it is submitted for your consideration.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment really carries out the intent of Congress when the Office of Defense Production of 1950, was approved.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 8243) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications which were read by the Clerk:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1952.
Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Texas my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Seventh District of Texas, effective midnight June 30, 1952.

A copy of my letter to the Governor is enclosed herewith.

Respectfully yours,

TOM PICKETT,
Member of Congress.

[Enclosure.]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1952.

Hon. ALLAN SHIVERS,
Governor of Texas, Austin, Tex.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I hereby tender to you my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the Seventh District of Texas, effective midnight, June 30, 1952.

Respectfully yours,

TOM PICKETT,
Member of Congress.

BRONZE REPLICA OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 84.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Library is hereby authorized to hold ceremonies in the rotunda of the United States Capitol for the acceptance of the bronze replica of the Declaration of Independence, the gift of Michael Francis Doyle, of Philadelphia, such ceremonies to be held on July 2, 1952, the one hundred and seventy-sixth anniversary of the adoption of the resolution of Richard Henry Lee for the Declaration of Independence by the Continental Congress in Philadelphia.

The Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the ceremonies, the expenses of which shall not exceed the sum of \$1,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

DISCRIMINATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I again wish to bring before the House the matter of discrimination that I think is practiced against New England, and I have reference particularly to Massachusetts, in the awarding of Government contracts. I refer also to discrimination against helping those industries after the contracts have been awarded to complete the contracts, even

to the extent of forcing an industry or industries to go into bankruptcy, whereas a little help, a little patience, and a little more in the way of loans would enable business to progress. These loans will be repaid in full as was the case in World War II. People will be able to work.

I have in mind one company in particular that makes a very vital defense product. When an industry goes into bankruptcy it requires about 9 months for another industry to take over and make the product which is needed so vitally in our national defense. It is incredible to me and I cannot understand why this is done.

Many people in the Department of the Army want to help, and people in other departments want to help, but someone steps in and stops their efforts and it is all over. People are thrown out of work and there is experienced great difficulty on the part of creditors to get their money and, of course, there is great lack of production for national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I find that the Navy does not seem to be practicing this discrimination to the same extent. The Navy awards seem to be more justly given. I know of a case in my district where a man was \$20,000 low in his bid on a cotton product yet he was not awarded the contract on account of a very flimsy technicality, a false excuse. If he had the will to fight, I am sure the Comptroller General would have agreed with him and he would have had a \$250,000 order. But he was afraid to fight the Government. That seems like Russia—not free America.

I do not know why the Army Department seems to be more difficult in this respect than the Navy. There is confusion in many of the special commissions that are appointed. They want to do all they can, but, in my opinion, many of them simply go around in circles. They get to the point of getting an industry started or they will help an industry, then the whole project collapses. There are numerous board meetings where nothing is accomplished; in the meantime we are lacking many items in our defense production.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. I have watched the gentlewoman for a number of years and I always admire the interest which she has in her great State of Massachusetts. It is a wonderful thing to love and fight for your country. But, you know, I have also heard people say that if the Government assists industry, it is socialism and if they do not, it is tyranny. Of course this does not apply to the able gentlewoman from Massachusetts. What would the gentlewoman suggest we do? It is socialistic if Government agencies assist industry and loan them money, and if they do not, it is tyranny, and throwing them into bankruptcy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman very much. I know that he has always been interested in public and national affairs. They are in many instances helping industry by

loans in different parts of the country. Massachusetts should have its fair share of loans.

Mr. LYLE. But it has been said on the floor that any time the Government undertakes to assist industry, that is either fraud or socialism.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Not always. I will say to the gentleman that many areas secure many loans for industry and many contracts are awarded when New England cannot receive them. I have never said that it is fraud or socialism to help war industries.

Mr. LYLE. The gentlewoman will find that statement in the Record.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have spoken on the floor frequently and I have never so stated that.

Mr. LYLE. Not the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. But, you understand, the cry is made.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Not that I am doing it personally.

Mr. LYLE. No; never have I heard the gentlewoman say that, but the cry is made that if the Government attempts to assist industry, that that is socialism; they ought to go to the banks; they ought to borrow from the RFC and let the people completely alone. And, if they do not do it, it is tyranny, and they run them into bankruptcy. So, actually, to the detriment of many small businesses, they are often relegated to take some great industry, well financed and well engineered, and give them the prime contract, and then let it dribble down to small industry.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it is very confusing, I will say to the gentleman from Texas. I think there is a lack of coordination and cooperation, and above all great favoritism is shown to certain areas of the country. I doubt very much if the Secretary of National Defense has much power himself. The whole national-defense system today is ineffective.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I regret that official business detained me in the District so that I could not be here to speak under the special order I had for Tuesday, June 17.

It was my intention on that date to insert in the Record a reply from Henry J. Kaiser to the charges I made in the House of Representatives on May 21, 1952.

I strongly feel that whenever charges are made against any person or group that ample opportunity should be given to enable that person or group to make reply through the same channels as those through which the charges were made. This is the American way.

As soon as the charges were made, Henry J. Kaiser's offices informed me that a reply would be made. On Thursday, June 12, I received the reply containing some 85 pages. In keeping with the principles of good Americanism that anyone against whom charges are made should be given an opportunity through

the same channels to make adequate reply I intended to insert Henry J. Kaiser's reply in the Record on Tuesday. It has already been inserted by one of my colleagues.

I wish to state at this time I had hoped to make some additional statements. However, due to the length of the reply and the press of my regular duties I have not had sufficient opportunity to study the reply.

Until such time as I have had ample opportunity to study the reply it is impossible for me to make any further statements on this matter at this time.

I have no objection to my colleague, Congressman JAMES MORRISON, of Louisiana, inserting the Kaiser reply for I would have done that if I had been here on Tuesday. However, all other statements attributed to me should have been released by me personally and only at my own discretion. The obvious reason for this being the fact that I did not have ample opportunity to study the reply and hence could not reach any conclusions. For that reason I request that all of these statements attributed to me will be expunged from the record. And because of lack of opportunity to study the reply at this time I am compelled to disown all such statements. Until a close study can be made of the reply any retractions or further statements would not be in order and meaningless.

I respectfully call the attention of the Members of the House to this reply and after I have made a thorough study of it, I shall have a further statement to make on this subject.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. VINSON, for 10 days, on account of important business.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. BROOKS), for 10 days, on account of illness in his family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record or to revise and extend remarks, was granted as follows to:

Mr. BARTLETT and to include an address delivered at the University of Alaska by Hon. John C. Wright.

Mr. HART and to include an editorial.

Mr. O'NEILL and to include a letter received from Dr. V. Stefan Krajacovic.

Mr. MORANO and to include a tribute to James L. McGovern.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN the remarks he will make in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER and to include an editorial.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN and to include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH, the remarks he will make in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND the remarks he will make in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HORAN and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan in two instances and also the remarks he will make in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER the remarks he will make in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER in two instances.

Mrs. BOLTON relative to the recent effort of two constituents to be heard on a matter greatly affecting fire and police widows and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include a letter received from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and an enclosure in relation to the extension of the Defense Production Act.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia in two instances and to include extraneous matter in one instance.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include a magazine article written by Beardsley Ruml, notwithstanding the fact that the Public Printer estimates the cost will be \$196.

Mr. PRICE and to include a record on mine safety, notwithstanding the fact that the Public Printer estimates the cost will be \$448.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIVERS to extend his remarks under the authority of general permission granted on S. 658 amending the Communications Act, and include two addresses by a former Member of Congress, the Honorable Robert F. Jones, one delivered at Columbus, Ohio, on May 1, and the other at Pittsburgh, Pa., on May 20.

Mr. GAVIN.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in three instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. BAKEWELL and include extraneous material.

Mr. SCHENCK and include an editorial from a Hamilton, Ohio, newspaper.

Mr. JENISON and include a report.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. JENISON) and to include a report.

Mr. BRHEM and to include the text of a citation on the awarding of a medal of honor to a boy in his district.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5990. An act to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 20, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1579. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to urging that the Congress give early and favorable attention to the bills H. R. 7571 and S. 3061 now pending before it, which would enable the men and women in our armed services to exercise their right to vote (H. Doc. No. 513); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1580. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 10, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach-erosion-control study of the shore line of the State of Connecticut, area 4, Connecticut River to Hammonasset River, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 514); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1581. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the loan of certain naval patrol type vessels to the Government of Japan"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee of conference. S. 677. An act 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 (Rept. No. 2199). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7654. A bill to amend section 508 of title 14, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 2200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3195. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 241. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 8243. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1422. An act for the relief of Jerry J. Lencioni; without amendment (Rept. No. 2201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2232. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products; without amendment (Rept. No. 2202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York; Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2075. A bill for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York; Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2171. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Robinson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2181. A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner; with amendment (Rept. No. 2207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2780. A bill for the relief of Clara Gabriel; without amendment (Rept. No. 2208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2972. A bill for the relief of Harold Joe Davis; with amendment (Rept. No. 2209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3268. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers; with amendment (Rept. No. 2210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3502. A bill for the relief of Arthur Staveley; with amendment (Rept. No. 2211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4296. A bill for the relief of Franklin Jim; with amendment (Rept. No. 2212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4398. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Columbia Basin Orchard, the Seattle Association of Credit Men, and the Perham Fruit Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5207. A bill for the relief of Julio Mercado Toledo; without amendment (Rept. No. 2214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4909. A bill for the relief of Arthur J. Boucher; with amendment (Rept. No. 2215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5538. A bill for the relief of Alexel Frank; with amendment (Rept. No. 2216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6738. A bill for the relief of Mary Fox; without amendment (Rept. No. 2217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6788. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery; without amendment (Rept. No. 2218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7094. A bill for the relief of Pio Valensin; with amendment (Rept. No. 2219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York; Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 685. A resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 8159) for the relief of P. Diacon Zadeh; without amendment (Rept. No. 2203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 8293. A bill to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of the lower Brule and the Crow Creek Reservations in South Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development; and to authorize an appropriation for the removal from the taking area of the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, and the reestablishment of the Indians of the Yankton Indian Reservation, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 8294. A bill to authorize the construction of a ships' base for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 8295. A bill to authorize the construction of two surveying ships for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 8296. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 8297. 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.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 8298. A bill to provide pensions for all World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 8299. A bill to provide that a taxpayer may elect to have section 340 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (relating to family partnerships) apply to certain taxable years beginning after 1938; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. Res. 701. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct a comparative study of the different kinds of employees' benefits available to persons in public and private employment; 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. 8300. A bill for the relief of Jose Cristiano Vieira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 8301. A bill for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 8302. A bill for the relief of Wendelin Schweitzer and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 8303. A bill for the relief of Spain-hour Furniture Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 8304. A bill for the relief of Rosa Huch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8305. A bill for the relief of Hildgard Helena Stern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FURCOLO (by request):

H. R. 8306. A bill for the relief of Joseph Strani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 8307. A bill for the relief of Chaim Borgenicht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8308. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Klein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 8309. A bill for the relief of Maria Adam (Maria Adam Schattauer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8310. A bill for the relief of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 8311. A bill for the relief of Pallie D. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 8312. A bill for the relief of Ruth Mangold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 8313. A bill for the relief of Margherita Gentile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE.

H. R. 8314. A bill for the relief of Epaniondos Zhoustis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

764. Mr. GROSS presented a petition submitted by Mrs. John Frisbie, of Eldora, Iowa, and 33 other citizens supporting House bill 2188, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1952

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 10, 1952)

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

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Father of us all, we pause in this moment to praise Thy glorious name. We would reaffirm our faith and allegiance in the things unseen which, from the beginning, have been the fabric and fiber of our Nation's life. Help us to plant the seeds of confidence in spiritual things wherever we may go. Assist us to strengthen the bulwark of liberty by a serene trust in the things that cannot be shaken. Help us not to be torn asunder or put to flight by the utterances of little men, but rather enable us to stand strong in the faith that we know is able to encompass and overcome all lesser things, because it is of Thee. We pray in the name of Him who came to make all things new. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 19, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 19, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 97. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee; and

S. 1828. An act to confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 677. An act 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; and

H. R. 6291. An act 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.

CONVENTION AND RECOMMENDATION OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 516)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting an authentic text of a convention (No. 94), and an authentic text of a recommendation (No. 84) concerning labor clauses in public contracts, adopted on June 29, 1949, by the International Labor Conference, at Geneva from June 8 to July 2, 1949, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. IVES was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning at 3:30 this afternoon until Tuesday, June 24, 1952.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may make insertions in the Rec-

ord and transact other routine business, without debate.

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

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

THE POINT 4 PROGRAM—LETTER FROM PAUL C. EMPIE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a copy of an important message to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], sent by the executive director of the National Lutheran Council, Paul C. Empie. This letter points up the importance of continued adequate appropriations for the point 4 program for aid to underdeveloped areas, particularly in Asia. I for one believe that point 4 holds immense possibilities for humanitarian and intelligent aid to these various foreign peoples. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point and be thereafter referred to the Appropriations Committee.

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

NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., June 18, 1952.

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, the United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In connection with your consideration of this bill, I want to stress the deep interest the church people of America have in the point 4 program. In annual meeting the National Lutheran Council adopted the following resolution:

"That the National Lutheran Council express its appreciation for the underlying Christian idealism in the 'point 4' program of the United States Government, and for the increasing emphasis and support being given by the Government to programs of technical assistance which help the peoples of economically underdeveloped areas toward a fuller realization of their desires for a better economic, social and cultural future."

I note that the Congress has already made a substantial cut from the administration's askings for point 4. Further, I understand that the largest cut in the whole bill, 32.6 percent, was voted on the request of the Administration for the point 4 program in Asia. It is our hope that the Congress will now appropriate the full amount authorized for these positive programs of the point 4 type which give so much promise in the present world situation.