

Brig. Gen. Robert Hunter Clarkson, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. James Alexander Crothers, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Edward Courtney Bullock Danforth, Jr., [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Carlton Spencer Dargusch, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Robert Charles Dean, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. John Ross Delafield, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Brice Pursell Disque, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Georges Frederic Doriot, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Henry Russell Drowne, Jr., [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. John Bettes Dunlap, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Ken Reed Dyke, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Daniel Collier Elkin, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Edward Arthur Evans, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Charles Birdsall Ferris, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Charles Lyn Fox, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. James Calvin Frank, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Michael Joseph Galvin, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Robert Joshua Gill, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Thomas Rodman Goethals, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Harold Leroy Goss, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Edward Samuel Greenbaum, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Robert Dinwiddie Groves, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Clement Bates Ellery Harts, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Ernest Henry Hawkwood, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. John David Higgins, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Maurice Hirsch, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Gordon Cloyd Hollar, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Julius Cecil Holmes, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Whitfield Jack, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Ephraim Franklin Jaffe, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. William Rodes Jesse, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Bernhard Alfred Johnson, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Edwin Whiting Jones, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Kenneth Barnard Keating, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Henry Kirksey Kellogg, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Francis Rusher Kerr, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. John Reed Kilpatrick, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Rudolph Charles Kuldeil, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Norman Miller Lack, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Andrew Frank McIntyre, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Ralph Hendricks McKee, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Hugh Stanford McLeod, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Richard Leeson McNelly, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. William Claire Menninger, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton II, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. John Williams Morgan, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. William Robert Clayton Morrison, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Harry Paul Newton, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Henry Carlton Newton, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. John Joseph O'Brien, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. George Hamden Olmsted, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Frederick Henry Osborn, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Ralph Albert Palladino, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Washington Platt, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Russell Archibald Ramsey, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Isidor Schwaner Ravdin, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Francis J. Reichmann, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Henry Joseph Reilly, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Riter, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. James Thomas Roberts, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Francis Willard Rollins, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Charles Eskridge Saltzman, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, [REDACTED]

Brig. Gen. Herbert Norman Schwarzkopf, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Harry Hodges Semmes, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Henry Alden Shaw, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. John Henry Sherburne, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Conrad Edwin Snow, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Oscar Nathaniel Solbert, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Albert Hummel Stackpole, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Carl Ferdinand Steinhoff, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Arthur Elsworth Stoddard, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. William Miles Stokes, Jr., [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Frederick Smith Strong, Jr., [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Carl Thomas Sutherland, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. John Thomas Taylor, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Samuel Morgan Thomas, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Lamar Tooze, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Kenneth Castle Townson, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Thomas Edison Troland, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Morris Carlton Troper, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Alfred Girard Tuckerman, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Elbert Parr Tuttle, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Herbert Harold Vreeland, Jr., [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Frederick Marshall Warren, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Arthur Pope Watson, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Richard Seabury Whitcomb, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Lawrence Harley Whiting, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. L. Kemper Williams, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. William James Williamson, [REDACTED]  
 Brig. Gen. Thomas Bayne Wilson, [REDACTED]

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
 The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose blessed Son identified for us the true way of life and always walked in it, inspire us daily with the urge, the faith, and the courage to follow and walk in that same way.

Grant that we may be ready to challenge, with the inexhaustible and invincible resources of Thy divine wisdom and strength, every difficult human problem which we may encounter.

May we be numbered among those courageous souls who fear man and circumstances and hard experiences so little because they fear God so much.

Show us how we may hasten the coming of that glorious day when every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that the Christ is the Lord to the glory of God. Give us the assurance that nothing can ever separate us from Thy love. Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 23, 1953, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one

of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 14, 1953:

H. R. 2332. An act to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

On March 23, 1953:

H. R. 2466. An act to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas.

## SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MARCH 24, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,  
 House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on March 23, 1953, the Clerk yesterday received from the Secretary of the Senate a message reflecting the action taken by that body on the bill (H. R. 3053) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," and amendments thereto, which message is attached herewith.

Very truly yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,  
 Clerk of the House of Representatives.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The message announced that the Senate agrees 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. 3053) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

*Resolved*, That the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate amendments numbered 24 and 27; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Senate recedes from amendment numbered 33 to the above-entitled bill.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1362. An act for the relief of Rose Martin; and

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, March 23, he signed the following enrolled bills of the House:

On March 23, 1953:

H. R. 1362. An act for the relief of Rose Martin.

On March 24, 1953:

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

**REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111)**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganizations in the Department of Agriculture.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 is designed to make it possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to simplify and improve the internal organization of the Department of Agriculture. It is substantially in accord with the recommendations made in 1949 by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

With certain exceptions, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 transfers to the Secretary of Agriculture the functions now vested by law in other officers, and in the agencies and employees, of the Department. It allows the Secretary to authorize any other officer, agency, or employee of the Department to perform any function vested in the Secretary. He is directed to utilize this delegation authority in such a way as to further certain objectives set forth in the reorganization plan. Those objectives are to simplify and make effective the operation of the Department of Agriculture, to place the administration of farm programs close to the State and local levels, and to adapt the administration of the programs of the Department to regional, State, and local conditions. Further, to the extent deemed practicable by the Secretary, he is required to give appropriate advance public notice and to afford appropriate opportunity for interested persons and groups to present to the Department of Agriculture their views on such proposed delegations of the Secretary as involve assignments of major functions or major groups of functions to major constituent organizational units of the Department or their officers.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 will permit the establishment of a clearer line of responsibility and authority from the President through the Secretary of Agriculture down to the lowest level of operations in the Department. It will make the Secretary responsible under law for activities within his Department for which he is now in fact held accountable by the President, the Congress, and the public. Also, it will enable the Secretary, from time to time, to adjust the organization of the Department in order to achieve continuous improvement in operations to meet changing conditions.

The Congress has in the past repeatedly followed the sound policy of vesting functions directly in department heads so that they can be held accountable for the performance of their agencies. In acting upon recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Ex-

ecutive Branch of the Government, the Congress approved, in 1949 and 1950, a series of statutes and reorganization plans which applied that policy to all the executive departments except the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture. While some laws vest important functions directly in the Secretary of Agriculture, others place major functions in subordinate officers and agencies of the Department. By transferring to the Secretary the latter functions, with certain exceptions, the reorganization plan corrects the present patchwork assignment of statutory functions in the Department.

The functions excepted from transfer to the Secretary are the functions of hearing examiners under the Administrative Procedure Act; of the corporations of the Department, including their boards of directors and officers; of the Advisory Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and of the Farm Credit Administration and the banks, corporations, and associations supervised by it.

The exception of the hearing examiners is in accordance with the intent of the Administrative Procedure Act, and is consistent with the status of hearing examiners in other departments and agencies.

The corporations of the Department, together with their boards of directors and officers, are excepted because they have a different legal status than other constituent agencies of the Department. Bodies corporate have independent legal personalities and act in their own name rather than in the name of the Department of Agriculture or of the United States.

The same reasons which prompt the exception of the corporations of the Department make desirable the exception of the entities supervised by the Farm Credit Administration. The Farm Credit Administration itself is also excepted, since it is anticipated that general legislation covering this field will be recommended to the Congress.

The Department of Agriculture now has only one Assistant Secretary. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 provides the Secretary with two more Assistant Secretaries and an Administrative Assistant Secretary to aid him in supervising the Department. The Assistant Secretaries will be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Administrative Assistant Secretary will be appointed under the classified civil service by the Secretary, with the approval of the President. These methods of appointment are similar to those prevailing in other executive departments.

The Secretary will prescribe the functions to be performed by these new assistants. It is his intention to have the new Assistant Secretaries aid him in providing closer policy and program supervision over the Department of Agriculture, and to have the new Administrative Assistant Secretary perform substantially the same role as that performed by the Administrative Assistant Secretaries in other departments. Thus, the new officers will assist the Secretary in giving continuous attention to matters which are essential for the most

efficient and economical operation of the Department.

The Secretary of Agriculture has advised me that the two new offices of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and the one new office of Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, provided for in the reorganization plan, will merely replace existing positions in the Department, and that hence the creation of these offices will not result in any net increase in the personnel in the Department of Agriculture. He has further advised me that both the number of officers and employees in the Office of the Secretary and the aggregate of their salaries will be less than those existing prior to January 1, 1953.

The Secretary of Agriculture, aided by the Interim Agricultural Advisory Committee, has been studying the organization and functions of the Department of Agriculture. Recently the Secretary rearranged the organizational units of the Department so as to form (in addition to the Office of the Solicitor and a reorganized Foreign Agricultural Service) four major groups of agencies, each with a supervising head to whom the agencies within the group report. By so doing, the Secretary sought both to reduce the number of separate officials reporting to him and to improve coordination within the Department. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 will make it possible for the Secretary to make further internal adjustments within the Department as study and experience identify opportunities for improvement. It will thus further the better management of the affairs of the Department of Agriculture.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I have found and hereby declare that it is necessary to include in the accompanying reorganization plan, by reason of reorganizations made thereby, provisions for the appointment and compensation of two Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture and an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

Reductions in expenditures will result from reorganizations of the Department of Agriculture made possible by the taking effect of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, but such reductions cannot be itemized at this time.

I recommend that the Congress allow the accompanying reorganization plan to become effective.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 25, 1953.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953  
(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, March 25, 1953, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, approved June 20, 1949, as amended)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Subject to the exceptions



specified in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions not now vested in him of all other officers, and of all agencies and employees, of the Department of Agriculture.

(b) This section shall not apply to the functions vested by the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1001 et seq.) in hearing examiners employed by the Department of Agriculture nor to the functions of (1) corporations of the Department of Agriculture, (2) the boards of directors and officers of such corporations, (3) the Advisory Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation, or (4) the Farm Credit Administration or any agency, officer, or entity of, under, or subject to the supervision of the said administration.

SEC. 2. Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture: Two additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each such Assistant Secretary shall perform such functions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall, from time to time, prescribe and each shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments.

SEC. 3. Administrative Assistant Secretary: An Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture shall be appointed, with the approval of the President, by the Secretary of Agriculture under the classified civil service, and shall perform such functions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall, from time to time, prescribe. The provisions of the item numbered (1) of the third proviso under the heading "General Provisions" appearing in Chapter XI of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, approved June 5, 1952 (66 Stat. 121), are hereby made applicable to the position of Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 4. Delegation of functions: (a) The Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of Agriculture of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan.

(b) To the extent that the carrying out of subsection (a) of this section involves the assignment of major functions or major groups of functions to major constituent organizational units of the Department of Agriculture, now or hereafter existing, or to the heads or other officers thereof, and to the extent deemed practicable by the Secretary, he shall give appropriate advance public notice of delegations of functions proposed to be made by him and shall afford appropriate opportunity for interested persons and groups to place before the Department of Agriculture their views with respect to such proposed delegations.

(c) In carrying out subsection (a) of this section the Secretary shall seek to simplify and make efficient the operation of the Department of Agriculture, to place the administration of farm programs close to the State and local levels, and to adapt the administration of the programs of the Department to regional, State, and local conditions.

SEC. 5. Incidental transfers: The Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time effect such transfers within the Department of Agriculture of any of the records, property, and personnel affected by this reorganization plan and such transfers of unexpended balances (available or to be made available for use in connection with any affected function or agency) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of such Department, as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this reorganization plan; but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made.

## FLOOD DISASTER IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, March 24, 1953.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On February 12, 1953, the House considered and agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12 "That the Congress on behalf of the people of the United States expresses its deep sympathy, affection, and concern for the peoples of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Belgium, whose countries have been ravaged by disaster, its admiration for their courage in adversity, and its hope for the early restoration of their homes and livelihoods." At the direction of the Secretary of State, signed originals of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12 were presented by the American Ambassadors at The Hague, London, and Brussels to the appropriate officials of the Governments of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Belgium.

In response to the presentation of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12 by the American Ambassador to the Netherlands, the President of the First Chamber of the Netherlands States General and the President of the Second Chamber of the Netherlands States General addressed to Ambassador Chapin a message of appreciation to be conveyed to the President of the United States Senate. A photostatic copy of this message is enclosed.

This message included the text of a resolution passed unanimously by the Second Chamber of the Netherlands States General expressing gratitude to all peoples who sent or offered their help to the Netherlands. The text of this resolution is also enclosed.

In response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12, delivered to the United Kingdom by our Ambassador, the British Foreign Secretary wrote the American Ambassador the following letter:

"MY DEAR AMBASSADOR: My colleagues and I were deeply touched by the concurrent resolution of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, which you were kind enough to send me under cover of your letter of the 19th February.

"The sympathy of the Congress and the people of the United States not only reaffirms the strength of the ties which exist between our two nations, but is a strong comfort and consolation to my countrymen in this time of affliction.

"Yours sincerely,

"ANTHONY EDEN."

The delivery of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12 by the American Ambassador in Brussels was responded to by the following letter from the Chief of Protocol of the Belgian Ministry Affairs:

"MR. AMBASSADOR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of the document dated February 25, 1953, No. 793, by which Your Excellency transmitted a resolution voted by the Senate of the United States of America, expressing to the Belgian people the sympathy of the American people after the floods which have devastated the coasts of Belgium.

"I have forwarded this message to the President of the Chamber of Representatives, asking him to communicate it to his colleague of the Senate.

"Thanking Your Excellency for sending me this document, I take this occasion to renew the assurance of my highest consideration.

"MOUCHET BATTEFORT DE LAUBESPIN,  
"The Chief of Protocol  
"(For the Minister of Foreign Affairs)."

The Department is pleased to transmit these responses from the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Belgium.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,

Assistant Secretary

(For the Secretary of State).

(Enclosures: 1. Letter from Presidents of the First and Second Chambers of the Netherlands States General. 2. Resolution of thanks by the Second Chamber.)

## SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for 30 minutes tomorrow be transferred to Thursday, April 22, following any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

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

There was no objection.

## OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. TOLLEFSON. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that is designed to secure a dignified, adequate old-age pension for all of our elder citizens, and which will be uniform in all States. Every person who has been a citizen for 10 years or more, and has reached the age of 65 years will be qualified to receive a pension of \$100 per month. It will operate on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Both political parties made the improvement of the Social Security Act a campaign issue. The Republicans in their platform made reference to a pay-as-you-go pension system. The chairman of the Senate Finance Committee has said:

It has been apparent for a long time that our social-security system has reeked with inadequacy and other faults. As I see it, we will have to come to a truly pay-as-you-go system, leading perhaps to a universal coverage.

Millions of people in the United States are still not covered under the Social Security Act. In fact only about 27 percent of persons aged 65 or over receive social-security pensions. The rest of them are either not qualified or prefer to keep on in the labor market. The number of our people over 65 is increasing. They are at an age where they cannot do much, if any, hard work, and are excluded from many types of employment. Yet they are expected to eke out a living on their present meager means. Actuarial findings of insurance companies indicate that out of 100 men at the age of 25 years, 54 of them at age 65 will be broke or dependent, and subject to privation and worry.

Our older citizens deserve our best consideration. We should provide an adequate national pension for them which will permit them to live their declining years with dignity and comfort. This they cannot do under present conditions

and most programs. Canada has adopted a national pension after years of consideration of the problem. Certainly we in the United States can be as forward looking.

#### GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DODD. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 132d anniversary of Greek independence. That day in 1821, when the Greek people threw out the Turkish invaders, sounded the death knell of the Ottoman empire. By their bravery, the Greek people exposed the myth of Ottoman invincibility and, one by one, the nations of the Balkan Peninsula followed the example of their valiant neighbors and brought liberty back to that part of the globe.

As the news of the successful uprising in Greece spread throughout the world, it served as a source of inspiration to captive peoples everywhere. The revolutions that shook South America and forced the Spaniards to withdraw to their own land undoubtedly gained their impetus from the Greek war of liberation.

Greece, the birthplace of democracy, blazed the way for the 19th century movement toward the independence and the self-determination of peoples, as Greece has always led the crusade for freedom.

Since 436 B. C. when democratic Athens went to the aid of Corcyra, to our own day when Greek troops are fighting against the Communist forces in Korea, the people of Greece have fought tyranny whenever it has appeared.

When Greece won her independence in 1821, the Greek Senate appealed to the United States for aid. The people of the United States, led by President Monroe and Daniel Webster, promptly responded. This partnership in the cause of freedom is but one of the things that has bound the people of Greece and America.

The men and women who came here from Greece as immigrants greatly enriched our land. Americans of Greek descent figure prominently in all fields of our national life.

In the present struggle against world communism, we know that the people of Greece are among our staunchest allies. Following the policies set down by President Truman in his aid to Greece program, we shall continue to stand by that courageous nation. In addition, let me assure my fellow Americans of Greek descent and the people of Greece, that we here have not forgotten about the victims of Greece's stand against Communist aggression.

We shall continue to do all we can to bring about the repatriation of the 3,000 Greek soldiers and of the thousands of Greek children still imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. On this day of jubila-

tion, those thousands are a grim reminder that the fight for liberty still goes on.

#### PUERTO RICO

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. 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 Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1952, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was born; the people of Puerto Rico commenced living under a constitution of their own adoption; self-government became operative in Puerto Rico.

This important event was the result and culmination of Public Law 600, 81st Congress, and Joint Resolution 447, 82d Congress. Within the terms of compact embodied in the first of these measures, Puerto Rico adopted a constitution and organized a constitutional government; the second ratified the constitution adopted by the people of Puerto Rico, subject to stipulations which were later accepted by the people of Puerto Rico. Thereupon, the Constitution of Puerto Rico became effective and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico became a reality. Thus, for the first time in approximately 500 years of its history, Puerto Rico became fully self-governing in all matters not locally inapplicable.

Obviously, this is a matter of great prestige to the United States in its position of leadership with the nations of the world.

On March 20, 1953 our Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., addressed a communication to the Secretary General of the United Nations stating, on behalf of our Government, that the United States has decided to cease reporting on Puerto Rico as a non-self-governing area within the political jurisdiction of the United States. This is of significance to the world as well as to the United States and Puerto Rico, and I feel that this communication should be brought to the attention of every Member of the Congress. Accordingly, I include this communication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NEW YORK, N. Y., March 20, 1953.

His Excellency TRYGVE LIE,  
Secretary General of the United Nations,  
New York, N. Y.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the United States representative's note U. N.-1727/89, dated January 19, 1953, notifying you that as a result of the entry into force on July 25, 1952, of the new constitution establishing the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Government has decided to cease to transmit information on Puerto Rico under article 73 (e) of the Charter.

The attainment by the people of Puerto Rico of their new commonwealth status is a most significant step. This is the kind of progress to self-government contemplated by the United Nations Charter. This is the democratic pattern of the free world—of goals set and hopes realized. The people of Puerto Rico expressed their view by resolution at their constitutional convention in the following words: "Thus we attain the goal of complete self-government, the last

vestiges of colonialism having disappeared in the principle of compact, and we enter into an era of new developments in democratic civilization."

I invite your attention in particular to the enclosed letter of Governor Munoz Marin of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which after requesting the termination of the transmittal of information under article 73 (e), with respect to Puerto Rico, and after recounting the development of the island's political progress, he says: "The people of Puerto Rico are firm supporters of the United Nations and this great organization may confidently rely upon us for a continuation of that good will."

Let me add that the people of Puerto Rico at this moment are proudly cooperating to the utmost in the United Nations effort to repel aggression in Korea. The men of Puerto Rico who are bearing the hardships of battle with other United Nations troops have, by their courage and determination, demonstrated their strong love for freedom.

There are enclosed for the information of the members of the United Nations the following documents in compliance with the terms of resolution 222 (III) of the General Assembly:

1. Text of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
  2. Memorandum by the Government of the United States of America concerning the cessation of transmission of information under article 73 (e) of the Charter with regard to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
  3. Copy of the letter dated January 17, 1953, from the Governor of Puerto Rico to the President of the United States.
- Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,  
Ambassador.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ABBITT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. 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. 20]

Andrews	Gamble	Moulder
Barden	Green	Norblad
Blatnik	Hale	Poulson
Boykin	Haley	Price
Campbell	Heller	Rabaut
Cannon	Hinshaw	Reece, Tenn.
Carnahan	Holifield	Scrivner
Celler	Hruska	Shelley
Chief	Jackson	Staggers
Clardy	Judd	Taylor
Corbett	Klein	Trimble
Crosser	Krueger	Walter
Dingell	Lesinski	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Magnuson	Wilson, Tex.
Frazier	Morrison	Withers

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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



### EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN TANGIBLE PERSONAL PROPERTY

The **SPEAKER**. The unfinished business is the question of passage of the bill (H. R. 3180) to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property.

Mr. **BONNER**. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members who were not on the floor when the debate took place the other day, may I ask at this time whether the bill could be read so the membership of the House might thoroughly understand the question that is before the House?

The **SPEAKER**. Of course, it can be read by unanimous consent at this stage.

Mr. **BONNER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be reread.

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

Mr. **HALLECK**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if it would not satisfy the gentleman's purpose to have reported whatever is in controversy?

Mr. **BONNER**. I may say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned the whole matter is in controversy. There have been certain amendments to the bill that the Members should know about and they should have knowledge of the bill.

Mr. **HALLECK**. This bill has to do, as I am sure we understand, with the matter of exempting from taxation certain personal property, household personal property, located in the District of Columbia. It has been in the papers, many of us heard the debate and that has been printed in the *RECORD*. Much as I respect the gentleman's position, I cannot see where any good purpose will be served by reading the bill.

Mr. **BONNER**. It is a short bill.

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

Mr. **HALLECK**. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 143, noes 58.

Mr. **BONNER**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and seventy-four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. **BONNER**. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

The **SPEAKER**. The further unfinished business is the question on the committee amendment to H. R. 3655, on which a separate vote was demanded.

Without objection the Clerk will again report the committee amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "premises", strike out all down to and including line 11.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. **HAYS** of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. **HAYS** of Ohio. Many of the Members who are here today were not here when this bill was being debated, and I wonder whether it would be permissible to ask that the six lines that the amendment seeks to strike be read.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, the Clerk will read the matter stricken out.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "premises", strike out the following: "and to forbid the consumption on Sundays, but the Commissioners shall not authorize the consumption on such premises of any beverages at any time when the sale of beverages is prohibited to a holder of a retailer's license, class C, or of any beverages, other than light wines and beer, on Sundays, and such consumption is hereby prohibited."

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. **HAYS** of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION WORK ON THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. **DONDERO**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 229) authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to permit the performance within the United States Capitol Grounds of any excavation, temporary construction, or other work that may be necessary for construction of a national headquarters building for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, American Federation of Labor, at the northwest corner of D Street and Louisiana Avenue NW.: Provided, That*

no permanent construction shall extend within the United States Capitol Grounds.

Sec. 2. The United States shall not incur any expense or liability whatsoever, under or by reason of this joint resolution, or be liable under any claim of any nature or kind that may arise from anything that may be connected with or grow out of this joint resolution.

Sec. 3. No work shall be performed within the Capitol Grounds pursuant to this joint resolution until the Architect of the Capitol shall have been furnished with such assurances as he may deem necessary that all areas within such grounds, disturbed by reason of such construction, shall be restored to their original condition without expense to the United States; and all work within the Capitol Grounds herein authorized shall be performed under conditions satisfactory to the Architect of the Capitol.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. **DONDERO**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the *RECORD*.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. **DONDERO**. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 229, to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works.

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, an A. F. of L. affiliate, owns a tract of land situated at the northwest corner of D Street and Louisiana Avenue NW., in Washington, D. C., adjacent to the Continental Hotel. The property was purchased for the purpose of constructing a building thereon to be used as the union's headquarters.

In order that construction of the building may proceed, it is necessary for the contractor to make certain excavations, including the placement of temporary sheathing, and otherwise to work within the area of the Capitol grounds immediately adjacent to the new building site and approximately 2 or 3 feet beyond the boundary line of the site.

The Architect of the Capitol informed the committee that the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and its contractor, would be required to furnish him with such assurances as he may deem necessary that all areas within the Capitol grounds disturbed by reason of the contemplated construction would be restored to its original condition and without expense to the United States.

The committee has been advised, further, that all of the proposed work will be carried to completion under conditions satisfactory to the Architect of the Capitol and that no permanent construction will extend within the Capitol grounds. The committee was given assurance that the United States will not incur any expense or liability whatsoever.

ever by reason of the construction work contemplated, or be liable under any claim of any kind which may arise in connection with the erection of the building on this site.

The excavation work was started and is now temporarily suspended pending congressional authorization to the Architect of the Capitol as set forth in House Joint Resolution 229.

In view of this situation, I strongly urged immediate favorable action on House Joint Resolution 229.

Mr. MACK of Washington. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I introduced the resolution which has just been under consideration—House Joint Resolution 229—at the request of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters-Chauffeurs-Warehousemen and Helpers, affiliated with the A. F. of L. It is a most important bill to the officers and membership of this union.

The Teamsters Union is now engaged in constructing a five-story national headquarters office building at D Street and Louisiana Avenue Northwest, in the District of Columbia. In order to erect this building it is necessary that the union temporarily go 2 or 3 feet onto the Capitol Grounds and dig a trench on Government property so that sheathing can be put in place for pouring the concrete foundation of this new building.

The temporary use of the Government property requires, under existing law, that the union secure the approval of Congress. To grant the union that approval is the purpose of this bill.

The union agrees that the occupancy of the Government property will be brief and that any land used will be restored to its original condition without expense to the Government. No part of the permanent building will be on Government land.

The Architect of the Capitol, Mr. David Lynn, agrees this is appropriate legislation and in a letter to me, recommends its passage. I submitted this resolution to the House Public Works Committee yesterday and it was unanimously approved by that committee.

I have conferred with both the majority and minority leadership of the House, and they have no objection to the consideration of this resolution at this time in order that the Teamsters Union will not be delayed in continuing the construction of their new headquarters building in the District of Columbia, which, when completed, I am sure, will be a worthy addition to the fine architecture of this beautiful city.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 40 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### CONTINUATION OF THE PRESENT EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTAIN EMERGENCY POWERS

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 186 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3853) to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3853. It is an open rule, and provides for 1 hour of general debate.

H. R. 3853 is a measure which will continue until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency certain provisions of the criminal statutes which pertain to the penalty for espionage and sabotage. The present law expires on April 1, 1953.

The vote in the committee and in the Committee on Rules was unanimous. I see no need for extended debate on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statement of the gentleman from New York. I know of no objection to the rule or to the bill itself, and I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3853) to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3853, with Mr. CANFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, this bill was considered by Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Committee on the Judiciary. It was favorably reported by that subcommittee unanimously, and was later reported to the House unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Generally speaking, offenses against national security are divided into two classes for purposes of punishment—that is wartime and peacetime. Different punishments are provided if the particular act is committed in peace rather than in war. But, we are now in a situation which is neither war nor peace. We are in a period which has been proclaimed by the President to be a state of emergency. It is felt that these particular offenses should carry the same punishment in this emergency period that normally they would have in time of war. Last year, on July 13, 1952, a bill was approved to continue these wartime punishments for the duration of the national emergency plus 6 months, or April 30, 1953, whichever was the earlier date. In a very few days, this law will expire, and unless the Congress continues these wartime powers and punishments, which the Department of Defense considers so very important at this time, we will find that several major crimes against our national security, such as espionage, sabotage, and offenses of that nature must be treated under a peacetime status instead of a state of emergency or wartime.

The purpose of this particular bill is to extend for the duration of the emergency, plus 6 months, the present acts and the punishments relating to crimes such as gathering or delivering defense information to a foreign government, the destruction of war materials, the production of defective war materials, and offenses of that nature.

The committee feels it is most important that in this time of emergency, the punishments now provided under the law for these offenses be continued through the period of the present emergency plus 6 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, there is no request for time on this side. It is felt that in this time of emergency, when we are threatened from within and without, this measure should be extended.

I therefore yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That chapter 105 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting at the end of the chapter analysis preceding section 2151 of such title the following new item:

"2157. Temporary extension of sections 2153 and 2154."

SEC. 2. Title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting in chapter 105 thereof, immediately after section 2156, a



new section, to be designated as section 2157, as follows:

"§ 2157. Temporary extension of sections 2153 and 2154

"(a) The provisions of sections 2153 and 2154 of this title, as amended and extended by section 1 (a) (29) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (66 Stat. 333), in addition to coming into full force and effect in time of war shall remain in full force and effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2912, 3 C. F. R., 1950 Supp., p. 71), and acts of the kind giving rise to legal consequences and penalties under any of these provisions when performed during a state of war shall give rise to the same legal consequences and penalties when they are performed during the period above provided for.

"(b) Effective for the period above provided for, the words 'conduct of war' as used in section 2151 are extended to include defense activities.

"(c) Effective for the period above provided for, the words 'carrying on the war' as used in section 2153 and 2154 are extended to include defense activities wherever they appear therein."

SEC. 3. Chapter 37 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting at the end of the chapter analysis preceding section 791 of such title the following new item:

"798. Temporary extension of section 794."

SEC. 4. Title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting in chapter 37 thereof immediately after section 797 a new section, to be designated as section 798, as follows:

"§ 798. Temporary extension of section 794

"The provisions of section 794 of this title, as amended and extended by section 1 (a) (29) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (66 Stat. 333), in addition to coming into full force and effect in time of war shall remain in full force and effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2912, 3 C. F. R., 1950 Supp., p. 71), and acts of the kind giving rise to legal consequences and penalties under section 794 when performed during a state of war shall give rise to the same legal consequences and penalties when they are performed during the period above provided for."

SEC. 5. Chapter 115 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting at the end of the chapter analysis preceding section 2391 of such title the following new item:

"2391. Temporary extension of section 2388."

SEC. 6. Title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting in chapter 115 thereof, immediately after section 2390, a new section, to be designated as section 2391, as follows:

"§ 2391. Temporary extension of section 2388

"The provisions of section 2388 of this title, as amended and extended by section 1 (a) (29) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (66 Stat. 333), in addition to coming into full force and effect in time of war shall remain in full force and effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2912, 3 C. F. R., 1950 Supp., p. 71), and acts of the kind giving rise to legal consequences and penalties under section 2388 when performed during a state of war shall give rise to the same legal consequences and penalties when they are performed during the period above provided for."

SEC. 7. Section 1 (a) (29) of the Emergency War Powers Continuation Act (66 Stat. 333) is hereby repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CANFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3853) to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, pursuant to House Resolution 186, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF THE EMERGENCY POWERS CONTINUATION ACT

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 188 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 226, to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, this rule, too, is a 1-hour open rule; it provides for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 226. Whereas the previous bill was one pertaining to the criminal statutes, the bill made in order by the pending rule pertains to certain civilian emergency war statutes, and while the previous bill extended the time this one cuts the time during which certain civilian emergency war powers shall be in effect. It does extend the expiration date for a 3-month period, I understand, to wind up activities under those particular statutes.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no controversy about

this measure. I have no requests for time.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 226, to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 226, with Mr. BENDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is entitled to 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] to 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROSSION].

Mr. ROSSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, in the early part of last year the President transmitted to the Congress a request that certain powers be given to the Executive for the period of national emergency and 6 months thereafter. After due consideration of that request by the Committee on the Judiciary, it was felt there should be a time limitation upon the powers to be granted. When the bill passed the House it was limited to July 1, 1953, because there were a great number of pieces of legislation involved and several members of the committee and Members of the House felt that some of them should be made permanent and others dropped altogether. After the passage of the bill in the Senate, and it was considered in conference, the date of expiration was moved up to April 1, 1953. It was felt and hoped that prior to April 1, 1953, further study could be made of the various items included to the point where they would no longer be considered emergency items and could be either dropped or made permanent legislation.

In the meanwhile there has been a change of administration, and a change in the heads of a great many of the departments involved. As a result, the Department of Defense and the other departments concerned have not had sufficient time, they believe, to prepare proper recommendations to the Congress. Some of the reports on individual items have already been sent to the Congress and are now being worked upon by the various committees.

Included in the act as it was passed last year were some 45 statutory provisions. In this new resolution, House Joint Resolution 226, six of those statutory provisions have been dropped as no longer necessary. The present resolu-

tion includes 39 statutory provisions, 31 of which relate to the Department of Defense and 8 relate to other departments.

The officials and representatives of the Department of Defense, and members of our committee who are thoroughly familiar with this type of legislation, are of the opinion if the Congress grants the additional 3 months requested for the departments and the congressional committees to complete their study and preparation of these bills, within that period the particular items involved will have been disposed of by appropriate legislation and the need for emergency legislation such as this will have been eliminated.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] was chairman of the Subcommittee of the Judiciary last year that gave considerable study and held numerous hearings and investigations of these matters. He is thoroughly familiar with their nature. If I am not mistaken, the gentleman from Ohio feels that the 3 months requested is necessary in order to complete the work that was undertaken last year and believes that this will be sufficient time to complete the study and enact necessary legislation.

In my opinion, there is no reason why House Joint Resolution 226 should not be passed at this time. It was approved by the subcommittee unanimously; it was reported by the full Committee on the Judiciary unanimously, and we are asking today that the Congress give 3 additional months beyond the April 1 time limit to complete legislative action on these 45 statutory provisions included in the resolution now under consideration.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Kentucky has very well stated, this is legislation of a temporary nature and provides only for the extension of these necessary statutory powers for an additional 3 months for the purpose of enabling the various departments and agencies of the Government to bring before the several standing committees of the Congress legislation which would extend many of these statutes beyond that 3 months' period which we are asking now.

I feel that the administration has not been derelict in its duty in not bringing legislation for the individual statutory extensions before the appropriate committees earlier. I feel it is perfectly proper that we keep these statutes in effect until each standing committee has had an opportunity to have a full and complete hearing, and determine which statutes should be allowed to expire and which should be continued in effect.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 226 is one of these resolutions that has come out of the Committee on the Judiciary again this year and, as has been stated, it was given considerable study and thought at the last session of the Congress. The sub-

committee, headed by our colleague from Kentucky [Mr. ROSSION], has this year given the matter considerable study and thought, and, as he stated, the subcommittee and the full Committee on the Judiciary are unanimously in favor of this joint resolution. They are in favor of the extension until July 1, 1953.

While we are talking now on matters of a national emergency nature, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Defense Department would have us believe that all of the billions being spent to provide national security are a military secret.

"Don't ask why so much money is needed or where it goes; just appropriate it," seems to be the theme song of the Pentagon.

Maybe that is to cover up the fact that some of the funds just got lost.

At any rate, many of us cannot figure out why the Air Force cannot use its own planes instead of depending upon a civilian airlift.

The war in Korea is nearing the 3-year mark. The Congress has been most generous in providing funds for the military; in fact, almost at the level of spending for World War II. Two and a half years should be enough time for the Air Force to have sufficient transport planes to do a ferry job between California and Korea. But it appears that they have to hitchhike at a price.

Unfortunately, it took a tragedy to unmask this inexcusable lack of planning and function.

A March 20 AP report from Oakland, Calif., reported that "A 4-engine transport carrying some 35 crewmen and soldiers from Roswell, N. Mex., crashed in flames south of here today, killing all aboard."

The Transocean Airlines cargo plane was operated by a civilian crew. "Transocean is the world's largest non-scheduled carrier. Its headquarters are in Oakland. Transocean planes have flown thousands of military personnel and tons of supplies from the west coast to Korea."

Who was at fault? Why are there so many of these accidents? What can we do to prevent others? These serious questions must be our first concern.

But behind them is another nagging puzzle: Why cannot the Air Force handle this military transport airlift itself without depending upon private carriers?

They have the money and the men in abundance.

It cannot be claimed that all these resources are being fully and usefully employed under the present circumstances.

Even an amateur would reason that much practical experience could be gained if the Air Force took full responsibility for all the airlift operations on the route to Korea without calling for civilian help. If it cannot do this limited job, it will not be prepared to handle air transport on a global scale if war should come.

I have high respect for the Air Force, its personnel, and its accomplishments. Considering the lethal cargo it could deliver to the nerve centers of the Soviet Union, it may be that our air arm is a major factor in deterring the Communists from wholesale aggression.

The purpose of my criticism is not to tear down but to build up.

We want to see the Air Force become better than it is.

Why it should have to rely upon leased-out planes and civilian crews for the main-line run to Korea is a mystery, and we have had too many hush-hush situations in the defense setup. I hope that we can get a straightforward and commonsense explanation. If we do not, then the Department of the Air Force is due for a complete overhaul.

Lives are too precious to be wasted by poor planning, private arrangements, or any blunder that tries to hide behind the cloak of military secrecy.

The American people who are paying the whole bill with their hard-earned money and their sons have a right to know what is responsible for the series of disasters involving the Air Force.

The most recent one at Oakland, Calif., strains our patience.

Just why were Air Force personnel being transported to Korea by a private carrier and a civilian crew?

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON], and ask unanimous consent that she may speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

#### QUEEN MARY OF ENGLAND

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, last evening a very great personage slipped quietly across the threshold of the Unseen. Last evening Queen Mary of England died. We shall not see her counterpart again.

Having visited for brief moments with the granddaughter she adored, sleep came to her, and in that sleep her soul went free.

Queen Mary of England! A symbol to all her beloved people of strength, of honor, of integrity. A woman of magnificent courage, of firmness, of tenderness. Austere in outward appearance, her gaiety and above all, her humor permeated the Empire, now known as the Commonwealth.

It would seem that all sorrows were visited upon Queen Mary during the long years of her unswerving service to England and her far-flung frontiers. Undismayed by these, she carried her head high with an unflinching faith. Hers was the hand that reached out in strength to all her loved ones in their need—hers was the heart that in its own grief gave comfort to each in turn.

Mr. Chairman, women everywhere revered Queen Mary. Womanhood down the ages has been enriched by her life and living. That she has come to the end of her days is but the inevitable working of the Universal Law. We know more certainly each day that—

Never the spirit was born; the spirit shall cease to be never;

Never was time it was not; End and Beginning are dreams.

Birthless and deathless and changeless remaineth the spirit forever;

Death hath not touched it all, dead though the house of it seems.



Nay, but as one who layeth  
His worn-out robes away,  
And taking new ones, sayeth  
"These will I wear today!"  
So putteth by the spirit  
Lightly its robe of flesh,  
And passeth to inherit  
A residence afresh.

I am reminded of some very beautiful words of James Martineau—

We seem to have given her back to thee,  
dear God, who gavest her to us. Yet, as  
Thou didst not lose her in the giving, so  
we have not lost her by her return. Not as  
the world giveth, givest Thou, O Lover of  
Souls! What Thou givest, Thou takest not  
away. For what is Thine is ours always, for  
we are Thine. And life is eternal; and love  
is immortal; and earth is only a horizon;  
and a horizon is nothing save the limit of  
our sight.

May the Infinite bless the gallant soul  
of the woman we have known as Eng-  
land's Queen Mary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read  
the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That the Emergency Powers  
Continuation Act (66 Stat. 330) is hereby  
amended by deleting the date "April 1, 1953"  
wherever it appears therein and by inserting  
in lieu thereof the date "July 1, 1953."*

SEC. 2. The amendment contained in section  
1 of this joint resolution shall not apply  
with respect to the statutes referred to in  
sections 1 (a) (8), 1 (a) (30), 1 (b) (1),  
1 (b) (3), 2 (a), and 2 (b) of the Emergency  
Powers Continuation Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the  
Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and  
the Speaker having resumed the chair,  
Mr. BENDER, Chairman of the Committee  
of the Whole House on the State of the  
Union, reported that that Committee,  
having had under consideration the joint  
resolution (H. J. Res. 226) to extend until  
July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon  
the effectiveness of certain statutory pro-  
visions which but for such time limita-  
tion would be in effect until 6 months  
after the termination of the national  
emergency proclaimed on December 16,  
1950, pursuant to House Resolution 183,  
he reported the joint resolution back to  
the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the  
previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment  
and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to  
be engrossed and read a third time, and  
was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on  
the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the  
table.

#### CONTINUING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MISSING PERSONS ACT

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up  
the resolution (H. Res. 185) providing  
for the consideration of H. R. 3780, a  
bill to continue the effectiveness of the  
Missing Persons Act, as amended and  
extended, until July 1, 1954, and ask for  
its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as fol-  
lows:

*Resolved, That upon the adoption of this  
resolution it shall be in order to move that*

the House resolve itself into the Committee  
of the Whole House on the State of the  
Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R.  
3780) to continue the effectiveness of the  
Missing Persons Act, as amended and ex-  
tended, until July 1, 1954. After general  
debate, which shall be confined to the bill  
and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to  
be equally divided and controlled by the  
chairman and ranking minority member of  
the Committee on Armed Services, the bill  
shall be read for amendment under the  
5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the  
consideration of the bill for amendment,  
the Committee shall rise and report the bill  
to the House with such amendments as may  
have been adopted, and the previous ques-  
tion shall be considered as ordered on the  
bill and amendments thereto to final pas-  
sage without intervening motion, except one  
motion to recommit.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is a  
1 hour open rule providing for the con-  
sideration of H. R. 3780 which would  
extend the Missing Persons Act from  
April 1, 1953, to July 1, 1954. The Miss-  
ing Persons Act has to do with the allot-  
ments and insurance of those who are  
missing, principally those missing in the  
Korean war, and it gives authority and  
direction to the Department heads to  
act in a sort of guardianship capacity  
with regard to their dependents. The  
need for it is obvious, and I think the  
feeling is unanimous on it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further re-  
quests for time on this side, and I now  
yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from  
Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker,  
I have no requests for time. I think it  
is a very necessary piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance  
of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move  
the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on  
the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move  
that the House resolve itself into the  
Committee of the Whole House on the  
State of the Union for the consideration  
of the bill (H. R. 3780) to continue the  
effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act,  
as amended and extended, until July 1,  
1954.

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 con-  
sideration of the bill H. R. 3780, with  
Mrs. ST. GEORGE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first read-  
ing of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield  
myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we should dispose of  
this piece of legislation in very few min-  
utes. There is little I can add to what  
was said when we adopted the rule.

I merely want to point out to the Mem-  
bers that in 1942 the Congress passed the  
Missing Persons Act, and it remained in  
effect until 1947. It was revived in 1948  
by the Selective Service Act of that year,  
and it has been extended at various  
times by various acts until April 1, 1953.

Mr. Chairman, the general purpose of  
the Missing Persons Act was that the  
heads of the various executive depart-  
ments should continue to credit and pay

up the insurance, modify or allow de-  
pendency allotments in such manner as  
they themselves might determine, as  
long as the men in the service were miss-  
ing. In short, the departments assumed  
the responsibility of guardianship for  
these missing persons.

This law has rendered great service  
to all those men who were missing in  
action, not only in World War II but dur-  
ing the present Korean conflict, but un-  
less we pass this legislation today the  
law would expire on April 1, a little over  
a week from now. I am happy to say  
the Senate has already passed a similar  
bill, almost identical except as to the  
date of termination, extending the act  
until February 1, 1954. The House bill  
extends the act until July 1, 1954, but  
in our committee we amended the title  
to end the act on February 1, 1954, in  
order to conform with the Senate bill.  
That would expedite action.

I am sorry to say that 11,399 members  
of our Armed Forces, in the different  
branches, are currently being carried as  
captured or missing, as a result of the  
Korean hostilities.

It is impossible to estimate the accu-  
rate cost of this legislation because of  
the vicissitudes and fortunes of war, but  
the Department of the Army itself—that  
was chosen by the Defense Department  
as the representative to carry out this  
law—did develop data between the pe-  
riod of January 1 and June 30, 1952, as  
illustrative of the cost under current  
conditions. These data show that the  
cost was \$9,607,097 for that period, the  
first 6 months of last year. Representa-  
tives of the Department of Defense who  
appeared before us in recent hearings  
told us that the most accurate estimate  
they could make as to the cost for all of  
the military services would be in the  
neighborhood of \$20 million annually.

This particular measure, extending the  
date of the Missing Persons Act, is very  
much needed. There was no opposition  
to it from either the Department or our  
committee. The bill was reported unan-  
imously, and I trust the House will  
adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman  
from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask  
unanimous consent to extend my re-  
marks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a  
very important bill. It is urgent legisla-  
tion. The bill, as amended by the Armed  
Services Committee, extends the Miss-  
ing Persons Act until February 1, 1954.  
It also incorporates certain language  
changes made in the present law by  
Public Law 450, 82d Congress.

The latest report of the Department  
of Defense shows that we have 11,399  
members of the Armed Forces currently  
missing in action, or captured, as a result  
of the Korean hostilities. Unless this  
legislation is extended, it will expire on  
April 1, 1953. If the Congress should  
allow this to happen, there will no longer  
be any statutory authority for the heads  
of the executive departments to continue  
to credit the pay accounts, with pay and

allowances, of our military servicemen who are missing in action.

I do not have to explain to the Members what a terrible hardship this would bring to the dependents of these men. We cannot permit this to happen.

This legislation is not new to the Congress. The missing-in-action statute was originally enacted in 1942 and remained in effect until 1947. It was revived by the Selective Service Act of 1948 and has been extended by various acts until April 1, 1953.

The dependents of those who are missing in action have perhaps the greatest cross to bear of all dependents of servicemen fighting overseas. For they must go on, day after day, with no word from their loved ones, not knowing whether they are alive or dead. If the Communist aggressor in Korea would abide by the rules of the Geneva Convention—by the rules of humane warfare—their burden could be made lighter. These rules would require this hostile force to advise the United Nations Command of the names of those persons who had been captured. Since only one list of persons has been furnished to us—and that only a short time after the beginning of the Korean hostilities, the majority of all persons missing must be categorized as missing in action, since we have no way of knowing whether they are alive or dead, or in the hands of the enemy.

If only the International Red Cross was allowed to inspect the Communist prisoner-of-war camps, some comfort could be transmitted to the unfortunate dependents of those missing in action. The Communists will do none of these things and so these dependents must wait with heavy hearts for some word from their servicemen.

A grateful Nation can do no less than try to assist these dependents by crediting the pay accounts of those who are in a missing status. In this way, allotments can continue, or can be made, or modified, to financially assist those who remain at home and wait.

The Department of Defense has indicated that the Missing Persons Act should be revised and enacted as permanent legislation, but the subject is complicated and requires extensive study. Such a study is currently being conducted within the Department of Defense. However, in the interim, we must continue this very worthwhile law. I believe the terminal date of February 1, 1954, gives adequate time for the Department and the Bureau of the Budget to conduct this study and propose new legislation to the Congress.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this measure is very important. The great tragedy of war is the casualty list. In the Korean war, the painful duty of carrying the casualty lists is made complicated by the failure of the enemy to cooperate. Undoubtedly, many of our missing-in-action casualties are

alive today, and we fervently hope will be returned to us in time, to their homes, and their loved ones. In the meantime, the problems connected with the handling of pay and allowances are multiplied.

This act will permit the continuation of normal pay and allowances to those missing in action. It is estimated that this cost \$9,607,097 for the period of January 1 to June 30, 1952, and that the cost for all military services will approximate \$20 million annually. Accounts carried under this act totaled 467 officers, 18 warrant officers, and 9,547 enlisted men.

We must pass this act to continue in effect this law. We must not break faith with those who are making the sacrifice.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the Missing Persons Act (ch. 166, secs. 1-12, 14, and 15, 56 Stat. 143-147), as amended (ch. 828, 56 Stat. 1092-1093; ch. 371, 58 Stat. 679-682; ch. 70, 61 Stat. 96; ch. 356, 65 Stat. 207) as extended by section 4 (e) of the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 608), and as it read before the enactment of Public Laws 313 and 450, 82d Congress, is further amended as follows:*

(a) Section 2 (58 Stat. 679) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, captured by an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned in a foreign country, captured by a hostile force."

(b) Section 6 (56 Stat. 145) is amended by deleting "in the hands of an enemy or is interned in a neutral country" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the hands of a hostile force or is interned in a foreign country."

(c) Section 9 (58 Stat. 681) is amended by deleting "in the hands of an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the hands of a hostile force" and by deleting "such enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "such hostile force."

(d) Section 12 (65 Stat. 207) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, or captured by the enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned in a foreign country, or captured by a hostile force."

(e) Section 14 (56 Stat. 147) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. The provisions of this act applicable to persons captured by a hostile force shall also apply to any person beleaguered or besieged by a hostile force."

(f) Section 15 (56 Stat. 147, 1093) is amended by deleting everything following the words "and shall remain in effect until" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1954."

SEC. 2. Section 1 (a) (7) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (ch. 570, 66 Stat. 331) is repealed without effect upon rights accrued, liabilities incurred, or actions taken thereunder.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 23, strike out "July 1, 1954" and insert "February 1, 1954."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Com-

mittee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3780) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954, pursuant to House Resolution 185, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1229) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954, a similar bill to H. R. 3780.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the Missing Persons Act (ch. 166, secs. 1-12, 14, and 15, 56 Stat. 143-147), as amended (ch. 828, 56 Stat. 1092-1093; ch. 371, 58 Stat. 679-682; ch. 70, 61 Stat. 96; ch. 356, 65 Stat. 207), as extended by section 4 (e) of the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 608), and as it read before the enactment of Public Laws 313 and 450, 82d Congress, is further amended as follows:*

(a) Section 2 (58 Stat. 679) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, captured by an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned in a foreign country, captured by a hostile force."

(b) Section 6 (56 Stat. 145) is amended by deleting "in the hands of an enemy or is interned in a neutral country" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the hands of a hostile force or is interned in a foreign country."

(c) Section 9 (58 Stat. 681) is amended by deleting "in the hands of an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the hands of a hostile force" and by deleting "such enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "such hostile force."

(d) Section 12 (65 Stat. 207) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, or captured by the enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned in a foreign country, or captured by a hostile force."

(e) Section 14 (56 Stat. 147) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. The provisions of this act applicable to persons captured by a hostile force shall also apply to any person beleaguered or besieged by a hostile force."

(f) Section 15 (56 Stat. 147, 1093) is amended by deleting everything following the words "and shall remain in effect until" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1954."

SEC. 2. Section 1 (a) (7) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (ch. 570, 66 Stat. 331) is repealed without effect upon rights accrued, liabilities incurred, or actions taken thereunder.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until February 1, 1954."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 3780 was passed were vacated.



# ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 187 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4130) to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for 1 hour general debate and the Rules Committee in this instance saw fit to insert a provision waiving points of order because the aspects of the legislative bill perhaps affects an appropriation. H. R. 4130 is a bill amending title 5 of the Defense Appropriations Act and would remove a restriction written into the law in reference to the use of certain appropriated funds having to do with the Arnold Engineering Development Center authorized by the Congress in 1949.

This development center is a wind tunnel experimental proposition made along very supermodern lines for the testing of aircraft missiles and supersonic range. The legislation which is before the House now would remove the restriction written into the law previously because the Committee on the Armed Services feels it is no longer necessary or good to have it remain in the law. I think the feeling on this is unanimous. I have no further request for time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that this restriction upon the use of funds for this purpose was not considered either by the Armed Services Committee or by the Appropriations Committee but arose on the floor last year during the consideration of the armed services appropriation bill and was in the form of a restriction prohibiting the expenditure of funds for this project. It was debated at considerable length and adopted.

I had some question about the matter when it came before the Rules Committee because as the provision was on an appropriation bill I questioned the matter of jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee to take it up; however, I inquired of the chairman of the Armed

Services Committee and ascertained that he has consulted with the Appropriations Committee and that this provision is agreeable to that committee. There was no objection to it in the Rules Committee. As far as I know the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee both approve the legislation.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4130) to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the H. R. 4130, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H. R. 4130 is to repeal a provision in the fiscal 1953 Defense Appropriation Act, which denied funds, beyond March 31, 1953, for the payment to ARO, Inc., a corporation which was selected by the Department of the Air Force to manage a highly complicated and very expensive installation, now known as the Arnold Engineering Development Center, located at Tullahoma, Tenn.

For the benefit of the new Members of the House, and to refresh the memory of the Members who were here last year, I want to point out that a highly complicated and very expensive research and development installation had been authorized by the House Committee on Armed Services during the 81st Congress. Approximately \$170 million in authorizations and appropriations were granted by the Congress to construct this facility. The Air Force was given the overall responsibility for the facility since its main function was the testing of aircraft and component parts and guided missiles at speeds far in excess of the speed of sound. As a matter of fact, there is no other comparable facility in the United States and, so far as we know, it is not duplicated any place in the world. It includes some of the largest wind tunnels ever constructed and it also includes some very complicated engine test facilities, which we captured from the Germans during World War II and brought to this country. They are being reassembled at this facility.

The Air Force not having within its own Department the technical capacity to operate this complex facility, contracted with the newly created corporation, known as ARO, Inc., to take over the management and direction of the

facility, and I want to point out that this corporation is a wholly owned subsidiary of the engineering firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., of St. Louis, Mo., which engineering firm had the contract for the preparation of all of the detailed plans and specifications for this facility.

The new management corporation has operated on a percentage fee which fee is directly related to the cost involved. Since it assumed management for this facility, ARO, Inc., has had the responsibility of recruiting a vast array of highly skilled technicians and scientists who will operate the various mechanisms which are being constructed. These people have been recruited from all over the United States and some have come from foreign nations. About 1,000 of them have been employed and they represent a very high degree of performance in the field of scientific research and development. In performing its managerial duties, ARO, Inc., on the basis of its fee of 3½ percent, has received the sum of only \$118,000 over a period of 2 years and 9 months and of this gross fee only \$31,500 has been net to the corporation.

In spite of the foregoing facts, there were those who attacked the integrity and capabilities of ARO, Inc., and the parent firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., during debate on the fiscal 1953 Defense Appropriation bill. At that time, I opposed on the floor of this House that restrictive rider, not because Mr. Jack Sverdrup, of the firm of Sverdrup & Parcel Inc., was a citizen of my native State of Missouri, but because I sincerely felt that the attack was wholly unfounded. A handful of Members stood with me in that fight but we lost.

After the House had completed its action on the bill, Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., who had been denied a hearing in the House before the adverse action was taken, requested and received the opportunity to present their side of the case before a Senate subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator O'Mahoney. That subcommittee included, among others, Senator SALTONSTALL, who is presently the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Our committee report summarizes the findings of the Senate subcommittee but for the moment I merely want to say that that Senate subcommittee unanimously voted to reject the restrictive rider which had been added by the House. Subsequently, the entire Senate rejected the rider. But we were in the waning days of the Congress when the conferees, after extensive argument over this restrictive rider, finally agreed to the House provisions. As a result, the firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc. and its subsidiary corporation, ARO, Inc., stood convicted by the Congress of the most serious improprieties. So far as I am concerned, and I now state it publicly on the floor of this House, that was a most irresponsible action on the part of the last Congress.

What about the firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc.? Are they a bunch of fly-by-nights, or are they responsible people?

I want to say to the Members that I have known Mr. Jack Sverdrup for 25 years. He came to this country from

Norway at the age of 16. He enlisted as a private in the United States Army in 1918, served until 1919, when he received a commission as a second lieutenant in the field artillery. He attended Augsburg College in Minnesota and is a graduate engineer of the University of Minnesota. He subsequently served with the Minnesota State Highway Department, the Missouri State Highway Department, and rose through the ranks to become bridge engineer of the Missouri State Highway Department.

In 1928, Jack Sverdrup founded the firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., Mr. Parcel having previously taught at the University of Illinois and the University of Minnesota, and he is the author of several standard engineering text books.

Before the entrance of the United States in World War II, Jack Sverdrup, as a civilian, was engaged to lay out our air routes through the Pacific. These airfields later became the United States air route through the war theaters of the South and Southwest Pacific. In May of 1942, he was appointed a colonel in the Army of the United States. He became a brigadier general in May of 1944 and a major general in January of 1945. He served in the Southwest Pacific under General MacArthur throughout the war, and I need not point out to this body that General MacArthur would not have selected Jack Sverdrup as a major general to command the entire Engineer Construction Command for General Headquarters of the Southwest Pacific area if he had not been a man of integrity and great capability.

Finally, I want to say, in behalf of Jack Sverdrup, that he participated in 6 military campaigns in the Pacific for which battle stars were awarded, during which time he was awarded the Legion of Merit, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star, and the Purple Heart. So, let no man question his integrity, or his patriotism.

As to the capability of this firm, I think the fact that it has been the principal engineering firm in approximately \$1 billion worth of construction in the United States speaks for itself.

When the new Secretary of the Air Force was appointed one of his first acts was to review this situation with reference to Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., and its subsidiary, ARO, Inc. He had the advantage of other surveys and investigations which had been made subsequent to the restrictive action of the Congress last year. These included the report of the Air Inspector General of last December, the report of an independent group of scientists and educators of last December, and the report of last June of the General Accounting Office. The General Accounting Office found no evidence of fraud or impropriety on the part of ARO, Inc., and the other two agencies fully supported the action of the Air Force in employing ARO, Inc., to manage the Arnold Engineering Development Center.

The Secretary, Mr. Talbott, personally inspected the situation at Tullahoma. On his return to Washington he thought that he had an interim solution which would not necessitate any congressional action prior to consideration of the fiscal

1954 defense appropriation bill. There is a solution, but that solution would require Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., through ARO, Inc., to operate the Center without any fee whatsoever for a period of 4 months. The firm is perfectly willing to do this, but there is a much more serious aspect to the situation. As I have pointed out, approximately 1,000 highly skilled technicians and scientists have been recruited. How long do you think we can hold these people beyond March 31, which is the date when all funds are shut off for the payment of ARO, Inc., unless we take some affirmative action to reverse the action of the Congress last year. The Secretary of the Air Force stated to the committee yesterday that, in his opinion, we will lose a very substantial number of these highly skilled people unless we take immediate action. That is the principal reason why this bill is before the House today. In that connection I want to point out that it is impossible under the current legislative situation for the House Appropriations Committee to take action in this matter. The recent supplemental appropriation bill was passed before it was realized how acute this situation had really become. Nevertheless Air Force Secretary Talbott, on March 10, 1953, wrote to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee enclosing suggested legislation which is identical to the bill now before us. Since it was impossible for the Committee on Appropriations to act, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] handed the proposed bill to me and has since written to me advising me of this situation and suggesting that the Armed Services Committee take such action as it deemed necessary.

In view of the fact that the engineering firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., is located in St. Louis, Mo., there may be those who do not fully understand this situation and who may have some feeling that I have initiated this action. I want to make it crystal clear that I have not initiated the action but have been governed solely by the position of the Secretary of the Air Force and the fact that it was impossible for the House Committee on Appropriations to consider the matter at this time.

Yesterday the full House Committee on Armed Services held a hearing on H. R. 4130 and after listening to and questioning of Congressmen EVINS and SUTTON, of Tennessee, Secretary of the Air Force Talbott and his Special Assistant, Mr. Garder, and General Sverdrup, we unanimously reported the bill. The Rules Committee considerably and wisely granted us a rule for its immediate consideration for unless we enact this legislation by next Tuesday, our national defense will suffer a severe blow and millions of dollars of the taxpayers dollars will be irrecoverably lost.

I hope the House will follow the unanimous report of the Committee on the Armed Services, the suggestions of the Committee on Appropriations, and the action of the Rules Committee, and will be no less emphatic in correcting an action which never should have occurred.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized. Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Serv-

ices Committee [Mr. SHORT] has clearly covered all the facts pertinent to this bill.

I might add that the Armed Services Committee yesterday, after most careful investigation, concluded the proper thing for the House to do would be to repeal the rider that was placed on the appropriation bill during the last Congress.

In the 81st Congress the House Committee on Armed Services considered two legislative proposals, both of which were subsequently enacted into law. As a result of these two laws, total authorizations in the amount of \$169,500,000 were granted for the establishment of the Air Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma, Tenn. Appropriations in the same amount were made by the Congress, in recognition of the vital part which this proposed facility would play in our national defense program.

The Air Force was given primary responsibility for the establishment and operation of this facility and proceeded to obtain an engineering firm which had the capability to construct this very complicated establishment. The Air Force, after considering numerous engineering firms, selected the firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., of St. Louis, Mo., to prepare the plans and specifications, following which the Corps of Army Engineers represented the Government in contracting for the construction.

Having provided for the physical construction involved, the next problem facing the Air Force was the manner in which the installation was to be operated. Obviously a Government installation of this nature is a nonprofit operation and it is so complicated that none of the military services have uniformed personnel who have the technical capabilities to supervise and operate a scientific laboratory of this magnitude. As a result, the Air Force sought a private firm for this purpose. Since the firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., had prepared the detailed plans and specifications for the construction it seemed reasonable that this firm would be well equipped to direct and supervise this operation. Following this decision, a management corporation known as ARO, Inc., was created and it is now a wholly-owned subsidiary of Sverdrup & Parcel. The parent corporation has furnished many of its most highly skilled personnel to ARO, Inc., to insure the proper operation of the facility and on the basis of the record to date I can find no justification for the criticism which has been made of the manner in which ARO, Inc., has discharged its management and operation responsibilities.

Since ARO, Inc., contracted for the management of this facility it has been responsible for the recruiting and paying of the numerous highly skilled employees who have been recruited throughout the Nation and from abroad, there now being approximately 1,000 of those employees. The Government reimburses this corporation on an actual cost basis and the corporation is in turn paid for its services by receiving a stipulated fee of 3½ percent of the cost. Over the past 2 years and 9 months the total gross fee paid to the corporation has



been \$118,000. Of this amount only \$31,500 has been a net earning to the corporation. Out of the total sum of \$118,000 approximately \$33,000 had to be paid for items such as interest on borrowed money, to operate the plant and other nondeductible items, and more than \$53,000 has been paid in taxes to the Government. So you see that in the final analysis the net earnings of ARO, Inc., for the management and direction of the Arnold Engineering Development Center have been small indeed. They represent a net fee of about \$15,000 per year for slightly less than 3 years of management services. The Secretary of the Air Force has advised us that while there are literally thousands of defense contracts for research and development which are identical to or similar to the present contract, that he knows of no other case where the management services have been obtained for a fee as low as 3½ percent.

So here we are, faced with this situation. We have authorized and are building a highly complicated research and development center which is vital to our national defense and for which we have already pledged almost \$170 million of the taxpayer's funds. However, in the waning days of the last Congress, and without according a hearing to this management firm, this body took the position that this management corporation was irresponsible, incompetent, and wholly unworthy of the management of this great research facility. For my part our position is wholly untenable. I am fully satisfied with the subsequent investigations and hearings, including that by the House Committee on Armed Services on March 24, 1953, that the action of the House in adopting this restrictive appropriation rider last year was wholly unfounded. We now have the opportunity to correct that mistake and we should promptly do so.

I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take 5 minutes, because I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], our chairman, has covered this subject well. In fact, he covered it well in the last Congress. Unwisely, this House did not heed his advice at that time.

This facility is not only a wind-tunnel facility that we have erected in Tennessee. We had only one engine-testing facility in the whole United States at the end of this war. At the end of War II we were far behind in the field of basic research in the field of speed, supersonic and hypersonic. So we initiated the unitary plan of wind tunnels, so that we could coordinate this field in research and not have it scattered all over the country, and coordinate the intensive research necessary, which includes physics and chemistry. The top scientists in this field are very hard to secure and today still are very scarce and will remain so for some time.

This facility was placed in Tennessee for basic research for the Air Force. There were only a few places in the country where we could possibly place these facilities, due to the fact that we must have available immediately tre-

mendous kilowatt power. You simply cannot operate a wind tunnel otherwise. You cannot operate engine-testing facilities without it. And this is the only facility we do have of this character. We captured from the Germans a supersonic wind tunnel. France took one of them and we took the other one, and we moved it to this country. And we learned how far behind we were in the development of these facilities.

Our Congress wisely adopted the policy of setting up these facilities for research so that we would have the most superior Air Force in the world, which we have today, thank God, and we cannot have it without these facilities.

We do not have the technical personnel in the Air Force to operate them. We did not have it in the Government. So we had to go out and ask somebody to do this job. We went out and asked a reputable concern, a man of the highest character. Unfortunately, he was attacked on the floor of this House. This man served in the service of his country not only in the First World War but also in the Second World War and the record speaks for itself. I hope that the House will adopt this measure speedily, and I certainly hope that the Senate will wisely adopt the measure; because if we do not we are going to destroy and disintegrate this whole force of scientific personnel, and where we will ever get them from again I do not know; they simply will not be available, because you cannot secure aerodynamic engineers in this country today, and that is what you have got to have if you expect to remain in a superior position in air power. This is the heart of our air power and must continue uninterrupted.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. EVINS. Let me thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, and may I also commend him for the diligent work which he and other members of the Committee on the Armed Services have put forth in the bringing of this bill to the House at this time.

This measure, as the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has so well stated, is designed to repeal a legislative rider on the appropriation act—namely, that portion of title V of the Appropriations Act of 1953 which relates to the restriction on payment of funds to ARO, Inc., for operation of the AEDC.

On Tuesday, last, the Committee on Armed Services unanimously reported—and properly so—the pending bill to repeal this existing legislation. In the event this legislation ban and rider is not lifted prior to March 31 of this year the operation of a great defense installation will come to a standstill.

As Representative of the district in which this great defense facility, namely, the Arnold Engineering Development Center, is located and representative of the people most directly affected by action which the Congress may take in this

matter, I think it is appropriate that we should have a brief recital of the history of the AEDC and of its operations.

The Arnold Engineering Development Center, referred to as AEDC, is a United States Air Force facility to provide testing and evaluation of supersonic aircraft, guided missiles, and aircraft engines of all types. As a wind tunnel and jet-engine testing facility AEDC is destined to become the largest facility of its kind in the United States; so far as we know, in the world.

ARO, Inc., Arnold Research Organization, is a Tennessee corporation organized at the request of the Air Force to operate the AEDC as a contract operator.

Following the recommendation of legislation to create this great center by the Committee on Armed Services of the House, and following the enactment of this legislation into law, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of Defense located this project in Tennessee for a multiplicity of reasons.

I might mention the necessity for, first, an abundance of electric power; and, second, an abundance of patriotic labor as being highly necessary for the successful operation of this important defense installation.

In addition, the area is rather interior in location and, therefore, is considered ideal for security reasons.

The State of Tennessee gave to the Air Force some 33,000 acres of land for this purpose—an area already developed as the location of a former Tennessee State Guard campsite.

President Truman flew to Tennessee 2 years ago and dedicated this great project which is located in Coffee and Franklin Counties, near Tullahoma, Tenn., in the district which I am honored to represent.

The AEDC has been progressing splendidly since its establishment with only a few minor initial interruptions. ARO, Inc., which has served as a contract operator for this project, has supervised and aided in the growth of this great center from a planned paper project to a great defense installation which is now far advanced in its development.

The importance of this installation to the Nation's defense has been repeatedly expressed by top Air Force and Defense personnel. It has been stressed by members of both political parties and both administrations. It is a vital defense installation highly essential to the future security and defense of our country.

Because of the highly scientific and technical nature of its operation the Air Force wants the project run by civilians under contract with the Government. ARO, Inc., was chosen for this purpose. A contract operation of this nature has been determined by the Air Force to be the best method, the most feasible method, for operating this great testing laboratory.

ARO has recruited some very excellent and skilled personnel to operate this center—scientists, engineers, and skilled technicians who can perform this work—who are not always easy to attract. It is this personnel, which the Air Force insists, and rightly so, should not be lost, but retained.

I repeat, the Air Force wants this facility operated by civilians under contract. The Air Force has made this determination. I am not in a position to disagree with the wisdom of the decision of the Air Force in this matter.

I should like to point out that at the time the legislative rider was adopted in the 1953 Appropriations Act, I stated at that time my position on the matter in debate on the floor. Not being a member of the Appropriations Committee, I expressed the hope that no action would be taken that would impede the progress or in any way jeopardize the fullest development of this great air center located in the district which I represent.

During the period of time that has elapsed, extensive studies of the operation of the AEDC and ARO have been made. We have had a new look at ARO as a contract operator.

The inspector general of the Air Force has made an investigation into the situation and the inspector general has come up with a report giving ARO a clean bill of health. There are numerous details in the inspector general's report, including the conclusion that ARO's organization structure is essentially sound, that the educational and experience background of key personnel are excellent, that the engineer-training program was effective in building up a well-qualified and integrated work force, and that ARO's accomplishments were commensurate with the expenditure of funds under its contract, and that the payments to ARO were not unreasonable.

The General Accounting Office has also made an investigation of ARO at the request of the Armed Services Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. Although the report points up a few questionable items—matters in the realm of opinion and judgment—the conclusions reached are that there was no illegality and no wrongdoing, and further, that there was no evidence developed which would indicate that there were any actions taken in connection with the project under any condition other than proper motives.

In other words, the Comptroller General and the GAO also gave the operation a clean bill of health—and, as we all know, the GAO is very efficient and it is difficult for any operation to successfully pass the surveying eye of a General Accounting Office investigation.

In addition, a civilian industry and education advisory board—a nonprofit civilian board—has on two separate occasions had an investigation and evaluation of the performance of ARO as a contract operator. And, in each instance, this civilian advisory board has also given ARO a clean bill of health and has reestablished the position of the Air Force in this matter.

The previous Democratic administration recommended ARO as a responsible contract operator in this connection.

The new Republican administration has taken a new and fresh look at the entire situation, and the Republican administration is also recommending the continuance of ARO as a contract operator for this important defense facility.

It thus appears that this operation has been amply investigated and has bi-

partisan support; and in view of the results of these investigations and of the position of the Air Force in the matter, I feel that the Armed Services Committee should be commended and congratulated for its unanimous favorable report of action in this connection.

It is the considered opinion of the Air Force that this great project—now well advanced—should not be disrupted but should go forward. Time is of the essence, gentlemen, the world situation is critical. We must get on with the job.

Without repeal of this rider the program cannot go forward at this time. Not only officials of the Air Force and our defense personnel, but the people of the District whom I represent are greatly concerned about this matter. We are at a standstill. We are witnessing here today another example of the difficulty which the Congress gets itself into when the Appropriations Committee endeavors to write legislation.

It will be recalled that the Congress recently passed another bill repealing a rider on the Appropriations Act affecting the Navy Department. Here we have another rider—in this instance affecting the Air Force. This provision was recommended as has been stated by our former House colleague—now Senator GORE, from my State—a former member of the House Appropriations Committee. I should like to repeat a statement which I was pleased to make on Tuesday before the House Armed Services Committee—namely, that I have a high regard for Senator GORE, but that I certainly reserve the right to disagree with him, and I do so in this instance as this matter is so vital to the people whom I represent and so vital to the Nation's defense.

I repeat, time is of the essence. I trust that the House will vote favorably and adopt the pending bill in order that we may lift and repeal this restrictive legislative rider. Let us remove the uncertainty which exists with respect to the future of this most vital and important defense installation.

Let us pass this bill and go forward.

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

Mr. EVINS. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Will my colleague state what, in his opinion, the situation would be in case this contract under the provision becomes invalid as of the end of this month?

Mr. EVINS. The morale factor would be very bad. For some time there has been a great deal of uncertainty in the area of the center as to whether or not the life of this organization is to be continued. Many highly skilled personnel have been recruited for this work, and if they are not to be paid we will lose the services of many skilled technicians and scientists and others. The project would be set back and, I feel, its growth and progress impaired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, the only thing I would like to say is that some 10 months ago when this rider was before this body, I joined the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr.

SHORT], now chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, in asking that the House delete this rider from the appropriation bill. The reason I asked for the deletion was because I believed that every man should have his day in court, so to speak, and at that time, of course, this corporation had not had a chance to present their views before any committee. There had been several charges preferred against it, but at no time had they been heard on these charges. For that reason I voted against the rider we now have in the appropriation bill.

Since that time, Mr. Chairman, there have been several investigations not only by the Air Force but by the General Accounting Office and various other organizations with reference to this Tennessee project. Everyone who has investigated has given the corporation a clean bill of health. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly supporting this bill, because who am I to say that the Air Force is wrong and the General Accounting Office is wrong as well as the other people who have investigated this project? With the reputation this corporation has, who am I to say that they are not qualified to operate AEDC?

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think the committee acted properly in reporting this unanimously. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, particularly in view of the fact that the gentleman who recommended this for the Air Force was Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Harold Stuart, of Oklahoma. I appreciate his name being cleared, too.

Mr. SUTTON. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from the Committee on Armed Services. We appreciate the fact that the Air Force brought this great project down to our State of Tennessee, when it was first allocated.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question my distinguished colleague from the Fifth District of Tennessee asked my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] about what the results would be should this bill not be passed, I believe that we would lose at least 1,000 technicians from the project that we now have. The type of technicians we have at AEDC cannot be replaced by the average man on the street. They are scientists. Once we lose them they are gone and they are difficult to replace. This, plus the fact that there are many millions of dollars the Government would lose, plus the fact that the project would be set back several months, when it is needed so badly in our defense program.

I hope the committee and the House will go along with the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Rules and we who have looked into the matter and support this bill wholeheartedly.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been explained very thoroughly and very convincingly, especially by our chairman the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. I want to emphasize one or two things that have been touched on



and one thing that has not been touched on in this discussion.

Let me emphasize, as others have, the fact that this is another good illustration of the futility of putting riders on appropriation bills. When these riders are placed on appropriation bills they have not been adequately covered by hearings. What sounds like a plausible explanation of the situation and a plausible answer to the problem, in the form of a rider, has met us face to face three times in this Congress already. In each case legislation was required to remove the bad effect of the rider. It shows that we should not permit these riders to be tacked onto these bills without prior hearings of the problem, at least by one of the legislative committees.

One thing that I think has not been referred to here and that might be of interest to the Members is the lurking idea of some Members that I talked to who have not read the hearings that this great project we are talking about might be a duplication, in part, of similar facilities somewhere else. We have them at Langley Field, we have the great Ames Laboratory in California. It was my thought that perhaps there would be a duplication of the work done in those laboratories. I asked several of the gentlemen testifying whether there was any duplication of this project in any similar installation in the United States and they all answered emphatically there was not. As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] explained, this is a supersonic wind tunnel. There is nothing like it in the United States; perhaps not in the world. We are lucky we have it.

The great symbol of power today in the world in the military field is air power. That is the symbol in the Navy, and it is the symbol in the Air Force. If we can keep this operation going, it means that the air superiority we are hoping to attain very shortly will be ours, and our protection will be that much greater. All of you have heard the comments by the Chief of the Air Force many times that in some types of planes we are losing our superiority. The way to keep and increase that superiority is to keep this tremendous installation down in Tennessee going as it is now operating.

What would happen if the project is abandoned, has been asked here several times. Let me point out that following the World War we had some very interesting and rather exhaustive hearings in the Committee on Military Affairs with some scientists. They thought the development of science in the atomic field was going to wither away, and these men came all the way from Alamogordo, N. Mex., to appear before our committee and try to emphasize to us that if we did not lay down a program where these scientists could look at it and see there was an opportunity for them to carry on their scientific studies and researches and make their contributions, scientific research would wither and die. There were a group of them there following the hearing and during the hearing on the atomic-control bill. Scientists, so they tell us, are a sort of odd, temperamental people, and if these people down in Ten-

nessee in the ARO project have any uncertainty about the continuation of this project, they will go back to private industry or go back in the educational field. Just yesterday I talked to a man, an engineer, and he pointed out to me that industry is searching the country over for scientists. They are 25 percent short of scientific men whom they need for the development of industry. He was talking to me about a bill to screen that type of manpower in the event they were taken into the armed services. So I would like to stress as much as I can that if we want to retain the superior air power which is ours today, and make it still greater, and make America still more secure, we will pass this bill and allow this project to have the continuity which will make it a success. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the rider was passed. No witness appeared in any hearing in any phase of this problem who testified that something wrong, or illegal, or crooked had been done. Yet now they propose to cut this project off at the pockets, which could kill the most fantastic project of its kind in existence.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the repeal of a rider which was attached to the military appropriation bill last year. I agree with the great majority of the Members of the House that usually these riders—far-reaching riders on appropriation bills—are a mistake. I think this matter, which is before us today, should have originally been handled by the legislative Committee on Armed Forces. In my judgment, the House made a mistake in adopting the rider.

I doubt that all Members of the House understand what we are doing here today because I doubt that all Members have had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the situation. Many Members will recall the controversy over this matter last year. I do not recall all the details of the ARO controversy, but I have no disposition to question the good faith of anyone. The Air Force, the Army, and the Navy have generally run their own installations in the past. This is the first and only major departure in the Air Force of which I know. This is the situation: The Air Force makes a contract with a private concern called ARO to run the installation, ARO providing the personnel and management. We have established overall personnel ceilings in an effort to try to reduce civilian personnel in the Armed Forces, but ARO personnel will not be affected thereby. These people will not be added to the list of people who are on the Federal payroll. From now on you will find that in the list of personnel on the Government payroll thousands of people who will be employed at this laboratory will not be listed as Government personnel. They will be hidden, so to speak. I do not mean hidden in a dishonest way, but they will be hidden. If the Air Force should run the machine shops and other large and complicated facilities by contract, industry would get out

and do the work and hire the people and pay them, and we in Congress would give them a lump-sum appropriation. It may be a good thing. I am going to vote for this repeal, but I am just telling you that we are taking a significant step, although perhaps a necessary step. The issue raises a policy question. For that reason, I thought the matter ought to be studied by the legislative Committee on Armed Services rather than be handled as a rider on an appropriation bill.

Under the contract system there will be no ceiling on salaries at the facility except as provided in the contract. The head of ARO can draw more money than the Secretary of the Air Force or the President of the United States, as far as that is concerned, unless there is some restriction in law or in the contract of which I do not know.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Of course the president of ARO is serving without pay. He draws no salary whatever. While I agree with the gentleman that each branch of the armed services usually conducts its own work, the gentleman is well aware of the fact that because of the peculiar nature of this project, the highly technical aspects of it, not only the Air Force but no branch of the armed services, no branch of the Government is capable of carrying out this research and development work.

Mr. MAHON. That may be true. The gentleman has made a greater study of the problem than I have and I have great respect for his judgment. I believe General Farrell is now being paid \$30,000 as the top man on this project.

Mr. SHORT. Yes. There was one salary of that amount, but the president of ARO is serving without pay.

Mr. MAHON. But the man who runs that laboratory gets \$30,000 a year.

Mr. SHORT. He gets \$30,000, and he could get \$60,000 if he were in private industry.

Mr. MAHON. I know that General Farrell is a highly capable man. I am not saying that he should not get it, but what I am saying is that the contract holder is footloose and fancyfree to hire any people he wants to hire and pay them any salary he wants to pay. It is wholly up to the discretion of the Air Force in negotiating the contract, and the Congress does not get into the picture except in providing a lump-sum appropriation for operating the plant. Of course, Congress can control the lump-sum appropriation. If we ran all our Federal installations that way it would change the picture. You could take half a million people off the payroll of the Government today by appropriating a lump sum and contracting with industry to run the various facilities. That might be a good thing. I am just raising the question of broad policy of government which is involved.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. The point that the gentleman stresses is the fact of how

you are going to operate these facilities. I have high respect for the gentleman's opinion, but we are faced with this situation: how to operate this highly technical tool with men who can demand and get twice as much salary as we can pay.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman raises a valid point. Of course if we should determine that the contract policy is wrong we should have the courage to raise the pay of highly qualified personnel in the Air Force.

Mr. DURHAM. I might point out something that happened this morning. A boy has been hired by industry. Just this morning they hired him at twice the salary we pay here. I do not know how we are going to replace him. What are we going to do? We are operating the atomic energy plant practically on the basis on which we are operating this. Are you going to let the Army, Navy, and Air Force take over the scientists of the country and try to conduct this basic research? If you do, you will be making a most colossal failure.

Mr. MAHON. I have merely raised a point which I thought should be raised in connection with this bill. I hope the committee has made the proper determination.

Now, let us face the facts.

After ARO has run this multimillion dollar project for, let us say, 5 years, it will have an undue advantage over the Government when contracts are renewed from time to time. I think the point is obvious. The Government could hardly refuse to renew the ARO contract because there would be no other qualified bidder. I hope the Armed Forces Committee has thoroughly explored this aspect of the matter. On the face of the thing it would seem that the Government would soon lose much of its bargaining power.

Mr. DURHAM. Just at that point, the NACA has been running other facilities.

Mr. MAHON. The NACA has been running its own facility.

Mr. DURHAM. That is a Government facility run by a civilian agency, it is not an Army agency installation.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. And it has done a good job. You could bring it under Government operation and build up one of the most colossal Government agencies in this country, but the whole theory of this thing is to bring private enterprise into this picture so we can get some efficiency and not run into all these dead ends.

Mr. MAHON. That may be the way to get it, and it could be that we should fully explore the possibility of running many of our military installations on a contract basis with private industry.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman has had extensive experience with appropriations for defense. Does the gentleman feel that if this installation were run by the Air Corps it would be more economical or that it would cost more money? Please understand that it would be personally satisfactory with me for the Air Force to run this base, but some decision

must be made. This uncertainty as to the future operation of this installation cannot be continued.

Mr. MAHON. I could not say, with certainty. It could be that a private operation would be cheaper. The principal question which I raise is one of policy.

Mr. EVINS. It would be a more cumbersome operation, and they would have to have the same type of men running it.

Mr. MAHON. That may be. I felt that the policy question should be raised. I shall vote to repeal the rider.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution pending before the Committee.

In the first place I think we should remember that this is a contract negotiated by the previous administration; that since the new administration has taken over it has been reviewed in great detail.

Mr. Talbott, the present Secretary for Air, appeared before our committee, as did his chief of research and development, or whatever his title may be. They reviewed the contract as it had been made by their predecessors. I do not believe it would be necessary to convince anyone that they had no reason to justify the contract made by their predecessors. There are but a few sources to contact for services such as this, pure research, organizations such as Westinghouse, General Electric, and other great research organizations of the country. They had been original suppliers in the building of this institution, and it was not thought they should receive the contract. In any event, they endorsed the contract.

I will agree with my colleague from Texas that on the policy of contracting I would not agree that it would be a good policy to contract for standard services such as repair, maintenance, and things of that kind; but when it comes to basic research you have an entirely different question. I do not know how you are ever going to get men qualified in basic research who would be willing in the first instance to work at Government salaries when so much better salaries are available to them in industry, and the great advantage to these scientists of being connected with the large engineering organizations, such as in this case now being used by that organization in the case of ARO, or being connected with Westinghouse working on a Government contract even for a subsidiary corporation. The moment they secure connection with a great nationwide organization their career is fixed; they know that their career is stable and that if this one thing should ever play out there is other work available.

It was testified that many of these highly skilled men are temperamental

and some of them not too practical as businessmen, and they look for a position where their thoughts will be free for them to devote themselves entirely to technical things on which they are working. It has proved successful in connection with atomic energy. I happen to serve on that committee as well as on the Committee on Armed Services.

Now, this idea, that they could pay anything they want, I do not believe is quite correct. The contract is negotiated every year. It is true it is based in reference to what the future expenditures of operation might be, on what was required for operating the previous year, but the contract is subject to renegotiation. After the money is paid the Government still has the opportunity to recoup for any excess profits or for any extraordinary or extravagant expenditures. So that there is definite control on the part of the Government.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate what the gentleman said, particularly with reference to the question of a contract that must be negotiated annually. Is there any other provision other than the renegotiation approach whereby the Armed Services Committee of the House or the Senate would have any opportunity to know anything about the details of an annual contract before it is negotiated without having to resort later, if necessary, to the question of renegotiation?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know that there is any provision that would apply to a contract of this kind. In connection with the reactivation of a plant and a contract then being entered into for operation, it would have to be resubmitted. But you do have direct control of renegotiations in connection with it.

Mr. Chairman, this is a highly important matter. It was testified before our committee that so far as is known this is the only installation of its kind in the world. There is nowhere else in the world an organization of this kind for research and development in connection with aircraft. Some of the machinery there is at least twice as large as anything of a comparable nature known to exist anywhere else in the world.

We have here a provision which cuts off the money for ARO on the 31st of March. You have \$100 million invested. There is not a single word in this provision as to what you are going to do with that \$100 million plant. Are you going to close it up and disband the personnel and have no way to operate or manage something so highly essential to the aviation industry and to the progress of these supersonic speeds? I think it is highly essential that the House take action to remove the restriction which was placed in an appropriation bill. I will not belabor the point of passing restrictive provisions or substantive legislation on appropriation bills where they are offered on the floor of the House and considered under a very limited time for debate, with no opportunity for the committee to develop the facts.



I think the main thing here is that administrations have changed. An entire new administration of the Air Force has come in. The new Secretary of the Air Force has had no responsibility for issuing the contract and now he wholeheartedly defends the contract as made by his predecessors. That is a very wholesome thing, in my opinion. I was very glad to see that these gentlemen who have taken over from our Democratic administration were objective about it and that they recognize the welfare of the country requires this provision be removed. I hope it will be without delay.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That so much of title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 530), as reads: "Provided, That no part of such appropriation shall be used to make any payment to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953, unless Congress shall have directed otherwise," is hereby repealed.*

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4130) to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953, pursuant to House Resolution 187, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 89 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the activities and operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs with reference to (1) the manner in which the Bureau of Indian Affairs has performed its functions of studying the various tribes, bands, and groups of Indians to determine their qualifications for management of their own affairs without further supervision of the Federal Government; (2) the manner in which the Bureau of Indian Affairs has fulfilled its obligations of trust as the agency of the Federal Government charged with the guardianship of Indian property; (3) the*

*adequacy of law and regulations to assure the faithful performance of trust in the exchange, lease, or sale of surface or subsurface interests in or title to real property or disposition of personal property of Indian wards.*

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable, including (1) a list of the tribes, bands, or groups of Indians found to be qualified for full management of their own affairs; (2) legislative proposals designed to promote the earliest practicable termination of all Federal supervision and control over Indians; (3) a listing of functions now carried on by the Bureau of Indian Affairs which may be discontinued or transferred to other agencies of the Federal Government or to the States; (4) names of States where further operation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs should be discontinued; (5) recommended legislation for removal of legal disability of Indians by reason of guardianship by the Federal Government; (6) findings concerning transactions involving the exchange, lease, or sale of lands or interests in lands belonging to Indian wards, with specific findings as to such transactions in the States of Oregon and Washington.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any other member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 24, after "wards", strike out "with specific findings as to such transactions in the States of Oregon and Washington."

Page 3, line 4, strike out "its Territories, and possessions."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is practically identical in every way to a resolution which was passed by this House in June of last year. The investigation authorized and directed by the resolution passed at that time was begun by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but no hearings were held, and the report made by the committee, while it is an excellent volume, is very little more than a catalog of the statistics concerning Indians and the Indian problems, which are stated.

The Secretary of the Interior recently gave an expression of his views on the various problems involved in administering the affairs of the Indians. One of the paragraphs in that statement reads in part as follows:

Federal responsibility for administering the affairs of individual Indian tribes should be terminated as rapidly as the circumstances of each tribe will permit.

In order to prepare the legislation necessary to carry out that and other

parts of the announced policy regarding Indians, a complete and full study of the subject must be made. This is not an investigation. There is no witch-hunt type of thing involved in this resolution. It is a study of a problem which has faced this country for some years, and which must be resolved.

At the present time there are approximately 300,000 Indians in this country. We are presently employing 12,000 people to administer their affairs, at an annual cost of some \$83 million. It is vital not only that this expense be stopped but that as many of these people as possible be given their full and free citizenship in this country.

The pending resolution also directs the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make a full and complete inquiry into land transactions involving lands belonging to Indians. During 1951 some transactions in Indian timberlands in the State of Oregon and Washington appeared to be irregular, to say the least. It is important that complete information regarding those transactions, or similar deals in other States, be obtained.

Practically the same resolution has been introduced by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] and was sponsored in the last Congress by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOWL].

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules reported this resolution unanimously. We thought it might present an opportunity to save us some money.

I have no desire to consume any time discussing the resolution, and yield back my time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. BAKER. 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. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend section 8 (a) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 so as to provide that the Tennessee Valley Authority shall continue to maintain its principal office at Knoxville, Tenn.

My proposed amendment to the act reads as follows:

Sec. 8. (a) The corporation shall maintain its principal office in the immediate vicinity of Knoxville, Tenn. The corporation shall be held to be an inhabitant and resident of the eastern judicial district of Tennessee within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to the venue of civil suits.

Tennessee Valley Authority was created as a corporation by the Congress on May 18, 1933. The stated purpose of the act was to maintain and operate the properties then owned by the United

States in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Ala., in the interest of the national defense and for agricultural and industrial development, and to improve navigation in the Tennessee River and to control the destructive floodwaters in the Tennessee River and Mississippi River basins.

The act provided that the corporation should be held to be an inhabitant and resident of the northern judicial district of Alabama. However, Tennessee Valley Authority has always maintained its principal offices at Knoxville, Tenn.

On March 19, 1953, the general manager of TVA at Knoxville announced to a committee of the Knoxville Chamber of Commerce that the TVA board of directors and managerial staffs now located in Knoxville and Chattanooga will move to Muscle Shoals about 18 months from now and that about 500 office employees will make the transfer.

The general manager further stated that a lease has been arranged for an office building which is to be erected adjacent to the Wilson Dam Reservation, which will be completed in the summer of 1954. That the following offices will move from Knoxville: Board of directors, general manager, and the headquarters of the divisions of finance, law, personnel, agricultural relations, regional studies, and reservoir properties. Moving from Chattanooga will be headquarters office of the division of health and safety, with about 35 employees.

Thus, it will be readily seen that if this plan is carried into effect approximately 500 families who have been residents of Knoxville, Tenn., for many years, and most of whom own their homes in Knoxville, will be required to move to Muscle Shoals, Ala.

It was announced that the contemplated office building would be a 7-story structure containing 120,000 square feet of usable space, and that the lease would be for 20 years with TVA holding an option to purchase.

The announcement by John Oliver, the general manager, contained the further provision:

TVA will do everything it can, within the limits of its authority and consistent with sound management, to help employees get relocated. TVA will work with the Muscle Shoals community to get school, transportation, and other facilities expanded if necessary. Decisions on housing, of course, must finally be made by each individual.

I respectfully submit that there is no justification for this action. These people are citizens of Knoxville, Tenn. They have always engaged in community and welfare work such as Red Cross drives, Community Chest and educational programs. They own their homes and would have to sell their homes at a great sacrifice if 300 or 400 homes were placed on the market at about the same time.

The school plants of the city of Knoxville and of Knox County have been enlarged and vast sums of money spent to take care of the education of the children of these welcome employees of TVA.

It is certainly not in the interest of national defense to create an acute housing shortage at Muscle Shoals, Ala., and to require the building of 500 homes and the enlargement of educational facilities.

TVA is logically associated throughout the Nation with the State of Tennessee, although it serves a seven-State area. The reason for this association is apparent from the following figures.

There are 14 major TVA dams in Tennessee; and only three in Alabama. The two new dams under construction are in Tennessee.

There are 6 major TVA steam plants in Tennessee and 3 under construction; only 2 steam plants in Alabama with 1 under construction.

Eight hundred and sixty-five thousand customers are served by TVA electricity in Tennessee through municipalities and cooperatives; only 143,000 in Alabama.

The income by TVA from power revenues in the calendar year 1952 in the State of Tennessee was \$72 million; in Alabama, \$15 million.

The net TVA plant investment in power facilities as of June 30, 1952, in Tennessee was \$477,273,095; in Alabama, \$157,725,455.

At the time TVA took over the Government reservation at Muscle Shoals, Ala., I am informed that there were about 200 dwellings on the property. In 1950 these dwelling houses were declared surplus by TVA and sold at public auction for something over \$100,000, with the requirement that the houses be moved off the Government property, which was done.

I requested the Tennessee Valley Authority to furnish me with a copy of whatever contract or agreement they had in respect to the proposed new office building at Muscle Shoals, Ala. A copy of this agreement has been furnished to me by TVA.

The agreement bears date, March 10, 1953, and is between Wallace S. Pitts, Sr., and TVA.

Its pertinent provisions are that TVA proposes to declare surplus 30½ acres of land located in Colbert County, Ala., a part of the Wilson Dam Reservation, and that Pitts, the contractor, proposes to bid personally, or through a corporation to be formed by him, for said site at the auction sale an initial bid \$26,000, and in the event of other bids to continue to raise the bid in an amount not to exceed \$60,000. Then in the event Pitts becomes the owner of this piece of land, he proposes to erect thereon an office building for occupancy by TVA.

Section 4 of the contract provides that Pitts shall cause to be formed an Alabama corporation and it is contemplated that the financing of the erection of the office building will be with New York Life Insurance Co. and certain banks in Alabama. The building is to be leased to TVA for a term of 20 years.

The agreement provides that—

TVA will pay a base rental in equal quarterly installments in such amount as will, during the 20-year term of the lease—

1. Will amortize a principal sum of \$3,140,000 (plus that part of the cost of the site, if any, which is in excess of \$26,000, but such excess for this purpose shall not be more than \$34,000;

2. Pay interest on unamortized principal balances at the rate of 4 percent per annum; provided, that during the first 10 years of lease term, the base quarterly rental payments shall be uniformly increased by such amount as will amortize a principal sum of \$580,000, and pay interest on unamortized

principal balances at the rate of 4 percent per annum during said 4-year period.

It is further provided that in addition to the base monthly rental specified, TVA shall pay all ad valorem taxes and assessments lawfully levied against the premises and premiums on insurance and shall maintain the premises in good and tenable repair.

It is further provided that at any time during the term of the lease, TVA shall have the option to purchase the leased premises, the base purchase price being placed at \$3,720,000 plus that part of the cost of the site, if any, which is in excess of \$26,000, not to exceed \$34,000, less such part thereof as has been amortized by TVA's base rental premiums.

In the event the option to purchase is not exercised until the end of the term of the lease, the property shall be conveyed to TVA upon expiration of the lease and payment of the final base rental installment.

The agreement contains the following provision:

The lease shall contain a provision that it shall be deemed to contain, as if fully set forth herein, all the provisions required by section 104 of the Renegotiation Act of 1951.

In addition to urging passage of the bill, which I have introduced, I shall ask the Appropriations Committee to incorporate in the current appropriations bill at the appropriate place in connection with the TVA current appropriation substantially the following language:

Provided, however, no part of the funds herein appropriated or any corporate funds of Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the purpose of defraying the cost of moving the administrative offices of Tennessee Valley Authority from Knoxville, Tenn., or for the payment of rental of a proposed new office building not yet erected at or near Muscle Shoals, Ala.

#### MAPLE SIRUP

Mr. MARSHALL. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Indians along the shores of Mille Lacs Lake taught the early Minnesota settlers to make maple sirup, the sap run has come to be one of the first signs of spring in our State.

This week Members of the Minnesota delegation received a welcome reminder of the maple sirup harvest—a bottle of pure maple sirup from the Holbert Bros., of Onamia, Minn., in my district.

Attractively packaged as Old Grand Mom, this sirup represents the finest skills of old and new methods of bringing a great natural product to the dinner table. Since the Indians first boiled the sap gathered from the maple forests while the snow is still deep to quicken the flow, modern science has blended with age-old experience in improving nature's valuable food.

During my visit to the Department of Agriculture's Northeast Regional Laboratory in Philadelphia with the agriculture appropriations subcommittee last weekend, I was pleasantly surprised to



find this product from my district held up as a prime example of the latest in maple-sirup making. The experts regard it as a fine demonstration of what can be done to bring the enjoyment of pure maple sirup to more and more people.

I was shown maple-sugar cubes from the Holbert Bros. which bring the essence of the sap gathered in the maple forests into concentrated form without losing the rich, natural flavor and sweetness. Modern methods and a natural product combine to make Minnesota's maple sirup the equal of the finest produced anywhere.

The maple-sirup industry is unique to the American Continent and from its beginnings in early New England it has been carried on in family traditions. In my district people everywhere in the sugar-maple areas join in boiling the sap and making the sirup in their own ways.

As an industry, maple-sirup production is growing in importance with each new advance made by our scientists to improve the techniques without ever sacrificing the natural values of the clear, sweet sap which runs from the pierced trees each spring. The Holbert Bros. represent the aggressive and forward-looking Minnesota sirup industry and the merits of their product can be attested to by the Minnesota delegation privileged to receive this finest of maple sirups.

It takes almost 35 gallons of sap gathered painstakingly to the sap house to make 1 gallon of pure sirup. The sap is gathered by hand from the buckets and taken to the sap house in a tank drawn by horses through the still heavy snow.

Maple-sirup making is a pioneer industry and the gathering of sap is still the colorful experience it was in its oldest days. Yet the industry utilizes the most modern improvements and best in modern packaging to bring its product to the family buyer.

This is a good example of what can be done to open new opportunities for the products of our farms and forests. The Department of Agriculture has expressed its appreciation for the cooperation of the Holbert Bros. in carrying forward the best scientific advances in the maple-sirup industry.

It is good to know that new methods help to bring us all of the best in one of nature's own products. Once again Americans show their unique ability to use the old and the new together for better living.

If you visit Minnesota when the "sap's running" be sure to see all of the excitement of maple-sirup-making time.

#### PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate of the Minnesota State Legislature have passed a joint resolution memorializing the Congress to take active steps to improve and make perma-

nent our price-support program. These recommendations are worthy of the serious consideration of every Member of the Congress since this 11-point program is prompted by firsthand knowledge of the farm situation at home.

#### Resolution 5

Joint resolution memorializing the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States to support measures promoting fair prices for agricultural commodities in the national interest

Whereas the continuing upward trend in farm-operating costs and the downward trend in farm prices threaten acute distress to farmers in this area; and

Whereas the Government has again called on farmers to meet huge production goals in the interest of the national defense and welfare, and to build up surpluses of food in the national interest which in the absence of further supporting action will depress prices further, and thus penalize farmers for patriotic effort; and

Whereas only two Minnesota crops, wheat and corn, are treated as basic commodities under the present law; and

Whereas designation of oats, rye, barley, flax, and soybeans as basic commodities for mandatory price supports under the law would tend to balance farm production, and help prevent unneeded surpluses; and

Whereas perishable farm products such as milk, meat, butter, and eggs make up approximately 70 percent of the cash farm income of Minnesota farmers and these commodities are without adequate price protection; and

Whereas younger farmers are already in financial difficulty and it has become difficult for young men to start farming with today's high costs and uncertain outlook, and

Whereas a farm depression would have a serious effect upon the entire national economy; and

Whereas legislation has been introduced in Congress to improve and make permanent the farm-price-support laws: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States, be requested to do all in their power to improve and make permanent a farm-price-support program; by*

First, extending price supports to include oats, rye, barley, flax, and soybeans as basic commodities; and

Second, attempting to provide a balanced system of price supports for perishable products, including hogs, beef cattle, milk, poultry, and eggs, returning producers of these important products parity for their work and investment; and

Third, providing whenever practical, self-regulated and self-financed price-support programs; and

Fourth, providing an incentive system of price supports on commodities in short supply to encourage production shifts without acreage controls; and

Fifth, taking steps to protect and expand markets at home and abroad for farm products, including the consideration of the International Wheat Agreement; and

Sixth, to expand greatly research for farm production and marketing, especially in ways to reduce the spread between farm and retail prices for farm products, so as to safeguard the farmer's total income; and

Seventh, to permit family farm ownership and operation by providing an adequate and available supply of long-term, low-interest credit; and

Eighth, using a system of democratically elected farmer committees to carry out the operations of all possible parts of the farm program; and

Ninth, encouraging more soil conservation so as to meet the needs of the Nation without

depleting our agricultural resources and productive capacity; and

Tenth, recognizing that as a strong Nation we must have food to win and hold allies, to provide that when farm products are purchased for such use the farmer should not get less than the support price; and

Eleventh, providing for adequate crop storage facilities so that the loan program is freely available to all farmers;

All to the end that agriculture may continue to meet the ever-increasing food demands of our Nation, without jeopardizing the farmers' economic position; and be it further

*Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.*

JOHN A. HARTLE,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

ANCHER NELSEN,

*President of the Senate.*

Adopted by the house of representatives, the 9th day of March 1953.

G. H. LEAHY,

*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*

Adopted by the senate, the 17th day of March 1953.

H. Y. TORREY,

*Secretary of the Senate.*

Approved March 20, 1953.

C. E. ANDERSON,

*Governor of the State of Minnesota.*  
Filed March 20, 1953.

Mrs. MIKE HOLM,

*Secretary of the State of Minnesota.*

#### A HAVEN FOR IRON CURTAIN ESCAPEES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, all of us applaud the escape of the six who prefer freedom from Czechoslovakia by the sensational passenger airplane exploit under the leadership of Helmut Cermiak, an engineer, and M. Slovak, the pilot. We have similarly applauded other sensational escapes, some, like that of the young Polish pilot who flew a Russian MIG to Denmark, of inestimable aid to free world defense and security. These escapes are a tremendous blow to the Communists and their satellites. We want them continued, but are we offering the escapees a real haven? The nonpreference Czechoslovak immigration quota into the United States is mortgaged ahead to the year 2000.

Those escapees from behind the Iron Curtain who have been crowding into West Berlin by the thousands since the Communists have been trying to seal off the East from the West zone of Germany, are living under the grave difficulties of crowded refugee camps far beyond the capacity of West Berlin to maintain. West Berlin is now receiving almost 1,500 refugees a day. The situation is such that Mayor Reuter, of West Berlin, is here on a money-raising mission for their relief.

Only adequate immigration opportunities can give these escapees from behind the Iron Curtain a fair haven. The number is not unmanageable. There are 15,000 escapees, other than East zone

Germans (who have German nationality), from behind the Iron Curtain in West Europe. But resettlement by immigration will not work if we do not take our fair share as we did with the displaced persons. The displaced-persons law permitted the admission of political refugees; there is now no such provision on the books. Such legislation should be high on the congressional agenda as a must. This agenda is the responsibility of the administration and of our congressional leadership. The Judiciary Committee could take prompt action on this matter, as there is no trouble in getting up the necessary legislation as soon as it gets the green light for this session.

#### NATIONAL GENERAL STAFF SYSTEM

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### DAYTON, OHIO: FROM DOOMED CITY TO FORTUNATE VALLEY

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today my home town of Dayton, Ohio, was at the darkest moment in its entire history. The waters of the Miami, Stillwater, and Mad Rivers raged through the streets. During the days that Dayton and many other communities in the Miami Valley were under water, great fires raged unchecked and added to the destruction and loss of life. When the waters receded, 300 lives had been lost and property damage exceeded \$100 million.

Many people claimed that Dayton and the Miami Valley could never recover from this disaster, that never again would the area be out of danger from similar floods. Ten years later this threat had been removed forever—removed through the efforts of the people themselves. The secret of the achievement was cooperation. All the citizens of the Miami Valley worked steadfastly for the group as a whole in cooperation with each other, recognizing that what is good for one is good for the other and never losing sight of the fact the future of any group lies in the hands of all the people and not just a selective few.

I feel that the lesson learned in those harrowing days of the flood itself, and the years which followed is one which should serve not only the people of my district, but all the people of our great Nation, as an example of what men and women can accomplish when they work together with an unconquerable spirit toward a common goal.

I remember those dark and frightening days well. My father owned a grocery store at the corner of Broadway and Riverview. Although the water did not come into the store itself, it was surging in the street just out the door. Best of all I remember the long, tense hours we all worked to distribute my father's grocery stock to as many families who were without food as we could reach.

The record of flood control in the Miami Valley and the establishment of the Conservancy District is an epic in American history. It is also a tribute to the pioneering spirit of the people of the Miami Valley and the men who led the flood-control movement, men such as Col. Edward A. Deeds, John H. Patterson, Arthur E. Morgan, John A. McMahon, Judge Horace S. Oakley, and many, many others.

I would like to briefly outline how cooperation changed Dayton from the "Doomed City" to the "Fortunate Valley."

The Dayton of 1913 was a city of character. Although the population was a mixture of people from New England, Bavaria, Pennsylvania, and the South, with a touch of Irish, Slav, and Negro, it had elements of homogeneity and of a common spirit which gave it some of the characteristics of a village with a long history in which the people were neighbors. It was a city of greatly varied home-owned industries, nearly all of which had originated and developed there. Life in the narrow valley was prosperous, but constantly subject to one menace—that of flood. The pioneer towns of the valley had barely begun their development when, in the month of March 1805, a flood occurred which probably was not exceeded in size until the disaster of March 1913. After the flood a levee was built along the river by the new settlers which was washed away in 1828 by another flood. Although the levee system was enlarged through the years, it was again breached in 1847. As the cities grew larger, flood damage increased. The floods of 1866, 1897, and 1898 and the lesser ones during the intervening years finally stirred the city government of Dayton. Plans for flood control were made and remade as the years passed. Finally, in the spring of 1913 all formalities were completed, finances were arranged, contracts were let, the construction equipment was erected, and the work was to start the following week, when the great flood of 1913 burst upon the valley. When it was past, the contractor's equipment was a wreck in midchannel.

However, failure to have the construction completed in time was not a disaster since the flood of 1913 was more than 2½ times as great as that against which protection had been planned.

The flood itself is history. The storm began on March 23. By March 25 the water was overflowing unprotected lands in the north part of Dayton and finally the muddy waters spilled over the top of the levees into the city. By morning on the 26th, the floodwater in Dayton had reached its crest, about 10 feet deep in the main section of the city. From then it fell slowly.

That so few people did lose their lives is witness to the generally widespread initiative, resourcefulness, and courageous self-reliance of the people of the valley. As soon as the nature of the catastrophe became known, local citizens went to work at rescue and relief, without instruction or direction, as though each one were the person individually responsible for saving life. Stories of individual heroism are legion. Naturally, the National Cash Register factory, with its organization ready for work, was the biggest of the relief stations. It was unharmed by water, and it had so extensive a plant that it was the logical place to house a large number of people. Heat, water, shelter, were all at hand, and a start on the food problem was made. John H. Patterson, with his drive and executive ability, organized the relief work in the southern part of the city. In the northern part, an equally fine job was done by a citizen-organized group.

At best, the structure of local government is adequate for only the usual activities. The floodwaters in effect washed away the relatively weak city government, and its functions were taken over by forceful men who quickly created or adapted organizations to serve the immediate need, or by outside State or Federal agencies. Among a people without democratic traditions, the situation might have led to efforts to gain permanent control of city affairs. In fact, however, these emergency agencies were created on the spot or were brought in from outside, served their short-time purposes, and then disappeared, leaving civil processes and authority in control.

Because of the physical setup of National Cash Register Co. and because John H. Patterson, the founder and owner, was a master of system, organization and effective leadership, Mr. Patterson assumed control of the situation. On March 28, a number of citizens met with Gen. George H. Wood, of the Ohio National Guard, and communicated with Governor Cox, who went through the form of creating a Citizens' Relief Committee. Mr. Patterson was appointed president, and W. F. Bippus, secretary and treasurer. All orders signed by Mr. Patterson were honored by all the posts of the National Guard.

Too many Daytonians to name gave able assistance as members of this committee. The National Guard, the Red Cross, and the Citizens' Relief Committee worked hand in hand to bring order out of chaos. On May 6, the period of emergency administration for Dayton was at an end. Martial law was suspended by Governor Cox and the civil government resumed its usual functions, although the Red Cross and Citizens' Committee continued to be of service.

I go into this emergency government period to prove that controls and dictatorlike authority can be inaugurated and as easily abandoned when the need is over.

Even before martial law had been lifted, the people of Dayton had organized to prevent the threat of future tragedies. Five committees were set up to work along with the city government. They were flood prevention, finance, public improvement, sanitation and traffic.



The finance committee began a whirlwind campaign to raise \$2,000,000 to apply toward flood prevention, and Arthur E. Morgan was engaged to take charge of flood-prevention investigations. An open meeting was held and a final accounting showed contributions of \$2,130,000 from 23,000 subscribers. This flood-prevention fund financed the preparation of plans and the other essential expenses for about 4 years, until proceeds from bond issues were available. Thereupon 10 percent was reserved for possible further needs, and about 83 percent was turned back to the subscribers. This, you will admit, is an unusual history for a contributed fund. As Mr. Patterson withdrew from active leadership, Col. Edward A. Deeds, then vice president of NCR, became the spearhead of the project. He went up and down the valley speaking untiringly on the need for adequate flood control.

In addition to surveys and studies on which the engineering plans were to be based, and the actual development of those plans, the group was also engaged in working out the general structure of flood-control legislation. When the general outline was prepared, it was turned over to a legal staff, headed by John A. MacMahon, to be cast into suitable legal form. The Ohio conservancy bill, which he drafted in close cooperation with Arthur Morgan and others, was one of the first in the field, but nevertheless extremely sound. Its soundness was attested by the fact that it withstood prolonged and vigorous attack in the State and Federal courts. All through the process of drafting the conservancy bill and its tests in the courts, Judge O. B. Brown and his associate, Alfred Swift Frank, carried the legal work of the district.

On January 19, 1914, the conservancy bill was introduced into the Ohio House by Representative Victor Vonderheide, of Dayton. After some hesitation on the part of the house, the bill was passed with the emergency clause and became part of the laws of Ohio on February 7. While the conservancy bill was on its way through the legislature, the legal staff of the district was preparing to circulate a petition for the establishment of a conservancy district. On February 18, 1914, the petition, with far more than the required signatures, was filed in the common pleas court of Montgomery County. On June 28, 1915, after long legal battles, the conservancy court declared the Miami Conservancy District organized. The court appointed Edward Deeds, Henry M. Allen, of Troy, and Gordon S. Rentschler, of Hamilton, as directors. Colonel Deeds, who became president of the board, donated the Miami Conservancy Building to be "an outward and visible sign of inward and spiritual strength" in order to encourage those citizens who were beginning to lose heart in the project. The building had the desired effect since the citizens plunged even more vigorously into their fight to protect their homes from this threat of flood.

Plans for actual construction began. While the legal hearings on appraisals and bids were underway, plans for the financing through the sale of bonds were

completed. Fifteen million dollars of serial bonds were issued. Then, only 5 years after the flood, in January of 1918 actual work began. It is one of the shortest periods recorded among similar projects. In April of 1923 announcement was made of the completion of the work included in the official plan.

Just 10 years earlier the people of the valley were cleaning the mud out of their houses and were wondering what would be the future of an area subject to such a threat. In no other great flood-control project in America, aside perhaps from the one on the Mississippi, had construction work even been begun within 10 years of the time of the disaster which brought it about. The expenditure had been about \$30,000,000.

However, it is not the actual dollars spent that make this project significant. It is the fact that the people themselves without financial help from the Federal Government worked together and personally provided the funds to make their valley safe.

The Miami Conservancy District, through its pioneering, not only succeeded in its direct aims but wrote another chapter in the history of rugged American individualism.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE], the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER], and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] be excused from the House this week. They are in California as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities conducting hearings on the west coast.

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

There was no objection.

#### A PROPOSED CHIEF OF INFANTRY FOR THE MILITARY FORCES

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to develop in the days ahead one important concept which, implemented, I think will add to the security of the Nation and to a fuller understanding of one aspect of foreign affairs.

I intend to develop the theme of having a chief of infantry for our ground forces.

I think circumstances in Korea have shown clearly that only that ground which the foot soldier holds does civil government control.

If this Nation had appreciated that fact during World War II it might have realized that the enforcement power of

our covenants extends to the end of our bayonet.

I shall develop this idea of a chief of infantry, Mr. Speaker, in the days ahead.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report on the so-called submerged or tidelands oil bill, reported out by the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

#### MONETARY POLICIES OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by the turn of things as they relate to our economy and insofar as they concern our monetary affairs. I know there is a great deal going on right now affecting economic conditions. I know the sincere desire of people in responsible positions of government and outside of government for a stable economy. I share their views. We need a stable economy, and we need a stable dollar. I do not share the views of those who believe that we should make the dollar worth a great deal more so quickly and so suddenly. I think our number one must problem is to stabilize the dollar where it is, and then take a look and discreetly go from there.

Recently the Federal Reserve Board issued orders and caused to be put into effect certain practices that have resulted in an increase in the interest rates. The increase in interest rates on short-term Government obligations, certificates, and bills, has caused other interest rates to go up. This has had a tremendous effect on our economy as a whole. For instance, Government bonds have gone down in value, until they went to 99, 98, 97, 96, 95, 94, and on yesterday they dropped below 94. That is the first time since World War I when such a situation has existed. After World War I, many of us remember that Government bonds went down even lower than 93. They went down to 80, and in some of the remote sections of our country, where they did not have access to quick information, they went down as low as 76. Those bonds were very quickly bought up by people who were traveling over the country buying them, and shortly thereafter they went back to par. The people of our country were aroused and disturbed by that, and when an emergency

came on, about 1938, the early part of 1939, one of the first things this Congress considered before the Ways and Means Committee in determining a good way to finance the emergency which we could see approaching us, was to determine a good way to protect the people against losses on the purchase of bonds which they had bought and would buy in order to carry on the national defense program, which was this very problem. I was before the Ways and Means Committee, and other Members of Congress went before the Ways and Means Committee, and we told about this cheating on Government bonds, and we asked the committee to do something to stop it in the future; that we did not want that to occur in America again; that people who patriotically bought bonds should not be compelled to sell those bonds at a great loss; the Government should not permit them to sell those bonds or cause them to sell those bonds at a great loss; that it was absolutely wrong. All right. They decided we would not have any such thing as that to happen again. They arranged for E, F, and G bonds, and the Federal Reserve Open Markets Committee protected the bond market, so they would not go below par. That protection continued until the last year or two, but then the peg was taken out by the Federal Reserve Board through the Open Market Committees that they dominated, and bonds were allowed to go down again. That is the same situation facing us now which faced us after World War I, and something which we were determined to guard against.

Now, why are these bonds permitted to go down? Of course, the idea is to raise interest rates. Well, why raise interest rates? We are told that is the way to make the dollar worth more; that we have a 50-cent dollar, and we will make it worth more. Well, how much more valuable do we want to make it? Do we want to make it a 75-cent dollar? If we do, that means it will require 50 percent more labor, 50 percent more services, 50 percent more farm products and 50 percent more goods to pay the dollar that is created on these debts. How high do you want this dollar? Do you want it to go back to 1939 where it was 100 cents? If you do, in effect you double the value of the debts of this Nation. At one time in 1920, the farmers of this country borrowed money to make crops like cotton, corn, and wheat, when the prices of those products were very high. Cotton was about 40 cents a pound and the others were at a comparable price. But everything went down so much that when the time came to pay those debts cotton was worth one-fourth that much, and the other products in proportion. So they had to pay four times the same kind of dollars to pay those debts. We do not want that to occur again. It broke the country, absolutely broke the country. We do not want that to happen any more. But if you double the value of the dollar it will happen. So we do not want the dollar to go down any more in value; we want to stabilize the dollar and maintain it as a stabilized dollar, but we must first determine how much that dollar should be before making it too valuable too quickly.

In 1919 and 1920 before the great boom and bust certain things happened to which I want to invite your attention. I have before me certain charts. They were not prepared by any particular economist or any person who had a personal axe to grind or personal idea to sell; they were prepared by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. They are Federal Reserve charts on bank credit, money rates, and business, put out in September 1952. On page 42 of this book of charts I find the short-term interest rates chart commencing from the early part of 1919 down to 1950. You will notice that the short-term interest rates went up real fast before the boom and bust in 1920 and 1921. The rediscount rates of the Federal Reserve banks went way up and they reached the top and then there was a bust. You know what happened to the country; the country went through a wringer; people lost their homes by the thousands and tens of thousands, their businesses went broke and everything else. Then the rediscount rate went way down, took a nosedive; short term money rates went way down; the country got stabilized again. Then in 1927 and 1928 they started up again, the boom and bust just like it was in 1919, exactly the same way, the same change in interest rates until in October 1929, October, there was another bust, a boom and bust exactly like there was in 1919 and 1920. All right; now I concede to any person the right to make one mistake; we all make mistakes, we cannot help that, we are subject to mistakes, and under certain conditions and circumstances, possibly the second mistake might be tolerated and the person not be condemned for making it. But now, then, we are starting out on the same thing the third time, doing the same identical thing that largely contributed to and caused the boom and bust of 1919 and 1920, and the boom and bust of 1929 and 1930; we are doing exactly the same thing today. Who is doing it? The Federal Reserve Board.

The Federal Reserve Board—composed of 7 members appointed for 14-year terms—has enough power over monetary affairs that Congress has given to the Federal Reserve Board, that they have more weight and effect on the economy of this Nation than this entire Congress has. Let me say that again: Those seven members of the Federal Reserve Board have enough power and weight to accomplish more on the economy of this Nation than this entire Congress can accomplish, whether we have an annual budget of \$40 billion or \$120 billion; the Federal Reserve Board has more power than this Congress has, and this Congress has given them that power. They determine whether we have good times or hard times. The administration in power is responsible if this Board is permitted to cause this country to be wrecked.

I am of the opinion that we should determine from the Federal Reserve Board where they are going, what are their objectives, how far do they expect to go. We ought to find out what they are doing, because they are following the same pattern that has caused the booms and busts in this country; and if they are

starting out on the same road now we want to know it and we ought to be able to take some of that power away from them that they are using and exercising, which can only result in something happening that we do not want to happen any more.

#### WHAT HAPPENED IN ENGLAND

In the fall of 1951 the Banking and Currency Committee of the House visited England and other Western European countries. We visited the financial leaders of those countries and we discussed financial policies with them. While we were there under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, Hon. BRENT SPENCE, we had a conference for one whole afternoon with Chancellor Richard A. Butler of England. He had just gone into office. He outlined to us his program and projected to us what he expected to do in England. Many of us thought then: We do not know what it will do for England but it certainly would ruin the United States. Many of us openly expressed ourselves. He went ahead and carried out that policy. Of course, he was not asking us for advice and we were not trying to give him any.

What was his policy? Just the same as the Federal Reserve Board has started here—raising the rediscount rates at Federal Reserve banks, making money harder to get and causing commercial banks to increase their rates, just exactly what they are doing here. Now, I do not know whether it will have the same effect here or not. It has had it twice before, we know that.

I have in my hand here an article that appeared in *Business Week* of March 14, 1953, commencing on page 30. I am going to insert this complete article in the *Record*. The heading of the article is: "Trying Hard Money on Britain—It Has Been Tough on Businessmen and Resulted in a 30-Percent Drop in the Stock Market and a Cash Squeeze on Small Firms, but the Shakeout Has Restored Competitiveness and Labor Discipline." All right.

You will find in here that the interest rates were forced up on commercial banks from 3 to 5 percent, the rediscount rate went up, Government bonds went down, just exactly what is happening here in the United States.

The article is as follows:

**TRYING HARD MONEY ON BRITAIN—IT'S BEEN TOUGH ON BUSINESSMEN: A 30-PERCENT DROP IN THE STOCK MARKET AND A CASH SQUEEZE ON SMALL FIRMS BUT THE SHAKEOUT HAS RESTORED COMPETITIVENESS, LABOR DISCIPLINE**

Ever since the Churchill government took office early in November 1952, it has been using monetary policy to squeeze inflation out of the British economy. In charge of this operation is Chancellor Richard A. Butler, who has been in Washington for talks with Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey, the man chosen by President Eisenhower to give the United States economy a dose of similar hard-money medicine.

Butler wasn't here to talk only about monetary matters. He had a larger problem on his mind—how to get Britain and the sterling area on a sounder footing via a policy of trade not aid (*Business Week*, February 21, 1953, p. 25.) But during the talks Humphrey may well have picked up a tip or two on what to expect, especially by



way of business reaction, when a democratic government shifts to a hard money policy after a long period of easy money. For Butler has been through the mill for some 16 months, though in a country where economic conditions are somewhat different from here.

#### NEW APPROACH

When the Conservatives took over from Labor they introduced something new in postwar British financial policy—the deliberate use of interest rates and credit management to curb inflation. There's no doubt that the policy has transformed the economic climate in Britain. Today inflationary pressures are pretty well gone, the work pace has quickened in most industries, and there has been a perceptible revival of competition in Britain—all without any increase in unemployment. Although a lot of businessmen have been hurt in the process, most of them are satisfied today that British business is in far healthier shape than it was a year ago. And they give the hard-money policy credit for getting Britain out of the foreign-exchange jam it was in last year.

#### SLUMP

True, part of the change in the economic climate was brought on by last year's textile slump and by the trouble Britain began to meet in export markets. But Butler used monetary policy to accelerate the adjustments that were forced on the British economy by these two developments, whereas the Socialists undoubtedly would have softened the blows by easy credit and cheap money.

For a while, British businessmen were badly shaken. Instead of the easier times they had expected under a Conservative government, they faced the heaviest pressure since the war. Many businessmen even wished that Labor's hated controls would return to replace the tough monetary policy imposed by the Conservatives. The record shows that Chancellor Butler put on a squeeze that was plenty tough for business.

#### QUICK MOVE

Once in office, Butler didn't waste any time in applying a stiff dose of monetary medicine. He took two steps immediately: (1) He raised the Bank of England's rediscount rate from 2 percent to 2½ percent; and (2) £1-billion of Treasury bills held by the banks were funded into bonds. The second move reduced the liquid assets of the commercial banks from 39 percent of deposits to 31 percent, automatically enforced restrictions on bank loans.

Within 6 months from the time Churchill took office, industrial stocks in Britain had slumped 15 percent, long-term government securities 10 percent. Then, in March, the bank rate was raised again, this time to 4 percent. By midyear industrial stocks had dropped another 15 percent.

#### WIDE EFFECT

Meanwhile, the impact of Butler's policy had spread from the financial community to British business in general. The commercial banks were nearly panicked by the slump in government bonds. On top of that they were being pressed by the Bank of England to tighten up their loan policies. So the banks pressed their customers for quick repayment and for additional security. At the same time they reduced agreed borrowing limits and boosted loan rates. The average rate on loans went up from 3 percent to 5 percent.

The bigger British companies were able to resist demands for repayment. And they found enough working capital by streamlining inventories and trimming off marginal expenditures. But medium and small firms felt the full force of the financial squeeze. They were stampeded into inventory liquidation. Materials and components that had been stockpiled during years of shortages were sold out in a rush.

In order to get cash to repay the banks, thousands of local stores throughout Britain stopped buying radios, TV sets, and bicycles, sold their stocks at cut prices. The same thing happened in the case of stores handling clothing, shoes, and household goods.

#### EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

Meanwhile, Butler's budget brought more bad news for British business. Instead of an expected tax cut, business got an excess-profits levy on American lines. The only tax relief went to the low and middle income brackets. This made many businessmen hopping mad, produced real discontent within the Conservative Party.

#### PRESSURE EASES

Then, after midyear, the financial pressure eased up some. On the one hand, Butler felt that his monetary policy plus drastic import cuts had already achieved one of his main goals—strengthening the pound in world currency markets. On the other, Butler feared that too tight a monetary squeeze might produce a serious recession in Britain.

So the Government intervened directly in the textile slump by placing big defense contracts ahead of schedule. At the same time, the Treasury began to run a cash deficit because defense spending was heavier than it had planned.

After midyear, the Treasury also allowed the banks to increase their liquid assets again. These assets rose from 31 percent in March to 38 percent in September. And bank deposits, which had dropped for a while, rose by the end of December to a postwar high.

#### MARKET RISES

It was the stock market that probably gained the most when Butler eased up his monetary policy at midyear. The market rose gradually again, and yields dropped from their former high levels. After a slump of 30 percent, industrial stocks rose by about 20 percent between mid 1952 and February this year. Medium-term Government securities, which had yielded 3.7 percent before the Conservatives came to power, rose to 4.3 percent in May 1952, then dropped to 4 percent by February.

Business in general gained only slight relief from this easing of policy. For the Government swept up all the additional credit. The story is told in two figures: In calendar 1952 the Government borrowed £400 million more than in 1951; business borrowed £300 million less in 1952 than in the previous year. Actually, bank loans to business dropped by 10 percent in 1952.

What's more, even after midyear the high cost of bank advances forced the continued clearance of inventories not only by retailers but by wholesalers and manufacturers as well.

#### SHAKY ON CASH

Inventory liquidations throughout 1952 prevent monetary pressure from being disastrous for more than a few firms. But a large part of British business is still in a shaky cash position. That has brought on a booming new business in credit insurance—covering against nonpayment of trade debts. The funds are provided by a group of big insurance companies.

Today bills aren't being paid in Britain as promptly as they were. Even some of the big-name British companies don't pay their bills until they have had two or three reminders. They are quite ready to let the suppliers battle with creditors and the banks.

#### DEBT COSTS UP

The government, of course, has had to pay a price for its tough money policy. The interest that it pays on the national debt has risen by 20 percent. This will add £100 million to this year's budget.

As the biggest holders of government securities, the British commercial banks were hard hit at first. But since midyear they have recovered their capital losses and made

good profits from higher loan rates. In fact, all the banks reported higher profits from 1952 than from 1951. One bank was able to raise its dividend, something that hasn't happened in Britain since the mid-1930's.

#### FEELING THE SQUEEZE

Business profits as a whole felt the impact of the monetary squeeze—though not too seriously. Net profits before taxes for calendar 1952 were 11 percent above 1951. Still, the 1951 gain over 1950 had been 24 percent and profits for the fourth quarter of 1952 were actually below the previous year.

What's more, total profits don't tell the whole story. Profits of industries such as aircraft, machinery, engineering, and construction materials were all up as a result of higher government spending on defense and housing. But profits in textiles, clothing, shoes, and other consumer goods all dropped fairly sharply. Retail stores barely held their own, after a steady rise over several years.

It's clear that if Butler maintains his hard money policy, profits in 1953 will show a real drop.

#### COMPETITION

Overall, a hard money policy has meant new troubles for British business. It has ended seven fat years and finished the days of easy finance within British companies. But for the most part the growing competitive pressure has pleased efficient firms and worried only the inefficient.

Almost every British industrialist is delighted by the way the new climate has restored plant discipline and cut down political abuse of "capitalists." Several unions have recently made statements urging their members to help management raise output and cut costs. They have even declared that profits are essential to maintain equipment. That's such a novel line for British unions to take that British management is willing to believe that the squeeze may bring better times.

#### TAX RELIEF

However, taxation is one area where British business is asking for relief. Business spokesmen are pressing the Government hard to cut its spending and to clear the way for tax cuts. Invariably they argue that unless business taxes are cut, British industry cannot even maintain its equipment.

Chancellor Butler must decide on this tax question before his April budget. And the betting in London is that business will get some kind of break on taxes. But there's no expectation at all that monetary policy will be eased. In fact, it's possible that Butler will tighten the credit screw again to cut down domestic consumption and make more goods available for export.

I want you to read that article, and then I want you to read another article which, incidentally, also appeared in Business Week, although I do not know the exact date of its appearance. I happen to have a reprint. I saw the article when it came out in Business Week. It discloses information about our debts that we should know about. It is a very interesting article, and I hope all of you will read it. It states that the Federal Government owes about \$267 billion; the State and local debt about \$30 billion; private debt, corporations, \$195 billion; individuals, \$135 billion—a total of \$627 billion. That is our debt here in America.

How much will it mean to the people of America if you increase interest rates 1 percent? That means \$6,270,000,000 a year extra that you will have to pay, and that is just increasing the interest rate 1 percent on existing debts. If you increase the interest rate one-half of 1 percent it is three billion plus just on what we already owe.

The article is as follows:

**PROSPERITY IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:  
HOW DEEPLY IN DEBT ARE WE?**

How prosperous are the people of the United States? Previous messages in this special series have answered this question in part by recording the progress—relatively slow progress—we have made in increasing both the income and the wealth per person in the United States of America.

This fourth and concluding piece of the special series deal with the extent to which our prosperity should be discounted because it has been accompanied by an increasing volume of debt. Many correspondents have suggested to us that an individual or a nation can temporarily increase prosperity by borrowing, but in so doing lives on both borrowed goods and borrowed time. Our purpose here is solely to throw light on the question of whether or not we are now in that unenviable position.

On January 1, 1953, the total debt of the United States Government and of its citizens was \$627 billion, as shown in the table below. On its face a debt of this magnitude, which represents about \$3,900 of debt for each person, suggests that we are heavily debt ridden.

**Total debt, public and private**

Federal Government debt.....	\$267,000,000,000
State and local debt.....	30,000,000,000
Private debt:	
Corporations.....	195,000,000,000
Individuals.....	135,000,000,000
	<hr/>
	627,000,000,000

The burden of our debts, however, does not depend simply on their size. It depends in much more decisive degree on our capacity to carry the load successfully. This capacity, in turn, is partly a matter of attitude, and attitudes defy objective measurement. A community that gets very jittery about its debts has less capacity to carry its burden successfully than one that does not. But the accurate measurement of jitters, present or prospective, still remains to be mastered.

**CAPACITY TO CARRY THE DEBT LOAD**

Nonetheless, it is possible to throw some light on our capacity to carry the debt burden by studying key economic elements that can be measured with some degree of accuracy. The following paragraphs indicate how some of these key economic elements stand:

Compared with our national income, the total volume of our debts, public and private, is still well below the level of 1929, when it proved to be too big for the good of the country. Our total debt is now 113 percent greater than the national income, whereas in 1929 it was 146 percent greater.

There are several other cheering facts about our debts. One is a sharp decline in interest rates, which makes the cost of carrying our debts relatively much less than it was in 1929. It took 8 percent of our total national income to carry our debts in 1929; it takes only about 5 percent of the income today.

**MORE CHEERING FACTS**

We also have much more ready cash now than in 1929. Today individuals and corporations hold a total of \$269 billion in cash or its equivalent which is almost twice as much as the portion of private short-term debt (about \$140 billion) that is subject to sudden demand for payment.

Many students of the subject cite the relatively low cost of carrying our debts and the large volume of cash on hand, and reach the comfortable conclusion that our debt burden is nothing to worry about. In further support of this view they emphasize the fact that no important part of our debt is owed abroad. Hence, they reason there is not the danger, so conspicuous in Britain since the end of World War II, that our economy will

be upset by the necessity of making heavy debt payments to other countries.

**SOME DANGERS OF PRESENT DEBT**

However, the nature of our debts presents dangers that it would be foolish to ignore. This is true of both the debt of \$267 billion owed by the Federal Government to its citizens and the \$330 billion in private debts owed by some citizens and corporations to others.

Public debt can be a dangerous kind of debt because Government has the power to print money or to create its equivalent by expanding bank credit. Of the \$215 billion that the Federal Government borrowed during World War II, over \$90 billion was borrowed from banks. This was the largest single contributor to the inflation of prices that since the war has robbed the dollar of about half of its purchasing power, and thereby robbed the buyers of Government bonds of about half the purchasing power these bonds were supposed to represent.

If, as is quite possible, a new emergency should again require the Federal Government to borrow heavily while its debt remains so high, it is doubtful that the public would be avid to buy its bonds. Hence, the Government might again be forced to resort to the inflationary process of relying on bank credit.

Private debts can be dangerous if the people take on new debts more rapidly than is justified by the growth of business or by their ability to repay. Last year bank loans were increased by the imposing sum of about \$6½ billion, which represents an increase of about 11 percent in total loans outstanding. This is almost twice as much as the increase in the volume of business over the same period. Installment credit for consumers increased by \$3 billion last year, again an increase in debt about twice as great as the increase in business volume in the fields where the credit was used. It is also the fastest rate of such growth in our history.

**CONSTRUCTIVE USE OF CREDIT**

So long as the expansion of credit does no more than keep pace with expansion in the volume of business, the expansion is constructive. Also, when credit is expanded to acquire resources and equipment that will enlarge the volume of business a little later, that use is clearly constructive. But when private credit expansion begins to run ahead of business growth, it is time for us to be heads up. Such credit expansion courts price inflation. It also creates a forced draft under business so that, if credit is cut off, there may be a painful drop.

To give a summary answer to the question: Is the level of debt in the United States a danger to our prosperity?—the answer seems to be, "Not at the moment." We owe nothing abroad. The interest burden on present debt is relatively small, and we appear to have the resources to handle the short-term debt. Yet both the total amount of debt and the recent rapid increase in total private debt, especially the latter, are enough to signal for caution. We need restraint on the part of business and consumers to avoid expanding private borrowing at an excessive rate. The Federal debt needs to be reduced and put in more manageable form. If these things are done, we can proceed to build a sound prosperity.

Do you not think it is a good time for us to pay off a number of these debts with what they call the cheap dollar before we begin to make the dollar too expensive? Yes; let us stabilize the dollar where it is, but let us—particularly the Federal Government—pay off some of these debts while we can do it with this low-priced dollar. It will be in the interest of our economy to do that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PATMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the Government bonds go down to a rate that compares with 3 percent—the 20-year bonds—they will have to go down to 92. If they go down to compare with the 3¼-percent bond—we are told that is where the Federal Reserve Board is aiming, 3¼ percent interest on Government bonds—that means these bonds will go down to 88. Do you want that done? That is the direction in which they are going.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. They have also reduced the margin rate on the stock market from 75 to 50 percent. I know the gentleman can make some very interesting observations on that, but I remember some years ago when they did that, they did it to get the public, the suckers, into the market, and then they unloaded on them about 9 months later.

Mr. PATMAN. It sounds like 1927 and 1928, preceding the last and most devastating boom and bust, when hard times and the Hoover depression hit us at the same time.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. An observation might be made of the fact that during our years of survival from Pearl Harbor to the end of the war our dollar was worth nothing in a sense. We gave our products of survival away under lend-lease. When that was finished we converted our dollar from nothing to over 50 cents, if you wish, to make not goods available but money available so that others could buy our goods. To me that seems like progress, when you look at it in a transitional sense from war to trade and peace.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

About this speculative incentive, the gentleman is exactly right. That is encouraging speculation. Why, if the Federal Reserve wants to stop inflation, which they claim—I claim we are going over the inflation hill now, and I think the Federal Reserve feels that way and they want to relax, but why start on speculation? Why let the speculators in the stock market get the benefit of Government credit? Why not use it for the people in a more constructive way?

**CAPITAL EXPENDITURES**

Business is planning capital outlays in 1953 above the record 1952 rates, according to a survey of capital budgets conducted during February and early March by the United States Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission. This survey indicates that if present programs materialize, new plant and equipment expenditures in 1953 will total \$27 billion, compared with outlays of \$26.5 billion in 1952 and \$25.5 billion in 1951.

This is very interesting and encouraging information. It is contained in a



news release by the United States Department of Commerce on business capital expenditures in 1953. However, if the Federal Reserve Board's policy of increasing interest rates continues, it is possible that many of these expenditures will not be made. It is perfectly natural for higher interest rates to discourage capital expenditures. As optimistic as this report is, we should not overlook the fact that higher interest can change the good outlook entirely and cause us to face a bad situation instead of a good situation.

#### WOMAN'S ARMY CORPS TRAINING CENTER

The SPEAKER. Under previous orders of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House today a matter which has been brought strongly to my attention in the past few days.

On March 12, I addressed the House concerning the proposal to transfer the Women's Army Corps Training Center from Fort Lee, Va., to Fort McClellan, Ala. At that time I read to the House a telegram I had sent to Secretary of Defense Wilson urging him to reconsider this move on the grounds that it is just one of the many illustrations of wastefulness on the part of the military.

Before and since that time, I have been endeavoring to get information to substantiate my claim that this proposal is too costly to be considered at this time in view of our promises to effect reductions in our Federal budget.

I have dealt with the authorities at Fort Lee, Va., and they have been most cooperative, although naturally limited by the restrictions imposed by the Army. I requested certain information from the commanding general at Fort Lee on March 10, which information was needed to evaluate the feasibility of the Wacs remaining at Fort Lee. The following day I was informed by the officials at Fort Lee that the information I desired was classified and therefore it was being forwarded to me through regular Army channels.

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

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would like to say to the gentleman that he is talking about a matter which affects the district I represent. I would simply like to ask the gentleman if he is familiar with the fact that construction at Fort McClellan to facilitate the removal from Fort Lee is underway now, and supposed to be completed in December of this year.

Mr. ABBITT. I understand it is 16 percent completed as of this date.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would like to further ask the gentleman if he is aware of the fact that extensive hearings were held on this matter in May and June of 1951, also in May and June of 1952, before the Committee on Armed Services, in which it was revealed by the military that the existing facilities at Fort Lee were not adequate, and that even if the Wacs were removed, the

testimony showed that Fort Lee would have to have additional expansion to take care of expansion in the Quartermaster Corps.

Mr. ABBITT. I might inform the gentleman that I have gone into that matter previously very thoroughly. We have been informed reliably that the facilities at Fort Lee are adequate and could amply take care of what they have now, and will be sufficient to take care of what is contemplated that Fort McClellan will take care of. Not only this but my further information is that nothing further is contemplated by the Quartermaster Corps by way of expansion at Fort Lee in the foreseeable future. Those facilities at Lee have been renovated. While they are not as fancy buildings as they might be if they were built new, they will take care of the situation.

Not only that, the Army has no idea what it will cost to erect these facilities at Fort McClellan. When they say \$11,000,000, they merely reach up into thin air and pick some figure. It is estimated now it will cost far beyond any such figure as that.

Further, it is highly doubtful that they will complete it any time near December of this year, and when it is completed it will take care of only several hundred more than can be adequately taken care of at Fort Lee.

Mr. ROBERTS. May I ask the gentleman if he read the hearings in June of 1951 and 1952?

Mr. ABBITT. I have been over those hearings. May I suggest to the gentleman that I have only 5 minutes, and he can take his own time and not take all of my time. I do not mean to be discourteous toward him at all, but I am sure he can get whatever time he needs here to go forward with that point. I should like to proceed with my statement.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman, but may I make this statement. I will certainly be glad to argue this matter with the gentleman in the proper forum. However, I do not think this is the proper forum to discuss transferring the Wacs from Fort Lee to Fort McClellan.

Mr. ABBITT. To continue with my statement, although I have called the officials here several times, I have yet to receive the desired information through the regular Army channels but have been informed over the telephone that it will be forthcoming.

Needless to say, however, I have secured the information from sources higher than the Department of the Army, but had it been necessary for me to wait for the regular Army channels to supply it, I do not know when it would be forthcoming.

It is interesting, too, to realize that shortly after I was informed that the information was classified and therefore could not be given me at the lower level, part of the information was released by a public relations officer of the Army to the press and carried in all the interested newspapers for the whole world to see; and it is also interesting to know that the information so released was only that part of the requested information that would tend to back up the prior decision

of the Army to remove the Wacs to Fort McClellan. It makes me wonder just how far the Army is willing to go to substantiate a decision that they have made and to try to prevent a reversal of same even though it develops that they were wrong in the first instance, and the reversal is justified.

To me it is an illustration of the kind of cumbersome procedure we have in our defense setup, and I hope that by bringing it out in public, at least some improvements can be made.

Here we find that restrictions are placed by the Army on information which might readily have been given out at the local level, except for these restrictions, and then is withheld at the upper echelon and released only when it suits their purpose, and then only that part of the information that suits their purpose and backs up their prior action.

I would like to place this as an illustration of the way our military operates and to offer this as an example of why more scrutiny should be given to the defense budgets which are presented us with the request of quick approval. All items should be looked into with an eye to saving money where money can be saved, to getting rid of the fat, and no longer approving items just because certain people request them. I contend that this is one of the places where reductions in our Federal budget could be effected if proper consideration were given to the facilities which are at hand and are available at the various places in the country without constructing new facilities at a cost of millions of dollars at this time when balancing our budget is so essential to the Nation's economy.

It seems to me that our experiences of the past should at least provide us with some commonsense understanding on matters of this kind. We have twice in the past 12 years built up our military forces after they have been allowed to dwindle following our great wars. In both instances rather than making use of some of the facilities we had available, the military services have gone out and purchased large tracts of land and built new facilities. We in Congress have not questioned this too much, feeling that it is important that we give as much support as possible to our military leaders in these times of trouble.

There was certainly some justification for this prior to the beginning of World War II. At that time we had allowed our military facilities to drop off to practically nothing during the depression. We spent billions of dollars building bases throughout the country and these, of course, were built in some places at a tremendous increase in price. However, we tend to overlook things like this in times of need. We were caught with little preparedness and it was necessary to get those things we needed as soon as possible. However, 1940 was more than 20 years after World War I and there was certainly more justification for such an outlook then than there is now, only 8 years after World War II.

It is hard for me, and I might add, many of our citizens, to understand how we built our military program up to such heights in World War II only to have the Armed Forces come back less than 5 years

later and tell us they are again in need of facilities. In many places in our country we have military installations built in World War II which are now unused, although we have allowed the military in the last few years to construct the same kind of facilities still of a temporary nature. It seems that the Army gets a joy out of moving around over the country and the taxpayers are taken for the ride.

I am firmly convinced that some of these conditions should be corrected, but this is not the principal reason why I am addressing the House today. I just want to take this opportunity of bringing to your attention the trend of military thinking which seems to follow the principle that only that information which is to the advantage of the military is released wherever there is a question in which two sides are presented.

If we listen to the Army they, no doubt, would tell us that within the next few years all of our present facilities would be out of date and eventually would have to be replaced. This seems to be the argument given for the transfer of the WAC Training Center at this time. The WAC has become a permanent part of the Army and therefore needs a permanent home, of course, but that does not mean that new and costly facilities must be provided or that they must be moved away from their present location. We are in a real emergency, both abroad and at home. We are facing the communistic threat. The one last hope of the free people of this world is America and if we are to meet the challenge we must keep our economy strong and dynamic for if we collapse inwardly never again would our people know and experience freedom as we do. The public debt today is over \$266 billion. We are operating this year in the red and it is the hope of many of us that soon we will be able to at least balance our budget, and it is just such items as this that must be cut out if we are to achieve that goal because we cannot longer continue operating on borrowed money and still maintain a free and strong economy.

If the Armed Forces could convince me that it is more economical to house the Wacs at Fort McClellan, and that such economies would result over a period of years, I would not be raising the objections that I have to this move; or, if the Army could give assurances that there is to be an expansion of the Quartermaster Training Command at Fort Lee in the foreseeable future as well as a real need for the facilities now being used by the WAC at Fort Lee, there would not be as convincing an argument against it. But this is not the case. The only reason this decision has been made, in my opinion, is because the Army feels that now, with high budgets and easy money, it would be more to their advantage to make such a request today than it would in the next few years with the purse strings of the Federal Treasury likely to be drawn tighter.

I realize, too, that this decision was made sometime ago during the days of the past administration, but our people have been told that reductions can be expected and I contend that this is one

of the places where such reductions ought to be made.

I do know and I feel that if we are ever going to start giving our people economy in government, now is the time we should begin. Our Federal budget is increasing year after year and our military budget is now running 58 percent of our total expenditures. We, as Members of Congress, cannot go minutely into every item in the military budget, but it certainly seems to me that we should get away from the idea that the military budget is untouchable and that no economies can be found therein. If we contend that economy can be practiced in other departments of the Government and that cuts can be made here and there in services rendered by those who spend far less than the military, then it is only logical to assume that there is some padding in the military budget as well.

I, for one, would like to go on record as saying that we should begin to question the blank checks we have been giving in these forms of authorizations and appropriations, especially in cases where it is not of an immediate essential nature.

I feel very strongly about the question of balancing our budget and I feel that we owe it to the American people to bring our expenditures down to within a reasonable point of normalcy. While we cannot look at the budget of pre-World War II days as a guide, we certainly cannot expect to keep spending at the rate we have been doing since the end of World War II. Preparedness is one thing—provided it is achieved—but it seems to me there is more talk today of our not being prepared than there is from those who say that we are. Thus it would seem to me that spending money is not always a guaranty that we are getting what we need in the way of preparedness.

The billions that we are spending around the world and here at home are going for naught unless we can see results from the moneys we have spent. The only way we will ever get those results is to get at those things which are nearest home and go from there on to the greater things. We see waste here in Washington and we can point to an eight- or ten-billion-dollar budget deficit and say it should be reduced but few of us would know how to just knock off that much and apply it down the line. The way to get economy is to hit at individual items and this proposal to build a permanent training center at this time when adequate facilities are available is not in the best interest of economy.

I would like to call on the Secretary of Defense, as I have done, and upon the other leaders to reconsider these proposals which have been made by the past administration and to have them evaluated in terms of an economy program.

We have here presented an opportunity to find out the real attitude of the present administration toward achieving economy in the armed services as it will be necessary to cut every bit of the "fat" out of the defense expenditures regardless of amounts if the budget is to be balanced.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. BEAMER), on account of official business.

Mr. FISHER (at the request of Mr. LYLE), for an indefinite period, on account of a death in the family.

## WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS TRAINING CENTER

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, while I am not thoroughly prepared to answer the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT], I think I can do so in a general way.

Too often some of us are inclined to jump on the military in the name of economy when a decision is made which runs counter to our personal wishes. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia, has just charged the Defense Department with lack of economy, in its decision made many months ago and concurred in by the Armed Services Committee, to transfer the WAC Training Center from Fort Lee, Va., to Fort McClellan, Ala. The gentleman is in error in his statement since the move is in the interest of economy and efficiency as shown by the hearings on this matter which were held in June of 1951 and in 1952. The Department of Defense came in and was asked for its considered opinion on this matter. The testimony shows that extensive investigations were conducted as to available places where the Wacs might go. It appears in the record of hearings that during World War II, these patriotic girls in the WAC Corps had been kicked around from pillar to post, and had undergone training at 4 or 5 different places in the country. Also that the greatest percentage of these girls, who enlisted in the Women's Army Corps came from down in the Southeast, and the Government would save millions of dollars in transportation alone.

Extensive preparations have been made to give the Wacs a permanent home. I am cognizant of the fact that the gentleman a few days ago made the statement on the floor that this move was not in the interest of economy. Well, I fail to see the economy in the gentleman's proposal to cancel out a contract that is 16 percent completed, when the record will bear me out that the Army testified before the Committee on Armed Services that there was not room at Fort Lee for the Wacs. Even if the Wacs were removed from Fort Lee, there would not be enough room to take care of the proposed expansion in the Quartermaster Corps at Fort Lee.

To go just a little bit further into this proposition, the thing was thoroughly thrashed out in the committee. Questions from both sides of the aisle were



asked in the committee, and I understand that action was unanimous in favor of this transfer in the meeting of the Committee on Armed Services. I would simply like to say to the gentleman from my understanding of the proposition that the vacancy he will have at Fort Lee will be more than taken care of by the proposed expansion in the Quartermaster Corps. I would like further to say to him that this thing is not a jumped-up proposition. It has been considered now for a period of over 2 years, considerable sums of money have been spent, and the program is well under way.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield.

Mr. ABBITT. I wonder where the gentleman got his information, or did he mean to infer that in the foreseeable future, the facilities now occupied by the Wacs or available for such additional Wacs as may be needed will be used by the other units at Lee.

Mr. ROBERTS. I will say to the gentleman that I took my information from reading the hearings. That is the highest and best evidence, I think.

Mr. ABBITT. I do not remember that testimony.

Mr. ROBERTS. I will be glad to furnish it to the gentleman at his convenience.

Mr. ABBITT. I do know that the present Secretary of Defense, who I trust is interested in some economy at this time, has through his office given me the information to the effect that the facilities will not be used in the foreseeable future.

Mr. ROBERTS. The WAC barracks are not exactly built along the same lines as barracks for male troops, and to expend the money that has been spent down there in preparing for this transfer, and to simply cancel it out would be the worst kind of false economy. My distinguished friend speaks in the name of economy and yet the suggestion he makes in the light of funds already expended would cost the taxpayers millions of dollars, and would hamper seriously the development of the Women's Army Corps.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENTLEY in two instances, in one to include the text of a speech made on March 23 by Secretary of Agriculture Benson, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$231.

Mr. ANGELL in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. CHURCH and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in two instances, in one to include an article from the Foreign Service magazine by Admiral Zacharias, and in the other an editorial from the Herald Tribune.

Mr. RADWAN in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. JAVITS in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska and include an editorial.

Mr. TOLLEFSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and include a letter.

Mr. MORANO and include biographical material of a constituent of his and an address made by Mr. Stanley Griffith.

Mr. MASON and include an editorial that clarifies the present position of the majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee and its chairman on H. R. 1 and corrects a generally false impression.

Mr. KEATING in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE in the Appendix in six instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABERNETHY and to include a resolution.

Mr. FORAND.

Mr. SIKES and to include an address.

Mr. HEBERT and to include extraneous data.

Mr. LANTAFF and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include certain recommendations by Walter Reuther with reference to amendments to the National Labor Relations Act of 1947.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include an article by Mr. Stokes appearing in the Washington Star.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEANE and to include extraneous newspaper matter.

Mr. SUTTON.

Mr. FINE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an address by the Honorable KENNETH ROBERTS.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska on the subject of Puerto Rico Makes Progress.

Mr. HALLECK.

Mr. GUBSER and to include an article.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. WEICHEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$210.

Mr. FALLON and Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT and to include a statement.

Mr. ROBERTS and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARRETT (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK).

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 23, 1953:

H. R. 1362. An act for the relief of Rose Martin.

On March 24, 1953:

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 26, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

575. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1942, relating to the making of photographs and sketches of properties of the Military Establishment, to continue in effect the provisions thereof until 6 months after the present national emergency"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

576. A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the semiannual report on tin operations for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1952, pursuant to Public Law 125, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

577. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill authorizing the District of Columbia to enter into interstate civil-defense compacts"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

578. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting two publications entitled, "Production of Electric Energy, Capacity of Generating Plants, 1951" and "Consumption of Fuel for Production of Electric Energy, 1951"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

579. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled 'An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries,' relative to the composition of claims commissions"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

580. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 23, 1953, the following bills were reported on March 24, 1953:

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 226. Joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4130. A bill to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 185. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3780, a bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 204). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 186. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3853, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 205). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 187. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4130, a bill to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 206). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 188. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 226, joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 207). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 89. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct an investigation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; with amendment (Rept. No. 208). Referred to the House Calendar.

[Submitted March 25, 1953]

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. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. House Joint Resolution 229. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2347. A bill to permit continued exercise, until 6 months after termination of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, of certain powers, relating to preferences or priorities in the transportation of traffic, under sections 1 (15) and 420 of the Interstate Commerce Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 214). 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. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1752. A bill for the relief of William Robert DeGraff; with amendment (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1888. A bill for the relief of Gary Matthew Stevens (Kazuo Omiya); without amendment (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1952. A bill for the relief of Cecile Lorraine Vincent; with amendment (Rept. No. 212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2176. A bill for the relief of Norma Jean Whitten; without amendment (Rept. No. 213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 4198. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. R. 4199. A bill to establish a Commission on Overseas Investment and Trade; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 4200. A bill to provide that time spent as a civilian intern during World War II shall be considered as active service in determining priority for induction into the Armed Forces of medical, dental, and allied specialists; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4201. A bill relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear on the menus of public eating places serving such trout; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4202. A bill to amend section 2 of the Missing Persons Act, so as to provide

that benefits thereunder shall be available to certain members of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4203. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 4204. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4205. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4206. A bill to allow widows, widowers, heads of household and certain other persons to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid in providing for the care of children and other dependents under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4207. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4208. A bill to abolish the action for alienation of affections in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 4209. A bill to provide that the Navy shall continue to maintain a clothing factory at Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4210. A bill to exempt admissions to moving-picture theaters from the Federal tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 4211. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 4212. A bill to establish a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 4213. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4214. A bill to continue the effect of the statutory provisions relating to the deposit of savings for members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4215. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Federal Security Administrator shall, under certain circumstances, disclose the current address of husbands and parents who have deserted their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4216. A bill to provide for the arrangement of the stars in the union of the flag after the admission of the 49th State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 4217. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special air-mail postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Wright brothers' flight at Kitty Hawk, N. C.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 4218. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 4219. A bill to relinquish the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States over Federal lands within the State of Maryland, and to provide that the United States and the State of Maryland shall hereafter exercise concurrent jurisdiction over such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4220. A bill to amend the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, so as to increase and make mandatory the prison sentences to be imposed upon second and subsequent offenders under the narcotics laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4221. A bill to authorize the employment by the United States of aliens who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4222. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 4223. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Capt. Samuel Chester Reid; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 4224. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4225. A bill to permit deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses actually incurred by working mothers in providing care for their children while they are at work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4226. A bill to regulate the operation and conduct of commercial parking of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:

H. R. 4227. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4228. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians asserted in Court of claims case No. 47568 and to provide for the administration of the lands and moneys paid or to be paid Indians in settlement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALLE (by request):

H. R. 4229. A bill to change the name of the Polycultural Institution of America to Polycultural University of America, to grant a congressional charter to such university, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 4230. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct Federal pension of at least \$100 per month to all American citizens 65 years of age and over who

have been citizens 10 years or more, to be prorated according to the cost of living as on January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 4231. A bill, to authorize appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of certain individuals who were killed in action or who died or shall die as a result of active service in World War I, World War II, or between the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending on a date proclaimed by the President or the Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 4232. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4233. A bill to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution providing for participation in the Fourth of July, 1953, observance at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution providing for participation in the Fourth of July, 1953, observance at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution providing for participation in the Fourth of July, 1953, observance at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution providing for participation in the Fourth of July, 1953, observance at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 189. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to discharge of committees; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

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

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to the Congress of the United States to protest the present political division of Ireland and the presence of British troops therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to the President and the Congress of the United States to instruct delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to pass anti-poll-tax legislation; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress of the United States to

urge the Federal Power Commission to insure that Massachusetts obtains the lowest possible natural gas rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to pass anti-lynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress for legislation whereby aliens serving in the Armed Forces of the United States while engaged in hostilities under the flag of the United Nations may, prior to their being shipped overseas, be granted United States citizenship, as was the practice during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to pass legislation to provide free mailing privileges to all persons or organizations sending letters or merchandise to persons serving overseas in Armed Forces of the United States, while engaged in hostilities under the flag of the United Nations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress for the payment by the Federal Government of a Federal old-age pension of \$100 monthly for all persons who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado to consider legislation allowing a Federal income tax deduction for certain military, Air Force, and naval reservists; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, to enact legislation authorizing the Colorado River storage project and participating projects in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, for the granting to the States of all minerals and mineral rights in deposits in certain public lands belonging to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to protest the present political division of Ireland and the presence of British troops therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to instruct delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to urge the Federal Power Commission to insure that Massachusetts obtains the lowest possible natural gas rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to pass anti-lynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to pass legislation to provide free mailing privileges to all persons or organizations sending letters or merchandise to persons serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States, while engaged in hostilities under the flag of the United Nations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts for the payment by the Federal Government of a Federal old-age pension of \$100 monthly for all persons who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relating to the establishment of an Air Force Academy in Arizona; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to consider legislation allowing a Federal income-tax deduction for certain military, Air Force and naval reservists; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, with respect to Federal taxes on gasoline and motor fuel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to limiting influx of foreign agricultural products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4234. A bill for the relief of Alessandra Barile Altobelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 4235. A bill for the relief of Edward Zepp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 4236. A bill for the relief of Nahi Youssef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4237. A bill for the relief of Osjazz Hersh Braksmajer (Sam Braksmajer), Rysa Margolit Braksmajer, and Mosher Braksmajer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 4238. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Adele Vance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 4239. A bill for the relief of Arthur K. Jefferson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4240. A bill for the relief of Arturo Ordonez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 4241. A bill for the relief of Oscar Neumann, Mrs. Magdalena Neumann, and Judith Gabrielle Neumann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4242. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Barroso De Orozco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4243. A bill for the relief of Kuo Lum Leong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 4244. A bill for the relief of Ara Giragos Farajian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of Louis Rizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 4246. A bill for the relief of Light Liang-liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 4247. A bill for the relief of William R. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4248. A bill for the relief of Albertas Bauras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of Mary Wyshoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 4250. A bill for the relief of Lester H. Kroll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4251. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cosciani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 4252. A bill for the relief of Gerald Lillo and Karl Heinz Lillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4253. A bill for the relief of Walter Adolphus Burke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 4254. A bill for the relief of Aneta Popa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 4255. A bill for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4256. A bill for the relief of Magda Manoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 4257. A bill for the relief of Willmore Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 4258. A bill for the relief of Katharina Steinbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 4259. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Spencer C. Clark for extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed between 1929 and 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

107. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of the New Jersey Association of Nurserymen recording its vigorous opposition to the proposed changes relating to peat moss balls, and its support of additional restrictions governing such importations due to the ever present danger of introducing new and dangerous pests to the United States of America and the increased danger that would result if the regulations of quarantine No. 37 were modified as now proposed by the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

108. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the National Defense League of America, Inc., to the end that the Congress of the United States of America as the duly elected Representatives of all the people of this Republic, initiate action to cause immediate withdrawal of this Republic's membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

109. Also, resolution adopted by Board of National Trustees of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution that Constitution Day be reestablished and the resolution by Congress signed by the President on February 29, 1952, creating Citizenship Day, be repealed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

110. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, city of Indio, Calif., to provide funds for adequate hospitalization for the needy and ill veterans of the United States Forces; to the Committee on Appropriations.

111. Also, petition of Edith Johnson, and others, Brockton Townsend Club No. 5, Brockton, Mass., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

112. Also, petition of Mrs. E. E. McNeely, and others, of Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

113. Also, petition of William G. Loehr, and others, of Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

114. Also, petition of Lithuanian Democratic Club, Inc., of Newark, N. J., requesting enactment of legislation to amend the social-security laws allowing payment of benefits to everyone in covered employment upon their having attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

115. Also, petition of Ibrahim Velutini, President, Caracas, Venezuela, relative to legislation which would tend to reduce the importation of Venezuelan petroleum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, grant that we may go forth in the hours of this day with a more adventurous and steadfast faith in Thee and in the ultimate triumph of the true and the good.

We humbly confess that we so frequently allow our faith to become eclipsed by doubt and by difficulties which seem insurmountable.

Help us to understand that if our faith is to be vital and strong, then we must cultivate it and guard it, for eternal vigilance is the price of faith as truly as it is the price of freedom.

Hear us for the sake of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tomorrow in which to file a report on the bill H. R. 4198.

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

There was no objection.

#### REDUCTION OF MILITARY DOCTORS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by Mr. John G. Norris in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post says that Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson has ordered a 9-percent cut in the number of Army, Navy, and Air Force doctors. I only hope that he is right in ordering that cut and that the doctors are not needed. Our forces in Korea apparently have had a shortage of arms and ammunition, but they have had the most excellent medical care, which is of great importance.

There seems to be an effort to make cuts in the medical personnel in the Veterans' Administration. There again, we are responsible for the veterans who have been wounded and who have given