To be assistant surgeons, effective January 1, 1953

Arden A. Flint, Jr.
Calvin L. Young

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer, effective July 25, 1952

Lester M. Klashman

To be senior assistant scientist, effective October 6, 1952

Martha K. Ward

To be senior assistant veterinarian, effective September 1, 1952

Karl R. Reinhard

To be senior assistant veterinarian, effective October 1, 1952

William Kaplan

To be senior assistant veterinarian, effective December 13, 1952

Donald D. Stamm

To be senior assistant veterinarian, effective January 1, 1953

Robert W. Menges

To be assistant sanitarian, effective October 20, 1952

Harold V. Jordan, Jr.

To be nurse officers, effective September 1, 1952

Helen M. Danley
Jane Wilcox

To be dietitian, effective September 1, 1952

Edith A. Jones

To be therapist, effective September 1, 1952

Elizabeth M. Finke
Esther Anderson

To be senior assistant surgeon, effective date of acceptance

Fred L. Stricker

To be assistant surgeons, effective date of acceptance

James T. Foster — George Roush, Jr.
John W. McFadden — Allen T. Jones

To be assistant veterinarian, effective date of acceptance

John G. Wadsworth

To be senior assistant scientists, effective date of acceptance

John A. Alford — Frank Eisenberg, Jr.
Robert R. Omata — Charlotte M. Damron

To be assistant scientist, effective date of acceptance

Tod E. Mittwer

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Eternal Spirit, by whose word man goeth forth to his work and to his labor until the evening, through all the terror and tumult of these tragic days may we discern the shining path which is leading upward to the City of God. Make us, we pray Thee, alive and alert to the spiritual values which underlie all the struggle of these decisive times. In spite of suspicions, animosities, disappointments, and disillusionments which plague the councils of men, gird our hearts to seek peace and pursue it, that the sadly sundered family of mankind may at last be bound by golden cords of understanding fellowship around the feet of the one God. In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 10, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HUNT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and for the remainder of the week, because of a death in his family.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO DAILY SESSIONS ORDER FOR RECESS TO 11 A. M. TUESDAY

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order which was agreed to on last Friday, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has the floor.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement, the subject of which I have not had an opportunity to discuss with the minority leader; but I believe he has notice of it. It is the purpose of the majority leader, who is not here today, not to hold the Senate in session too long today. However, it is desired that Senators be aware of the fact that the Senate will convene tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock and that there may be long sessions during the remainder of this week, running even into the evening. The majority leader will give notice in advance of such evening sessions.

On this basis, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it recess to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 13, 1953.*

(Only copy of report transmitted to House of Representatives.)

AUDIT REPORT ON THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON (H. DOC. NO. 125)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 12

"Concurrent resolution relating to legislation integrating the study of soil conservation into grade- and high-school education which is now before the Congress of the United States

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has under consideration certain bills relating to conservation and providing for a soil-conservation specialist in the Office of Education who would integrate the study of conservation into the grade- and high-school curriculum; and

"Whereas we are living in the world at a time when, in many nations, there is a continuous need for more food and where this condition is causing great social and political unrest; and

"Whereas in America itself in the not too distant future we may face food shortages; and

"Whereas in Minnesota we are, by wind and rain, losing $100 million worth of our topsoil annually, because of a lack of soil-saving farm practices; and

"Whereas conservation practices are purely a matter of education; and, that as older farmers are not anxious to adopt the new and different methods of farming which are soil saving: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress be requested to enact legislation which would allow the employment of a soil-conservation specialist by the Office of Education, who would integrate the subject of conservation into the grade- and high-school subjects so that every child may learn the fundamentals of conservation; also, that the Office shall provide in the training of its teachers a thorough understanding in the conservation of our natural resources; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of

Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Minnesota delegation in Congress.

"ARTHUR NELSEN,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate the 12th day of March in the year of our Lord 1953.

"H. J. TASING,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives the 27th day of March in the year of our Lord 1953.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 39

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to provide for the relief of Edward C. Searle

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States of America H. R. 2885, 83d Congress, 1st session, entitled 'A bill authorizing and directing the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle'; and

"Whereas such bill was introduced in response to Joint Resolution II, approved May 5, 1951, of the 26th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the request for relief therein presented has great merit: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact H. R. 2885, 83d Congress, 1st session, into law; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 23

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce; and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas under the present policies established imports of fillets, fish, and fish products have increased from over 9 million pounds in 1940 to in excess of 107 million pounds in 1952; and

"Whereas the United States Government through the administrative branches has purchased these imports from foreign countries; and

"Whereas it is in the national interest that the development and preservation of our fishing industry be maintained; and

"Whereas the fishing industry of Alaska and of the Pacific Coast and of the United States is being threatened by the influx and increase of these imports:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully petitions the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States, and the Department of Commerce, to make a determination of the average imports of fillets into the United States in the 10-year period from 1940 to 1950 and establish a quota on such imports based upon that 10-year average; and

"That the President of the United States and the Congress take immediate steps to see that all administrative and other branches of the Government utilizing fillets purchase and use said products caught and processed by American fishermen operating on American boats; and

"That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce; the Secretary of the United States Senate, and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate March 25, 1953.

"CHAS. D. JONES,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"DORA M. SWEENEY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house March 25, 1953.

"GEORGE J. MISCOVICH,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET GRISHAM,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Memorial 22

"To the Congress of the United States; to the Bureau of the Budget; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, 21st session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the United States Army engineers have approved 12 or more harbor projects in Alaska during the past several years; and

"Whereas these harbor projects have not been completed because of lack of sufficient appropriations; and

"Whereas many of these harbors are fast becoming overcrowded by our fishing fleets; and

"Whereas this harbor-improvement program has a direct bearing on the defense program, not only as it affects food production, but also because the improved harbor facilities would not only provide sufficient safe anchorage for fishing vessels but would also provide good and adequate harbors for the many Government vessels in Alaskan waters.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that Congress make a sufficient appropriation to complete those harbor projects which have already been approved for Alaska by the United States Army Engineers.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 26, 1953.

"GEORGE J. MISCOVICH,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET GRISHAM,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 21

"To the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; to the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas the peak season for the mass movement of military and civilian traffic by the Alaska Railroad is close at hand; and

"Whereas there is urgent need for immediate planning and policymaking by railroad officials to competently handle such traffic and integrate it with that of other carriers serving Alaska; and

"Whereas the incumbent General Manager of the Alaska Railroad has tendered his resignation and is now awaiting replacement; and

"Whereas the new appointee should be afforded ample time to correct present management policies and to initiate a more efficient and dependable service for the approaching peak season.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that an immediate appointment of a general manager of the Alaska Railroad be made to relieve the incumbent official and that the Congress of the United States authorize an appropriate committee to investigate the present and past operations of the Alaska Railroad and any alleged mismanagement in past policies of the incumbent official.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 26, 1953.

"GEORGE J. MISCOVICH,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET GRISHAM,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Memorial 17

"To the Congress of the United States; the Secretary of Labor; the Secretary of Commerce; and the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the economy and welfare of Alaska and the successful prosecution of the defense effort in Alaska are almost wholly dependent upon uninterrupted water-borne commerce between the United States and Alaska; and

"Whereas water-borne commerce between the United States and Alaska has been frequently interrupted by strikes, tieups, lockouts, or other labor or labor-management difficulties, for an average of 72 days per year and, in 1952, for a total of 86 days, to the detriment of the economy and welfare of Alaska and the defense effort in Alaska; and

"Whereas no existing legislation provides an adequate remedy to prevent the intolerable disruptions of water-borne commerce to Alaska; and

"Whereas Senate bill No. 225 was introduced in the 83d Congress to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, 'so as to prevent interruptions to ocean transportation service between the United States and its territories and possessions as a result of labor disputes':

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully prays that Senate bill No. 225 in the 83d Congress be immediately enacted.

"And your memorialist will ever prav.

"Passed by the house February 17, 1953.

"GEORGE J. MISCOVICH,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET GRISHAM,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate March 25, 1953.

"CHAS. D. JONES,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"DORA M. SWEENEY."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Maui, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide adequate funds to furnish permanent white crosses for the National Cemetery of the Pacific; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Folsom, Calif., Chamber of Commerce, favoring the name "Natoma Lake" for the lake to be formed by

the construction of the Nimbus Dam on the American River, Calif., to the Committee on Public Works.

EARNINGS OF INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE—JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning from Thomas M. Donahue, senate chief clerk of the Wisconsin Legislature, a joint resolution adopted by the senate, and concurred in by the assembly, dealing with earnings by individuals receiving old-age assistance.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Finance Committee.

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

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act so as to enable States receiving Federal grants for old-age assistance programs to disregard the first $50 of income received by a person eligible for old-age assistance in computing the amount of aid payable

Whereas the present period of inflation has inflicted its greatest hardship on persons living on fixed incomes and, in particular, on people of advanced years who are dependent upon the assistance of the State for their living expenses; and

Whereas as a consequence of the higher cost of living, it is manifest that those of our aged dependent upon State aid require some manner of supplementing their limited resources; and

Whereas productive activity in advanced age tends to promote an active and healthy interest in living; and

Whereas the present Social Security Act, in regard to Federal grants to states for old-age assistance, requires that the state take into consideration any other income or resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to amend the Social Security Act and in particular 42 United States Code section 302 (a) (7) so as to provide that income up to $50 per month earned or realized by person claiming old-age assistance be disregarded in computing the amount of old-age assistance payable; and be it further

Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the clerks of both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of Congress from this State.

GEORGE M. SMITH,
President of the Senate.
THOMAS M. DONAHUE,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
ORA R. RICE,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR VETERANS' SERVICES—LETTER FROM WISCONSIN AMERICAN LEGION, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from Robert G. Wilke, department adjutant of the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, a letter expressing the deep interest of that Department in the forthcoming appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. Particular reference is made to the need for adequate funds for servicing the medical needs of our veterans.

Like my colleagues, I very definitely feel that one of our foremost obligations as a Nation is to remember those who have preserved this country on the field of battle. The debt which we owe them can never really be repaid.

At this time, as an indication of grassroots sentiment on the issue of VA funds, I send to the desk Mr. Wilke's letter and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF WISCONSIN,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 8, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The American Legion has always believed foremost in the principles of rehabilitation and medical service to the veteran. The department of Wisconsin is greatly concerned with the present actions of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget who requested the VA to revise its proposed 1954 budget. More so, since no figures or any data on the revised budget has been released and evidentally will not be released until the time the House Subcommittee on Appropriations holds its hearings.

The American Legion is strongly opposed to any reduction in any of the present VA service now available to veterans and most strongly is opposed to any reductions and appropriations which would further reduce the program of 131,000 hospital beds for veterans. We believe that those who made great sacrifices during the years of conflict should have afforded some consideration for the sacrifices and hardships they have endured and that consequently, the American Government should be grateful.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT G. WILKE,
Department Adjutant.

FIVE PERCENT DOWN PAYMENT IN CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, VIRGINIA, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Virginia, Minn., requesting Congress to retain the 5 percent down payment feature in the price-control law governing construction of buildings be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

Resolution 5943

Resolution requesting Congress to retain the 5 percent down payment feature in the price-control law governing construction of buildings

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Virginia, That we request Congress to retain the 5 percent down payment feature in the price-control law governing construction of buildings, and that the down payment requirements be not increased; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the honorable Senators THYE and HUMPHREY, and the honorable Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK.

Adopted March 31, 1953.

ARTHUR J. STOCK,
President of the City Council.

Approved April 6, 1953.

JOHN VUKELICH,
Mayor.

Attest:

J. G. MILROY, Jr.,
City Clerk.

FARM POLICY—RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA FARMERS UNIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several resolutions of the Northern Pine Farmers Union and a resolution of the East Marshall Farmers Union, signed by representatives of the Grygla Local, the Thief Lake Local, the Gatzke Local, the Ringbo Local, and the Spruce Grove Local, on farm policy, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF EAST MARSHALL COUNTY FARMERS' UNION

Whereas the farmers of Marshall County and the Nation as a whole have been adversely affected by falling prices and mounting costs; and

Whereas we believe that to discriminate against farmers and especially the family-size farmer is to discriminate against the welfare of the entire Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we demand that the Congress of the United States take immediate action to correct the injustices that are being done to the Nation's farmers, and that we notify our duly elected Senators and Representatives, with the request that they work for immediate enactment of full parity at once.

East Marshall Farmers' Union: Delmar Hagen, President, Gatzke; Algat Skaglund, Secretary, Holt. Directors: Arthur Nordby, Grygla Local, Grygla; Orrin Benson, Spruce Grove Local, Grygla; Ernest Berg, Thief Lake Local, Middle River; Neil Morrissey, Gatzke Local, Gatzke; Roger Skogland, Ringbo Local, Holt.

RESOLUTION OF NORTHERN PINES FARMERS UNION, WILLOW RIVER, MINN.

Whereas way back in March 1933, Congress adopted a commitment, "To achieve parity of income for farmers." During the past election campaign practically all farm State Congressmen and Senators and the political parties pledged themselves to full parity of income for the farmers. President Eisenhower declared in his speech at Kasson, Minn.—"a fair share is not merely 90 percent—but full parity"; and

Whereas in spite of all these clear-cut pledges of protection the farmers are now faced with the most drastic threats to their solvency that they have experienced for many years. Farm debt is rising at the most rapid rate in the history of American agriculture, caused largely by skyrocketed operating costs, taxes, and living expenses: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the new Congress reaffirm the commitment made by Congress in March 1933, to achieve parity of income for American farmers, this to cover all major farm crops and products, including livestock, poultry, eggs, butter, wool, etc.; be it further

Resolved, That all family farmers may at the close of the marketing season or at the end of the calendar year, or shortly thereafter, present evidence of production and sales to the county farm office and if the average price of any commodity has been less than parity for each of the commodities produced and marketed during the year, the difference between this amount and full parity will be automatically due such farm and may be collected by methods which the Congress shall provide; be it further

Resolved, That crop insurance be provided for all crops. This should be automatic full coverage for all crops and all hazards, weather and other; and be it further

Resolved, That an adequate appropriation should be immediately provided for Farm Home Administration to meet the needs of all family farmers needing credit for their operations, land purchases, improvement, expansion of herds, etc.

The above minimum demands must be met if the family farmers are to collect on political promises.

Passed unanimously by Northern Pine Farmers Union, March 1953, at Willow River, Minn.

MRS. A. E. BORCHARDT,
Legislative Chairman, Willow River, Minn.

RESOLUTIONS OF WEST MARSHALL COUNTY (MINN.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the West Marshall County Farmers Union, relating to the decline in farm prices, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARGYLE, MINN., *April 2, 1953.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the West Marshall County Farmers Union, which was held at Argyle, Minn., on March 30, 1953, the organization went on record to adopt the following resolutions:

"Whereas the increasing pressure of rising operating costs and declining farm prices makes it very essential that Congress take action to extend and strengthen the farm price support laws: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Congress take action at this session to—

"First. Enact a system of price supports to assure full parity income on all major farm production, including perishables, based upon a realistic parity formula, and

"Second. To retain the system of democratically elected farmer PMA committeemen to continue handling of ACP conservation payments through the PMA committees, and to increase appropriations for the ACP program.

"Third. To work for extension of the International Wheat Agreement.

"Fourth. To oppose the import of low-grade wheat and feed grains from Canada."

"Whereas the offshore oil reserves belong to all the people, and

"Whereas an attempt is being made to give title to a few States to these rich reserves: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That this meeting go on record favoring Federal ownership of the offshore oil reserves and use the proceeds for Federal aid to education."

Yours truly,

OSCAR TVERSTOL,
Chairman, West Marshall County Farmers Union.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—LETTER FROM BARNESVILLE (MINN.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the Barnesville Chamber of Commerce, Barnesville, Minn., in support of the St. Lawrence seaway proposals, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

APRIL 3, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Chamber of Commerce of the City of Barnesville, Minn., wishes to make known to our representatives in the Federal Government in Washington our feelings in respect to the St. Lawrence seaway proposal. This is not a new proposal, but one which has been in the minds of our national leaders in the past. It is a project which stands to benefit the Nation as a whole from the standpoint of trade, commerce, and industry, as well as from the standpoint of national defense. In the long run it should work to our advantage as well, from the standpoint of national economy.

Now, when Canada is ready to go ahead with this project, is surely the time when we should join hands with that country and cooperate to the fullest in bringing about the realization of this waterway.

This great natural watercourse into the interior of our country lies waiting to be made use of, but for the addition of certain manmade alterations and improvements which we have the engineering skill and resources to accomplish.

Failure to put this asset to use is tantamount to a wasting of our resources, and the development of this natural resource has already been too long delayed.

Completion of the project would bring closer together the vast producing areas of the West and the large marketing and industrial areas of the East. It would also bring the avenues of international commerce to the front door of the great Northwest area.

We believe that no really honest or legitimate objection has been raised to the completion of this project. We feel rather that it is being obstructed by a couple of special groups, one of which represents certain railroad interests, and the other of which represents a segment of big-business interest which wishes to hold the center of wealth, trade, and commerce on the east coast of the United States.

We feel that while legislators have a responsibility to the community which elected them, they also have a responsibility to the Nation at large, and while they are in matters of local significance bounden to give consideration to local areas, that in matters of national significance and which concern the welfare of the Nation as a whole, that special interests and sectional interests should give way.

The bills for the seaway project are: S. 589, proposed amendment thereto by Senator THYE; Senate Joint Resolution 45, House Joint Resolution 104, and House Joint Resolution 195. We particularly urge support of the Lehman-Roosevelt proposals.

Very truly yours,

BARNESVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By PAUL T. AITKEN,
Chairman, National Affairs.

CONSTRUCTION OF TRANSMISSION LINES FROM DAMS ON MISSOURI RIVER IN NORTH DAKOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA, AND MINNESOTA—RESOLUTION OF CROAKS FARMERS UNION, RENVILLE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Croaks Farmers Union Local, of Renville, Minn., favoring adequate appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation to build transmission lines from dams on the Missouri River in North and South Dakota into Minnesota.

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

RENVILLE, MINN., *April 3, 1953.*

Hon. Senator HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The following resolution was passed by the action committee of the Croaks Farmers Union Local:

"*Resolved,* That we ask our Senators to use all of their power and influence to persuade the Agriculture Appropriations Committee to make funds available to the Bureau of Reclamation for the building of transmission lines from the dams on the Missouri River in North and South Dakota into Minnesota; and also

"*Resolved,* That when the seven men negotiating of 20 REA's of Minnesota come to Washington, we ask you to give them every assistance in their endeavor to obtain legislation favorable to Minnesota REA's."

Thank you.

Sincerely,

CLINTON HAROLDSON,
Legislative Secretary of Croaks Farmers Union Local, Renville, Minn.

REACTIVATION OF NATIONAL GUARD UNITS—APPROPRIATIONS FOR MEDICAL PROGRAM OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions of the Department of Minnesota, American Legion on the reactivation of National Guard units and on appropriations for the medical program of the Veterans' Administration be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RESOLUTION ON THE REACTIVATION OF NATIONAL GUARD UNITS

"Whereas it is a well-known fact that the National Guard has provided an essential force in every war and major catastrophe of the Nation; and

"Whereas the National Guard constitutes the only internal security force available to State authorities in cases of civil emergencies; and

"Whereas the National Guard provides a trained reserve, ready for first-line defense at a fraction of the cost necessary to maintain regular defensive forces; and

"Whereas the Army and Air National Guard units, having just returned from active Federal service in the present emergency, are in the process of reorganization; and

"Whereas for budgetary reasons the strength of the National Guard units is at present limited to 50 percent officers and 25 percent personnel; and

"Whereas there apparently are more qualified personnel available and willing to join these organizations than the above limitations will permit; and

"Whereas the organizations at this strength are handicapped in conducting effective training programs which directly and seriously reduce their effectiveness, both as an internal-security unit and as an element of the first line of defense; and

"Whereas the continuance of this situation is a serious threat to the future of the National Guard organizations as an integral part of our national-defense forces: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, That every Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from Minnesota be forthwith advised by proper communication from the commander of the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, of the existence of this serious limitation on the reactivation of the National Guard units in this area; and be it further

"Resolved, That said communication stress the necessity of providing sufficient funds in the forthcoming and future budgets to insure the maintenance of all National Guard units at a strength adequate for the fulfillment of their prescribed missions; and be it further

"Resolved, That when such budgetary deficiency is corrected the posts and members of the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, actively assist in the building of National Guard units to full strength; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the national security commission of the American Legion for presentation to the proper body for appropriate action on the national level."

The above resolution was adopted unanimously by the American Legion, Department of Minnesota in executive committee session on March 8, 1953, at Minneapolis.

MILTON G. BLOCK,
Department Commander.

Attest:

CARL GRANNING,
Department Adjutant.

"Whereas high standards of excellence in medicine, surgery, and hospital care were achieved in Veterans' Administration hospitals exceeding any hitherto known as a result of the introduction of the so-called Dean's committee plan; and

"Whereas this plan brought to the bedside of the disabled veterans the best available medical and surgical skills through affiliation of medical schools and centers and their outstanding specialists with Veterans' Administration hospitals at a time when a rapidly growing patient load was developing following World War II, and which has since been further increased as a result of the Korean conflict; and

"Whereas 2 years ago the first slowdown in this highly important program occurred in the reduction in force in nonprofessional personnel which did affect the medical program, however, and which was followed a year later by another reduction in force which did affect professional personnel, resulting in closing down of a large number of beds; and

"Whereas further decreases in budgets impend as an economy measure which will have a serious effect in maintaining the high degree of medicine and surgery which is now threatened through pinchpenny budgeting, which is creating a feeling among top-bracket medical personnel that the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration no longer offers career opportunities to attract and hold highly skilled medical personnel necessary to insure the continuance of this program of unsurpassed excellence: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Executive Committee of the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, in regular session on March 8, 1953, in Minneapolis, That the Congress of the United States give careful consideration to the budgetary needs of the Veterans' Administration and appropriate sufficient funds to safeguard the future of a medical program which has placed the Veterans' Administration in the forefront with the best medicine, surgery, and hospital care obtainable. A grateful nation can do no less for its disabled veterans."

The above resolution was unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, on March 8, 1953.

MILTON G. BLOCK,
Department Commander.

Attest:

CARL GRANNING,
Department Adjutant.

OFFSHORE OIL RESOURCES—RESOLUTION OF MIDLAND COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Midland Cooperative Wholesale, Minneapolis, Minn., at their annual meeting on March 30 and 31, relating to offshore oil resources.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 1—OFFSHORE OIL RESOURCES

Great petroleum reserves lie off the coast of the United States which should be developed for the benefit of all of the people. The United States Supreme Court has heard the whole case for and against title of coastal States to these resources and has ruled 3 times that oil beyond the tidelands belongs to all the 48 States.

Now an effort is being made to take that oil for the benefit of only a few of the States: Be it

Resolved, That we here assembled, representing 700 member cooperatives of Midland Cooperative Wholesale, hereby express our opposition to all efforts to transfer to the States any of the existing rights of the Federal Government in oil resources beyond the tidelands, and we urge our representatives in Congress to work and vote to retain such Federal rights; be it further

Resolved, That the Federal Government make an appropriation for the purpose of making a full, impartial survey to determine the extent and location of oil deposits beyond the tidelands, and that the results of such a survey be made available to all interested parties; and, further, that rights to lease and develop such oil lands be open to all corporations, cooperatives, and other groups on an equal basis.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1613. A bill for the relief of Tom Hellander Co., Superior, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1614. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1615. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. George P. Price;

S. 1616. A bill for the relief of Attila Kassay;

S. 1617. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen; and

S. 1618 (by request). A bill for the relief of Luigi Orlando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1619. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tungsten ores, and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; and

S. 1620. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tungsten, manganese, chromite, mica, asbestos, beryl, and columbium-tantalum-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1621. A bill to expand and extend to June 30, 1955, the Direct Home and Farmhouse Loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, AND THE PRODUCTION OF TUNGSTEN ORES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tungsten ores, and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1619) to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tungsten ores, and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Domestic Tungsten Program Extension Act of 1953."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby recognized that the continued dependence on overseas sources of supply for strategic or critical minerals and metals during periods of threatening world conflict or of political instability within those nations controlling the sources of supply of such materials gravely endangers the present and future economy and security of the United States. It is therefore declared to be the policy of the Congress that each department and agency of the Federal Government charged with responsibilities concerning the discovery, development, production, and acquisition of strategic or critical minerals and metals shall undertake to decrease further and to eliminate where possible the dependency of the United States on overseas sources of supply of each such material.

SEC. 3. In accordance with the declaration of policy set forth in section 2 of this act, the termination date of the domestic tungsten program, as amended, which program was established by regulation issued pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, shall be extended an additional 2 years to July 1, 1958: *Provided*, That this section is not intended and shall not be construed to limit or restrict the regulatory agencies from extending the termination date of the domestic tungsten program beyond July 1, 1958, or from increasing the quantity of tungsten that may be delivered and accepted under the program as permitted by existing statutory authority.

DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, AND PRODUCTION OF TUNGSTEN, MANGANESE, CHROMITE, MICA, ASBESTOS, BERYL, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM BEARING ORES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tungsten, manganese, chromite, mica, asbestos, beryl, and columbium-tantalum bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1620) to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tungsten, manganese, chromite, mica, asbestos, beryl, and columbium-tantalum bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby recognized that the continued dependence on overseas sources of supply for strategic or critical minerals and metals during periods of threatening world conflict or of political instability within those nations controlling the sources of supply of such materials gravely endangers the present and future economy and security of the United States. It is therefore declared to be the policy of the Congress that each department and agency of the Federal Government charged with responsibilities concerning the discovery, development, production, and acquisition of strategic or critical minerals and metals shall undertake to decrease further and to eliminate where possible the dependency of the United States on overseas sources of supply of each such material.

SEC. 3. In accordance with the declaration of policy set forth in section 2 of this act, the termination dates of all purchase programs designed to stimulate the domestic production of tungsten, manganese, chromite, mica, asbestos, beryl, and columbium-tantalum-bearing ores and concentrates and established by regulations issued pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, shall be extended an additional 2 years: *Provided*, That this section is not intended and shall not be construed to limit or restrict the regulatory agencies from extending the termination dates of these programs beyond the 2-year extension periods provided by this section or from increasing the quantity of materials that may be delivered and accepted under these programs as permitted by existing statutory authority: *Provided further*, That the extended termination date provided by this section for the columbium-tantalum purchase program shall not apply to the purchase of columbium-tantalum-bearing ores and concentrates of foreign origin.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, some 20 years ago the Congress felt it expedient to delegate to the executive branch its constitutional authority to levy tariffs and import fees and to regulate foreign commerce. Periodically the Congress has extended its delegation of constitutional authority and approved the fussing and tampering which the State Department has done with tariffs. Because of the uncertainty which this fussing and tampering has injected into an already financially risky industry the investor of private capital has become extremely reluctant to invest any money in the mining industry and as a consequence it has become badly injured.

So long as the State Department sees fit to manipulate tariffs and import fees and create general economic uncertainty, something must be done in the interest of promoting a going-concern mining industry and the bills which I have just introduced are designed to provide the incentive to get investment capital into the mining industry.

REGULATION OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION WITHIN THE METROPOLITAN AREA OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA — EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a resolution was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with respect to the bill (S. 922) to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C. At the request of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the bill was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, with instructions that it should be reported to the Senate not later than April 13, 1953, which is today.

I have conferred with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who has agreed that we should have until April 20 in which to report the bill.

In that connection, I may state that a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia has conducted hearings on the bill and has prepared an amendment and a report. However, it is necessary to have a meeting of the full committee before they can be reported. We do not anticipate that it will be necessary to take even a full week, but we should like to have that amount of time. I understand that there is no objection on the part of the minority leader. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the extension of the time until April 20, 1953.

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

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

Text of address delivered by him on April 11, 1953, at banquet of Indiana Law Journal Board, Bloomington, Ind., on the subject of the need for adoption of a uniform code of procedure in the Senate for conducting Senate investigations.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Statement by Curtis Campaigne, Jr., national chairman, Americans Veterans Committee, relative to admission of pro-Nazi pianist, Walter Gieseking, into the United States.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Essay entitled "The Security Council of the United Nations," written by Joan Marx, of Huntsville, Ala., Junior High School.

Editorial entitled "Mr. McKay Looks Around," published in the Decatur (Ala.) Daily of recent date.

By Mr. GREEN:

Article entitled "The Bricker Amendment," written by George W. Potter, and published in the Providence Journal-Bulletin of April 10, 1953.

AWARD BY FREEDOM'S FOUNDATION TO THE CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

Mr. IVES. Recently the distinguished Chaplain of the United States Senate received an unusual award for distinguished service. He was awarded a very beautiful medal by the Freedom's Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa. On the medal is inscribed:

For outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life.

The medal was awarded at a notable ceremony held in the old Supreme Court Chamber in the Capitol on Thursday, April 2, 1953.

The jury making the decision as to who should be thus recognized was composed of Supreme Court Justices of the various States.

THE RELIGION OF THE REDS—ARTICLE BY CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in the Washington Star of yesterday there was published an article entitled "The Religion of the Reds," written by our distinguished Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris. This article not only contrasts effectively the difference between Judeo-Christianity and communism, it also reveals most completely the intense and abiding faith of its author, who is a true patriot in every sense of the word. I urge my colleagues in the Congress to read it, and I ask that, at this point in my remarks, it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE RELIGION OF THE REDS

(By Frederick Brown Harris, minister, Foundry Methodist Church; Chaplain, United States Senate)

Once red was but a color. Now it shouts of a conspiracy, a diabolical conspiracy

against decency and morality. Now red symbolizes a scourge threatening the painfully accumulated treasures of a thousand years. Red represents a slavish concentration camp for untold millions of humans shut out from the light of the truth which makes men free. Red is shorthand for the flood of villainies and abominations which have flowed from the poisoned springs of the Kremlin, contaminated by the warped theories of Marx mixed with the sinister expediencies of Lenin and Stalin.

Communism is a perverted religion. It has been called a religion because it demands of its devotees absolutely everything, body, soul, and spirit. Into the spiritual and political vacuums of the world it comes as a substitute for Christianity, because it promises paradise on this side of the grave instead of alleged postponed pie in the sky. It paints a final worldwide brotherhood of equality. Let it be admitted that, in lands beyond Russia, at first many high-minded people were duped by its specious blueprints for an ampler life. But, long since, every shred of pretense has been snatched away. To all who have eyes to see and hearts to feel there are sufficient horrible exhibitions of the bitter harvest it brings to make questionable the moral and intellectual integrity of any sane person who espouses the system.

Perhaps crucified Czechoslovakia would be exhibit No. 1, where the Red regime has changed life from a glad adventure in liberty to a nightmare of horrors and regimentation. The army of refugees flying from the Red terror in East Germany speaks more eloquently than could the Voice of America.

There are three fundamental unbridgeable differences between Judeo-Christianity and the religion of the Reds. These have to do with God, with man and with morality. Communism has no place for God. There is no allegiance higher than the state. Its leaders speak with disdain of the holy water of Christianity. Matter is everything, spirit is a delusion. The Red philosophy denies the supernatural, root, and branch. There is absolutely no ground for compromise or reconciliation.

Then there is the nature of man. Christianity teaches his greatness as being created by God, to love and to serve Him with eternal life as his destiny. Communism takes from him all dignity and all rights. He exists for the state, which can use him as it desires for its advantage. It can put him on a pedestal or send him to a slave camp. It can torture and kill him, without trial, if he even appears to question its authority.

Archbishop Temple, one of the greatest church leaders of our generation, thus summed up the difference between the two systems: "The great and profound difference between Christian civilization and the kind of civilization which the Communists are aiming at lies in our affirmation that the primary fact of the world is God, that each individual is the child of God, that at the root of his being he is a child of God, and that he is a child before he is a citizen of any national community."

And then, of course, out of these sharp differences grows the yawning gulf separating divergent conceptions of morality. Christianity asserts that there is a moral law which comes from God, who is the sovereign of the universe. Justice and truth and love have absolute claims for obedience. But the Red teaching is that morality is anything which serves to destroy an enemy. Lenin declared: "It is necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful methods, even concealment of the truth."

Surely, it is the solemn duty of our free land to ferret out and to expose subversives who here secretly dare confess the blasphemous religion of the Reds. To bring any such dangerous citizen to the bar of judgment is no more thought-control than is bringing a murderer to justice an infringement of personal liberty. When, by any legitimate investigating body, the question is asked "Are you a Communist?" the real test is: Do you affirm or deny the spiritual verities which are the very foundations of this free land? Have you given your allegiance to a system which accepts lying, treachery, deceit and cruelty as instrumentalities for the accomplishment of its purpose? In the searching blaze of that question for one to hide behind the fifth amendment must be interpreted as a confession of guilt. Any suspect using that bulwark of freedom as a refuge for treachery is a coward and a traitor.

But, of course, in dealing with the termites we must be careful not to damage the national structure. We must never use un-American methods in fighting un-Americanism. Whenever that is done we are surrendering to the very evil forces we are combating. But this is a time not only for confessing our faith; there must be a new purpose and a new passion in the practice of our dearly bought freedom. Added to our cherished bill of rights must be an equally compelling bill of responsibilities.

Our democracy must be purged of its betrayals if it is to live at home and be fit for export to the ends of the earth. It is high time in America we realize that a mild, undemanding, bleached Christianity cannot successfully combat a militant, masterful paganism. Too often this desperate crisis finds us with a religious faith which is timid, tame and tepid, in a land too largely devoted, even in a struggle for survival, to gadgets, comforts, moneymaking and pleasure.

The worldwide misery on which the Red vultures feed must be lifted to levels of more abundant living, if any part of the earth is to be safe. Some time ago, a Member of the United States Congress returning from parts of Europe and Asia where, at first hand, he had seen fanatical communism blazing with the intensity of an acetylene torch, exclaimed: "Would to God we had the flaming zeal and the consuming beliefs that would make us, as Americans, in this decisive day match with the intensity of our convictions the sacrifice and the devotion of the deluded Communists." We cannot beat something with nothing. We must meet the spurious religion of the Reds with the glorious religion of redemption.

Simply to tell the world what we are not is insufficient. To show by our flaming zeal what we are will fling us into a resistless crusade on whose banners of freedom is emblazoned—"God wills it."

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF A KOREAN TRUCE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, on April 10 I addressed a letter to members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report enclosing a memorandum which I had asked the committee staff to prepare on the possible economic consequences of a Korean truce. Because of the widespread interest which has been expressed in these materials, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

APRIL 10, 1953.

To All Members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

In the belief that as a member of the Joint Economic Committee, I have an obligation to keep abreast of the economic implications of changing world conditions, I asked the committee staff a few days ago to prepare a memorandum on the possible economic consequences of a Korean truce. The staff, in consultation with technicians in the executive agencies, has submitted to me a statement which I am attaching herewith.

It is important to recognize, of course, that we may be a long way distant from achieving a truce. Nor is a truce a settlement. These staff materials, therefore, were prepared at my direction on the basis of what might turn out to be a hypothetical assumption.

I hope that the joint committee can give early consideration to these and other materials bearing on the economic outlook.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. FLANDERS,
Vice Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT,
April 10, 1953.

Memorandum to: Senator RALPH FLANDERS, vice chairman.

From: Grover W. Ensley, staff director.

Subject: Possible economic consequences of a Korean truce.

As per your request, the committee staff has just completed the attached tentative analysis of the possible economic consequences of a Korean truce, assuming that the current talks lead to such a truce. In the course of preparing this statement we have consulted with technicians in the executive agencies.

It is important that the public generally realize that a truce is not a settlement and it will not bring with it, automatically, marked changes in Federal programs or alter the sustaining economic forces ahead.

Unless there is public confidence in the underlying long-run strength of the economy it is conceivable (although not warranted) that we could have the reverse of the business and consumer buying wave of July 1950. It will be recalled that with the outbreak of the Korean war, business and consumers thought there would be immediate and inflationary increases in Government expenditures and civilian shortages. This widespread belief caused a buying spree which pushed wholesale prices up 16 percent and consumer prices up 9 percent. However, it was months later before actual Federal expenditures rose significantly and this rise in defense spending was more than offset by increases in national production.

In spite of the bearishness of the stock market over the possibility of a Korean truce, the present outlook for private business activity and continued high levels of production and employment remains good. There may be expected, of course, the usual rolling adjustments in certain segments of the economy or more general inventory-price fluctuations of the 1949 type—as is always the case even in prosperous periods.

With respect to the transition period ahead, the committee staff stated in its Sustaining Economic Forces Ahead last December (Joint Committe print, p. 65):

"The ability of the economy to adjust to shifts will in the end depend principally upon the attitudes and behavior of businessmen, investors, and consumers at that time. As our ability to produce increases and Government defense purchases level out, will businessmen and consumers go ahead with their private plans and expenditures, or will they too withdraw from the market out of fear or uncertainty about the ability of the private economy to go ahead without artificial stimulus? If they do, it will not be from lack of opportunities for growth and investment; of that we can be certain."

POSSIBLE ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF A KOREAN TRUCE

It is assumed that the recent shift in Soviet policy is only a temporary tactical maneuver, not a fundamental change in long-term strategy, so that United States economic policy should continue to be based on long-run needs for defense as well as for stability and growth without psychological waves of speculative buying or selling every time some Soviet move occurs.

I. Recent Communist overtures for a Korean truce probably reflect the Soviet belief that a truce at this time will strengthen

communism in the long-run struggle but will weaken the United States:

A. A truce would represent a local cessation of fighting only and may be a temporary shift in policy to gain time for:

1. Further rapid Soviet industrial expansion: The fifth 5-year plan calls for production increases from 1950 to 1955 by 43 percent in coal, 85 percent in petroleum, 62 percent in steel, 80 percent in electric power, 85 percent in metallurgical equipment, etc.

2. Political consolidation of the new Soviet regime.

3. Political, psychological, economic, and military preparations for a new Communist move.

B. A desire for a truce may be based on a Soviet belief that it would:

1. Induce a relaxation in the rearmament of the United States and its allies, while Russia continues to arm.

2. Cause economic dislocation and recession in the United States (and hence throughout the free world) by suddenly inducing a substantial cut in Federal defense spending, and a reversal of private investment.

3. Cause a psychological let-down in the United States and thus a recession, or spiraling depression, because of a suspected business and consumer belief that peace and full employment are incompatible.

II. A Korean truce alone would not remove the basic threat of Communist aggression against which Western free-world military preparedness and industrial expansion have been directed. Military and economic adjustments resulting from a truce would be comparatively minor in light of the broad, long-run needs, objectives, and dangers which remain unaffected.

A. Direct identifiable expenditures on Korea account only for 10 percent of military spending, or $4 to $5 billion per year which could be cut gradually, depending on:

1. The need for supplies to R. O. K. forces to prevent a new attack, and to aid in rebuilding the economy of Korea.

2. When and where United States forces now in Korea are relocated, and the cost of transportation, training, and equipment for the size of the total military forces considered necessary.

3. Decisions on the speed and extent of building military reserves (i. e., stocks on hand to meet possible future aggressions) which could not be made in many cases while operations were continuing in Korea.

B. These direct Korean military expenditures of $4 to $5 billion are minor compared to a current gross national product of over $360 billion. Their reduction would not warrant a change in business or consumer expectations or any significant cuts in private spending. The only real danger is that an unjustified psychological reaction will set in similar to July 1950, but in the reverse direction, resulting in widespread retrenchment in anticipation of reductions in Government demand larger than actually develop.

III. A Korean truce should not alter present expectations of continued high employment and output combined with stable prices unless purely psychological setbacks of the type mentioned above should occur.

A. Effects of the Korean truce alone on the Federal budget are unlikely to change previous expectations that total administrative budget expenditures in fiscal 1954 will fall within the $70 to $80 billion range, and in fiscal 1955 within the $60 to $70 billion range and that tax receipts under present laws providing for automatic cuts will amount to $68 to $70 billion in fiscal 1954. The administration's current review of the budget in relation to our military objectives, time schedules, organizational structure and efficiency, might be expected to narrow the 1954 expenditure range to $70 to $75 billion—even without a Korean truce. Continued improvement in the over-all budget position is likely to provide increased hope for future tax adjustments, stimulating to private investment and consumption.

B. Private investment plans should not be altered by a Korean truce from the high levels previously in prospect:

1. Latest SEC-Commerce Survey of Business plans for purchase of new plant and equipment indicate a rise of about 2 percent for 1952–53—5 percent larger than planned last October for 1953. This optimistic outlook is supported by the recent upward movement of new orders for capital goods reversing the 1952 trend and by the new survey of business investment plans by McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. In addition, analyses by the United States Departments of Commerce and Labor and by private building industry economists, and a survey of builders by Fortune magazine, all point to nonfarm residential construction in 1953 as high or higher than in 1952.

2. Present investment plans appear to be based on long-run considerations such as were spelled out in the Joint Economic Committee print on The Sustaining Economic Forces Ahead, and hence are reasonably secure from fluctuations due to a Korean truce since:

(a) They were made in expectation of a cut in defense spending after the peak in the present year so the modest reduction due to a Korean truce would be no great change.

(b) There is no evidence of excess capacity in industries where additional investment is now planned, e. g., electric power.

(c) The demand for residential construction reflects the effects of new family formation, continued high birth rates particularly for third and fourth children, replacement of old units in central urban areas by modern suburban units in new locations, and high levels of consumer incomes and savings sufficient to turn housing needs into effective demand.

3. Present inventories are not considered excessive relative to rates of sales though presently available data do not permit accurate assessment of some industries which will be planning readjustments as defense production passes its peak. Recent additions to inventory were due to the replacement of losses caused by the 1952 steel strike.

C. Consumer expenditures seem likely to continue stable to rising through fiscal 1954 supported by rising disposable personal income, ample liquid savings, stable prices, and favorable terms of finance for durable goods—the same outlook as reported recently by the Federal Reserve Survey of Consumer Plans and Expectations.

1. A Korean truce is unlikely to have appreciable immediate depressing effects on disposable personal incomes since eventual reductions due to reduced Government spending may be offset by direct reductions in taxes planned for such time and the indirect stimulating effects of tax revisions on private spending.

2. Continued high consumer incomes and relatively stable prices probably mean rising consumer expenditures in line with rising real disposable incomes. [If consumer disposition to spend should rise even slightly it would sharply reduce recent high savings.]

3. A Korean truce might influence consumers either to hesitate in their spending for a month or two particularly on durable goods and luxuries, or to reduce recent high savings, thus bolstering demand.

D. As a result of a Korean truce, the standards of living in noncommunistic countries might be raised and United States foreign trade through private channels might increase if world tensions are relaxed enough to:

1. Reduce burden of military programs on other countries as well as on United States.

2. Render feasible the expansion of private United States investment abroad and Government policies conducive to such investment.

3. Replace foreign military aid in part with increased technical assistance programs.

IV. The possibility of a Korean truce points to the likelihood that the years ahead might be marked by alternating Russian policies of tension and relaxation. Any Russion intention of creating dislocations and disturbances in our economy (as well as in our military readiness) by such tactics must be defeated. Therefore, study of our national economic prospects and our policies to promote healthy economic growth needs continued attention and reappraisal in the light of changing international as well as domestic conditions. Among the Government programs and policies which should be given continued attention are:

A. Indirect controls such as credit and debt management.

B. Long-range tax policies to improve economic incentives.

C. Automatic stabilizers such as agricultural price supports, unemployment insurance, and flexible fiscal policies.

D. Rising standards of living abroad as a means of successfully combating communism, through improved international trade, investment, and interchange of technical information.

REQUESTED NOTIFICATION TO SENATOR MORSE OF ANY REQUESTS FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET DURING THE DEBATE ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is necessary for me to leave the floor for a conference with some constituents. Therefore I should like to announce that it is my personal wish that in case a unanimous-consent request for any committee to hold a hearing while the submerged lands debate is going on, either the majority leader or the acting majority leader, the minority leader or the acting minority leader, object in my behalf; or, if not caring to do that, to give me the courtesy of a quorum call so that I may come to the floor and do my own objecting.

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

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE SENATE ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate upon its convening next Wednesday, or after the disposal of routine business, if such there be on that day, regarding a matter which is wholly unrelated to the present order of business, without prejudicing my right to speak to the pending resolution or to any amendment to it which may be proposed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished Senator from how long a period of time he desires to address the Senate?

Mr. NEELY. For less than an hour.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) 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.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], for himself and other Senators, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for the committee amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the question before us is simple.

It is not, primarily, a legal problem.

It is not a question of who is right. It is more of a question of what is right. In a major sense the pending question is a moral question.

I am not a lawyer, as my colleagues know.

It is not necessary to be a lawyer to vote on this bill. Perhaps it is even a handicap.

The legal cases cited in this debate are interesting. But most of them are beside the main point.

The main point is this: Why should we vote to give away these vital and valuable offshore oil resources—these resources in the land beds beneath the sea?

Why should we vote to abdicate the National Government's power to regulate what goes on in the open sea and in the land beds beneath the sea?

Why should we vote to give Texas, Louisiana, and California the exclusive key to a national treasure said to be worth $50 billion—perhaps much more than that?

The Supreme Court has ruled that this treasure, these rights, and this regulatory power are vested in the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court made that decision in three separate cases.

That is the law.

Why should we vote to overrule the Supreme Court?

Most of the arguments made in this debate have been over the question of whether the Supreme Court was right.

We have been retrying the case.

That is an interesting exercise. I have received much profit from this phase of the debate. But that is not our function or our jurisdiction.

We must not lose sight of the main question before us, much as the proponents of this legislation would like to have us lose sight of that question.

That question is: Why should we give these rights away? Why should we give these billions away?

Under the rulings of the Supreme Court these rights and this great wealth belong to all the States—to New York, and Connecticut, and Virginia, and Ohio, and Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and North Dakota, and Iowa—to all the 48 States and all the people of this country and to their descendants.

Why should Congress vote to take these rights away from all the people, from the Nation as a whole, and give them to three States?

The proponents of this legislation have not given the answer. In my remarks today, Mr. President, I shall try to state why the Congress should not give these rights away. I propose to argue what I deeply believe, that the national interest and the national need require the retention of these rights, and that the alienation of these rights—this proposed giveaway—is a denial of the national interest, and a handicap to our national security.

What we should be doing, Mr. President, in the proper exercise of our obligations as Members of the National Congress, is to be debating how best to use these rights to promote the national interest and to advance the national security—not what manner we can legally follow in giving away these rights which lawfully belong to the Nation.

The Anderson bill offers a method of using the rights lawfully vested in the National Government—to develop our oil resources, to expand our oil production, to promote the national defense, and incidentally to award to the States adjacent to these resources a very generous share of the benefits from the development of these resources, within the 3-mile area.

The Hill amendment offers a way of using the benefits accruing to the National Government to promote the general welfare of the Nation by advancing the cause of education throughout our land, by investing part of the Federal Government's share of the proceeds from this development in the future of America, in the education of our young. In my opinion, nothing could possibly be more important.

The Holland joint resolution neglects these needs entirely. It concentrates on a confused and questionable formula for giving away what can be given away, and for paralyzing the National Government's access to those rights which cannot, even under the most extreme stretch of the legal imagination, be given away.

The national rights of the 3-mile belt are proposed to be given away. The bill proposes to give away title, but comprehends the strong possibility that title cannot be given away, and so provides for the contingency that this part of the giveaway will be declared illegal. So the Holland joint resolution proposes to give away the rights to the resources in the 3-mile belt, even if the courts find that Congress could not legally hand over the legal title to this area.

Then the Holland measure goes further, and edges out beyond the 3-mile zone, into the international zone, and seeks to give to certain States title to areas in the open sea beyond any limits which our country has ever claimed to be the exclusive territory of any country, even our own.

We have protested and resisted the claims of Russia, Ecuador, and Mexico, among other nations, to exclusive territorial rights beyond the 3-mile zone off their shores; but today it is proposed to give to certain States proprietary rights to ocean areas far beyond our coasts—rights which we as a Nation have never claimed to possess.

What a travesty on national responsibility. How irresponsible we will seem in the eyes of the world if we approve this legislation.

Of course, Mr. President, we have claimed, and will continue to claim, certain regulatory powers over the Continental Shelf, as far out as it may extend. But this claim must be maintained in the international sphere, by the United States as a Nation; and any rights which accrue to this Nation as a result of our successful contention in this sphere belong to the Nation as a whole, and should not and cannot be given away to certain States, to the prejudice of the whole Nation.

My own State of New York is a part of this Nation, a great part, I must say. I cannot consent to an act of Congress which would transfer to the State of Texas the rights of New Yorkers as Americans. I would hope that even Texans, not to speak of the citizens of other States, would feel the same way.

If the time has come when the citizens of the several States think only of what they can grab from the Nation, and not of what they can preserve for the Nation, and share together as citizens of the Nation, it is time to stop and take stock.

It has always been my concept, Mr. President, that we are New Yorkers, and Iowans, and Pennsylvanians, and Tennesseeans—only to the water's edge. After that, we are all Americans, citizens of the United States. In the open sea, we are Americans. And whatever rights any of us enjoys in the open sea, we enjoy by virtue of being Americans; and any rights this Nation enjoys in the open seas, and in the lands beneath these seas are enjoyed as a Nation. Beyond the water's edge, there is no Texas, no California, no Louisiana, no New York. There is only the United States of America.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note the statement of the distinguished Senator from New York to the effect that beyond the water's edge there is no New York. Is it not completely and entirely true that under the Anderson bill, which the Senator states he supports, New York State would be given filled lands which now, under the three decisions, belong to the Federal Government, and on which there are developments representing many hundreds of millions of dollars in value? Is it not therefore the case that, so far as the State of New York is concerned, it is highly interested under the pending measure in securing for itself and its grantees extremely valuable lands which are a part of the submerged bottom of the Atlantic off the south shore of Long Island and off the shore of Staten Island?

Mr. LEHMAN. If the distinguished Senator from Florida will permit me to say so, I am very familiar with what has happened in the State of New York. The recreational facilities to which the Senator refers in New York State, such as Jones Beach, Manhattan Beach, Oriental Beach, and the Causeway are still at the water's edge. They are not in the open sea. With respect to Jones Beach, nothing I did as Governor gives me greater pride than the fact that I had a great part in the development of Jones Beach. I was responsible for the many appropriations for the beach which were made by the State of New York.

All the facilities to which reference has been made are at the water's edge.

They are all a part of the shoreline of New York State, and they extend into the channel known as Jones Inlet. So I do not think the question which the distinguished Senator from Florida has raised is at all apposite to this matter.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from New York now denies the fact that many millions of dollars worth of developments have been built upon fills made into what was formerly a part of the bottom of the Atlantic off the open south shore of Long Island?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course not. But I will say categorically that the developments to which the Senator from Florida refers, the improvements, and the projects were all carried out with tax money provided by the State of New York, and they are a part of the shoreline of the State of New York.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the distinguished Senator deny that the shoreline of New York, on the south shore of Long Island, has been extended sizable distances into the shallow waters of the Atlantic by fills which are now occupied by multi-million-dollar developments?

Mr. LEHMAN. They are adjacent and contiguous to the shoreline. They are a part of the shoreline. The Federal Government permitted them to be built because they were not a menace to navigation.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the Senator is not answering my question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I am.

Mr. HOLLAND. The question is whether or not they were built into a part of the open Atlantic, by the advancement of the shores which were formerly at mean low water.

Mr. LEHMAN. They are contiguous and adjacent to the shoreline. I am very proud to have been Governor of the State of New York for many years, and am very proud to represent in part the State in this great body, and I may say that the Senator from Florida may not recall, as I do, that the State of New York came to the Senate, not once, but many times, and asked that appropriations be made for the protection of some of the very localities to which the Senator has referred, for instance, an appropriation to widen and broaden Jones Inlet, even though it was certainly within the confines of the State of New York. There was never any question about it. That refers also to Staten Island, and other similar bodies of land.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from New York will yield further, I wish he would give a categorical answer, if he will and can. Is it not a fact that as to the location of many million dollars of present developments, those developments on the south shore of Long Island and Staten Island are built upon filled lands which represent an extension of the shorelines of New York into what was formerly part of the submerged bottoms of the Atlantic Ocean below mean low-water mark, submerged bottoms outside the natural shoreline of his State?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say——

Mr. HOLLAND. Can the Senator answer that question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be delighted to answer it.

Let me say that the master of the Supreme Court has already decided that improvements on filled-in land in the sea adjacent to the shoreline belong to the State. There can be no question about that, and if I may be so bold as to intimate, I think the Senator from Florida is merely playing on words. The Anderson bill, which has been offered as an amendment to the pending joint resolution, merely confirms that determination of law. There can be no doubt about that. No one is questioning the right of the States to filled-in land. We have agreed to that. The Anderson bill covers it so thoroughly that there can be no argument about it. The Senator from Florida will also recall that last year I offered an amendment to what I think was his bill, though I am not sure about that, which would safeguard and recognize the rights of the States.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from New York will yield further, his amendment last year was not to the bill of the Senator from Florida, because the bill of the Senator from Florida already adequately safeguarded the rights of the States in such filled lands.

Mr. LEHMAN. It was the O'Mahoney bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. It was the O'Mahoney-Anderson bill, which up to that time had not so safeguarded the rights of the States.

Mr. President, will the Senator let me state my question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not a fact that by section 11 (a) of the Anderson bill, the Senator from New York, who has so far evaded answering the direct question of the Senator from Florida, specifically recognizes that fills have been made in the Continental Shelf adjoining State shores, and that the Anderson bill makes allowance for that by giving to the States and other public units, and to private-property owners, the rights to have those bottoms quitclaimed so that they will be free from the menace and the jeopardy of the existing situation, brought about by the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases, which have clouded those titles?

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from Florida that he is merely setting up a strawman. He knows perfectly well that the opponents of the Holland bill and the supporters of the Anderson bill—as well as the Federal Government itself—are today and have at all times been willing to recognize the right and title to these lands as being vested in the States. There is no question about that. I say very emphatically that, in my opinion, the distinguished Senator from Florida is merely attempting to set up a strawman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further to me? I hope he will let me complete my course of questions before yielding to another Senator. That is generally done as a matter of course.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

At this time I ask that here be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks subsection (a) of section 11 of the so-called Anderson bill, S. 107.

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

SEC. 11. (a) Any right granted prior to the enactment of this act by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from New York who has just charged the Senator from Florida and his associates with setting up a strawman in this regard, whether the distinguished Senator, in supporting S. 107, is not, insofar as the filled lands are concerned, supporting exactly the same philosophy which is supported by the Senator from Florida and his associates in urging the passage of the so-called Holland joint resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Oh, if I may say so, I think the distinguished Senator from Florida is a million miles off the mark. We have been willing to acknowledge, as a matter of natural law and morals, the rights of the States to filled-in lands in the inland waters and navigable waters within their boundaries, but the Senator from Florida, instead of a million miles off the mark, as I said, if I may deal with astronomical figures, I would say is a billion miles off. There is no similarity, not the slightest, between that and giving away the rights of the Nation, without justification, without reason, without moral basis, to the three States concerned.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask the Senator what is meant by this provision in subsection (a) of section 11:

Any right granted prior to the enactment of this act by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this act.

Does the Senator from New York mean by that provision to quitclaim to the States, to the local subdivisions of government, to individual owners who have filled in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjoining State lines, important fills, with important values, both private and public—to quitclaim those values and those former bottoms to the States and to the present owners, whether public or private?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, section 11 deals with the governmental agencies enumerated.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator is referring to the legal obligation in his conclusion, as he is, I think, he is completely wrong, because subsection (a) of section 11——

Mr. LEHMAN. I was referring to subsection (b), I believe.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I desire to answer the Senator.

Let me say that certainly we are willing to recognize the rights of those who, with appropriate authority, have built upon filled-in lands. However, we are willing to recognize those rights only insofar as the surface rights are concerned, not insofar as the mineral rights are concerned.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that under the provisions of both subsection (a) and subsection (b) of section 11 of the Anderson bill, the Senator from New York and his distinguished associates propose to quitclaim fee simple title to the present occupants, whether they be States, local units of government, or private individuals?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have never denied that. We have emphasized that fact many, many times, namely, that we recognize the rights of States to be——

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the Senator from New York is not withholding——

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask the Senator from Florida to permit me to complete my statement, please.

We have always acknowledged that the States have full rights with regard to navigable streams and inland waters, including lakes; and under the Anderson bill, the rights of the States to projects undertaken and completed on filled-in lands would be recognized by the Congress of the United States. There has never been the slightest question in the minds of any of us on that subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the Senator from New York did not mean to state, did he, that under the Anderson bill there is to be a withholding of mineral rights, or anything else, other than the rights to the surface of these filled-in lands?

Mr. LEHMAN. As I understand the Anderson bill—and the principal sponsor of that bill is now on the floor, and he can correct me if I am wrong in what I state regarding the bill—the Federal Government has never yet challenged, and the Anderson bill confirms, the right of developers of filled-in lands to the mineral rights in projects which have been developed adjacent to the shoreline on the ocean side.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at this point?

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, is it not a fact that the distinguished Senator from New York and his associates are in the position of being perfectly willing to grant—and, in fact, they are proposing to grant—to the great State of New York the multi-million-dollar developments which have been constructed on the filled lands on the south shore of Long Island and off the shore of Staten Island, and to the State of Florida similar developments, and to the State of New Jersey similar developments, and to the State of Massachusetts and to the State of California and to the State of Texas, similar developments; but in the case of States such as the State of Louisiana—which has no developable fronts of that kind, but, instead, has a low and marshy front, and for the development of its coastal areas has to rely upon submerged resources, such as oil, sulphur, and the like—they insist that there be withheld from those States the same tender consideration which the Senator from New York offers to his own State and to other States which have high, dry coastlines which those States have developed into values totaling several billion dollars?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Florida that I am not familiar with the developments in the State of Louisiana. I can say to him that I know a good deal about the lands which have been filled in by the State of New York, and which the State has developed into recreational facilities, parkways, and airfields. Furthermore, I have seen some of the corresponding developments in the State of Florida, because I believe that many of the islands which lie between the city of Miami and the city of Miami Beach are filled in lands. I may be mistaken about that, but that is my impression.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New York is correct. However, the island developments he has in mind at those places are not at all the primary ones affected either by the section of the Anderson bill which he has mentioned or by the Holland joint resolution; but, rather, the development on the filled-in lands of Miami Beach which front on the ocean and the multi-million-dollar developments which, as the Senator from New York well knows, have been constructed there and continue to exist there, are developments on fills into the open sea, in the case of the State of New York, the State of Florida, the State of California, and numerous other coastal States to which I have adverted. The Senator from New York has stated that he is perfectly willing to quitclaim the title to those valuable developments to the several States, although he is not willing to quitclaim to other States not so fortunately situated the title to the valuable lands to which they must look if they intend to develop their coastal areas.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not think the Senator from Florida is accurate in his statement. Of course we are willing to quitclaim the same privileges to other States. Of course we are willing to permit other States to take and to hold title to filled-in lands, in the case of the surface rights to those lands. So we are not discriminating.

Let me also point out that when the distinguished Senator from Florida refers to the great improvements which have been made in the State of New York along the shores of and adjacent to the various inlets and bays on the south side of Long Island, he is referring to undertakings which were completely and exclusively financed by the taxpayers of New York for the benefit not only of the people of New York but also the people of the entire Nation, who come to New York and there use and enjoy Jones Beach, Idlewild and LaGuardia Fields, and the other developments. The State of New York is not trying to make any profit from those developments, and I resent any implication that the State of New York and the junior Senator from New York are seeking to manifest any selfish interest.

We are willing to have these great new facilities for recreation, for which the people of New York have paid through taxes, shared by all the people of the entire United States. We want for New York State nothing that is not available to the rest of the Nation.

But let me say vehemently, with all the force at my command, that we want the money which will come from royalties arising by virtue of the development of the fabulously valuable oil resources under submerged lands to go, not to Florida, not to Louisiana, not to Texas, not to California, not to any one State alone, but to all the people of the United States, and to be used for education. We want the children of Mississippi, the children of Florida, the children of Georgia, the children of Wyoming, the children of Arizona, and the children in New York to have a share in this great natural resource. That is what we are fighting for.

We do not want anything for New York alone. I do not believe the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] want anything for their States alone. We are fighting for equity, an equal share in what God has given in the way of resources to our great Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, of course I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator from New York offering to grant, insofar as his own State is concerned, for the enjoyment of all the States, the multi-million-dollar developments now located off the coast of his State of New York and situate upon what formerly was a part of the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean off the original shores of Long Island and Staten Island?

Mr. LEHMAN. As I have said, of course we are willing to share them with the entire Nation. No one has ever been excluded from these great developments. We have invited all the people of the United States there, and have urged them to come there. Of course we want them to come there; of course we will share those developments with them.

I am amazed at the question of the Senator from Florida, because I thought my associates and I had made that point very, very clear in the course of the debate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I had not heard any offer to share with other States the

revenue from these multi-million-dollar developments.

Furthermore, when I listened to the testimony of the Senator from New York regarding this matter before the committee, and also when I listened to the testimony of the distinguished public servant from New York, Mr. Moses, I received the impression that not only public developments on the sea frontage of Long Island and Staten Island were involved, for, as I recall, the Senator from New York himself referred to some filled land, made back in the old days on Huntington Beach, which was filled, not as a public enterprise but as a private enterprise; and I well recall the argument before the committee with reference to the fact that the United States Government had had to pay the private developer a good many million dollars in order to secure that particular area as public property for defense purposes during World War II. I am sure the Senator from New York recalls that discussion.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not remember the discussion about Huntington Beach, but the Senator from Florida may have more knowledge of New York State than I have.

However, the Senator from Florida asked me whether the State of New York will share with the other States of the Union the revenues and profits accruing from these great recreational developments.

I may say to the Senator from Florida that, although I cannot bind the Legislature of the State of New York or the Governor of the State of New York, I am quite certain we shall be very willing to share the revenues with other States of the Union, if the other States of the Union are willing to assume their share of the losses in operating these great facilities; and there have been losses in connection with some of them for many, many years.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. No. I may say it is important that we keep our eye on the pending measure. I think all the questions which have been addressed to me, while interesting, and while I was very glad, indeed, to have them addressed to me and to have the opportunity of this little fencing operation, are pretty irrelevant. The fact is—and I want to point this out, as my associates and I have done on many occasions—that the Federal Government has never claimed filled land, but has always recognized the right of the States to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I will ask the Senator to wait a moment. In my opinion, there never was any question of the title to the filled-in lands. But if there were any question, that is fully taken care of by the Anderson bill. The important question and the matter that concerns u , and which I think concerns the entire country, is in whom the mineral rights to the submerged lands are vested, and whether the royalties, the profit from those mineral rights, belong to the entire country or whether they belong merely to three States.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I will, if the Senator will address to me questions which, in my opinion, are relevant. I have been engaging, it seems to me, in a fencing operation, and I do not think the Senator from Florida has really uncovered anything that I have not said, or that my associates have not said, during many hours of debate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was particularly interested in the statement of the distinguished junior Senator from New York that he does not know what the attitude of his Governor is, or what the attitude of his legislature is; whereas I recall that the RECORD shows that the distinguished Governor of New York has put himself on record repeatedly in favor of the philosophy of the Holland joint resolution; that the Legislature of New York has twice followed that course; that the attorneys general of New York, both the present one and the one who served as attorney general when the Senator from New York was Governor, have followed that course; that Mayor Impellitteri, of New York City, has followed that course; that the distinguished public park commissioner of New York, Mr. Moses, has followed that course; and that the New York Port Authority has followed that course. I was wondering whether the Senator really meant what he said, when he stated that he did not know the attitude of the Governor and the legislature of his State.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very grateful to the Senator from Florida for having asked that question, because it demonstrates, beyond anything I could say, how this whole issue is being twisted by questions being asked which are not relevant. I did not say—and the RECORD will so show—that I did not know the policy or views of the administration of the State of New York with regard to the measures which are now before the Senate. My answer to the Senator from Florida was in reply to his inquiry as to whether I would be willing to share the revenues from these great recreational facilities with the other States. To that question—and it was a definite question—I replied that, of course, I could not answer for the Legislature or the Governor of New York with regard to sharing revenues with other States, but that I felt we, in New York, would be willing to share the revenues, if the other States would share the losses. My reply had nothing whatever to do with the attitude of the Governor or the Legislature of New York.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I will, but——.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the event of the discovery of oil or other minerals of value in the submerged lands lying offshore from the present developments on Long Island or Staten Island, would the Senator from New York feel that the State of New York and the city of New York would have a very great interest in determining what portions of such values should be developed, whether they should be developed by derricks and oil wells placed immediately in front of the million-dollar developments already appearing there, and whether, for instance, oil derricks should be placed within a couple of hundred yards of any of the great parks of New York, or Coney Island, which, itself, is built on filled-in lands? Does not the Senator from New York feel that the decision as to where such developments should occur—or whether they should occur—and the determination of which value should come first, should rest in the State of New York and its municipalities, such as the city of New York, rather than some Federal bureau in Washington?

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator that, by implication, I think he is charging the Senator from New York with being rather insincere and disingenuous. I cannot say too strongly, and I cannot repeat too often, that we in New York want nothing that the other States do not get. Of course, if oil should be discovered off the coast of New York, and title to oil under submerged lands had been confirmed to the States by the Congress—which I hope will not be the case—New York would expect to profit by it. But I do not want New York to profit by exploiting a great national resource, any more than I want Florida or Mississippi or West Virginia or New Mexico or California to profit by such exploitation. If I believed otherwise, I certainly would be very insincere, and almost dishonest and dishonorable in making this argument before the Senate of the United States. I do not want New York to have any advantage, I do not want Florida to have any advantage, I do not want Texas to have any advantage, or California or Louisiana. I want this great natural resource to belong to the 159 million people of the United States, to be used, I hope, for the education of our young, than which I think nothing is more important.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Adverting, now, to subsection (b) of section 11, of the Anderson bill, which was the Lehman amendment of last year, written at that time into the O'Mahoney-Anderson measure, I note that that subsection provides that States and political subdivisions, municipalities, and so forth, can, after the passage of the Anderson bill, if it be passed and become law, have the complete right to continue filling new lands out onto the Continental Shelf for the purpose of parks or any other public purpose, and that in such case—and I quote from that provision—"the right, title, and interest of any State, political subdivision—is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States."

I note that the distinguished Senator, apparently attaching little importance to the fact that most of the shoreline is owned by private persons, did not give a right to private developers to proceed with fills in the future and to have their titles automatically confirmed, but, instead, refused to do so. I wonder whether, for the record, the Senator would state his philosophy in this connection, in order that there may be no misunderstanding whatever about the matter.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that we

recognize the rights in reference to the tidal lands, but only the surface rights. I feel very inadequate in that I have not been able, apparently, to convince the Senator from Florida that what we are interested in today, and what the Nation is interested in, is the mineral rights to minerals which lie under the sea. That is where the wealth comes from; that is where the income will come from. It is not a question of a recreation park here or there or at some other place. It is not a question of filled-in land. So long as two things are recognized, one, that the mineral rights belong to the Federal Government, and, two, that the defenses of our Nation are safeguarded, I have very little interest in the question. I should be perfectly willing to make the rule apply to private property also, always, reserving, however, the mineral rights to the Government and always reserving the defense considerations of the Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. Why, then, does the distinguished Senator from New York limit his amendment to public filling and public values and thus discriminate against private enterprise and private ownership in the nearly 5,000 miles of frontage of the coastal States upon the various salt-water bodies?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not recall that I submitted that kind of a perfecting amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New York was present when that was discussed by the Senator from Florida and offered no affirmative suggestion whatever and has not offered any up to this moment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Having received no cooperation with regard to the protection of public developments, I may have thought it was useless to do it.

But I desire to remind the Senator from Florida of the fact that at the time we discussed the proposed amendment concerning filled-in land in Texas, we were concerned with the question of Jones Beach, in New York, with respect to which some of the officials of New York, including the corporation counsel and the mayor of New York City, asked that we take steps to have an amendment adopted which would protect us.

I repeat to the Senator from Florida what I have said several times, that the amendment was drafted in consultation with and with the full approval of the corporation counsel of New York City and the mayor of New York City, as being adequate to protect the public developments which had been made on filled-in land. So far as I am concerned, I should be perfectly willing to extend that amendment to privately developed filled-in lands, provided it applies only to the surface rights and not to the mineral rights.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that I hold in my hand a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of New York in which that official body representing the people of New York states:

> Whereas since its inception the State of New York has claimed and exercised ownership, dominion, and jurisdiction over the lands under the ocean seaward for a distance of 3 miles and the lands of all tidal waters within those boundaries—

Then the legislature goes on to ask the Congress to pass appropriate legislation restoring this property to the States.

Is it not true that the Senator's position is contrary to that of the Legislature of New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. Obviously it is contrary to that of the Legislature of the State of New York; but I may point out that this is not the first time I have differed with the Legislature of New York or with the present Governor of the State of New York or with the present mayor of the city of New York. While they are perfectly justified in taking any position they care to take, I believe that I, as a Senator from New York—and I have been twice elected by the people of New York—have a right to represent them as I believe it to be in their interests and as my conscience dictates.

I will say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that, although I have no means of proving my statement—I have no means of taking a "Gallup poll"—it is my very strong and sincere belief that the great majority of the people of New York take the position which I have taken. In other words, I construe these great resources about which we are now speaking as natural resources to be used by all the people of the United States, and not by only three States.

I may say that in the years I have been in this body I have voted time and time again for appropriations which were of no direct benefit to my own State but which were of direct benefit to States such as California, Arizona, Florida, New Mexico, Washington, and Oregon, and that even though I knew it would cost the taxpayers of my State money, I voted for the appropriations because of my firm conviction that we, as a federated Nation, must consider the interests and the rights of all the people of the Nation.

What is good for one section of the country helps the prosperity, the happiness, and the well-being of all other sections of the country. If I did not so believe, I would not have voted so frequently as I have voted to provide aid for the public construction of dams, waterways, and flood-control projects in various other States of the Union.

Mr. DANIEL. I feel certain that the Senator from New York is sincere in his statement. I asked the question simply to point out that his position in the Senate, when he speaks of "we," is contrary to the official position of the Legislature of New York, the Governor of New York, the attorney general of New York, the mayor of the city of New York, and the New York Port Authority.

May I ask a further question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me add one word. I wish to point out to the Senator from Texas that the Supreme Court has ruled that title ends at the water's edge. I believe, and I am convinced, that most of the people of my State recognize the law. They do not claim rights which the law says belong to the entire Nation.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to ask the Senator from New York if his State has ever had its day in court. Has the Supreme Court ever said that New York stops at the water's edge, and that New York has no rights to its submerged lands, which the Senator's State has been claiming since the formation of the Union?

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe the Supreme Court in three decisions has affirmed that the paramount right and full dominion, in all these lands, lies with the Federal Government. I do not think it makes very much difference whether those decisions were addressed specifically to New York, to California, to Texas, or to Louisiana.

Mr. DANIEL. I have one other question. The Senator from New York speaks of the Holland joint resolution as restoring lands and valuable resources to Texas, Louisiana, Florida, California, and a few other States, only. I wish to ask the Senator if it is not true that the Holland joint resolution also restores to the State of New York, whether he considers it valuable or not, a total of 243,840 acres of submerged land extending from low tide out 3 miles from shore, which the New York Legislature asked Congress to restore to his State.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall discuss that matter a little later in my remarks.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from New York does not deny that statement, does he?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, I do not deny that the Legislature of New York passed such a resolution. That is a matter of record. I accept it as a fact. But that is no reason why the Congress of the United States should be expected to do something which many of us believe is contrary to the interests of the Nation as a whole. I presented to the Senate many resolutions and many requests from the Governor of the State of New York and the mayor of the city of New York, and I submitted them, I thought, with great appeal and, I hoped, with some possibility of success. But the Senate of the United States in its wisdom refused to accept them.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from New York might have misunderstood me. I was merely trying to point out that whether or not the Senator thinks the land is valuable, the Holland joint resolution would restore to New York 243,840 acres under the marginal sea within the 3-mile boundary claimed by the State of New York. In addition, of course, it would quitclaim to New York 2,321,000 acres beneath the Great Lakes within the boundaries of New York.

Is the Senator, in his generous mood—and I am certain that he is sincere in his views—willing to let all the other States share in whatever valuable resources may lie beneath the 2 million acres of the Great Lakes which are within the boundaries of the State of New York, and which have been held to be open seas, comparable to the marginal seas of the coastal States?

Mr. LEHMAN. There has never been a question about the title to the lands underneath the Great Lakes. I have said so time and time again.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the Senator be willing to allow other States to have a share in the more than 2 million acres of submerged lands beneath the Great Lakes, in which his State's boundaries extend as far as 20 miles from shore?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, of course not; nor am I claiming that the United States should take title to the inland waters of Minnesota, Texas, Wisconsin, or New York. Of course not. Those are matters which have been determined by the courts of the land time and time again.

Mr. DANIEL. There being only 2 million acres within the 3-league belt in the State of Texas, which is all that Texas would receive under the joint resolution, I think the Senator from New York can understand why we do not want the Federal Government to take away that property. It is not any greater in area, and probably not any greater in value, than the area beneath the Great Lakes, which the Senator from New York wants to keep for his State.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, although I am not a lawyer, I have known many lawyers. They have told me that when they begin the study of law, they are given, among others, one simple rule to follow in considering cases arising under contracts, cases of equity, and even torts. The rule is to find out: "Who has the money."

It would be well, in considering the question of offshore oil, to keep our eye on the question of "Who has the rights, who wants the rights, and who needs the rights?" Nor should we overlook in each instance who has the title, and what is involved besides the title. In other words, what concrete substance is here at issue? Who wants what, and who now has it?

Under the law, all these rights are now in the National Government. All the rights and title and resources involved in this pending legislation are vested in the United States, in all the people of this country, in all 48 States. The Nation has those rights. They are a national resource.

The Supreme Court said so. It said so in the California case. It said so in the Texas case. It said so in the Louisiana case.

The legislation before us proposes that the Congress of the United States divest the Nation of some of these rights—of an undefined portion of those rights—take them away from the people of New York, of Illinois, of Minnesota, and Alabama—and donate them to the State of Texas, and the State of California, and the State of Louisiana.

The Nation, the United States, bought the territory that is now Louisiana, and a number of other States; we bought that territory from France for $15 million, and there was created from what became the Territory of Louisiana, the State of Louisiana. And now the State of Louisiana comes here to ask the United States to divest itself of billions of dollars worth of national resources, and turn those resources over to Louisiana. And Louisiana asks it not as a matter of grace, but as a matter of right.

I say to you, Mr. President, there is no such right in the State of Louisiana, or in the State of California, or in the State of Texas. And I am not going to reargue the Supreme Court cases. The law has been decided. It has been interpreted by the courts. That is the law.

We speak a good deal, Mr. President, about the three coequal branches of the Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Members of this body have attacked the executive branch for encroaching on the jurisdiction of the legislative. Now we here propose not only to encroach, but to evade, avoid, and overrule the judiciary, the Supreme Court of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to introduce into the RECORD at this point in my remarks a very fine news article, the report of an interview with Mr. Philip Perlman, former Solicitor General of the United States, which appeared in the Baltimore Sun.

This interview which is headlined "Perlman Sees Tidelands Steal Worse Than Teapot Dome," represents the views on this subject by a man who knows as much about it, if not more, than any man in the United States. For General Perlman was the man who pleaded the Government's cases before the Supreme Court, and won those cases for the United States.

General Perlman knows the law in the case. He laid the groundwork for the final and definitive interpretation of the law. He heard and answered every argument that was made in the course of those cases—every argument that has been made and will be made on the Floor of the Senate with regard to the legal rights involved.

After hearing those arguments—those presented by all the distinguished legal counsel that could be hired by the States involved, and by the oil companies, including the brilliant arguments made by the then attorney general of Texas who is now our able colleague [Mr. DANIEL]—the Supreme Court decided in each case against these three States, and in favor of the Nation.

And that is the law today. I hope every Member of the Senate will give attention to the views expressed by General Perlman in the interview printed in that fine newspaper, the Baltimore Sun, one of the finest in the land, a paper which belongs in the select company of the great newspapers of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

PERLMAN SEES TIDELANDS "STEAL" WORSE THAN TEAPOT DOME—EX-UNITED STATES AID PUTS BLAME ON THREE STATES—SAYS EISENHOWER RESISTS EFFORTS TO INFORM HIM OF "FACTS AND LAW"

(By Paul E. Welsh)

If Congress sanctions the Submerged Lands Act—more commonly, the tidelands bill—it will be a party to "the boldest, most brazen grab of national assets in history," Philip B. Perlman declared here yesterday.

In an interview, the former Solicitor General of the United States described the proposal as "a thousand times worse than the Teapot Dome scandal of the Harding-Fall regime."

The Baltimore attorney stated that bill results from years of false propaganda and from the activities of one of the most powerful lobbies ever to control the House and Senate of Congress.

BILL PASSED BY HOUSE

Last Wednesday, by a 285-to-108 vote the House of Representatives passed the bill, which already has the support of the Eisenhower administration. The Senate now is debating the issue.

Under provisions of the bill, the Federal Government will grant coastal States full title to the offshore submerged lands extending seaward to what has been described as their historic boundaries.

The Government would also have to return to oil companies or State governments from $60 million to $75 million collected as royalties and rent after the Supreme Court declared the Federal Government to be the legal owner of tidelands oil.

TO PERLMAN "IT'S CRAZY"

"It's crazy," Mr. Perlman said. "The deviltry in this is that the money was collected during a period when there was no doubt that it belonged to the United States.

"Congress is making the Federal Government pay back money legally collected—give away what it already owns," Mr. Perlman said.

Mr. Perlman, who represented the Government through 5 years of marginal sea area litigation, said yesterday that "the pity of this situation" is that President Eisenhower has resisted all efforts to persuade him to learn what the facts and the law are in the issues involved.

FOREIGN POLICY INVOLVED

On this point, Mr. Perlman said that Jack B. Tate, deputy legal adviser to the Department of State, has told a congressional committee that the bill, if passed, would cause a great deal of difficulty in the United States relationship with foreign powers.

Mr. Tate, according to Mr. Perlman, advised the committee that the State Department was against recognition of a State's claims beyond 3 miles and that he stated this position with the authority of Secretary of State Dulles.

Under the bill already passed by the House, Mr. Perlman said, some States get more territory in the sea than the United States claims and this opens the way for further encroachments.

AVOIDS SPECULATION

Mr. Perlman said that he did not want to speculate on "if's" when asked what other nations, including Russia, might be inclined to do with their sea frontiers if the United States Congress should authorize States to extend their domains for many miles into the international domain.

Of the three States principally involved—California, Texas, and Louisiana—each is seeking a different interpretation of the extent seaward of its sovereignty.

California is not interested much beyond 3 miles. The Continental Shelf drops off abruptly at about that point and the submerged minerals—mostly oil and gas—are not accessible.

Texas claims that its legitimate domain extends seaward for 10½ miles, basing this position on what it claims was its rightful possession at the time it became a member of the Union.

Louisiana, apparently for no particular reason of law or historical precedent, has extended its sea frontier out 27 miles into the Gulf of Mexico.

"Despite these scattered claims, I defy anyone to define any boundaries in the act," Mr. Perlman said yesterday.

He added that it is his opinion that Louisiana had selected the 27-mile length of jurisdiction just because they found oil out that far.

In addition to its 10½-mile claim, Texas also wants full authority to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf, which goes as far as 150 miles, Mr. Perlman added.

It has been the Government's position that the United States does not claim control or ownership beyond the 3-mile limit.

Further, as sustained by the Supreme Court on June 23, 1947, the United States contends that a State's title to its seaward land ends at the low-water mark.

In California's case, Mr. Perlman asserted, it has been the Federal Government's position that from the low-water mark outward there begins the international domain and the United States had paramount domain and California had no title.

BACKED BY HIGH COURT

On this point, the Government's position was sustained by the Supreme Court.

Regarding the steps being taken to give the States full control over such offshore areas, Mr. Perlman said:

"The effort being made in Congress to strip the United States of its oil and other mineral resources in the marginal sea, and beyond, for the benefit of 3 States at the expense of the other 45, is the boldest, most brazen grab of national assets in history.

"In some respects, this proposal, backed by the national administration, is a thousand times worse than the 'Teapot Dome' scandal of the Harding-Fall regime.

"It results from years of false propaganda and from the activities of one of the most powerful lobbies ever to control the House and Senate of Congress.

"From $20 billion to $200 billion are believed involved.

"The manipulation of the high-finance barons of a half-century ago are peanuts in the presence of this grab.

"California, Louisiana, and Texas have never advanced a single valid reason why they should be given the Nation's much-needed oil in the submerged lands of the marginal sea, which has belonged to all the people since the Union was established.

"These three States have already benefited by many millions of dollars because they took the Nation's oil without authority."

BILL "PERPETUATES THE STEAL"

"Senate Joint Resolution 13 perpetuates the steal. It also gives some States more territory in the sea than the United States claims and opens the way for further encroachments.

"The pity of this situation is that President Eisenhower has been misled into taking an uninformed position in the controversy, and, so far as known, has resisted all efforts to persuade him to learn what the facts and the law are," Mr. Perlman declared.

He said "the big argument" started in the late twenties or early thirties when it was discovered that oil could be taken from under the ocean.

California first entered this field, he added, by leasing large areas to oil companies.

In 1937, a resolution was introduced in the Senate aimed at stopping California or any other State from extracting oil, gas, or other minerals from submerged grounds.

This resolution was adopted unanimously in the Senate, but failed of passage in the House, Perlman said.

For a while, Harold Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, was of the opinion that the ownership of the land belonged to the States, "but after study became convinced he was wrong." Mr. Perlman added:

PERSUADED ROOSEVELT

"Secretary Ickes then persuaded President Roosevelt to bring suit against California and it was this action which eventually led to the Supreme Court decision in July 1947," he said.

Meanwhile, California had received many millions of dollars from the leases.

These payments, he explained, are based on 12½ percent of the value of the oil being given to the State by the lessee, plus millions of dollars paid in bonuses.

The Government started collecting rent and royalties on oil pumped up off the California coast after the Supreme Court decided in 1947 the United States owned the tideland fields, Mr. Perlman said.

To date the Federal Government has collected $50 million, according to one informed estimate, and now Congress proposes to make the Federal Government pay this money to California.

Other legal actions, interspersed by a tug of war in Congress between the conflicting forces, ultimately led to the Federal Government's obtaining injunctions in June 1950 against Louisiana and Texas.

After that the Federal Government began collecting royalties and rent from the companies taking oil off the coasts of Louisiana and Texas. So far, the Federal Government has collected between $10 million and $25 million in these two States, it is estimated.

The tidelands bill would force the Federal Government to pay all this back.

Mr. LEHMAN. We should all give attention to Mr. Perlman's statement on the law on this subject, and to his conclusions. Mr. Perlman is no longer with the Government. He is a private citizen. There is no vested interest reflected in his opinion, which is simply that of a brilliant legal mind, reinforced by a passionate conviction that the law, once decided, should be abided by. I commend the opinion of this distinguished American, of this great lawyer, just as I would commend the Supreme Court decisions and all the briefs in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, to those who are interested in arguing the fine points of law, in retrying the cases that were so thoroughly tried in all the appropriate courts of the land.

Mr. President, I also have at hand a very fine editorial which appeared in the New York Times of April 10. The New York Times is another great newspaper which is very sympathetic to the present administration. This editorial takes sharp issue with the pending proposal, and bids the American people to take heed of what is going on. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

GIVEAWAY IN OIL

A debate is going on in the United States Senate at the present time that deserves far more attention than is being given it. This debate provides no thrills or sensation, but it is of vital importance to the people of this country all the same. It concerns an attempt to take from all the people of all the United States billions of dollars' worth of property that is rightfully theirs, and to present it to the people of a handful of States, notably Texas, Louisiana, California, and Florida. It is the debate on offshore oil.

Three times the Supreme Court has held that the National Government has paramount rights and full dominion over the submerged lands of the marginal sea, which means the area from low-water mark out to the 3-mile limit. It will be noted that lands covered and uncovered by movement of the tides are not involved, as they clearly belong to the States, as do lands under inland waters—and throughout this battle the Federal Government has never laid claim to them.

The bill now under discussion in the Senate would grant the States development rights to oil found within their so-called historic boundaries, which means at least out to the 3-mile limit, and in some cases an indeterminate distance beyond. No one knows just what will happen in international law when a State's boundary is extended farther than the traditional 3-mile limit, in view of the historic position of the United States that all governments, including our own, can properly claim jurisdiction over the sea only 3 miles out from low-water mark and no farther. Even the Presidential proclamation that in 1945 established the Federal Government's claim to the natural resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf (extending far beyond the 3-mile limit in the Gulf of Mexico) specifically stated that "the character as high seas of the waters above the Continental Shelf * * * [is] in no way * * * affected."

The administration itself, which, unfortunately, has favored this gigantic giveaway to the States, has had to do a certain amount of backtracking already in an effort to bring the offshore oil bill into conformity with constitutional and international law. But quite apart from the complications involved in giving indivdual States any kind of rights beyond the 3-mile limit, there is no justification that we can see in giving them even the oil between the low-water mark and the 3-mile limit.

Congress unquestionably has the right to do so if it chooses, but in doing so it nullifies decisions of the Supreme Court; it benefits a few States at the expense of the rest of us; it divests the Federal Government of control over a resource vital to the national defense; it paves the way for State claims even beyond the historic boundaries; and it raises a threat to the rest of our federally owned properties in public lands, forests, and parks throughout the Nation. The Senators, including Mr. LEHMAN, of New York, who are fighting the offshore oil legislation are doing a public service in calling its dangers to the attention of the country.

Mr. LEHMAN. The pending proposal is not that we correct an existing law. What is here proposed is that we change the judicial interpretation of the basic proprietary relationships between the States and the National Government, in the matter of national natural resources. It is further proposed that we vacate the National Government's sovereign regulatory powers in the marginal seas, and on the high seas beyond the 3-mile belt. What is proposed is in my opinion preposterous, to my way of thinking, but what is worse, it is shrouded in the garment of States rights.

If this is anything, it is a usurpation of States rights—a usurpation of the rights of 45 States, and of all the people of the Nation.

Here we have national resources belonging to the Nation. The Supreme Court says so. There is lying on the desk a proposal for the orderly development of those resources, under the aegis of private enterprise, but with due regard for the national defense and security—and I shall shortly come to that phase of the question.

There is also a proposal—it will be offered by my distinguished colleague, the very able senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]—to devote the vast income received as royalties from the development of the oil and other resources

in the submerged lands to the cause of education—to the building of school houses, and the hiring of teachers—to invest those sums in the future of our Nation, to wiping out illiteracy, to raising the level of learning in this great land of ours, for the children of all the families of all America, not just for those of Texas, Louisiana, and California.

Are the rights of all these children to be recognized by Congress, or shall we deny these rights to all these children? The committee bill proposes to deprive the children of the Nation of the rights they now have, in law, to these resources, and to turn those rights over to three States—Texas, Louisiana and California. This strikes me as unconscionable and intolerable.

Oh, I know, Mr. President, that the proposed legislation would give to other coastal States the equivalent rights in the submerged lands off their coasts. But Mr. President, let us remember the principle I enunciated some moments ago: "Where is the money? Where are the objects of substance and value?"

They are in the submerged lands in the open sea off Texas, California, and Louisiana, perhaps also off Florida, perhaps also off Alaska.

So the grant of theoretically equivalent rights to other coastal States is meaningless. It is worse than meaningless. Most coastal States will suffer from this proposed abdication of sovereign rights on the part of the United States and from the proposed enunciation by the Congress of a policy of extrusion of territorial rights beyond the 3-mile zone. All coastal States except those I have mentioned will lose their proper share in the resources of known value off the coasts of Texas, California, and Louisiana.

Other coastal States, such as Massachusetts, Maine, and Washington, will lose greatly, because of the new difficulties which their fishermen will confront in carrying on their activities off the coasts of other countries, such as Canada, which may well view our proposed extension of the territorial limits of some of our States into the open seas as more than ample justification for similar action off the Canadian coast.

Mr. President, speaking only in terms of practical values, even most of the coastal States will lose far more than they can gain. Those Senators from coastal States who vote for the committee proposal are reaching eagerly for a shadow, while letting the substance slip from their grasp and from the grasp of the Nation as a whole. I think that is far more important than the individual interest of a particular State.

As for the three States in question, Mr. President, may I remind them of Aesop's well-known fable about the monkey who tried to remove the nuts from the jar. He got his hand in easily enough, but when he had filled his fist with nuts he could not pull his hand out. What is here proposed is not far off the fable, and these three States may well find themselves in a position of not being able to pull the nuts out of the jar, once they have gotten from Congress the right to these resources.

If I may cite one further fable to the other coastal States represented in this Senate, I trust they will remember the fable about the crow and the cheese. The crow had the cheese, but when the clever fox had talked him into trying to sing, he opened his beak, and had neither song nor cheese. But the legislation before us, Mr. President, is not a fable, although some of its terms seem extreme and some of its purposes fabulous.

Actually, what is proposed here is a mischievous thing. It is fraught with danger. It is wrong in principle. It is perilous in practice.

Again let us revert to the question of what is invoked here, in actual substance. What is the cheese in this instance? What are the sums of money involved? What are we talking about?

I hope that the Members of the Senate have noted the estimates set forth in the minority report. This report estimated the value of the oil and gas reserves in the Continental Shelf, at today's prices, at $50 billion.

I wish now to refer to a recent report which was issued by 18 Texas geologists and registered engineers. This report makes an estimate of the oil, gas, and sulfur on the Continental Shelf off the coast of Texas. This estimate is not for the entire Continental Shelf, but only for that portion lying off the coast of Texas. The estimates are based on an analysis of proven reserves and production from wells which have been drilled in the same geological structure which begins in southern Mississippi and Louisiana and extends down the coast of Texas into the Gulf of Mexico. To quote from this report:

> These undeveloped lands * * * occur along the same structural trend and at similar depths to the large number of oil and gas fields and sulfur domes that are presently being produced in southern Louisiana on submerged areas raised above sea level by the great delta of the Mississippi River and its distributaries. The vastness of the oil and gas, condensates, and sulfur potential in this submerged land area is indicated by the discoveries made on the landward portion of this basin.

What do these engineers and geologists tell us lie in the Continental Shelf off the coast of Texas? First, they estimate that on the basis of the production already obtained from this same geological structure, "The gross ultimate income for gas at 15 cents per 1,000 cubic feet," and I am quoting now, "would amount to $9,291,000,000. The oil and condensates at an average of $2.65 per barrel, $29,179,150,000, and the sulfur at a value of $25 per long ton, $3,022,500,000, or a total of $41,492,650,000."

This $41 billion, the report says, is very conservative and it goes on to state that a more realistic forecast of the possible gross ultimate income would probably be twice the above figure, or say $80 billion.

These geologists and registered engineers estimated the value of oil, gas, and sulfur off the coast of Texas at $80 billion. Now, I have been told that Texans are sometimes prone to exaggerate just a little when they are talking to outsiders about Texas, but I don't believe it applies in this case, for this report was for home consumption; it was Texans talking to Texans, and not Texans talking to New Yorkers.

Then this Texas report goes on to estimate that on the basis of a 12 percent royalty, the amount of money that would accrue to the State government of Texas, as a result of the development of these reserves, would be $5 billion on the basis of the most conservative estimate of the oil and gas reserves; and royalties of $10 billion on the basis of the more realistic estimate of the size of the reserves of these resources.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. So that they will not be misunderstood the figures the Senator has given of $5 billion or $10 billion apply to the entire Continental Shelf, do they not?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Within the historic boundaries covered by the joint resolution there is only one-tenth of the area covered by the Continental Shelf, is there not?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not see in Senate Joint Resolution 13 any reference to "historic boundaries."

Mr. DANIEL. It is already in the record that only one-tenth of the area of the Continental Shelf is within the historic boundaries, and the record shows that only one-sixth of the potential oil resources are to be found within historic boundaries. Therefore is it not true that under the Holland measure the Senator would have to divide his figures either by one-tenth or one-sixth in order to get the actual amount which might be received by Texas in the next 100 years?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know exactly what is covered in the Holland measure. Senate Joint Resolution 13 contains no reference to any specific boundary limitations.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator really and sincerely mean that? The Holland joint resolution restricts the area of ownership which the State may claim to its historic boundaries as they existed at the time the State entered the Union. There may be doubt about some other State, but the Senator is talking about Texas, and I do not see how he could arrive at the conclusion that the pending bill covers anything with respect to Texas beyond its historic 3-league boundary.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder whether the Senator from New York is able to define what the historic boundary of any State is, when it has been clearly stated that whatever the boundaries are, those are the boundaries, and the court must pass on them. We tried for days to ascertain what the boundaries of Louisiana were, and we have at least three answers, that they extend out 3 miles, and 3 leagues or 9 miles, and 27 miles. Somewhere between 3 miles and 27 miles is the answer.

While the very distinguished and capable Senator from Texas himself feels that 10½ miles is the correct figure, and I know he would contend that, there is nothing to stop a future representative of his State from claiming from 10½ to 150 miles, because it is impossible to read history and reconstruct it carefully enough to enable one to know what the boundaries are.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for that purpose, if I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether throughout all the enjoyable hearings in our committee there was ever a word of evidence introduced under which anyone could argue and claim that the boundaries of Texas extended beyond 3 leagues at the time Texas entered the Union?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; there was not, but I also know that there is permission in the pending measure to extend the boundaries, although, frankly, I am not able to ascertain where they can be extended to, or who could extend them. I know that the junior Senator from Texas has been as straightforward as anyone could be, as was the distinguished Senator from Florida, but we must assume that others may come into the Senate at a later time who might not read the record in exactly the same way that these Senators have read it, and who might claim, regardless of what is said here in this debate, that the boundaries extended not 3 miles, or 3 leagues, but perhaps 150 miles.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his frank statement about Texas. As I understood, the Senator from New York was talking only about Texas, and I merely wanted it to be clear that so far as the pending resolution is concerned, the Texas historic boundary cannot be more than 3 leagues, or 10½ statute miles.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should be very glad to have the Senator from Texas point out where the historic boundaries of Texas are described in the joint resolution.

Mr. DANIEL. The joint resolution does not undertake to fix the historic boundaries of any State, but it limits them all to the boundaries as they existed at the time each State entered the Union. There is no dispute that Texas' gulfward boundary at that time was 3 leagues—10½ miles from shore. At the request of certain officials of the States, section 4 permits extension of the boundaries out to 3 miles in case the States have not already done that, but as to the State of Texas, the Holland joint resolution limits us by its terms. It quitclaims to Texas only such lands as were within our seaward boundaries at the time Texas entered the Union, and there is no evidence anywhere in the record that that was anything different from 3 leagues, or 10½ miles from shore.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, these vast amounts do not include the bonuses which the oil companies pay to the Government for the leases, in the first place, before starting to drill; they do not include the rentals. They do not include ad valorem taxes on the oil produced, or a gross production tax, or a pipeline tax—all of which are provided for under Texas law, and which would amount, according to the report to which I have referred, to billions of dollars, in addition to the billions already cited.

When we speak only of the resources off the Texas coast, we are speaking of potential Government revenues amounting to more than $15 billion.

Are these revenues to be given, by the National Government, to the State of Texas? Why, Mr. President, should they be given to that State? On what basis are we of the other parts of the Nation asked to bestow such a vast sum on the State of Texas. If we do so, are we true to our trust as the custodians of the national interest? Are we true to our trust as the custodians of the heritage and birthright of all Americans, including those yet to come? What will our posterity say of us, if we do this thing?

I realize that Senate Joint Resolution 13 is not specific about just how much of this land we shall give to the State of Texas. We are not sure whether it is within a 3-mile limit, a 10-mile limit, or possibly out to the edge of the Continental Shelf. We all know that in 1947 the Texas Legislature claimed a boundary extending to the edge of the Continental Shelf, and that there have been placed before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee proposals which would give to the State of Texas the right to extract all the minerals to the edge of the Continental Shelf, as well as to extend the State's taxing power over this area.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the Senator from New York would not want to have remain in the RECORD a statement which is as greatly at variance with the facts as is the statement he has just made, for there has not been introduced in the Senate a measure under which the resources in lands extending to the Continental Shelf would be given to the State of Texas. I call that point to the attention of the senior Senator from Texas at this time.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not state that such a measure was before the Senate. I said proposals to that effect had been placed before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me at this time?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In the last Congress there was introduced a bill—as I recall, it was House bill 4484—to give to the State of Texas 37½ percent of any income or revenue from resources in the Continental Shelf, out beyond the lands lying under the marginal sea.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me at this time?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Such a proposal is not contained in the Holland joint resolution, however, is it?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; it is not.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. That proposal is not contained in the Holland joint resolution; but I am sure the Senator from Texas will not give us assurance that he will not request that very authority or introduce a measure containing that very proposal.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Alabama mean that it would be submitted as an amendment to the Holland joint resolution?

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; not necessarily that; but of course such an amendment could be offered to a separate bill or other measure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the debate on the floor, did it not develop from the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that when in the committee he submitted a proposal that this measure should specifically prohibit the conveyance of title to submerged lands beyond either the 3-mile or the 10½-mile limit that proposal was not adopted?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, that is quite true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that the pending joint resolution is "open end," so that if it can be claimed that Congress has heretofore approved such a claim, or that hereafter Congress, by means of a so-called sleeper provision, may approve such a claim, State ownership and control far out on the Continental Shelf may, under the terms of this measure, be granted?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is quite true. It is specifically set forth in the pending joint resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that, as a matter of law, the actions of a subsequent Congress will be just as effective to do what that subsequent Congress may desire to have done, regardless of whether the word "hereafter" is contained in the Holland joint resolution?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, that is perfectly true.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. But the distinguished Senator from Texas has been saying that the claim of Texas is limited to 10½ miles. However, certainly nothing to define that is contained in the pending measure.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is not the word "hereafter" more or less an invitation to future action?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. It opens the door, and is tantamount to a request for future action. Some persons might say, "You did not exactly promise it, but you implied that you would do something else when you included that word in the joint resolution."

Mr. LEHMAN. There is no question of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Could not this clause of the joint resolution properly be called the come-and-get-it clause?

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully concur in that description.

Mr. President, in order that there may be no mistake in the mind of anyone, and in order that the record may be clear on this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, section 4 of Senate Joint Resolution 13. That section is entitled "Seaward Boundaries."

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

SEC. 4. Seaward boundaries: The seaward boundary of each original coastal State is hereby approved and confirmed as a line 3 geographic miles distant from its coastline. Any State admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline, or to the international boundaries of the United States in the Great Lakes or any other body of water traversed by such boundaries. Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line. Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Since the Senator from New York has agreed that this clause might be referred to as a come-and-get-it clause, and since the Senator from New York has inferred that the words "or is hereafter approved by Congress" constitute, in the case of the boundaries, an inference that other States intend to use that clause to extend their boundaries to further ownership, I appreciate having this opportunity to say to the Senator from New York that those words were suggested by the New York Port Authority for application to the State of New York. The witness told the congressional committee that the State of New York had not specifically set a 3-mile boundary, and that it had not been specifically approved by Congress; and, in order to be technically correct, he wanted this measure to provide that in the future, Congress could approve the boundary of the State of New York. The National Association of Port Authorities joined in that request, through official action of the association.

So I point out that the Senator from New York is going outside the Holland joint resolution and is dreaming up some ulterior motive when he refers to that clause, because it was inserted at the request of New York, and for the benefit of New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Texas that, of course, I had no knowledge of the history of this particular section.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from New York for permitting me to state its history.

Mr. LEHMAN. But let me say that the Port of New York Authority, which I think has done a splendid job for both New York and New Jersey, has no authority in any way even to express an opinion, save a private one, regarding the attitude of the State of New York. That authority is composed of members from the States of New York and New Jersey, and those members are appointed by the respective Governors of those States. The members of the authority have nothing whatsoever to do, so far as I know, with the coastal holdings.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Knowing the history behind those words, as contained in the pending measure, would the Senator from New York be willing to submit an amendment to strike those words from the pending joint resolution, so as to have no further worry about boundaries hereafter approved by Congress?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not think it is necessary for me to submit an amendment. I hope the entire joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) will be defeated, for I believe it is opposed to the interest of the 159 million people of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. If the Senate will adopt the Anderson amendment, that will take care of the situation with regard to these words, will it not?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it is my impression that the Texas Legislature itself, by action taken by it, has extended or sought to extend the boundaries of Texas for a distance of 27 miles.

Mr. HILL. Not only has that been done, but subsequently the Texas Legislature sought to extend the boundaries of Texas to the edge of the Continental Shelf, a distance of approximately 150 miles.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct, Mr. President, and that is how the leases which have been referred to were made. The Federal Government did not find the oil or initiate the developments we are discussing; the States initiated those developments.

On the other hand, the Supreme Court has ruled that Texas does not own the property within its extended boundaries, and in no measure which has been introduced are we asking the Congress to give us or to restore to us any property beyond our historic 3-league boundary in the Gulf of Mexico.

The pending joint resolution has been trimmed down to our historic boundaries, to lands which have been claimed in good faith under the solemn agreement with the United States that Texas would pay its own debts and retain its own lands. That is what we are talking about.

Therefore, why include all this extraneous matter, in the discussion of the pending joint resolution which is specifically limited to the boundaries of Texas at the time when Texas entered the Union?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. For the sake of the RECORD, I wish to remind the Senator from New York that last year, during the argument of this matter, the distinguished former Senator from Texas, Mr. Connally, argued at great length for a proposal, known as the Walters bill, which would have claimed for his State 37½ percent of the royalties coming from the outer Continental Shelf, and he sought to have the Senate seriously consider and adopt that proposal. However, when it appeared very clearly that other Members of the Senate would not support such a proposal, inasmuch as no other Member of the Senate spoke for it, Senator Connally was forced to resign himself to the passage of the Holland joint resolution, rather than to the passage of the bill he had favored.

Furthermore, the Senator from New York will recall that when I introduced my measure at that time, I made it completely clear that I and the other Senators who joined me in sponsoring that measure did not agree even with the philosophy of Senator Connally, who thought that 37½-percent participation should be given to the State of Texas; but, to the contrary, we thought that the lands to be restored to the States should extend out only as far as the historic State boundaries. I am sure the Senator from New York will recall that that was the sentiment of the Senate at that time, and I believe it is the sentiment of the Senate now.

I do not believe the Senator from New York or any of the other Senators who oppose the pending joint resolution—all of whom have a perfect right to oppose it, of course—should seek to create from this RECORD the impression that any Member of the Senate, and particularly the sponsors of the so-called Holland joint resolution—40 of us—wishes to have the pending measure restore to the States the lands beyond the historic State boundaries. To the contrary, we are confining ourselves to that limit, and we have in our joint resolution a specific provision that, as to the areas without, they are confirmed to the Federal Government. I hope the Senator from New York will understand that that is the purpose.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from Florida I have no recollection of that particular colloquy, but I certainly have no intention or desire to question it.

At this point in the RECORD I wish to insert the entire report entitled "What the Submerged Lands of Texas or the So-Called Tidelands Case Means to Texas and Texans." I hope that it will help to enlighten the Members of the Senate and the American people in their study of the actual money involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE SUBMERGED LANDS OF TEXAS OR THE SO-CALLED TIDELANDS CASE MEANS TO TEXAS AND TEXANS

A confusion has been established in the minds of people, not only by the erroneous use of the term "tidelands" but also by an attempt to establish these offshore submerged lands to be of no economic importance to the State of Texas.

The offshore submerged lands of Texas and Louisiana are but a continuation of the gulf coast embayment, part of which is located on land, part of which is covered by water. This structural province covers the entire Gulf of Mexico, including the shore areas immediately surrounding it.

This geological province is a very large basin into which rivers, during millions of years, have deposited sediments many thousands of feet thick. Folding, faulting, and uplifting through earth structural changes and piercement by salt masses have resulted in the formation of reservoirs favorable for the accumulation of gas, oil, and sulfur.

The oil fields located along the gulf coast of Old Mexico, Texas, and Louisiana are on the landward parts of this basin. The early discovery of these fields was due to the fact that these areas were above sea level where it was cheaper and easier to drill and not because the structures, traps, and salt domes do not occur where the land is below sea level. Sea level has nothing to do with the occurrence of these traps and structures.

With the increase in the demand for oil, gas, and sulfur and improved methods for exploration and drilling, development of the submerged lands became economically feasible and resulted in the discovery of numerous structures and fields off shore. These operations were successfully conducted on the submerged lands of Louisiana and Texas until the title to these offshore submerged lands was questioned by the Federal Government in Washington, after which all drilling was terminated on the submerged lands of Texas.

These undeveloped lands of Texas occur along the same structural trend and at similar depths to the large number of oil and gas fields and sulfur domes that are presently being produced in southern Louisiana on submerged areas raised above sea level by the great delta of the Mississippi River and its distributaries. (Refer map exhibit.) If, by geological happenstance, the Mississippi River had been diverted westward into Texas, at an earlier time, the reverse of the existing status would no doubt exist. The Texas structures and traps would have already been discovered and developed.

The vastness of the oil, gas, condensate, and sulfur potentialities in this submerged land area is indicated by the discoveries made on the landward portion of this basin. As of January 1, 1952, there were 1,085 oil and gas fields producing in Railroad Commission Districts 2, 3, and 4, within a 100-mile belt along the gulf coastline of Texas alone. From these fields, as of the same dates, 11.9 trillion cubic feet of gas, 5.046 billion barrels of oil and condensate, and 70.9 million long tons of sulfur had already been produced. As of the same date, there still remains a future estimated reserve, already discovered, to be produced, of 50 trillion cubic feet of gas, 5.965 billion barrels of oil and condensate, and 50 million long tons of sulfur.

The total gas, oil, condensate, and sulfur discovered in the coastal belt of Texas as of January 1, 1952, was, therefore, 61.940 trillion cubic feet of gas, 11.011 billion barrels of oil and condensate and 120.9 million long tons of sulfur. These total ultimate future recovery estimates are very conservative in that they do not include the fields discovered since the first of the year nor those yet to be discovered in the same land area. Seventy new fields have already been discovered this year.

The Texas submerged land areas, immediately adjacent to the gulf coastal belt of Railroad Commission Districts 2, 3, and 4 extending for over 400 miles along the coastline having the same geological and structural features have a potentiality for the production of oil, gas, condensate, and sulfur greatly in excess of these totals because of its greater area, better reservoir conditions, and the full use of modern methods of recovery.

However, if the potentialities be assumed to be limited to the equivalent of the ultimate recoveries as set forth above, then the gross ultimate income from the gas at 15 cents per 1,000 cubic feet would amount to $9,291,000,000. The oil and condensate at an average of $2.65 per barrel, $29,179,150,000, and the sulfur at a value of $25 per long ton, $3,022,500,000 or a total of $41,492,650,000. A more realistic forecast of the possible gross ultimate income would probably be twice the above figure, or say $80 billion.

A royalty of ⅛ accruing to the public school fund would amount to, say $5 billion on the minimum estimate or $10 billion on that of the more realistic figure, not including the amounts that would accrue as a bonus for leasing the lands or the rentals received therefrom. It also would not include any ad valorem taxes or a 5 percent gross production and pipeline tax, the latter alone would amount to $2 billion or $4 billion, respectively.

If the ownership to these potential oil, gas, and sulfur reserves are seized and nationalized by the Government in Washington, it not only means the loss of this future income to the State school fund that will have to be replaced by taxes, but will also remove these taxable values as a source of future ad valorem income required to offset the declining oil and gas values of the existing fields located on the adjacent onshore unsubmerged land areas.

This brief review of what the submerged lands of Texas or the so-called Tidelands case means to Texas and Texans has been evaluated as a public service to the people of Texas by Texas geologists and registered engineers functioning solely as Texas citizens.

Alexander Deussen, Houston; David Donoghue, Fort Worth; L. A. Douglas, San Antonio; H. B. Fuqua, Fort Worth; George R. Gibson, Midland; Walter L. Goldston, Houston; Dilworth S. Hager, Dallas; Michel T. Halbouty, Houston; Oliver C. Harper, Midland; James S. Hudnall, Tyler; John S. Ivy, Houston; Charles P. McGaha, Wichita Falls; David Perry Olcott, Houston; Vincent C. Perini, Abilene; Harry H. Power, Austin; W. Armstrong Price, Corpus Christi; Wm. H. Spice, Jr., San Antonio; James D. Thompson, Jr., Amarillo.

Mr. LEHMAN. Now, Mr. President, these vast amounts represent a potential wealth that has been discovered in recent years. Twenty years ago, such legislation as is now before us would never have been dreamed of. There was no contention over the submerged lands, because nobody was interested in the submerged lands. Twenty years ago few people had any idea that there was anything of value in these lands. All so-called historic claims are without significance, Mr. President, because nobody thought of asserting or challenging rights which had no meaning in any event.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield gladly.

Mr. DANIEL. I simply cannot let the Senator's statement pass unchallenged that 20 years ago no one had any knowledge of anything valuable being in these lands, or that no one had any interest in them. The record shows that oil was known to exist off the coast of Texas as early as the first Spanish explorations of our State. It shows that in 1925—that is more than 20 years ago—a Mr. Leonard J. Benckenstein applied to the Secretary of the Interior in Washington for an oil-and-gas lease in the Gulf of Mexico off the coast of Texas. The Secretary of the Interior replied that title to this land in the Gulf of Mexico was in the State of Texas, having been retained by the State under the annexation agreement when it entered the Union. So there was knowledge more than 20 years ago specifically as to oil, and more than 50 years ago specifically as to the lands needed by the Federal Government for a jetty off Galveston Island, extending from low tide 16,000 feet out into the Gulf of Mexico. The land was valuable enough for the Federal Government to need it and to want it for the purpose of building a jetty on it. To whom did the Federal Government go to get the title? To the State of Texas, because it was always understood that Texas retained these lands.

I merely wanted to point out that far more than 20 years ago the question was raised as to the lands being available for certain purposes, and that all these questions, until 1950, were decided in favor of the State of Texas.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. If I may first answer the question of the Senator from Texas, I shall be glad to yield. It may very well have been that the possibility of oil production from the submerged lands was known to scientists and to a few other people, but it was certainly not known generally, or considered of any importance. There were claims by a few isolated individuals.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. DANIEL addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the opportunity given by the Senator from New York to supplement the statement just made by the junior Senator from Texas, by reminding Members of the Senate that the record clearly shows that, as long ago as 1858, the Nation, desiring the use of certain submerged lands in the Gulf of Mexico lying seaward from Ship Island, in the State of Mississippi, asked for a grant, and received a grant from the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, granting that island, along with submerged lands extending 1 mile into the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. So that the question is not a new one; and multiplied instances could be cited, in which the titles to the States have been recognized, going back almost to the founding day of our Nation.

Mr. LEHMAN. The constitution of the State of Florida, approved in 1868, has been cited as the basis of Florida's claim to territorial rights out into the

open sea. Mr. President, we must all be reasonably aware that when the Congress approved Florida's constitution, no serious thought was given to this minor provision of that document.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact, as the Senator from Florida very generously stated on the floor of this body, that the question of boundaries was never considered in the debate on the floors of Congress in determining whether the Senators and Representatives from Florida were to be readmitted to the Congress?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was never mentioned in the debate, or in the resolution of readmission, if we may so term it. The only provision was that, since the six States affected, including Florida, had set up a republican form of government, therefore, their Senators and Representatives should be readmitted to Congress.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is quite correct, of course.

Mr. President, we must all be reasonably aware that when the Congress approved Florida's constitution, no serious thought was given to this minor provision of that document. The question was: Should Florida be readmitted into the Union, and should its constitution be approved, as a democratic constitution, and satisfying the demands of the United States Constitution?

It could not be seriously argued that Congress would give approval, and the President sign, an enactment whose purpose was to extend the territorial limits of one State out into the open sea, beyond the limits claimed by the United States itself, before or since.

But again, Mr. President, these are legal questions. I do not pretend to be an authority on them. I am content to let the Supreme Court rule on such matters, and I accept the judgment of the Supreme Court on them.

The point I wish to make is that today we have an entirely different situation. These submerged lands contain resources of tremendous value, value to the Nation as a whole, and all its people—resources of vital importance for the national security.

Is the Nation going to enjoy the benefits of these resources? Are they to be developed in an orderly manner with due regard for the national security? Are the oil and gas and mineral resources to be developed in such a way as to meet the growing threat of an oil shortage which hangs over our heads, which would confront us with possible disaster in the event that we were cut off from our sources of supplies overseas?

Let us examine these questions.

Estimates of the United States Geological Survey show that there are at least 15 billion barrels of oil in the Continental Shelf off the United States. There are 33.7 billion barrels of oil in proved reserves within the continental limits of the United States, on shore, on what we now call the uplands to distinguish them from the submerged lands. Thus in the submerged lands we are dealing with at least 45 percent of the proved reserves we now have available for our country from all sources except Alaska.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the distinguished Senator does not mean to give the impression that the 15 billion barrel estimate for the entire Continental Shelf is a proven reserve, when, to the contrary, the record shows clearly that 259 million barrels is the total of the proven reserve in the Continental Shelf.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have not so stated.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood the Senator to say that we are dealing in the Continental Shelf with at least 45 percent of the proved reserves available for our country from all sources except Alaska, whereas, exactly the contrary is true. We are dealing with only a very tiny percentage.

Mr. LEHMAN. I referred to the proved reserves within the continental limits of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator was speaking of 33.7 billion barrels as contrasted with the 259 million barrels which represents all the known reserves of the Continental Shelf. So that they are an inconsequential proportion of the total.

Mr. LEHMAN. Where are they?

Mr. HOLLAND. They are within the Continental Shelf, as shown by the testimony of two experts from the Geological Survey in the Department of the Interior, as being the total proved reserves to be found in the Continental Shelf. The Senator should compare the figure of approximately a quarter of a billion barrels with the figure of 33.7 billion barrels.

Mr. LEHMAN. It seems to me that the argument of the Senator rather strengthens my statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New York had in mind the reserves in the entire Continental Shelf——

Mr. LEHMAN. I was quoting from a report of the Geological Survey.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the Senator will admit, what is undoubtedly the fact, that when he said we are dealing with at least 45 percent of the proved reserves, he was inaccurate.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should be perfectly willing to concede that they are not shown to be proved reserves, although they are shown in the report of the Geological Survey.

Mr. President, the Continental Shelf off Alaska represents another great potential reserve. Studies of Mr. L. C. Weeks for the American Association of Geologists suggests that there is an estimated reserve of 23.6 billion barrels of oil off the shores of Alaska in the Continental Shelf. If we add these official estimates of the reserves in the Continental Shelf off Alaska and the reserves in the Shelf off the rest of the United States, we have a total of 38.6 billion barrels, more than the total proven reserves in all the United States uplands today.

I wish to point out that I was speaking of estimates and comparing them with the proved reserves in the uplands of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator wish to say for the RECORD that the resolution now pending, or the Anderson bill, relates to Alaska reserves?

Mr. LEHMAN. I know it does not relate to Alaska reserves. I think the Senator from Florida will agree with me that it is only a question of a relatively short time when the Territory of Alaska will be admitted to the Union as a State. Then, of course, the proved reserves will belong to a State of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. At the time of the admission of Alaska to the Union—and I join with the Senator from New York in the hope that that time will come soon—must not the Congress fix the limits of Alaska rather than to include the whole Continental Shelf off Alaska running way out into the Pacific Ocean, the Bering Sea, and the Arctic Ocean?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, I recognize the wide powers of the Congress of the United States in determining the basis on which a State may be admitted, but on the principle of equal rights and equal responsibilities, I think it is a very reasonable and fair assumption on my part to say that Alaska will be admitted on the same basis as other States have been admitted on an equal footing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator know of any instance in reference to the admission of any territory to statehood in which Congress has granted to the Territory then becoming a State the lands clear out to the Continental Shelf, or when such a suggestion has been made?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I do not, of course. I think there is danger that some of the States now claim that right.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New York is certainly not contending, is he, that in any instance up to this time, when considering the claims for statehood by any Territory other than that of Texas and of the west coast of Florida, Congress has gone beyond the 3-mile limit?

Mr. LEHMAN. We have adopted in the Congress of the United States the principle of admitting new States on an equal footing. I cannot conceive that we will admit Alaska on less than an equal footing. When that time comes, the question of oil reserves will also be presented.

It is of crucial importance to realize that we are in danger of giving away to three States as much oil as can be found in the proved reserves of all the United States.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator realize that the Continental Shelf has only a small fraction of the proved reserves as compared with the estimated future reserves? Does the Senator really mean that there is danger of giving away to three States as much as the present known reserves in the whole United States?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have not said we will do it. I said we are in danger of doing it.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator means, by some other legislation?

Mr. LEHMAN. Not at all. I have quoted the figures of potential reserves of Texas and in other offshore areas. I read a little while ago from a report of reputable and responsible geologists which tells us that the value of the oil is $80 billion. It is as important in that one State as the value of all the proved reserves in continental United States.

I desire to point out again that there is no assurance that Texas will never ask for more than the area embraced within the 10½ miles. In fact, I would say that there is some indication that at some time in the future it may ask for a much larger area.

Mr. DANIEL. I think the Senator from New York has explained his statement and has answered my question. In other words, he is talking not about the pending resolution giving to three States as much undiscovered oil as can be found in the present proved reserves, but that some other legislation will do that.

Mr. LEHMAN. No. I believe the estimated reserve of oil in the Continental Shelf is at least as great as that in the proved upland reserve of the entire United States. Therefore, I say we are in danger of giving it away to three States.

Mr. DANIEL. But not by this joint resolution?

Mr. LEHMAN. It certainly would be in the joint resolution if it should be passed.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator has spoken of an estimated one-tenth of the Continental Shelf——

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the joint resolution is an invitation to all coastal States to come and get it.

Mr. DANIEL. That is exactly what I had in mind by other legislation, not in this bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is why I say I feel there is great danger, which I deplore.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes; in the case of proposed legislation being offered in the future, but the danger is not in the terms of the pending joint resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Such a measure could be offered and enacted only if the joint resolution were passed. That is one of the main reasons why I do not want to have the joint resolution passed. It would open the door.

There are two other primary sources of oil from which the free world is today drawing its petroleum. The first of these is Venezuela, which has a proven reserve of approximately 10 billion barrels. The other great source is the Middle East, which has 86 percent of the oil reserves in the Eastern Hemisphere. There also exists a 2 billion barrel-oil reserve in Canada and a small reserve in Mexico.

Now when our defense planners look at the problem of supplying oil and petroleum products to the countries of the free world, they are faced with the stark reality that one of the great sources of the free world's oil is extremely vulnerable both to the danger of external attack and internal subversion. This is the oil now being produced and lying underground in the Middle East. For instance, the great Abadan refinery in Iran lies only 600 miles from the Russian border and can be reached from the Soviet Union by a modern highway. The largest oil well in the Middle East area, producing 150,000 barrels a day, is only 500 miles from the Caspian Sea, the Russian border. Here in the countries of Iraq, Iran, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia are known reserves twice the amount we have in the United States today, but all less than 1 hour's flying time from Russian bases.

I need not remind my colleagues of the fact that this oil may be lost to the free world even though we may not become engaged in a major war. In recent months we have witnessed the effect of militant nationalism in Iran. The great refineries have been shut down, and the crude oil and refined products have not been flowing into the markets of the world.

We must look at the resources and reserves of the free world from the standpoint of their vulnerability to military or political elimination. We can only plan on the basis of the relatively nonvulnerable reserves.

The Middle East today is supplying the free world with approximately 2.5 million barrels of oil per day. Venezuela is shipping about 2 million barrels of oil a day, and the United States is producing 6.5 million barrels per day.

The Paley commission stated that—

> The gravest problem is the threat to the wartime security of the free world implicit in the pattern of the world oil supply that is taking shape. The Eastern Hemisphere, and Europe in particular, is coming to depend on huge imports of oil from the Middle East, which must be considered more vulnerable to attack by a potential enemy than are Western Hemisphere sources.

We in the United States today are consuming approximately 1 million barrels of oil more per day than we are producing. We are bringing our imported oil from Venezuela and the Middle East. Almost all of free Europe's oil is imported from the Middle East and Venezuela. In the event of war or further Middle Eastern revolt, where do we find ourselves? Of what value will our western allies be if the movement of their planes and military equipment is halted by lack of sufficient oil and gasoline? These are shocking questions which bring home the tremendous reliance the Western World has developed on readily available and nonvulnerable supplies of oil and oil products.

The press has carried, in recent weeks, apparently authoritatively reports on the vast expansion of the submarine fleet of the Soviet Union. There is evidence that the Soviet Union has the greatest submarine fleet that has ever existed, much larger than even our own.

Most of the Soviet submarines, according to these reports, are of the snorkel type, with a vast cruising radius. They can cross the oceans and strike at our supply lines not only from the Middle East, but from Venezuela as well. They need not surface. They do not need bases.

What such a submarine fleet could do to us and to our allies, in the event of war, in the way of interfering with our supplies of oil needs no further commentary from me.

So far I have looked only at the current demands for oil. We know the tremendous increase in demands which come with full-scale war. We also know that the annual consumption rate of petroleum products is increasing rapidly in both the United States and in the free world as a whole.

The Paley commission estimated that within 25 years the demand for crude oil in the United States will have increased 110 percent over that of 1950. The demands in Europe will have increased by 233 percent, and in South America also by 233 percent. This brings the total increased demands of the free world to an average of 168 percent.

The United States has embarked on great programs to rebuild the economic and military strength of the free world. We have engaged in programs to lend technical assistance to underdeveloped countries to broaden their economies. All of these programs will directly affect the increasing demands for oil next year, and every year following.

Armies, navies, and air forces are useless without a readily available supply of fuel. The industrial potentials of these revitalized countries will also be useless without adequate supplies of petroleum products.

This increasing demand can be most clearly illustrated by reference to a few facts. Not very many years ago the railroads of the United States relied almost entirely on steam locomotives using coal. Today over 85 percent of the engines on American railroads are diesel powered, and that percentage is growing greater every day. During World War II a P–51 fighter plane consumed about 65 gallons of motor fuel an hour. Today our jet fighters use 300 to 500 gallons per hour. A single B–36 bomber consumes 5 times as much fuel per hour as a B–17 consumes.

The United States is producing today about one-half of the world's supply of oil on approximately 30 percent of the world's proven reserves and probably a considerably smaller fraction of the world's undiscovered reserves.

In the event of a major war the United States reserves, along with the much smaller reserves in Canada and Venezuela, will have to supply most of the oil for the free world. The real impact of this demand begins to be realized when we see that 60 percent of the shipping tonnage transported to Europe during the last war was oil or oil products.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Since the Senator from New York is speaking about oil consumption during time of war, is it not true that if an enemy should take the Middle East and cut off the supply of oil from the Middle East to Europe, Europe would be entirely dependent on the United States and the other countries of the Western Hemisphere for oil? We speak today about the industrial develop-

ment and the productive capacity of Europe. But without oil, there could be no productive capacity. Europe would have to look to the United States and to other areas in the Western Hemisphere for oil if the Middle East oil resources were not available to Europe.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Alabama is completely correct in his statement.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. May I finish my thought?

I do not think that even through the development of oil reserves off the coastal States we shall be able to take care of all the demands which will be made upon us in the event of an all-out war, but we can go a long way toward doing so. That is why I want to be certain that we are in a position to develop these offshore oil reserves and to conserve our inland oil resources.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that under the concept of State ownership of submerged lands and regulatory power over all oil production during two World Wars, there was produced sufficient oil to take care of our war machinery. If the oil that is within the original boundaries of the States is allowed to remain under State management, the States will not burn it or hide it from the Federal Government. It will be available under the very terms of the joint resolution. The Federal Government is to have the first opportunity to get any of this oil which might be needed for national defense. The record of our committee shows that it can be produced by private industry under State control cheaper than the Federal Government itself can produce it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Texas that I shall advert to that very question in the next few pages of my speech.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. There is no thought on the part of anyone, is there, that the Federal Government itself is to produce oil? The Federal Government would lease the oil lands to private interests, just as the States would.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is no thought on the part of anyone that the Federal Government would itself produce the oil. But it is a fact that if the Federal Government were enabled to retain control of the oil lands, it would be in a position to proceed rapidly, whereas otherwise there might be endless litigation.

The United States must have a sufficient standby oil production capacity to enable us quickly to pick up the deficit of crude oil resulting from loss of vulnerable sources of supply.

General Johnson, of the Munitions Board, has estimated that we must have at least a 15 percent standby capacity in crude production and refinery capacity, and to be safe we should have a 25 percent margin. Today it is estimated that we have not more than 11 percent or 12 percent standby capacity. We need to develop new wells and new fields as rapidly as possible to provide this production margin. We must not be placed in a position of having to damage our existing wells by too rapid extraction of oil.

How then, can we achieve this standby production capacity in our relatively nonvulnerable oil wells in the United States in order to meet the possible loss of vulnerable fields? We must be able to replace the approximately 1 million barrels of oil we import each day, and be ready to supply Western Europe and the free world in the event the Middle East fields are destroyed.

It has been pointed out that oil wells on the Continental Shelf would be very vulnerable to attack from enemy submarines. This is undoubtedly true. Total reliance must not be placed on our offshore wells to supply us in the event of war. However, the offshore wells would be less vulnerable and more easily protected by subchasers and air cover than oil from the Middle East or even from Venezuela or Colombia. Nevertheless, it is my opinion—and I believe this would be substantiated by our defense planners—that we should develop the offshore wells as rapidly as possible, and keep our inshore or upland wells producing at a moderate or restricted rate, so that, in the event of war, most of the increased production can come in quickly from inshore fields.

The development of producing wells offshore is, of course, more costly than the drilling of wells on land. The exploration and mapping of geological structures is more complex when developing the ocean bottom. The construction of piers or floating platforms involves greater capital outlay, and the transportation of the oil from offshore pools may involve considerable costs. It is my firm conviction that, regardless of the difficulties involved, the private oil industry in the United States has the technical know-how and capacity to develop the oilfields in the submerged lands off our shores. I believe these pools should be developed by the private oil industry with full and constructive competition governing their operations.

The Paley commission, in its analysis of how to achieve the development of these offshore oil reserves in the quickest possible time, raised the possibility that some type of subsidy arrangement, through the adjustment of royalties, might be required in order to make feasible full-scale development of offshore oil by private industry. I am not competent to discuss the advisability of such a procedure. I do know that we must provide for the development of these reserves now, today.

We must assume that offshore wells will be more vulnerable to enemy attack in time of war than inland wells, and thus it is only logical to devise a method by which our peacetime oil demands are met more and more from offshore wells while we hold our inland wells to limited production.

I hope that the Malone subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which has been assigned the highly important task of studying and investigating our national fuel reserves and the formulation of a national fuel policy, will go into these problems and come forth with recommendations and proposed legislation.

In any event, let me summarize the defense aspects of the question now before us:

First. The United States is today importing one-sixth of the oil it consumes.

Second. The free world will have to rely primarily on the United States for a nonvulnerable source of oil in the event of a major war.

Third. Domestic production of inland oil can be increased by only 11 or 12 percent, and we should have at least a 15- to 25-percent standby production capacity to meet the possibility of the loss of overseas supplies and to meet the minimum emergency needs of our allies.

Fourth. The last great undeveloped oil reserves in the United States lie in the Continental Shelf off our coasts and today it is largely undeveloped.

Fifth. Wells producing from the Continental Shelf will be more vulnerable to enemy attack than those producing from inland fields.

Sixth. We should develop as rapidly as possible the offshore wells, drawing from them as much as possible for our peacetime needs, and at the same time developing an equitable method of protecting our inland reserves from too rapid depletion.

Seventh. The demands for oil in peacetime as well as during war are going to increase very rapidly during the next 25 years, thus requiring the most careful planning and development of our oil resources.

Where do these conclusions leave us with regard to Senate Joint Resolution 13?

I do not believe that Senate Joint Resolution 13 would permit private companies desiring to develop oil wells in the submerged lands to proceed as rapidly as they should. As is plainly indicated in the hearings and in the debate thus far, considerable litigation is certain to result from this legislation. This litigation will involve, among other things, the determination of the exact areas in which individual States can lease submerged lands. The distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee [Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska] has repeatedly stated that he does not know the exact location of the boundary lines of the States as defined in the pending legislation. The Attorney General originally recommended the drawing of a line on a map to prevent just this sort of litigation, but that proposal was never pursued. How can private companies be expected to invest millions of dollars in developing lands, jurisdiction over which will certainly be in litigation pending the final determnation of these seaward boundary lines?

I would further like to point out to the Senate that at least one State, Rhode Island, can be expected to initiate legal proceedings to test the constitutionality of the basic premises on which Senate Joint Resolution 13 rests. Such litigation would probably test the constitutionality of both the provision in the pending bill relinquishing title to certain of the submerged lands and that

further provision vesting in the States full rights to administer, lease and manage the submerged offshore lands. The Supreme Court, on three occasions in recent years, has clearly stated that the Federal Government has paramount rights and dominion over this offshore area. Such new litigation might very well act as a deterrent to the development of the offshore reserves, as has been the case in the past 7 years during the consideration of the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases.

We cannot afford to have this great oil reserve undeveloped. On the other hand, we cannot expect private investors to proceed to develop these fields when there still will be serious legal question concerning not only the basic constitutionality of the legislation, but also the precise areas with which the legislation deals.

Senate Joint Resolution 13 apparently does not deal with the entire Continental Shelf. We know that the great bulk of the oil lies beyond the so-called "historic" boundaries of the States. Senate Joint Resolution 13 does not provide for the development of this area either by the States or the Federal Government. The distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has assured us that the next matter to be considered by this committee will be legislation dealing with the remainder of the Continental Shelf area—whatever that remainder is. He has stated that he expects to have such legislation reported out by the time Senate Joint Resolution 13 has been disposed of.

This, Mr. President, is one of the reasons I am opposed to the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13. But we are not at a loss for a substitute which would do what I have proposed. Substitute legislation will be offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I am a cosponsor of this proposed legislation, and I strongly urge the Senate to support the Anderson substitute when it comes to a vote.

Mr. President, we cannot risk not having our naval tankers filled and ready when our task forces prepare to move to defend our coasts and our freedom. We cannot afford to have our strategic air force grounded for lack of gasoline and jet fuel. We cannot afford to have our armored divisions at a standstill for lack of fuel. We cannot afford to have our jet-propelled missiles and planes grounded while an enemy bomber force approaches. We cannot risk the loss of our industrial capacity for lack of readily available petroleum products.

These are the dangers which now confront us. We can eliminate a great part of this risk through wise and speedy action by our Congress. This is why I desire to see legislation passed now which will permit the prompt and proper development of the great offshore reserves.

Mr. President, I stand before the Senate as a Senator from New York, from a State which, in my judgment, has much to lose from the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13, the Holland joint resolution, and much to gain from the passage of the Anderson bill and the Hill amendment.

New York stands to lose, not as a State, but as an integral part of the United States. New Yorkers stand to lose not as New Yorkers, but as Americans.

Next week, Mr. President, I propose to describe at some length what New Yorkers stand to lose in this legislation, and what it would mean to the Nation if New York took the same attitude that Texas, and California, and Louisiana are taking in regard to the proposed legislation.

But today, Mr. President, I am prepared only to appeal to the Senate, and to the country, to oppose Senate Joint Resolution 13, and to support in its place the Anderson bill and the Hill amendment, which is more needed than any measure that has been needed during the years I have been a Member of the Senate.

To do otherwise will be to open up a Pandora's box of litigation, to set a precedent for grabs of Federal property and of our national resources, which the Nation will have good cause to regret in the months and years ahead.

Those who plead the case of Louisiana, Texas, and California today will not be able to withstand the appeals of Wyoming and Montana and Nevada and Washington tomorrow. The forests will go. The parks will go. The water power will go. What will remain?

Mr. President, the decision we will soon make will hang over our heads for years to come. I pray that we will decide wisely. Let us decide in the interests of all the people, of our national security, and of our Nation itself.

Mr. KUCHEL obtained the floor.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Senator is about to embark upon his maiden speech in the Senate, is he not?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator permit me to extend to him the courtesy and to the Senate the compliment of calling for a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield for that purpose?

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senator resumes his remarks after the quorum is developed, it may not be held to constitute the beginning of the Senator's second speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the calling of the roll be rescinded and that the proceedings in connection with the call of the roll be suspended.

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

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the State of California, together with the other States of the Union, views the pending proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 13, as one of transcendent importance. California hopes that the wisdom of the resolution will be recognized by the Senate, that the Senate will pass it, and that it will thus be on its way to becoming law. California believes that a wrong will be corrected, and that simple equity will be done when, and if, the joint resolution shall become law.

For a matter of a little more than 3 months now, I have had the honor, along with my able senior colleague [Mr. [KNOWLAND], to represent the State of California in the United States Senate. Each of us is a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 13, authored by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]; and I hope, Mr. President, that it may not be considered inappropriate for one who is a new Member of the Senate to comment upon the joint resolution and upon some of the reasons which prompt him to support it.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF CALIFORNIA

It is my desire to discuss, for a few minutes, a portion of the historical background of California in connection with the subject matter of the joint resolution, and with the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *California*, a decision which has raised a signal of warning to every sovereign State in the Union.

What, Mr. President, are the facts? The facts are that in 1849 California adopted a constitution providing that her boundaries extended 3 English miles into the Pacific Ocean. Our constitution was presented to the Congress of the United States on February 13, 1850. Congress accepted that constitution, and, on September 9, 1850, passed an act admitting California into the Union. This was a solemn act on the part of Congress. For almost 100 years thereafter, California asserted, exercised, and relied upon undisputed rights of ownership and control over all submerged lands beneath her navigable waters within these boundaries, extending 3 miles out to the sea. During this period of time, the California Supreme Court repeatedly held that title to this area was vested in our State.

Between 1851 and 1945, California made 85 grants of property in the submerged lands offshore, to municipalities and to other political subdivisions of the State. In 1911, California made grants to the city of Los Angeles and the city of Long Beach, so that the boundaries of these municipalities were extended into the submerged lands off their shores.

During the entire period of California's statehood, up to the time suit was brought against the State by the Federal Government, California's title to the coastal submerged lands within her boundaries remained unchallenged. Whenever the Federal Government desired use or control of any of such lands for its own purposes, it acquired them from the State by grant deed upon payment of agreed compensation, or through the exercise of the power of eminent domain, or by deed of gift, from either California or her grantees. The record is full of instances of such transfers having occurred. Let me cite but one. Long before the decision of the Supreme Court in the California case, the city of Long Beach, in my State, gave the Federal Government over 500 acres of submerged lands, and charged the Federal Government $1 for all of it.

In addition to these evidences of ownership and jurisdiction on behalf of California, our State, its grantees and lessees have occupied, possessed, and used large portions of the submerged area within its boundaries in the following ways:

First. Building wharves, piers, breakwaters, moorings, seawalls, and jetties.

Second. Drilling into and beneath the submerged lands as far as 2 miles offshore in the discovery and development of oil and gas.

Third. Assessing and collecting taxes upon interests in the submerged lands.

Fourth. Regulating and controlling fish and fisheries all on the basis of State ownership.

Fifth. Leasing areas in the ocean for the harvest of kelp.

Sixth. Expending large sums of money in developing and improving substantial portions of this 3-mile area.

The area of submerged coastal lands within the boundaries of California is approximately 3 million acres. Along its 1,100 miles of coastline—the title to every foot of which has been placed in jeopardy by the Court's decision—only 15 miles, or something over 1¼ percent, have been productive of petroleum. It was upon this small area of California's coastline that some people in the Federal Government cast covetous eyes, not long after petroleum had been found in any quantity.

Because it was the petroleum issue that precipitated this problem, I should like to develop some of the history of California as respects the discovery of oil along a part of her coastline. The first recorded oil development on tidelands and submerged lands of my State was at Summerland in Santa Barbara County in the year 1877. The first well there was located on the beach, where oil seepages had been observed. By the end of 1895, there were eight productive wells on or adjacent to the beach at Summerland. The results obtained in these oil wells attracted much attention to the area, and an extensive drilling campaign on the submerged lands there commenced in 1896.

In June of 1900, when development in this area reached its climax, there were 22 operating companies and 305 producing wells. By 1906 a total of 412 wells had been drilled from wooden wharves and piers extending from the beach out over the submerged lands. The production of oil at Summerland thereafter decreased, however, and after the year 1940, there was no oil production from the submerged lands in that area. The entire production per well had always been small.

The first State oil and gas leasing law in California was enacted in 1921—Chapter 303, Statutes of 1921. This law provided for the issuance of prospecting permits and preferential leases to permit drilling when commercial production was demonstrated. Between 1929 and 1931, oil development took place at Rincon and at Elwood in Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties. In 1930, the first well was drilled off Huntington Beach in Orange County. In the 1930's oil was also developed from submerged lands off the area southeast of Terminal Island—Senators will remember that in connection with the war effort—or, what might otherwise be described as the entrance to what was the original San Pedro Harbor. With the completion of the first discovery well in the submerged lands offshore from Huntington Beach in 1930, activity increased in that area, and 12 wells were completed there between 1930 and 1934. Development of this field, after 1929, proceeded in accordance with State legislation which required that the undersea oil pool be reached from drill sites located on the uplands, through directional or slant drilling, as it is known.

In the area of the city of Long Beach, the first upland discovery well was drilled in 1936. Following this first discovery, submerged lands drilling off Long Beach progressed rapidly until, at the present time, over 700 wells have been drilled, developed and are producing oil under drilling agreements between the city of Long Beach and its contracting parties.

Then, in the 1930's, applications for Federal leases on these same offshore areas began to be filed. They were filed by individuals who, for the first time, urged that the 3-mile belt within California's boundaries did not belong to California, but belonged rather, under their contention, to the Federal Government.

THE HISTORIC POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES

These applications squarely presented the issue of State ownership of these lands. In rejecting one such application, the late Harold L. Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior, issued a ruling on December 22, 1933.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter, containing the ruling, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks; and then I want to read but one or two sentences from it.

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

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., December 22, 1933.

Mr. OLIN S. PROCTOR,
Long Beach, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. PROCTOR: I have received, by reference from the Department of State, copies of your letters of October 15 and November 22.

As to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over lands bordering on tidewater, the Supreme Court of the United States has held in the case of *Hardin* v. *Jordan* (140 U. S. 371), as follows:

"With regard to grants of the Government for lands bordering on tidewater, it has been distinctly settled that they only extend to high-water mark, and that the title to the shore and lands under water in front of lands so granted enures to the State within which they are situated, if a State has been organized and established there. Such title to the shore and lands under water is regarded as incidental to the sovereignty of the State—a portion of the royalties belonging thereto and held in trust for the public purposes of navigation and fishery—and cannot be retained or granted out to individuals by the United States."

The foregoing is a statement of the settled law and therefore no rights can be granted to you either under the leasing act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat 437), or under any other public-land law to the bed of the Pacific Ocean either within or without the 3-mile limit. Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State. A permit would be necessary to be obtained from the War Department as a prerequisite to the maintenance of structures in the navigable waters of the United States, but such a permit would not confer any rights to the ocean bed.

I find no authority of law under which any right can be granted to you to establish your proposed structures in the ocean outside of the 3-mile limit of the jurisdiction of the State of California, nor am I advised that any other branch of the Federal Government has such authority.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KUCHEL. In this letter it will be noted that Mr. Ickes quoted from the case of *Hardin* v. *Jordan,* cited in the letter, as follows:

Title to the shore and lands under water is regarded as incidental to the sovereignty of the State—a portion of the royalties belonging thereto and held in trust for the public purpose of navigation and fishery—and cannot be retained or granted out to individuals by the United States.

Mr. Ickes continued:

The foregoing is a statement of the settled law and, therefore, no rights can be granted to you—

Meaning to the applicant, in this instance—

either under the Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), or under any other public-land law to the bed of the Pacific Ocean either within or without the 3-mile limit. * * *

I find no authority of law under which any right can be granted to you to establish your proposed structures in the ocean outside the 3-mile limit of the jurisdiction of the State of California, nor am I advised that any other branch of the Federal Government has such authority.

THE POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES CHANGES

For whatever reason may have motivated it, the Department of the Interior thereafter began to change its mind. It began to back away from the forthright position taken in the letter to which I have referred. And then, on May 29, 1945, the Federal Government filed suit in the Federal district court in southern California claiming ownership of land below low-water mark off the coast of California. This suit was later dismissed and a new complaint was filed in October 1945 by the Federal Government against the State of California in the United States Supreme Court, as the Court of original jurisdiction. The far-reaching results of the Court's subsequent decision are well known. The United States Supreme Court held that California is not the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along its coast. It announced that the Federal Government has "paramount rights in and power over" that area. It declined, however, to hold that the Federal Government owned the area. The Federal lawyers asked the Court to decree that the United States had rights of proprietorship in those lands. The Court refused to do so, and struck out this language of proprietorship.

I have listened to the able senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and other able Members of the Senate, recite in detail numerous decisions of the Supreme Court, indicating that the lands

beneath all navigable waters were reserved to the States. Typical of these many decisions is *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212, 229). In that case, the Court said in part:

> The territorial boundaries of Alabama have extended all her sovereign powers into the sea. * * * The shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them, were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively. Second, the new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over this subject as the original States.

I have heard comments made on the Senate floor that such language used in many such Supreme Court decisions was merely dictum and, therefore, not of determinative effect in the issue. But the fact is, as Senators know, that the Supreme Court, in its decision in the California case, made the significant admission that the Court had, many times, in past decisions "used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that the States also owned soils under all navigable waters within the territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

So, I think it can be said in entire accuracy that there never was a court decision which ever raised the slightest question as to who owned the submerged lands within the historic boundaries of California, or of any other State, until the agitation in some quarters in the 1930's leading up to the decision in the 1947 California case. The text of that case itself stands as testimony to the truth of this fact.

As a result of this novel "paramount rights" doctrine, a state of uncertainty has arisen. Representatives of the American Bar Association have termed that doctrine "strange," "extraordinary," and "unusual." As Manley O. Hudson, famed lawyer and judge, has said, with reference to the decision in the California case:

> It is a reversal of what all competent people had taken to be the law relating to those lands a few years ago. This is a capital fact that I feel the Congress will have no disposition to ignore. It may be said that it was the general feeling throughout almost the entire Nation that ownership of the lands beneath any navigable waters, within their boundaries, whether coastal or interior, was placed in jeopardy and that no State could have any sense of security in its ownership of these properties, however long such ownership had been fully recognized by the Federal Government.

The effect, Mr. President, of this decision is to create a new concept of Federal rights to property within State boundaries. Lands under navigable inland waters are presumably owned by the States, but even here a doubt has arisen, because of the following sentence in the Court's decision:

> The Government does not deny that under the Pollard rule, as explained in later cases, California has a qualified ownership of lands under inland navigable water, such as rivers, harbors, and even tidelands down to the low-water mark.

I emphasize, Mr. President, that the phrase used here is "qualified ownership."

On the other hand, lands under navigable waters, outside of inland waters are, by the decision, subject to Federal paramount rights, including dominion over natural resources. Ownership of these lands is not decided. The Supreme Court said that the Federal paramount rights in these lands and dominion over their resources are necessary in order to fulfill the responsibilities of the Federal Government for national defense and for international relations. Prominent lawyers and judges have pointed out the dangerous implications of the Court's pronouncement. These Federal responsibilities exist throughout our country, as pointed out by Justice Stanley Reed when he said in his dissenting opinion:

> The power of the United States is plenary over these undersea lands precisely as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation.

For that reason, Mr. President, there is, it seems to me, sound ground for the growing fear that this paramount rights doctrine may someday be applied to other lands presently believed to be under State jurisdiction. There we have the reason why Senators from every section of our country have joined in sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 13.

A BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION

Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 13, as it was approved by the Senate committee, declares it to be in the public interest that title and ownership of lands and resources beneath navigable waters within State boundaries are recognized, vested in, and assigned to them. It also provides that the rights of States to develop and use such lands and resources is recognized, vested in, and assigned to them. In other words, this joint resolution would recognize and confirm for the future what had been accepted and relied upon as the law prior to 1947 by the Federal Government and the several States.

In recognizing State ownership of lands beneath navigable waters within historic State boundaries, this joint resolution wisely makes no attempt to define exactly what those boundaries are. In substance, the resolution provides that each of the States has ownership of all lands beneath navigable waters extending, in the case of littoral States, 3 geographical miles seaward from its coastline, or to its historic boundary. But where, you may ask, is the coastline? The joint resolution does not provide a metes-and-bounds description of the coastline; rather, it provides that the coastline is the line of low-water mark, or, where there are inland waters such as bays, the seaward limit of those inland waters. What constitutes inland waters, what the seaward limit of those waters may be, and what the low-water mark is are questions left open for future adjudication.

THE RELEVANCY OF BOUNDARY DEFINITIONS

Criticism has been heard, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate, on the failure of this joint resolution to provide a metes-and-bounds description of the submerged lands in question. Some insist that the resolution should define with exactness the coastline and the boundary of each State. When we consider the background of this problem, I think, Mr. President, you may agree with me that these critics are in a paradoxical position.

In the California suit the Federal Government contended that the United States owned the lands seaward of the low-water mark and outside inland waters, on California's coast, running 3 nautical miles into the sea. California urged that the lands were not sufficiently described and that the 3-mile belt was unidentified. The Supreme Court brushed aside this contention of my State. Said the Court:

> Certainly demarcation of the boundary is not an impossibility * * * and there is no reason why, after determining in general who owns the 3-mile belt here involved, the Court might not later, if necessary, have more detailed hearings in order to determine with greater definiteness particular segments of the boundary.

Here, Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 13, following the guide furnished by the Supreme Court, would determine, in general, who owns the 3-mile belt, and would leave precise definition of the boundary for later determination. To those who object to the resolution on the grounds that coastlines and boundaries are not definitely established by it, I answer, in the language of the Court, "demarcation of the boundary is not an impossibility."

But it would take a long time, Mr. President, to define them with accuracy for each littoral State. Witness again the California situation, where the Court appointed a Master to assist it in locating the 3-mile belt. Six years after the original decision, the Court has not yet found where California's coastline is, along a very few miles of our shore.

THE ISSUE OF INLAND WATERS

The main issue involved in these current Supreme Court proceedings is the extent of California's inland waters. Since that matter is now before the Court, I do not intend to comment on it in detail. However, I will say that, having persuaded the Court in 1947 that California's ownership, albeit qualified, is limited to navigable inland waters, the Federal attorneys now claim that such inland waters along our coast are almost nonexistent. It seems to me that these attorneys are now seeking to overturn the established meaning of what inland waters are, just as in the main part of the California case, they persuaded the Court to accept the new paramount rights doctrine. For instance, these attorneys have argued that each of five California bays, long recognized and claimed by California as bays, are not bays at all.

A graphic example of this occurred in connection with Santa Monica Bay. The indentation at Santa Monica was explicitly held to be a bay by the California supreme court in the case of *People* v. *Stralla* (14 Cal. 2d 617 (1939)). During the course of that case, the United States attorney in southern California appeared and stated that he was "acting on the express direction of the Attorney General of the United States and in that name and in behalf of the United States." He filed a brief, in which he strongly urged the Court to hold that Santa Monica was a bay, and the California Supreme Court agreed.

However, when the matter arose in the Master's proceedings to fix an exact coastal line in California, the Federal Government repudiated this prior position, and asserted that Santa Monia Bay is not a bay at all. Thus, once again, representatives of the Government of the United States took one position with respect to California in 1939, and a completely opposite one a decade later. I cite this example, also, to indicate the difficulty Congress would encounter in establishing, by metes-and-bounds, coast lines and boundaries.

CALIFORNIA'S BOUNDARY STATUTE

One other question which has arisen in these debates is the California boundary statute, adopted by my State in 1949. When California was admitted into the Union, its constitution provided that its boundary was to extend 3 English miles into the ocean and also to include all the islands, harbors, and bays along and adjacent to the coast. In 1949 the California Legislature passed an act which sought to interpret and define the intent of the general language of the 1849 constitution. This act provided, in effect, that the State's western boundary is a line 3 miles oceanward from her farthermost islands.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that the 1949 boundary statute of my State is now interjected in this discussion in an attempt to demonstrate that somehow, in some manner, Senate Joint Resolution 13 would extend the boundaries of my State, or of any State similarly situated, beyond that which it originally had. But that is simply not so.

Whether the 1949 statute is valid is a question for the courts. It has been drawn to the attention of the Supreme Court in the Master's proceedings to determine the State's inland waters along part of the coast.

The point here, however, is that the pending joint resolution has no effect on the 1949 act. It neither validates nor invalidates it. The effect of this act of the State of California awaits judicial determination. California, like every other State, will have an equal opportunity to establish the location of its own coastline and historic boundary. This is the basic, underlying equity of the resolution.

THE MATTER OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Against the resolution is now raised the objection that, if passed, it would weaken the security of the United States. No Member of the Senate, or of Congress, or of the administration, indeed, no patriotic citizen of the United States, desires to do anything to weaken our national security. Let me, in this connection, quote from the testimony of Mr. Jack B. Tate, Deputy Legal Adviser of the State Department, appearing before the Senate committee on March 3 of this year:

> The Department believes that the grant by the Federal Government of rights to explore and develop the mineral resources of the Continental Shelf off the coasts of the United States can be achieved within the framework of its traditional international position (p. 1053).
>
> I assume that as far as our international relations are concerned, the United States could divide up with the States any rights which it had, and those rights would be certainly the traditional rights to the 3 miles, plus the right to the Continental Shelf as set forth in the 1945 proclamation. * * * Whatever the United States has as far as the international aspect is concerned, it may divide up with the States as it pleases (p. 1086).

Permit me also to quote from Mr. Justice Reed in his dissenting opinion in the California decision:

> This ownership in California would not interfere in any way with the needs or rights of the United States in war or peace. The power of the United States is plenary over these undersea lands precisely as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation.

So, Mr. President, in the light of statements such as these, I very much doubt that anyone can urge successfully a negative vote against Senate Joint Resolution 13 on the basis that it would weaken our national security. The situation which prevailed from 1789 to 1947 will be exactly the same situation which will prevail in the future if and when Senate Joint Resolution 13 becomes law. During all that prior period of our history, and until the time of the California decision, no one ever suggested that State ownership and control of submerged lands adversely affected this country's security.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE RESOLUTION

Mr. President, some also suggest that Senate Joint Resolution 13 is unconstitutional. But it ought to be pointed out that the American Bar Association and the National Association of Attorneys General, and other distinguished groups of lawyers, all endorse the principles embodied in the resolution. In our committee we listened to the Attorney General of the United States, Herbert Brownell. He stated in part:

> Instead of granting to the States a blanket quitclaim title to the submerged lands within their historic boundaries, the Federal Government would grant to the States only such authority as required for the States to administer and develop the natural resources. I do not thereby intend to cast any doubt upon the constitutionality of a so-called quitclaim statute, but merely to draw to your attention a method of minimizing, if not eliminating altogether, the constitutional points raised by the witnesses before this committee.

The bill incorporates the provisions suggested by the Attorney General, and retains, as well, those vesting title to all submerged lands in the several States.

In this connection, I wish to quote further from the majority opinion in the 1947 California case itself:

> We cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such a way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission.

There we have a suggestion, if not an invitation, by the Court to the Congress to consider the equities and the justice involved in such a piece of legislation as Senate Joint Resolution 13.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Mr. President, I wish now to recall for the record the pledge in the party platform upon which the President of the United States conducted last year's campaign:

> We favor restoration of the States' rights to all lands and resources beneath navigable inland and off-shore waters within their historic boundaries.

That pledge was strenuously debated last year, and President Eisenhower was elected on the platform which contained it. I do not labor the point, but I suggest that here is a promise which shortly now can and should be fulfilled.

The resolution treats all the States alike. The 28 million acres of land under inland waters in the several interior States, the 38 million acres of land under the Great Lakes, and the 17 million acres of land under navigable waters within State boundaries, all similarly used and claimed by the several States historically, will, under the resolution be dealt with alike.

JUSTICE FOR CALIFORNIA

Mr. President, for almost a century, from 1850 to 1947, the State of California dealt with the submerged lands off her shore. She dealt with them as owner of them. She developed them. She passed laws providing for petroleum products from them. She regulated fishing and the harvesting of kelp from them. She gave—or at least she thought she gave—title to parts of these lands to some of her coastal cities. She and they dealt generously with the Federal Government.

Through all this long period, California was a sovereign State, exercising sovereign power. It was a State responsibility which we believed we had, and we discharged it in the public interest.

Then, abruptly, that was all changed by the Supreme Court. A decision of tremendous portent held that these lands were not ours. The actions of a century were found meaningless. Federal authority, Federal rights, were once again expanded. State authority and State rights, as we had known them and believed them to be, were wiped out.

Two more decisions by the Court followed, and two more sovereign States were counted out. So the trend continued, and no one can tell where, if ever, it will end.

Why strip California of her resources? Why take away from any State that which was ever considered her own? Why destroy the rights of American States in their own lands, as they believed them to be, since the beginning of our Nation?

There we have the issue. Some of us believe that equity and simple justice admit of but a single conclusion: This joint resolution ought to become the law of the land.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I wish to express my congratulations to the distinguished junior Senator from California, who I think has not only made a most able and effective maiden speech, but has made a decided contribution to the debate upon this complicated subject.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator two questions with reference to matters which I think are significant contributions to the debate.

First, with reference to the first paragraph on page 14 of his prepared address, I notice that the distinguished Senator from California has quoted Mr. Tate, the Deputy Solicitor of the State Department, who appeared before the Senate committee, on a subject which I do not believe has been emphasized in the debate up to this time, and which I think is of very great importance.

I note that the quotation from Mr. Tate's testimony placed in the RECORD by the distinguished Senator is that part of his testimony in which Mr. Tate made the comment that—

> I assume that as far as our international relations are concerned, the United States could divide up with the States any rights which it had, and those rights would be certainly the traditional rights to the 3 miles, plus the rights to the Continental Shelf as set forth in the 1945 proclamation.

My question is this: Is it not the understanding of the distinguished Senator from California that by the testimony of the able Deputy Solicitor of the State Department it was made completely clear that there is no jeopardy of any kind arising in the international field from the division between the States and the Federal Government of all or any of the proprietary rights in the submerged Continental Shelf which the United States has under the law as it now exists?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Florida is completely correct. That was the tenor of the testimony to which we listened in the hearings before the committee. I wish to add, if I may, that I thank my friend the distinguished Senator from Florida for his comment, personal to me, which I know is not deserved, but which I appreciate very much.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is a great pleasure to a native son of Florida to pay a deserved compliment to a distinguished son of the Golden State.

To repeat the question in a little different form, is it the understanding of the distinguished Senator from California that so long as the pending measure or any other legislation on this subject addresses itself insofar as the Continental Shelf is concerned, solely to the division between the States and the Federal Government of proprietary rights now belonging to the Federal Government or claimed under the doctrine of paramount right in the Federal Government, there is absolutely no dangerous implication in the field of international relations in the opinion of the State Department?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Florida is again correct, and I wholly agree with that statement. As he has suggested, that again was the tenor of the testimony before the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from California will further yield, I wish to say that his well-made point should go very far toward eliminating one of the false issues which has been so repeatedly urged on this floor, to the effect that something disturbing our relations with foreign governments was involved in the measure, whereas now we are told by the witnesses appearing officially for the State Department that no such thing is the case, so long as the legislation confines itself, as it does, in dealing with the offshore areas, to rights now owned by or belonging to, or held under the paramount rights doctrine by the Federal Government.

If I may ask a second question, addressed to the paragraph at the top of page 15, I note that in that paragraph the distinguished Senator from California, as an able lawyer, calls attention to the fact that the distinguished Attorney General of the United States, appearing before the Senate committee on this subject, recommended a certain course of action which he thought would eliminate any question of constitutionality, namely, that there should be in this legislation a grant to the States short of title to the submerged lands, but a grant of right of development, and of appropriation by the States of all resources acquired through development in the submerged lands lying within State boundaries.

I am particularly pleased to note the statement by the distinguished Senator from California, with which I am in complete accord, that this joint resolution incorporates the provision suggested by the able Attorney General, and retains as well the provisions vesting title to all offshore submerged lands within State boundaries in the several States. My question is this: Is it the point of the distinguished Senator from California that, following the suggestions of the Attorney General of the United States, and pursuant thereto, the committee, in reporting the measure now under consideration by the Senate, saw fit to have the reported measure look in two directions, namely, primarily in the direction of a grant of title to or proprietary rights within State boundaries, to be given and released to the several States by the Federal Government; and secondly, a grant short of a grant of title, which would give to the States the right of development of resources found in the coastal belt, along with the right to hold as their own the proceeds of such development? Is it the statement of the distinguished Senator from California that the joint resolution, as reported, and as now under consideration, does include the two alternative proposals, one of which completely meets and follows the suggestion of the Attorney General of the United States?

Mr. KUCHEL. The distinguished Senator from Florida is entirely correct. As a result of the sessions of the committee subsequent to the time that testimony was taken from the Attorney General and others, both types of provision, as the Senator has suggested, have been incorporated in Senate Joint Resolution 13.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have one further question. Is it not true that, not content with simply placing those two alternative approaches in the joint resolution, the able committee of the Senate which reported the joint resolution also redrafted the separability clause in the joint resolution so as to make it completely clear that either of the two alternative approaches, or both of them together, can stand as the considered, deliberate action of the Senate if and when the joint resolution is passed?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes. I am sorry that I did not mention that as a part of my answer to the distinguished Senator from Florida, because it is true that with extreme care a separability clause was inserted in the joint resolution, so that in the event any litigation were to ensue, each part of the proposed law would stand by itself, and not depend upon any other provision.

Mr. HOLLAND. I sincerely thank the Senator for his very real contribution to the debate on the joint resolution.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is rare indeed that Californians and Arizonians discover ground upon which pleasantries may be exchanged, and I am prompted at this moment to join with the Senator from Florida in expressing the great appreciation of the junior Senator from Arizona for the maiden attempt of the junior Senator from California. I hope that it bespeaks a continuance forever of the good, warm feeling which animates the junior Senator from Arizona at this time toward our sister State to the west, California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I cannot begin to thank my colleague sufficiently for his kind words, and I know that he and I will continue to have the warm friendship we have enjoyed during the past several months. I thank him sincerely.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I wish to congratulate the Senator from California upon the very able presentation he has made, as well as for his conduct during the hearings in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the subject of submerged lands. His presentation today, and the points he developed in the committee, do credit both to him and to the State which he has the honor in part to represent.

I should like particularly to call the attention of the Senate to the point the junior Senator from California made concerning the attitude of the Federal Government when it was seeking to enforce the laws relating to prohibition, during which time Federal attorneys were urging that areas along the California coast should be considered inland waters so that they might extend the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and enable it to arrest those violating the prohibition laws. Since then we have seen the Federal Government attempting to take an attitude opposite to that taken by its agents when they desired to extend the Government's authority, and to contend that there are very few, if any, inland waters along the coast of California.

It seems to me that though the doctrine of estoppel seems to be inapplicable against the Federal Government, the Congress should recognize the equities, and try to apply the same principles of fairness with regard to a State, particu-

larly, that would be applicable between individuals.

Mr. KUCHEL. I completely agree with the Senator from Louisiana. What has happened does indicate that representatives of the Federal Government, with respect to so-called inland waters along the coast of my State, took a position in 1939 diametrically opposite to that taken subsequent to 1947 with respect to the hearings before the Master under the California decision.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should also like to direct attention to the fact that the entire Nation has benefited from the industry of California and its citizens in developing the offshore resources. The Nation has collected much revenue in the way of income taxes, corporation taxes, and personal payroll taxes, and, at the same time, the welfare of the people of California has been advanced because the citizens of that State have developed their submerged lands. If it had not been for their efforts which resulted in the discovery of oil under the submerged lands, the Federal Government would never have undertaken to deprive the State of its interest in the submerged lands.

Mr. KUCHEL. I agree with the comments of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. That was the testimony of the former Secretary of the Interior, the late Mr. Harold Ickes, who stated that several times he signed letters in which he said that in his judgment this property, the submerged lands, belonged to the States. Former Secretary Ickes was an attorney. He testified before the committee that it was only when he was urged by certain people who were applying for cheap Federal leases, with provision for a more favorable royalty and a smaller annual payment than the State leases required, that he was finally persuaded, upon their urging, that the Federal Government should lay claim to this property.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct, and I thank him for what he has said.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to join my colleagues in congratulations to the junior Senator from California on his able presentation on the Senate floor today and on the splendid work he performed in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my good friend from Texas, and I wish to say to him that I deem it an honor to be able to work with him and my other colleagues who have taken such an active part in sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 13 in our fight to have it become law. I repeat my thanks.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN HAWAII

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in my candid judgment, if Hawaii is admitted to statehood, we will have two United States Senators who, to say the least, would be greatly influenced by the Communist war conspiracy. It is my candid judgment that their representatives in the House of Representatives would be so influenced, and the State government, one of the sovereign States of the American Union, would be under the control and domination of Moscow. This would be a calamity and I think the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee should make a long on-the-spot investigation of the strength of the Communist movement in the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. President, in the Senate committee's minority views on statehood for Hawaii, published in June 1950, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] said:

> In 1948 I made a personal visit to the Territory of Hawaii and investigated the Communist situation there in some detail. After a rather thorough study of the problem I came to the conclusion that international revolutionary communism has a firm grip on the economic, political, and social life of the Territory of Hawaii.

He stated further:

> The other principal channel of infiltration for Communists in Hawaii has been the Democratic Party. Shortly after the end of World War II the Communists in Hawaii began an aggressive policy of organizing the hitherto unorganized workers. By 1947 the party felt strong enough to undertake a campaign to get control of the Democratic Party organization and through it to gain political control of the Territory.

In May 1951, in minority views signed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], it was stated:

> But nothing really effective has yet been done to rout out the Communists from their positions of influence. Known Communists continue to control the ILWU completely. So far as we know, several of the 39 cited for contempt still serve on the Territorial executive committee of the Democratic Party in Hawaii. All 39 of those cited for contempt by the House Committee on Un-American Activities were given their complete freedom, and are today allowed to carry on their activities unhampered.

Mr. President, since 1951 there has been considerable propaganda by those advocating statehood that the Communist menace in Hawaii has been receding. Nothing could be further from the truth. I should like to read an editorial that appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of Saturday, November 15, 1952. This newspaper is owned by the esteemed Delegate from Hawaii, Mr. FARRINGTON. The editorial is headed, "Hawaii Democrats and the Leftists," and reads as follows:

> The Democratic Party in Hawaii emerges from the 1952 political campaign in a difficult position so far as the fight against communism is concerned.
>
> The rightwingers who more than 2 years previously had walked out of a Territorial party convention in justified protest against the leftwing dominance have made an uneasy peace with the leftists, and been swallowed up.
>
> These rightwingers have disappeared as a political force standing forthrightly against the leftists.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In the 1952 campaign and election, the leading Democratic candidates accepted the support of the very leftists who a little more than 2 years previously had been denounced and repudiated.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Former Federal Judge Metzger, member of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, said at the commission's meeting in Hilo earlier this week that all the arguments against statehood for Hawaii have been worn out.
>
> This includes, he averred, the antistatehood argument based on alleged undue communistic influence here. Judge Metzger said that Hawaii has fewer Communists proportionately than individual States of the mainland.
>
> * * * * *
>
> His statement as to numbers is correct. But it is not the whole story.
>
> The election of 1952 showed a degree of activity by the leftists and a degree of acceptance by the Democrats that cannot be ignored.
>
> * * * * *
>
> For nearly 6 years after 1945 the political influence of the leftists and the fellow travelers waned.
>
> The Republican Party would have none of the leftist influence and activity. In the Democratic Party there was a wholesome and an effective (for the time) uprising against leftist infiltration and domination.
>
> This resistance to leftist infiltration was aided strongly by the subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee, which came here for an investigation in 1950.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The extent of Communist infiltration into Hawaii was defined in April 1950 by the House committee, headed by Representative FRANCIS B. WALTER, Pennsylvania Democrat, after it had conducted public hearings here.
>
> The report of the committee noted that these elements had infiltrated the Democratic Party in Hawaii.
>
> It was a clear signal to Hawaii's Democrats to clean house, as mainland political parties and the big union organizations cleaned house when the threat was revealed there.
>
> So the attempt was made, at the 1950 Democratic convention, to do just that.
>
> Right wing elements in the party demanded that members of the "reluctant 39," then serving as officers of the party, be ousted.
>
> The reluctant 39 were the witnesses who refused to say under oath whether or not they were or had been members of the Communist Party.
>
> When it was apparent that the rightwing did not have enough convention votes to oust these people, the rightwingers walked out. The people of Hawaii, took hope that this would lead to a cleansing of the Democratic Party.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Unfortunately that did not happen. As the months wore on, the rightwing retreated farther and farther from its original courageous position, and by the time the 1952 election rolled around, the people of whom the Walter committee objected were still doing business at the old stand.
>
> These forces concentrated upon two major objectives—electing the Democratic candidate for Delegate to Congress, and winning control of the Territorial senate, and as many seats as possible in the Territorial house of representatives.
>
> They failed in both objectives.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Although a good many voters did not realize during the campaign, and apparently still do not realize the danger inherent in the situation, the fact remains that Hawaii has survived a political ordeal of major proportions.
>
> The fact that it has survived, as it did, makes it possible now for Judge Metzger to say at a statehood commission meeting that the argument that Hawaii should not have statehood because of Communists here, is not a valid argument.

Mr. President, at this time let me say that the Communists came within 10,000 votes of electing a Delegate from Hawaii to the United States Congress.

I read further from the editorial:

But what he left unsaid is that the fight isn't over, and that the Democratic Party is still under obligation to cleanse itself of the elements at which the Walter report directed a sharply accusing finger 2½ years ago.

Not until that is done can we say that the danger of Red infiltration into our political life has been eliminated.

It's time for the Democratic rightwing to recover from its retreat, mobilize its forces and renew the attack.

* * * * *

This comment does not imply that Hawaii Democrats—true Democrats—are Communists. They aren't. But a surprisingly large number of the once-valiant rightwingers seem to have dropped the fight against the plausible leftists. They appear to have put expediency above realistic party duty.

That position now won't help the Democratic Party of Hawaii in the future.

Mr. President, that editorial appeared shortly after the November election. Former Judge Metzger, who won the Democratic nomination with the support of the Communists and the Communist-controlled ILWU, was defeated in the race for Delegate by Mr. FARRINGTON by a bare margin of 10,000 votes.

Let me explain that in the editorial I read, former Judge Delbert Metzger was identified as a member of the Statehood Commission of Hawaii.

At this time I wish to read to the Senate a story that appeared in the Communist Daily Worker of New York City, on Tuesday, February 24, 1953, on page 3, under a five-column headline, reading as follows:

SMITH ACT JUDGE TELLS WHY HE WAS FIRED

A Federal judge recently fired by Congress for lowering bail in a Smith Act case from $75,000 to $5,000 charged that Federal judges who guarantee convictions in trials of Communists are "promptly promoted."

Judge Delbert E. Metzger—

The same gentleman who is a member of the Statehood Commission for Hawaii—

recently of the United States District Court of Hawaii, also told the delegates at the Lawyers Guild convention at the Park Sheraton Hotel in New York that United States prosecutors who guarantee convictions in Smith Act cases "are made judges."

Judge Metzger made these charges in a slashing attack on the entire trend of thought control and hysteria in the courts.

His remarks came after the Lawyers Guild awarded him the annual award for having done most to continue the tradition of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Judge Metzger, a serene, white-haired figure, issued a timely and solemn warning to the American labor movement.

He recalled that the Assistant Secretary of Labor in the 1920's, L. F. Post, had proved in his book, The Deportation Delirium of 1920, that the "whole Red Crusade stood revealed as a stupendous cruel fake." Judge Metzger stated:

"Assistant Secretary of Labor Post exposed the antilabor purpose behind the raids. This basically is quite apparently the purpose today—to wipe out the gains of American workmen made under the era of Franklin D. Roosevelt."

Judge Metzger remarked acidly that "Federal judges whom the Constitution sought to protect for life to preserve their independence and mental courage seemed to be swayed by the influence of fear and hysteria to a greater degree than those who are appointed or elected."

CLASHES WITH COURTS

The Hawaiian judge who aroused the anger of the FBI and of Senator O'Mahoney for refusing to "play ball"—

So said the Daily Worker—

in the railroading of Communists under the Smith Act clashed with the courts upholding the Smith Act.

"I cannot agree with Justice Learned Hand," he said, "that the advocacy of ideas by 30,000 American Communists out of a population of 160 million Americans constitutes a clear and present danger to the people of the United States."

"My remarks made it clear," Judge Metzger wryly remarked, "why I was not reappointed to my Federal judgeship, particularly when judges who presided over Smith Act trial where there are convictions are promptly promoted and Smith Act prosecutors are made judges."

While Judge Metzger was defeated in the Territory by Mr. FARRINGTON, who received a majority of only 10,000 the Hawaiian Democratic Party, controlled by the Communist machine, won the election in the city of Honolulu and reelected John H. Wilson, who only last September had been advertised as a fellow speaker with Communist boss Jack Hall at an ILWU Labor Day rally in Honolulu.

Mr. President, only last Friday the mayor of Honolulu appeared at a rally in the interest of the defense of Jack Hall and the other Communists who now are on trial in the United States district court.

Mayor Wilson is highly esteemed; he is 87 years old; his health is not good, and the reports are that he spends a great deal of time in the hospital. I am certain that an investigation would show that the mayor is too old to take an active part, that he spends most of his time in the hospital, and that the man who exercises the political power is W. K. Bassett, his administrative assistant.

Mr. President, Bassett is a notorious Communist. He is an influential Communist. He was a member of a powerful Communist colony at Carmel, Calif., before he went to Hawaii. We have a Communist here who exercises the power of the mayor's office in the city which contains more than half the people of the islands. W. K. Bassett is the former editor of the Communist-line paper in California and in recent years an open contributor to the Communist weekly, the Honolulu Record.

According to the California Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Bassett was editor and publisher of the Pacific Weekly, published in Carmel, Calif., in 1935. The editorial staff of this left-wing publication was composed for the most part of members of the Communist Party. The same reference discloses that in 1948, Mr. Bassett's support of Henry Wallace for President received praise from the Honolulu Record, a Communist paper published in Honolulu, and also, according to this source, in 1949 he was a financial contributor to the Honolulu Record.

In November of last year, Harry Bridges, the Communist head of the Longshoremen's Union, arrived in Honolulu on one of his very frequent trips to the islands. I read to the Senate a story from page 2 of the Honolulu Star Bulletin, of Thursday, November 13, 1952. This news item states:

BASSETT GREETS HARRY BRIDGES

W. K. Bassett, the mayor's administrative assistant, greeted ILWU President Harry Bridges on his arrival at Honolulu International Airport Tuesday, but it wasn't an official welcome, Mr. Bassett says.

However, observers said he used his official title to get through the gate to the plane and was carrying leis.

They said Mr. Bassett presented the ILWU head with a lei, then escorted him to where Jack W. Hall, ILWU regional director and defendant in the Smith Act conspiracy trial, stood.

Mr. Bassett said yesterday he wasn't extending official greetings on Mayor Wilson's behalf.

"I just happened to be there," he said, adding that he has known Mr. Bridges for 30 years.

This incident took place shortly after the November election in which Bassett's position as administrative assistant to the mayor of Honolulu had been a major issue. In the Democratic primaries in October, Mayor Wilson's opponent, Frank F. Fosi, who was the Democratic national committeeman for Hawaii had pledged, when and if elected, that he would fire W. K. Bassett as his first task. He made this statement on the platform at a Democratic rally in Honolulu. Immediately, thereafter, the Democratic Party organization in Honolulu barred its own national committeeman from again speaking at Democratic meetings in the city sponsored by the local Democratic committee. This Communist-imposed gang would seem to indicate that Hawaii is already behind the Iron Curtain, at least so far as the Democratic Party there is concerned, and, Mr. President, the Democratic Party contains practically one-half of the voters of the islands.

Mr. President, I read, from the Los Angeles News, a story published in September 1952, as follows:

HAWAII DOCKWORKERS END 24-HOUR PRO-BRIDGES STRIKE

HONOLULU, September 9.—Hawaii's 23,000 members of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union began filtering to the docks and plantations today after a 24-hour walkout protesting the legal troubles of union president, Harry Bridges.

Stevedores moved to the piers this morning where at least seven ships were awaiting loading or unloading. Cane-cutting operations on the islands' 26 sugar plantations resumed, but canneries were forced to wait until midmorning for their daily supply of pineapple.

The tieup was touched off by the ninth circuit court's ruling last Saturday upholding the perjury conviction of Bridges.

The walkout began at Waialua Agricultural Co. Sunday night and spread to plantations and all island docks and the big naval base at Pearl Harbor.

Observers termed it the closest thing to a general strike ever staged in the islands.

Mr. President, such power is unheard of in the United States. This is a fearful thing. The ability to call a general strike in protest of a decision of the courts of the United States shows tremendous Communist power. For example, they had the power there to close down and interfere with the operation of the great naval base at Pearl Harbor. It speaks for itself. It shows that the

Communists control the economic life of the islands.

The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union is headed by Harry Bridges, now under conviction for perjury for denial of his membership in the Communist Party. The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, generally called the ILWU, controls the economic life of Hawaii through its 23,000 to 30,000 members, including not only the longshoremen, but also the sugar and pineapple workers in the islands. The union demonstrated its power during a 1949 strike and it halted all shipping for many months between Hawaii and the mainland, forcing the people of Hawaii to import foodstuff by plane.

Only recently, in November and December 1952, this Communist-led union again demonstrated its power by stopping all Matson Line shipping for a period of approximately 2 weeks as a result of the dismissal of a Communist longshoreman.

Let us see what Honolulu's other English-language newspaper, the Honolulu Daily Advertiser, has to say. In the Advertiser of Friday, October 31, 1952, there was printed a copy of the directives sent by the Communist-dominated ILWU to all of its local organizations with directives for pressure on the courts where Communist leaders are being tried under the Smith Act at the present time.

I ask unanimous consent that the clipping from the Honolulu Advertiser, including the Communist directives to Communist units in the islands, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, to anyone who has ever had any experience in the investigation of communism, this directive is certainly of Communist origin. This is a plain Communist attempt to intimidate the courts. It is an attempt to sabotage the administration of justice.

It shows the Communist power and that the Territory is not ready for statehood.

The following day, Saturday, November 1, 1952, the Honolulu Advertiser in an editorial said:

ILWU GIRDS FOR TRIAL OF SEVEN

A thoroughly organized program reviewing defense recommendations on behalf of seven men charged with violations of the Smith Act—

Those men are Communist leaders on the islands, Mr. President—

has been set up by ILWU, Local 142. The memorandum, specifically detailing the activities of the union membership during the trial of the seven, which begins next week, was printed on this page yesterday.

Almost like a military order is the format of the directive which provides for public rallies, the printing of posters, leaflets and pamphlets, a continuing publicity campaign by radio and press, and calls for a daily turnout by ILWU members to attend the trial itself.

Mass distribution of leaflets will be insured by special machinery. Every member is cautioned to report any rumors or incidents bearing on the trial to his union superiors. The high command even went so far as to recommend the various locals defer any complaints against management that might impair top priority of the trial of the seven. Somewhere along the line the union will arrange a dinner or picnic in honor of the defense attorneys.

About the only thing missing from the memorandum was a directive that all members vote for Judge Metzger for Delegate.

Mr. President, from my knowledge of the subject, it is plain to me that the Communist Party is stronger, more influential, and more powerful today in the Territory of Hawaii than was the Communist Party in the average satellite state of Central or Eastern Europe at the time they were taken over.

Even under the United States flag the economic life of Hawaii is at the mercy of the world Communist conspiracy. The party is so powerful that the politicians have to compromise, yield, and hedge because of it.

The administrative assistant to the mayor of the city of Honolulu, a city which contains more than half the population of the islands, is a recognized, noted, and powerful Communist. The mayor of this city owes his election to Communist power.

Judge Metzger, a member of the statehood commission, is an outspoken captive of communism. He attempts to make local political capital of the fact that as a judge under the Constitution and laws of the United States, whose sworn duty it was to uphold the Constitution of this country, he, for political purposes, and by his own admission, played politics with the Smith Act passed by the American Congress. And yet the Communists were powerful enough to place a man of this kind on the bench as judge and on the statehood commission of the islands who, because of his subservience to the Communist movement, was awarded a plaque by the American Lawyers' Guild, a recognized Communist front, at a public function in the city of New York. It is interesting to note that this plaque was awarded to Judge Metzger after he had reduced the bail of defendants under the Smith Act and turned loose 17 defendants voted in contempt of the United States Congress because of conduct before a congressional committee engaged in an investigation of communism in the islands.

I find, Mr. President, that a great many leaders of the political life of the Territory are representatives of the Communists. This constitutes a situation of great peril to our country, should Hawaii be admitted for statehood. It would be a sad day when there would sit in the Senate of the United States two Senators who could conceivably be subservient to a foreign power, and this is a strong possibility if Hawaii is admitted to statehood under present conditions.

Why, in the last election for Delegate to Congress there was a very narrow margin against the Communists but with the Communists carrying the city of Honolulu, the city which dominates the island. The newspaper of the Honorable JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON, Delegate from the Territory to the American Congress, stated:

Although a good many voters did not realize during the campaign, and apparently still do not realize the danger inherent in the situation, the fact remains that Hawaii has survived a political ordeal of major proportions.

But the editorial quotes from the same pro-Communist Judge Metzger, who stated, at a statehood commission meeting, that—

The argument that Hawaii should not have statehood because of Communists is not a valid argument.

But what he left unsaid—

Said the Farrington newspaper—

is that the fight isn't over, and that the Democratic Party is still under obligation to cleanse itself.

Mr. President, I submit that this admission by the leader of the fight, Delegate FARRINGTON, shows an unhealthy climate for admission to statehood. Hawaii must cleanse herself before she is entitled to consideration here. Delegate FARRINGTON runs a partisan Republican newspaper. I submit, Mr. President, the Communists are powerful both in the Democratic and Republican Parties in Hawaii, and they must both cleanse themselves. I make that statement on the basis of secret testimony which I have taken for the Subcommittee on Internal Security.

Yes, Mr. President, there are those who say that Hawaii should be admitted as a State into the Union, but I tell those Senators that the red lights are flickering; the warning signs are up. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] stated 2 years ago that communism dominated the islands. On the 8th day of April 1953, the United States Government was prosecuting seven Communist defendants charging overt acts to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence and the leading defendant was Jack Hall, head of the ILWU. On the 8th day of April 1953, Wednesday of last week, Mayor John Wilson, of the city of Honolulu, appeared voluntarily as a defense witness for Jack Hall, Communist leader of the islands, certifying to Hall's great integrity, truthfulness, good reputation, and loyalty to his country. Mr. President, here was the mayor of the great city of Honolulu, containing over half the people of the islands, appearing voluntarily before a jury in Honolulu certifying to the loyalty of one of the most outstanding and notorious Communists in the world conspiracy.

Not only has Mayor Wilson testified for the defense in the Smith Act trial, but, according to the Honolulu Spot Light, in its issue of February 11, 1953, he has made available the use of public school buildings in Honolulu for defense rallies of the Communist Party and he has gone so far, Mr. President, as to use the Royal Hawaiian Band to rally the public to the cause of the Communist conspiracy in the Smith Act trial. That is one of the great bands of the world, supported by public funds. The Communist movement is strong enough to force the use of that band at political

rallies to intimidate the courts to release Communists.

The mayor's administrative assistant, Mr. Bassett, has taken to the stump in connection with the defense of these Communist defendants

Mr. President, this is not a fantasy. In that same trial Charles N. Hite, ex-deputy attorney general of Hawaii, appeared as a character witness for Hall. So did Senator John B. Fernandes, Senator John Gomez Duarte, and Anthony Babtiste, who is chairman of the board of supervisors of the island of Kauai. Mr. Babtiste was likewise a member of the public utilities commission of the islands.

Mr. President, here are men, sworn to uphold the law, voluntarily appearing as witnesses for an outstanding member of the Communist conspiracy. No one challenges the right of these officials to appear, but it shows just how deeply the Communist conspiracy reaches into the governmental heart of the Hawaiian Islands. These people testified for Jack Hall because they are the captives of the Communist Party.

Mr. President, if the mayor of the great city of Honolulu, which contains more than one-half the people of the Hawaiian Islands, can be influenced and dominated by the Communist Party, would not such people also, in the event of statehood, come to dominate a State government, as well as the Senators and the Representatives sent to the United States Congress from the islands? Would they not most certainly influence its policies?

In a book called Hawaii, the 49th State, by Blake Clark, a handbook for the statehood lobby for the islands, Jack Hall is quoted. Incidentally this is a very fine lobby. I was told that I could vote for statehood, because the two Senators who would be sent to Washington from Hawaii would oppose civil rights. Other groups were told other things. But a book of directions has been published for the lobbyists. Here is a quotation from Jack Hall:

> Sixteen out of twenty-one candidates endorsed by labor's Political Action Committee won seats in the Territorial house of representatives.

This is the Communist leader of the Hawaiian Islands speaking, a man who has been indicted by our Government and is on trial today.

> Six out of seven went to the Senate.

Then Jack Hall, Hawaii's Communist boss, made the following statement, which I shall quote from page 18 of the book, Hawaii, the 49th State:

> If Hawaii becomes a State, we can send some good men to Washington from here—not only to represent the majority in the islands but also to strengthen liberal forces in the National Congress.

When Communist leaders talk about good men, they mean traitors, party members, or captives of the Communist Party. In the Communist vocabulary the word liberal means a fellow traveler, a concealed Red, or one who obediently follows the party line. That statement and definition as applied to Hawaii were given to me by an employee of the United States Government who organized the Communist Party in Hawaii.

Further, Jack Hall states on the issue of statehood in the same book, pages 17 and 18:

> We're for statehood — unqualifiedly — at once.

Mr. President, when Jack Hall says he wants statehood immediately, and at once, and that he wants to "send some good men to Washington," he reduces this argument to simple terms, and every man can take his choice. Do we want to admit Hawaii as a State so that we can then have some of Jack Hall's good men in the Halls of our National Congress? Hall is not engaging in day dreams; there is a real and imminent danger that if Hawaii becomes a State at this time Communists or captives of the Communist Party will be sent to represent Hawaii in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. President, a constitution framed by the Territorial legislature, which Hall boasts that he controls—and from the list of people elected, he does control the legislature—has already adopted a constitution which will go into effect if statehood is granted.

Mr. President, let us look for the fine Machiavellian hand of Jack Hall and the Communist conspirators. This constitution was tailormade to expedite their control of the islands. This constitution provides that a simple plurality is all that is required to elect the Governor of Hawaii. This constitution, designed to be a tool of communism, provides that the person receiving the largest number of votes should be governor.

With the genius which Harry Bridges has shown for organizing the workers of Hawaii and the superb organizing ability of world communism, one can readily visualize what would happen with several candidates running for governor. Such a situation would be made to order for the manipulation of bloc voters under the unscrupulous, ruthless leadership of the Communist, Harry Bridges. He would hold the balance of power. He would dominate the islands under this constitution. The Communists of Hawaii cannot show the full strength of their position until this constitution goes into effect, following the granting of statehood. They not only would be foolish to show their full power before statehood is granted, but they also need statehood with the opportunities provided them in the Hawaiian constitution to seize ultimate power in the islands.

Given a Communist governor, or even a governor who is a Communist captive, and the way would be cleared for Harry Bridges by manipulation, by intimidation, and by corruption to send Communist-controlled Representatives and two Communist-controlled Senators to the Congress of the United States. To me it is inconceivable that the Senate of the United States will fall into such a trap as this. The American people will not gain from Hawaiian statehood. The Territory will gain nothing. World communism will be the sole beneficiary, and what a great victory that will be.

EXHIBIT 1

(The directives in full, as published in the Honolulu Advertiser, read as follows:)

ILWU ORGANIZES STRATEGY FOR SMITH ACT TRIAL

An ILWU memorandum, dated September 9, 1952, has been sent from Honolulu headquarters of the Hawaii ILWU union defense committee to units throughout the islands outlining the union's program during the forthcoming Smith Act trial. One of the seven defendants is Jack W. Hall, ILWU regional director. The memo is as follows:

"REVIEW DEFENSE PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS, HAWAII ILWU UNION DEFENSE COMMITTEE, ILWU LOCAL 142, LONGSHORE, SUGAR, PINE, MISCELLANEOUS; KAUAI, OAHU, MOLOKAI, LANAI, MAUI, HAWAII

"1. Publicity

"(a) Information bulletin will continue to be issued during the trial; special issues will be put out from time to time.

"(b) A weekly written summary of the trial proceedings will be mailed to island leadership and to other ILWU locals and unions on the mainland.

"(c) Posters will be printed.

"(d) Special leaflets for mass distribution will be issued from time to time during the trial.

"(e) Pamphlets will also be published during trial.

"2. Public Relations

"(a) Set up speakers' bureau in each division. Speakers, representing the various language groups, would be 'on call' to speak at union, church, school, or community meetings. List of names should be compiled. Speakers' guides will be worked out.

"(b) Daily news releases will be issued to the press—local and mainland.

"(c) Public rallies ought to be scheduled. Mainland lawyers, union officials, defendants, and others will be available as speakers. Picnic-type rally can be worked out if desirable.

"(d) Special radio programs will be developed—over the Oloha network and on an island-wide basis. These programs would involve local leaders and rank and filers.

"3. Others

"(a) Everyone should be urged to give all matters relating to the trial top priority. Pending grievances, for instance, should be forestalled if any request for follow-through on anything having to do with the trial comes up. A slight delay may have serious effects.

"(b) Plans ought to be made now to guarantee good turnouts at the trial, especially rank and filers on Oahu. Each unit or gang (in longshore) will have a day assigned to them. For example: March 15 will be Waipahu day in court. Efforts should be made to get as many members from Waipahu (those on night shifts, etc.) to attend that day's trial proceedings. Other islands can participate in this type of program by the divisions or units financing expenses of 1 or 2 persons to attend the sessions and then reporting back to the membership.

"(c) Auxiliaries should be reorganized (or organized, whichever the case may be) on each island.

"(d) At any appropriate time we should plan on sponsoring a dinner or picnic honoring the defense attorneys.

"(e) There should be a constant exchange of information during the trial between the central office, divisions, and units. Telephones should be used only if it's necessary. It would be more advisable to communicate via letters for obvious reasons.

"(f) We should get everyone keenly interested in the trial proceedings—via the radio, bulletins, Reporter, and other means—so that by the time the case goes to the jury, everyone will be standing by the phone or

radio until the verdict is in. In other words, work the whole program out similar to that of any strike we have had in the past.

"(g) Someone should be assigned the responsibility of making sure that notices, posters, etc., on the bulletin boards are kept up to date. Old material should always be replaced with new ones to keep the membership fully informed. Special bulletin signs for trial reports will be printed.

"(h) Each unit should organize some sort of machinery (via the stewards system, etc.) to prepare for mass distribution of leaflets to both union members and the general public. This machinery should be carefully set up so that there will be someone responsible at each level—division, unit, gang, department, district, or section. The idea is to get materials down to the ranks with the least delay, instead of having it lie around in the division office accumulating dust. A good idea would be to set up 'leaflet stands' similar to those used for newspapers, in local stores, shops, mills, and various gathering places.

"(i) Everyone should be reminded to report any rumor or incidents that have any connection with the case immediately to the devision office or to any FTO's.

"(j) All defense committees should hold regular meetings hereafter."

PROGRAM FOR DAILY SESSIONS AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS—ATTITUDE OF SENATOR MORSE

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield, provided I do not lose my rights to the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I ask that the rights of the Senator from Minnesota be in no way jeopardized while I make a unanimous consent request that I be allowed 2 or 3 minutes in which to make a statement regarding my position concerning a series of requests which I understand it is desired to make with respect to the holding of committee hearings while the Senate is in session.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. With that understanding, I simply wish to say that I desire to have the Senate understand that if anything which has the appearance of a filibuster in connection with the pending joint resolution should be developed, I shall raise no objection to committee meetings being held when the Senate is in session.

Second, I shall not raise any objections if the leadership of the Senate sees fit to make some modification in the position it has taken that the Senate will be held in continuous session each day, even to the extent that the Senate will be held in session at night until a vote is taken on the pending joint resolution. Mr. President, I think such a program at this time is unreasonable. I think the present debate is so important that at least 1 day, or perhaps 2 days, during the week should be set aside for the preparation of speeches. During those days committee hearings could be held.

But when the position is taken that we are going to use the rules in order to force an early vote on the pending measure, irrespective of the inconvenience it may cause other Senators, then I think we should apply the rules on committee hearings while the Senate is in session. So far as the Independent Party is concerned, we are going to object to committee meetings being held while the Senate is in session. But at any time the majority party desires to take the position that on, say, Tuesday or Thursday we will not have a session of the Senate, so that we will have time in which to prepare our material, then I shall be more cooperative with regard to waiving the rule requiring that committees shall not meet while the Senate is in session. There is much committee work to be done this early in the session, and I think it is a mistake to hold sessions of the Senate each day and force committees to meet while the Senate is in session.

Mr. President, the only negotiating I ever have an opportunity to do is here on the floor of the Senate. But if the time ever comes when the majority party—and the minority party, too, for that matter—wish to respect the rights of the minority and recognize that we have some rights, perhaps we can have some gentlemen's understandings. But when it is announced to us, "This is the way it is going to be," we can apply the rules both ways.

During a debate so important as this Senators ought to be present in the Chamber. I wish I had kept a record of the numbers of citizens who, in the past few days, after visiting the galleries, have said to me, "What is the explanation? With a matter so important as this to 160,000,000 people being debated, only half a dozen Senators are on the floor listening to the debate."

If we think we are making a good impression on the American people by the manner in which we operate the schedule of the Senate, we are mistaken. I think the time has come to adopt an orderly program for holding Senate sessions. Whenever the majority party is ready to negotiate with the minority party on that subject, I shall be very glad to negotiate.

INCREASE IN INTEREST RATES ON LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT BORROWING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to read a statement signed by a number of Senators, including myself. It is signed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and myself.

This statement relates to a recent announcement by the Secretary of the Treasury concerning the offering of $1 billion worth of Government 30-year bonds, to draw 3¼ percent interest.

In our judgment, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey should withdraw the administration's offering of $1 billion of 30-year Government bonds to draw 3¼ percent interest until, first, he has thoroughly reviewed the enormous prospective cost of this new high-interest financing to the Government and the taxpayers; second, he has thoroughly surveyed the probable consequences of this administration action on the national economy; and third, until the administration has advised and consulted with the policymaking branch of the Government—the Congress—and there has been public disclosure of facts and open debate of such a drastic change in fiscal policy.

I may say that this offering of $1 billion of 30-year Government bonds at 3¼ percent interest is not an ordinary administrative action. It has extraordinary qualities to it; and, needless to say, it does a great deal to the financial market.

The new, high-interest, dear-money policy has been adopted without the advice of a Council of Economic Advisers, without any meetings of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and without consultation with the House or Senate Banking and Currency Committee. There is no assurance that overall, national economic factors have been adequately considered, although the new money policy confronts the American people with a triple threat of deflation, higher taxes, higher interest on a tightened private credit supply.

The potential costs of this action to the Government and the American people can make puny and insignificant all the economies in the Federal budget—wise or unwise—so far proposed by the Eisenhower administration.

The principal beneficiaries of this unnecessary and gratuitous 30 percent increase in long-term Government interest offering will be banks and insurance companies, who have no need for such a windfall of additional profits.

I fully recognize that many of the commercial banks are more interested in short-term loans and bonds. I am referring primarily to investment banks which primarily finance railroads and utilities. I shall comment on that subject later.

THE INFLATION DANGER

Treasury Secretary Humphrey has justified his interest raising decision on the following grounds—Washington Post, April 9, 1953:

> In the Treasury's view, both production and employment now are at the top and the situation is a little inflationary. Hence here is no sense in putting a bubble on top of the boom by increasing inflation-creating bank credit through short-term financing.

The Secretary's judgment that the current situation is a little inflationary should be assessed on the basis, among others, of these facts:

Farm prices have been falling substantially since July and are under continuing downward pressure. This is fundamental.

All wholesale prices have been falling steadily since August.

Consumer prices peaked out in August.

The Secretary's apprehension about the danger of increasing inflation-creating bank credit through short-term

financing is not well founded. When money supply is related to the current volume of business, as reflected in the gross national product, we find that the ratio is now about the same as the ratio which prevailed during the pre-World War II period.

In other words, when the volume of money is related to the volume of production, we find that the money-production ratio now is about the same as it was in the months before World War II.

Further, the role of increased bank reserves in stimulating inflation has been exaggerated. Experience of the 1930's suggests the naivete of taking the academic view on the relation between available reserves and actual borrowing. The mere availability of reserves or loanable funds in the banks does not in itself put disposable funds in the market.

We earnestly direct the attention of the administration to the caution advocated by Dr. Clark Warburton, economist for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, who said in a recent speech before the chamber of commerce's economic policy committee:

Maintenance of a constant quantity of money (now) is a dubious policy. It would exert a downward pressure on the price level of about 4 or 5 percent a year which, judging from the experience of the past, is sufficient to result in an occasional mild business depression.

COST TO GOVERNMENT

Discussing the significance of this interest-raising move, the New York Times states—April 9, 1953:

The new issue reflects a radical departure from the Treasury policy through successive Democratic administrations, and marks a rise in the Government's long-term borrowing cost to the highest level since 1933.

The ultimate rise in the Government's long-term borrowing cost incurred by this single administration action can be enormous.

On the $1 billion issue now proposed, interest has been increased over the last comparable long-term Government borrowing, from 2.5 percent to 3¼ percent. On this issue alone, the extra cost to taxpayers will be $7,500,000 per year. Over the 30-year term, it will be $225 million, close to a quarter of a billion dollars.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that what President Eisenhower had done by his proposal for this increased interest rate is to place a dollar sign on the patriotism of American investors?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator that what the Secretary of the Treasury has done under the administration's money program is greatly to increase the cost of financing, thereby greatly increasing the cost of industrial expansion, home expansion, and the general cost of living. It places an extra burden on the economy. I am unable properly to interpret what the Senator is driving at. If he will be more explicit I shall be glad to answer the question.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit me to ask a series of questions, I shall be more explicit.

Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that Eisenhower approves of increasing our national debt by way of an increased interest rate and placing the burden on the shoulders of future generations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is always to be assumed that when an agent of the executive branch of the Government takes action, such action represents the policy of the administration, and therefore has the approval of the President.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that, as a result of the course of action Eisenhower is following in this matter, of increasing the debt which American boys and girls years from now will have to pay, we are escaping from the fulfillment of an economic sacrifice which really is a challenge to our generation, and one which we ought to meet?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator is correct. I believe that it is our responsibility, at least within the limits of our ability, to meet the burdens of today, rather than have them spread out to future generations.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota know of any program on the part of the Eisenhower administration taking the form of an effort to inform the American people of the seriousness of this situation, and how important it is that they live up to their patriotic responsibility of investing in Government bonds at low interest rates, while at the same time their boys are being called upon to die in Korea in defense of our freedom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I sincerely believe that if the Government of the United States desired to finance the burdens of the present defense program, or whatever the requirements of Government financing might be, all they would have to do would be to lay the facts before the American people, and they would respond with alacrity.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota question that, as a result of the Eisenhower program of helping the bankers and the insurance companies make more money out of Government bonds, the little people of America are the ones who will pay the bill, and not the wealthy?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what I shall undertake to show in a moment. I further wish to say that while I realize that there is an apparent justification, namely, that of curbing inflation, for the announced policy of the Treasury Department, I believe that premise is highly debatable, and I believe the policy now being pursued will not stand the test of careful scrutiny.

But as I shall point out in a moment, inasmuch as the Government is the largest borrower in the money market, it sets the standard. Because of its tremendous weight and importance, it is ridiculous to talk about the Government being, so to speak, an equal competitor in the money market. Therefore, the interest and fiscal policy of the Government has a great deal to do with the general fiscal policy of the whole American economy.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Minnesota will permit me to do so, I should like to say that I think the argument about the increased interest rate being anti-inflationary is one of the most insincere and phony arguments I have heard in connection with the whole issue. All one has to do to answer that argument, as I did over a nationwide broadcast the other night, is to show that if the American people were led to an understanding of the importance of putting their money aside into Government bonds, they would put it aside in large quantities. The putting aside of their money and investing it in Government bonds is the principal anti-inflationary feature.

I do not deny that to some extent the increased interest rate will have some anti-inflationary effect, but in my opinion it is insignificant. It will not have nearly the effect that the recognition on the part of the people of their patriotic duty to set aside and take out of the stream of inflationary spending a certain amount of national wealth in terms of loose cash would have. That is our patriotic duty.

I am proud to join with the Senator in this matter, and he knows that some weeks ago on the floor of the Senate when Eisenhower first made the suggestion in his public statement, I walked over and made my sentiments known to the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I indicated that I was against placing the dollar sign on the paper of the bankers and insurance companies, leaving the little people of the country to pay the bill in 30 or 40 or 50 years. I said then, as I state now, that the proposal was shocking, and a clear indication of the kind of reactionary program we can expect from the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. He is a cosponsor in the statement I am making, and of the philosophy which the statement sets forth.

I would only add that when we speak of these matters of fiscal policy, it is not necessary to say there is a good deal of difference in point of view. However, it is my honest opinion that the Treasury Department, at least in this matter, which is as basic and fundamental as the revising of the whole fiscal policy of the Nation, should have brought it to the attention of the advisory groups within the Congress, the Banking and Currency Committees of the House and Senate, or at least the Council of Economic Advisers—which is practically nonexistent, I may suggest—or the Committee on the Economic Report. It represents a fundamental change in fiscal policy on the part of the biggest borrower in the world, which is the Government of the United States, which basically affects the whole market. At the conclusion of my remarks I shall submit news stories which I have gathered which document the assertion I have just made. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

On the new issue alone, the extra cost to the taxpayers will be $7,500,000 a year. Over the 30-year term, it will be $225 million, or a quarter of a billion dollars.

But the administration does not intend to stop there. It is proposed to shift a large part of our short-term, low-interest debt into long-term intermediate and

long-term issues. The effect of raising the average annual rate three-fourths of 1 percent, and establishing the prewar ratio of bonds to short-term debts (45 percent of all marketable debt was in long-term issues in 1939) will be to increase the total value of bonds maturing in 5 years or more from $40 billions to $63 billions. This latter amount, refinanced at the higher rate, will increase the annual interest cost of government by $470 millions annually—close to a half billion dollars each year.

EFFECTS ON PRIVATE BUSINESS

In its article on the administration move, the New York Times of April 9, 1953, said:

> The real significance of the Treasury move * * * will be found in the generally deflationary effect it is expected to produce throughout the entire economy. The new 3¼ percent rate virtually guarantees an increase in the cost of borrowing with an automatic increase in the cost of mortgage financing and so-called call money on short-term corporate financing.

This is a nice way of saying that this policy means a drastic increase in the overhead cost of business, which in turn will be translated to the consuming public in terms of increased prices. That is breaking it down into layman's language, and that is exactly what is going to happen.

With United States long-terms up, the rate on business and other private borrowing is sure to follow, as the Times predicts.

Private debt totals approximately $330 billions. An adjustment upward of just one-half of 1 percent on this debt would cost borrowers $1.5 billion annually. Some of the specific effects out of many which may be anticipated include:

FARMERS

Coupled with the fall in farm prices, increasing farm debt, and the urgent need for further borrowing to modernize and establish sound soil conservation practices, the increase of interest rates and tightening of credit availability is especially menacing. USDA officials are today advising small farmers that in order to survive they must borrow money to enlarge their holdings and get efficient equipment.

A recent bulletin of the United States Department of Agriculture, tells small farmers to modernize, to increase their holdings. Yet the administration's proposed action will be a roadblock to such modernization and to establishment of sound conservation practices on agricultural land, further worsening the situation of the farmer who still remembers, all too clearly, how a 50 percent increase in Federal Reserve rediscount rates in 1920 started him on the road to ruin.

UTILITIES

Now let me speak a word about utilities.

The biggest demand for debt financing is in the power, natural gas, and railroad fields. The cost of interest is a large element of total expense in these industries. The rates in the field of public utilities are set on the basis of a fair return on invested capital after deducting the cost of interest. It is reasonably to be expected that a rise in utility rate-increase applications will follow a rise in long-term interest rates.

In other words, if the cost of overhead of the utility which wants to expand or increase or modernize its facilities is increased, we can expect that the additional expense will be translated into increased consumer costs or consumer prices, because most utilities in this country are regulated businesses, and are regulated on the basis of a fair return on invested capital after deducting cost of interest.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, if the Republican Party follows the advice of its great spokesman, Herbert Hoover, who led the country into the severe depression of the thirties—and I refer to the advice he gave the other night in Ohio, namely, that at this time all the Federal Government's electric powerplants should be sold into private hands—the result will simply be to increase that much more the cost of utility rates to consumers in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There can be no doubt of that.

Mr. MORSE. Later in the week I propose to answer Mr. Hoover's speech of the other night, which I believe is another clear indication of where the Republican Party is going to lead the little people of the United States if the Republican Party's economic program of exploiting the little people is allowed to go unchecked.

I never thought I would live to hear a great leader of one of our political parties advocate, as Mr. Hoover did the other evening, that the great power projects which were built with the money of the taxpayers, and which belong to all the people of the United States, be turned over to the so-called private utility industry, when what he means is the private monopolists, who thus would be allowed to proceed to collect their tribute from the consumers of the United States. That speech must be answered, Mr. President; and I shall answer it before the week is over.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Oregon in reference to the Hoover proposal are certainly germane to the subject of the interest rates on long-term Government bonds, because when, on the one hand, we begin to discuss the disposal of great Government-owned assets, such as the hydroelectric utilities, and when, on the other hand, we begin to discuss interest rates, we must realize that the inevitable result of placing those great utilities into private hands will be to increase the rate burdens on the consumers of the product of those electric utilities, for the cost of interest payments is a large element of the total expenses of such industries.

In a moment I shall point out what will happen to the general price structure and the recent commodity-price increases in that structure, as a result of the present temporary 15-percent increase in railroad-freight rates. The inevitability of the result is evident, because the proposed increase in interest rates is basically tied in with the rulings of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the case of the railroad-freight rates.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator from Minnesota agree that if higher interest rates are charged for financing the bonds and securities of existing private utilities, the increased charges must necessarily be passed on to the consumers?

Before the Senator answers that question, let me make an additional inquiry. Does not it also follow that higher interest rates on the securities of private utilities will increase the demand on the part of the utility monopolists to get more and more of the Government-owned projects into private-utility hands, so that the people will not be able to enjoy the benefits of the public ownership of power facilities? Then, of course, the public utilities would be shown up as the exploiters they really are when they are given a monopoly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I was pointing out that the largest demand for debt financing is in the power, natural gas, and railroad fields. I wish to emphasize this point again, because the cost of interest is a large element in the total expenses of these industries; and, as I have said, in the field of public utilities the rates are fixed on the basis of a fair return on invested capital, after deducting the cost of interest. So it is reasonably to be expected that a rise in utility-rate increase applications will follow a rise in long-term interest rates.

Particularly pertinent to the proposed interest boost is the pending application of the railroads before the Interstate Commerce Commission to make permanent the present temporary 15 percent freight-rate increase. To the extent that this increase is made permanent, it will freeze into the general price structure the recent commodity-price increases that reflected the temporary 15 percent freight-rate increase.

On balance, the effect in the utilities field of the interest rate rise will be to firm up if not to increase the general price level.

This is a vicious circle, Mr. President, and a large part of the securities incident to the refinancing that is occurring in American railroads today and a large part of the billion-dollar bond offering will be purchased by investment banks that are financing in the field of these utilities. So in that field the Government is competing when it pays high interest rates on its bonds, for that, in turn, compels the private utilities to pay high interest rates on their securities, and that, in turn gives the private utilities an opportunity to go before the regulatory bodies and say to them that their overhead costs have increased, and that, in turn, gives the private utilities an opportunity to charge increased rates to the consumers—which is what is meant by inflation rather than deflation.

HOUSING

At this time, Mr. President, I should like to speak for a moment of housing.

A general rise in interest rates on home mortgages, which is bound to follow the long-term rise in the interest rates on United States bonds, will diminish the amount of new residential construction by raising monthly payments beyond the means of many current prospects for home buying. In addition, the effect will be to increase the general level of residential rents.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that when the Government steps into the money market at this high rate, the result is bound to be an increase in the costs of financing housing, and the costs of financing housing represent a great deal of the charges upon our young people or upon families desiring to buy ordinary residences. The tremendous amount of accumulated interest on unpaid principal is one of the real charges and one of the real burdens upon the purchasers of modern homes. Once a high interest rate on long-term bonds is established, it is bound to be reflected in a rise in the interest rates paid by consumers or in the interest rates on mortgages on housing.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. President, at this time I should like to discuss for a moment small business and the loans to small business. Small business, like farmers, will feel the stringency of funds and their increasing costliness at a time when their survival may be under severe test.

There has already been talk of doing away with one of the Government agencies which provides loans to small business; I refer to the Reconstruction Fiance Corporation. We know that small business will have an ever-increasing problem in attempting to compete in the field of procurement for defense purposes, once defense expenditures begin to be curtailed or reduced. At this time we find small-business enterprises being compelled—and I wish to make it clear that there is no voluntary action in that connection for once the Government establishes high interest rates, the rates on business loans rise; and thus there is an increase in the interest rates which the small-business men have to pay—to pay an increased price for the money that small business needs to borrow if it is to survive.

GENERAL

Mr. President, the Treasury states that the rise in interest rates is designed to channel new savings into Government. The facts are that in the calendar year 1952, corporate financial requirements were higher than they will be in 1953, and gross private savings were $1.5 billion greater than private investment requirements. State and local government deficits offset the $1.5 billions of excess private savings, while the Federal budget on an accrual basis was in balance.

THE BENEFICIARIES—BANKS AND INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. President, who are the beneficiaries of this policy? The beneficiaries of the administration's interest-rise action will include the large life-insurance companies who since 1947 have sought higher rates on long-term investments.

Mr. President, I have before me a column by Mr. J. A. Livingston, published in the Washington Sunday Star of April 12, in which he makes note of those who will be the primary purchasers of the Government's bonds. In his column he lists the insurance companies, investment banks, and certain pension and trust funds which like higher rate, long-term bonds.

According to the Wall Street Journal of April 9:

> The issue is designed to attract nonbank investors especially life-insurance companies.

When the Wall Street Journal refers, in that quotation, to the issue, it refers to the 30-year-bond issue.

Another beneficiary will be the group of investment bankers who finance the railroads.

These groups doubtless remember the hard-money policy that resulted in the dumping of 4¼-percent Liberty bonds until they reached about 82 in 1920. Many persons have forgotten those days, but it is significant that in the 1920's the high-rate Liberty bonds went down to a selling price of about 82, from their par value. Millions of small investors were wiped out, while big banks and financiers picked up the Liberty bonds at bargain-basement prices. Mr. President, I recall the difficulties of those who were involved in those financial transactions. The beginning of the recession in 1922 set in when the Liberty bonds were being bought up at their depreciated market value. Perhaps that experience is not so vivid in the minds of the present administrators, who have not consulted with economic or Banking and Currency Committees of the Congress, or had the advice of a council of economic advisers.

These higher interest rates amount to price supports—and, Mr. President, I emphasize that word—for bankers and insurance companies, even though there is evidence that they have no need for the supports the administration so obligingly offers them in this 3¼-percent Government bond issue.

Mr. President, I would make note of the fact that some of the journals that are praising the increase in the Government bond interest rate, which amounts to price support for the money market, are the same journals that are condemning any price supports in the farm-commodity market, and they are the same journals that are speaking about a flexible-price system or a free-market system in the case of farm commodities. Yet it is nothing but outright fiction to state that when the Government steps into the money market, that market is free. The Government is such a tremendous factor in the money market that whatever it sets as a policy is pretty much the determining factor. The Wall Street Journal April 9, 1953, says:

> INVESTED LIFE INSURANCE FUNDS IN 1952 EARNED BEST INTEREST RATE SINCE 1943
>
> The net rate of interest earned on invested funds of all United States life-insurance companies was 3.28 percent before taxes in 1952.

So apparently the insurance companies did not need any price supports in the interest field, because they had a very good rate of return—the best they have had in the business pickup since 1943.

Holdings of Government securities by United States life-insurance companies declined from $25 billions in 1946 to a little over $10 billions at the end of February 1953, as a part of a coercive dumping policy designed to force the long-term interest rate up. This trend can be expected to be reversed if the administration's obliging but unnecessary acquiescence to the pressure stands.

There appears little if any basis in fact for the reasons given as necessitating the boost in long-term interest rates.

Mr. President, let me merely point out some of the effects. It will cost the Government enormous sums at a time when the people are being asked to forego essential services to permit relatively minor economies.

It will cost the taxpayers equally large additional sums on private borrowings. That is the most important factor in this interest-rate maneuvering.

It will be a drastically deflationary step by administrative action at a time when there are increasing evidences that deflationary and not inflationary forces are the current economic problem. As a matter of fact, I cannot make this policy of controlling inflation jibe with the scuttling of so-called price control. During one week we are told we can do away with all price controls. We are even told that we do not need any standby controls. Then, when it comes to the matter of interest rates, the administration says there must be higher rates of interest in order to control what is identified as a little inflation, or an inflationary trend. Mr. President, if there was an inflationary trend in April, when the interest rates went up to 3½ percent, it is to be presumed that there must have been some inflationary impact or trend at the time when they were considering the price-control program, which they said was not needed at the time, simply because there was a deflationary trend in the economy.

Preceding the recession of the twenties, the Federal Reserve bank in 1920 raised its rediscount from 4 and 4½ percent to 6 and 7 percent.

Preceding the great depression, in 1928–29, Federal Reserve bank raised rediscount rates from 3½ to 6 percent.

The recession which started in 1937 was preceded by a 33-percent boost in Reserve bank reserve requirements.

All these orders were ill-timed. The only reason I mention them is that, each time, the Government, through its fiscal policy, has been going to do something to stabilize the economy, so to speak. Instead of stabilizing it, it has unstabilized it and driven the economy into an unnecessary recession, and, at times, paved the way for a depression. Yes, all these orders were ill-timed, hard-money policies of the same basic nature as the present interest-boosting policy of the Treasury.

The interest rise will benefit few but big insurance companies and banking institutions.

The American people are aware that similar hard-money policies were adopted preceding the serious recession of the twenties, the depression after 1929, and the recession after 1937. They are en-

titled to assurance, which can be given only by thorough study and open debate, that this momentous economic policymaking decision, which smacks of the Mellon-Hoover area, has not been made by a few self-interested men in privacy.

Any high-interest, long-term bond offering should be withdrawn and withheld at least until there can be the fullest study and full debate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in my remarks a news story from the Washington Sunday Star of April 12, 1953, entitled "Bond Prices Decline Due to Stocks' Drop and Treasury Issue," the first paragraph of which reads:

The bond market declined this week under pressure from sliding stock prices and the Government's announced 3¼-percent 30-year-bond period.

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

BOND PRICES DECLINE DUE TO STOCK'S DROP AND TREASURY ISSUE

(By Arthur Merims)

NEW YORK, April 11.—The bond market declined this week under pressure from sliding stock prices and the Government's announced 3¼ percent 30-year bond.

On Monday the stock market suffered its worst drop in nearly 3 years. This unsettled the bond market, especially convertible and income issues, and the whole corporate list declined with volume at $5,530,000 par value—greatest this year.

Volume slackened off a little each day until Friday sales barely topped the $3 million level. Nevertheless, bonds continued to drift downward, hurried at midweek by news of the Treasury's latest financing venture.

OFFERING ANNOUNCED

Shortly after the market closed Wednesday the Government said it would raise about $1 billion cash by offering a fully marketable 30-year, 3¼ percent issue on Monday.

The Treasury said it would raise an additional $1 billion by adding to its weekly supply of 3-month bills. Holders of $1.1 billion of series F and G savings bonds, which mature May 1 through December 31, were also to be offered the new 3¼s in exchange.

Officials said the new long-term bond, plus the additional weekly bills, would take care of the cash needs of the Treasury for the rest of the fiscal year, which ends June 30.

Though financial circles had predicted the new Government bond, even its exact terms, for many weeks, the announcement caused many high-grade corporate bonds to lose ground.

EXAMPLES LISTED

For example, these "gilt-edged" obligations fell to new 1953 lows: General Foods 3⅜s at 101½, American Tobacco 3¼s at 97½, Borden 2⅞s at 93, Koppers 3s at 97½, Pacific Gas & Electric 3s of 1971 at 95½, Consolidated Edison 3s of 1972 at 95, and Northern Pacific "D" 5s at 103.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in my remarks another news item from the Washington Sunday Star, of April 12, 1953, entitled "Business Volume Dips Slightly in Week for Industry, Retailers."

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

BUSINESS VOLUME DIPS SLIGHTLY IN WEEK FOR INDUSTRY, RETAILERS

(By T. E. Applegate)

NEW YORK, April 11.—Business volume slipped a bit this week in many industries and retail stores.

But allover activity stayed close to a record pace. Both corporate and Government officials made clear they expected it to continue at a high level.

Consumer income—one of the props of good business—is due for a minor reduction.

More than 2 million workers on railroads, in automobile and aviation, and some other industries, were put on notice for pay cuts of 1 to 3 cents an hour this week. It's the result of a drop in the Government's revised "old style" Consumer Price Index, to which wage clauses in their contracts were tied.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in my remarks a news story from the New York Times, Sunday, April 12, 1953, entitled "Three Banks Close in Chicago Area."

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

THREE BANKS CLOSED IN CHICAGO AREA—STATE AUDITOR ACTS TO PERMIT STUDY AND "READJUSTMENT"—LOAN BURDENS AT ISSUE

CHICAGO, April 11.—State Auditor Orville E. Hodge closed three Chicago area banks today for "examination and readjustment."

The banks are the Devon-North Town State Bank, Chicago, with deposits of more than $20 million; the West Irving State Bank of Chicago, with deposits exceeding $7 million; and the suburban First State Bank of Elmwood Park, with more than $16 million on deposit.

The bank closings were the first ordered in the Chicago area in more than 20 years. Savings and checking accounts and all other deposits in the three banks are protected by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and insured up to $10,000 for each account.

Henry J. Beutel is president and chairman of all three banks and there are other common officers of two or more of the banks. This was not a violation of the law, it was stated.

THE OFFICIAL STATEMENT

The State auditor issued this statement at his Chicago office: "Because it appears there may be violations of the Illinois State Banking Act and developing conditions tending to jeopardize the public interest, coupled with interlocking management, I found it prudent as of 9 a. m. today to take possession of the three banks * * * for examination and readjustment."

Mr. Hodge's office said that it was not known how long the banks would be closed. A bank examiner with a staff of six assistants was at work in each bank.

All funds in the banks were frozen and all operations, including those covering safety box vaults, were suspended. Barring of safety box users, however, was only temporary, until arrangements could be made to supervise use of the boxes.

Weymouth Kirkland of the law firm of Kirkland, Fleming, Green, Martin & Ellis, which represents the banks, and Mr. Beutel, said that the banks were closed because the State auditor felt they held too much discount paper.

LOAN AND DISCOUNT TOTALS

Discount paper is used in the process by which loan companies sell their transactions to a bank. Mr. Kirkland said that the amounts of loans and discounts for the three closed banks were as follows:

First State Bank of Elmwood Park, $4,400,000; Devon-North Town State Bank, $3,950,000, and West Irving State Bank, $2,200,000.

In each case, Mr. Kirkland asserted, a far greater proportion of the amounts was in actual loans, rather than in discounts. He added that all three banks "could open tomorrow" if the discount paper were sold.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "United States Bonds Designed To Battle Inflation," a feature story by the Associated Press, published in the Washington Sunday Star of April 12, 1953.

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

UNITED STATES BONDS DESIGNED TO BATTLE INFLATION

The Eisenhower administration is now launched on an economic policy it says will play a major role in battling inflation and producing a "sound dollar."

It consists of long-term instead of short-term financing of the national debt, the world's biggest financial structure.

The Treasury took the new administration's first full step in long-term financing last week when it announced the Government will borrow $1 billion between now and May 1 on a 30-year bond paying 3¼ percent interest.

That was the longest term issue announced in 12 years. The response of investors will help determine how fast Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and his aides, chiefly Deputy Secretary W. Randolph Burgess, move in raising new money and changing present short-term debt into bonds that will not mature for about a generation.

The new administration's fiscal advisers say short-term financing is inflationary and long-term financing is anti-inflationary. The national debt, they add, has grown so large that the way it is handled can be one of the major influences on the Nation's economy. Inflation, in the form of price rises, hits everyone's pocketbook, so that debt management is everyone's concern.

Virtually all debt issues now outstanding have been put on the market since the late Franklin D. Roosevelt became President in the spring of 1933. The national debt then stood at $22½ billion. It is no $264½ billion.

Some $65½ billion is in issues maturing in 5 years or less. Another $47½ billion is in marketable issues of 17 years or under. It is the $65½ billion of debt coming due in 5 years or less and a large part of the $47½ billion (the part in marketable issues of 10 to 12 years) which the present administration considers short-term debt.

Why is short-term debt inflationary?

Here are the arguments advanced by administration fiscal advisers:

1. Banks are the chief buyers of short-term Government securities. They can use them to increase their bank reserves, on which banks make loans.

When a bank sells a $1,000 bond, for instance, to increase its loan reserves, it can increase its loans five times that amount by law. So a $1,000 short-term bond may be used by a bank to create $5,000 credit. This builds up the supply of money and credit. Increasing the supply of money and credit increases the bidding (by consumers who get the credit) for goods. If the supply of money and credit outruns production, that is, if demand for goods increases beyond supply, inflation has set in, and prices rise.

2. Long-term issues (especially issues of 25 years or more) and savings bonds sold to individuals who want to keep them, go into

the sock. Commercial banks, by and large, cannot afford to tie up their funds for so long a time, and therefore do not buy the long-term issues to any great extent. Moreover, the Government limits the amount they can buy.

The long-term bonds are bought chiefly by insurance companies, savings bank, pension, and trust funds, and individual savers, who hold them off the market. These investors do not use the bond they get to create additional credit.

Consequently, the new administration's fiscal advisers say, long-term issues soak up savings without the danger of increased credit supplies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Business Outlook—Throwing Away the Controls," written by J. A. Livingston, published in the Washington Sunday Star, April 12, 1953.

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

BUSINESS OUTLOOK

(B. J. A. Livingston)

THROWING AWAY CONTROLS

It's a pretty good bet that Rocky Marciano, who's training for a championship fight, doesn't know it. Nor Joe Pilsudsky, who works in a coal mine. Nor Helen Hayes, who plays the lead in Mrs. McThing. Nor Amy Smith, who's secretary to the sales manager of a vacuum-cleaner company. They can't feel it yet. But they will.

This is a new business era. It's bound to affect everybody—eventually. America has moved from Roosevelt-Truman economics to Eisenhower economics, from the economics of control, regulation, and planning to the economics of the marketplace.

That was signaled last week by a major economic decision most people in the United States won't even read about. Yet it's an important event. Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey announced a new issue of 30-year 3¼-percent bonds. In doing so, he shattered the sacrosanct 2½-percent interest rate of his predecessors—Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and John W. Snyder.

In raising the rate to 3¼ percent, highest since 1933, President Eisenhower and Secretary Humphrey say, in effect, "Government bonds can get along without controls. The Government must compete for money in the open market just like Allied Chemical & Dye, Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, American Telephone and other corporations. We don't need Federal Reserve support."

This decision reaches beyond Wall Street, Washington, and high finance. It involves more than the price Humphrey is willing to pay to borrow money. It will have an impact on farmers, merchants, manufacturers, builders, home buyers, and consumers. It can't help influencing industrial production, employment, and prices. It's definitely anti-inflationary. You could even say it's disinflationary.

Humphrey and W. Randolph Burgess, his deputy in charge of Government debt, took no chances. They wanted to make sure the new bonds would go over. They consulted bankers and insurance companies beforehand. They limited the initial amount of 3¼s to $1 billion. But they also offered holders of F and G savings bonds, of which $1,100,000,000 will mature this year, the right to swap them for new bonds. The expectation was that heavy demand would send the bonds to a premium—more than 100 cents on the dollar.

WHY IT WAS SO JUICY

Humphrey and Burgess deliberately made the interest rate juicy—3¼ percent—at a time when 19-year Governments were selling to yield 2.9 percent. They weren't going to cut the rate as close as when they put out 5-year-and-10-month 2½'s in February. Thus the Government is competing with business for money. It means that businessmen who need funds to increase plants, install new equipment, or expand inventories will have to pay more. It means operating costs will go up a notch—at a time when increased competition is squeezing profit margins. It means that mortgage rates will tend to go up too.

Right now American businessmen are borrowing more money from the banks than at any comparable period in history. Loans are only off slightly from their pre-Easter high. Consumers are using the cuff freely too. Installment credit amounts to $16,700,000,000. Consumers have mortgaged 3 weeks of their current income to meet payments on automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, and so on. This is an all-time high.

NEW ECONOMIC POLICY

In the final analysis, Secretary Humphrey has done what former Secretary Snyder was unwilling to do—pay a price for sopping up loose funds in the money market. This is the traditional way in which governments help to check inflation. This won't be a forced loan. It's not a loan to the Government by the banks. It's a loan made to the Government because the rate offered is more attractive than other investments. It puts another straw on inflation's back.

Humphrey's action coincides with Secretary of Labor Martin Durkin's prediction of "another record employment year." It comes when wages are at record levels and industrial activity and retail sales show no ill effects from the Russo-Chinese peace overtures. It symbolizes the Nation's new economic policy under Eisenhower.

Here's a Government that wants to balance the budget, that's trying to cut expenditures, that's willing to get rid of price, wage, and materials controls. It's a Government that's willing to take a businessman's risk in the money market. These are conservative policies. They suggest that from now on Government decisions—Government purchases of goods and services—will be less and less important in supporting a high level of production and employment. And if a truce comes to Korea, you can underscore the paragraph.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I conclude by saying it is perfectly obvious to the American people that when the Congress of the United States undertakes to make a policy such as is proposed today with respect to the submerged lands and the resources therein, a struggle takes place and debate occurs on the floor of the Senate. The American people have been alerted to the problems of price supports for agriculture and minimum wages for labor, which constitute literally two great problems which affect health, welfare, and education. I submit that when an administrative agency of the Government, without even as much as a forewarning, can revise and alter and change drastically the fiscal policy of our Government, we are vesting far too much authority in that agency. The administrative officer of the agency had a duty to bring these policy changes to the attention of the Congress of the United States. It is this body that is supposed to protect the rights and the liberties and the opportunities of the people. While a three-quarter percent rise in interest rates may sound very small in arithmetical terms, it involves billions of dollars to the American economy. That economy, which moves along at the rate of $350 billion a year in gross national product, is dynamic and highly sensitive; it is literally pulling at the seams; and I submit that when the interest rate on bonds is jiggled and higgled, it fundamentally affects the entire economic life of the American business-enterprise system; it fundamentally affects the economic welfare of every wage earner, of every borrower, of every investor, of every businessman, and of every farmer. Never in the past 25 years—certainly not within the past 20 years—has a fiscal policy so drastic as this one been placed before the American people with such little consideration.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], for himself and other Senators, to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in the nature of a substitute for the joint resolution reported by the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the great significance of Senate Joint Resolution 13 to the Nation as a whole has been ably and clearly expounded by other Senators, and I do not wish to traverse ground they have already covered. But this measure also has consequences of particular importance to the seaboard States. Massachusetts is a seaboard State. I should like, therefore, to take this opportunity to state very briefly why the rights and interests of Massachusetts, as I see them, demand support of this resolution.

Senate Joint Resolution 13, as I understand it, will do two things. First, it will clearly and unmistakably vest in each State, and the persons who hold thereunder, paramount proprietary rights to the territory within the State's historic boundaries. In so doing, Senate Joint Resolution 13 will simply establish what has always seemed to me the position of ordinary fairness and justice. For 15 years, first as Governor of Massachusetts, and since 1945 as United States Senator, I have insisted that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was entitled, as against the Federal Government, to all the territory, whether above the sea or submerged beneath it, that belonged to it when it joined in forming these United States.

Second, Senate Joint Resolution 13 will confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the submerged lands extending seaward from the historic boundaries of the coastal States to the limits of the Continental Shelf. Since I have never believed that any State is entitled to claim more than it brought into the Union, I heartily support the action of the Committee on Interior and Insular

Affairs in so amending Senate Joint Resolution 13 as to make clear that it does not enlarge the historic rights of any State at the expense of the Federal Government or of other States.

Mr. President, I shall try to explain why I believe that this resolution, so far as Massachusetts is concerned, simply establishes ordinary fairness and justice. Massachusetts has never had its day in court with respect to its title to the submerged lands which lie off its coast between low-water mark and one marine league offshore. The Supreme Court of the United States has had before it the claims of California, Texas, and Louisiana. It has never passed upon the claim of Massachusetts.

I do not wish to suggest by that statement that I agree with the conclusions of the Court with respect to the claims of those other States; I wish only to make clear that I believe that the case of Massachusetts is meritorious. Had the claim of Massachusetts ever been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States the case might very well have been decided in favor of the Commonwealth.

To trace the claim of Massachusetts to the submerged lands off its coast, we must go back to the charter granted by Charles I in 1629. That charter begins with a recital of the grant by James I to the Council of Plymouth of "all that Parte of America" between specified degrees of latitude "together with all the Firme Landes, Soyles, Groundes, Havens, Portes, Rivers, Waters, Fishing, Mynes and mynerals, as well as Royal Mynes of Gould and Silver, as other Mynes and Mineralls, precious Stones, Quarries and all and singular other Comodities, Jurisdicons, Royalties, Privileges, Franchises and Prehemynences, both within the said Tract of Land upon the Mayne and also within the Islands and seas adjoining."

The charter of 1629 then recites that a conveyance of all the territory granted by James I had previously been made by the Council of Plymouth to a group of named individuals. To this group and their associates the charter goes on to make a new and larger grant including "all lands and grounds soyles, Havens, Portes, Rivers, Waters, Mynes, Minerals, jurisdiccons, etc., within its boundaries."

In 1691 a new charter created the "Province of Massachusetts Bay of New England." This charter recited in detail all the previous grants in the charter of 1629. It went on to grant to the inhabitants of the Province of Massachusetts Bay all of Massachusetts including Maine, "and all lands, grounds, places, soils, woods and woodgrounds, havens, ports, rivers, waters and other hereditaments and premises, whatsoever, lying within the said bounds and limits aforesaid, and every part and parcel thereof; and also all islands and islets lying within 10 leagues directly opposite to the mainland within the said bounds and all mines and minerals as well as royal mines of gold and silver as other mines and minerals whatsoever in the said lands and premises, or any part thereof."

By the Treaty of 1783, His Britannic Majesty relinquished "all claims to the government, propriety, and territorial rights" of the Thirteen Colonies which constituted the newborn United States. The eastern boundaries of these United Colonies, as described in article 2 of the treaty, comprehended "all islands within 20 leagues of any part of the shores of the United States, and lying between lines to be drawn due east from the points where the aforesaid boundaries between Nova Scotia on the one part, and East Florida on the other, shall respectively touch the Bay of Fundy and the Atlantic Ocean."

On January 9, 1788, the Massachusetts Convention met to consider the Constitution which had been drawn in Philadelphia and submitted to it for ratification. This Constitution, in section 3 of article IV, contained the following language:

> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Relying upon the reassurance of this language, Massachusetts ratified the Constitution. Mr. President, that language is still in the Constitution, and I entirely fail to understand how it can be said, in the face of it, that Massachusetts, by the very act of joining the Union, surrendered ownership of its submerged lands.

The claim of Massachusetts under the charter of 1629, the charter of 1691, the treaty of 1783, and the Constitution seemed so clear to the State's early lawmakers that in 1859 they adopted a statute defining it in unmistakably plain terms. That statute is still a part of the General Laws of Massachusetts as section 3 of chapter 1. It reads:

> The territorial limits of the commonwealth extend 1 marine league from its seashore at extreme low watermark.

We in Massachusetts have no oil or natural gas below our extreme low watermark and 1 marine league, or 3 miles, off shore, but our submerged lands do have many valuable natural resources, including the clams which make New England clam chowder so superior. The clams, quahaugs, oysters and lobsters, mackerel, tuna, and other fish taken from our coastal waters bring annual revenues to Massachusetts in excess of $10 million. This amount may not seem very large compared with the values that have been claimed for submerged oil and gas reserves, but it is more than we want to give away to the Federal Government.

I have been reliably informed, moreover, that next month a new company will start to drag for ocean clams in some of our bays. This is something new and shows how difficult it would be, if we ratified Federal control of the submerged lands, to list in advance exactly what rights and powers remain in the States.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Massachusetts aware of the fact that the Anderson bill vests the power to regulate the taking of all clams, mussels, oysters, lobsters, kelp, and so forth, in the States, and that, therefore, it is not necessary to pass Senate Joint Resolution 13 in order to protect the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am aware of what the Senator says. I would respectfully invite his attention to the fact that I am not going to vote to give away something which Massachusetts has always considered hers. I agree that the Anderson bill makes provision along the lines which the Senator from Illinois has stated. But it does not provide for the future. New industries will be developed which would not be covered by the Anderson bill. So it would be necessary for Congress to pass another bill giving jurisdiction to Massachusetts if we wanted to claim it.

My position is that I am not here to give away something which has always belonged to Massachusetts. I am not asking for anything which has not always belonged to Massachusetts. I shall vote to vest in the Federal Government title to everything beyond the historic boundaries, but I shall not vote to dispose of something that Massachusetts has had since 1629.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator aware of section 8 of the Anderson bill which provides that the respective States may regulate, manage, and administer the taking, conservation, and development of all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life within the area of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, in accordance with applicable State law?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to my good friend, who, I see, questions me with a bit of a smile on his face——

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a friendly smile.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say that I am not going to be put into the position of granting certain exceptions to certain States of the United States merely because of a desire to have certain legislation created. That is what it amounts to. I would say this to the Senator, with a smile, too, but at the same time, seriously, as I know the Senator is serious. The Senator from Illinois knows Boston, he knows Massachusetts, and he knows Maine, where he was born and where he went to college. At one time Maine was a part of Massachusetts. There are as many submerged lands and islands off the coast of Maine as there are off the coast of Massachusetts. A large portion of the city of Boston is built on submerged lands.

I now see the Senator from Illinois rise to call my attention to section 11 of the Anderson bill, but I make the same answer to the Senator with reference to section 11 as I made with reference to section 8.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that by section 11 (a) title to all filled land or reclaimed land in such areas on the open sea is vested in the States or their grantees? So there is no danger that the United States

Government is going to take away Back Bay or the Fenway from the people of Boston.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I respectfully request the Senator to wait for approximately 5 minutes, and I shall try to answer his question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

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

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

Mr. HOLLAND. While the Senator is so ably dealing with the present provisions of the public statutes of Massachusetts, which he has read into the RECORD, and with the prior provisions, both charter and otherwise, upon which the statute in question is based, I wonder if the distinguished Senator would allow me to read into the RECORD an additional recognition of the strong claim of Massachusetts, predicated upon the words of Mr. Justice Blatchford in the famous United States Supreme Court case of *Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240)?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Florida read that excerpt into the RECORD, after I ask unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor while he is doing so.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Florida that I have not read that decision, so I am relying on him, as one of the sponsors of the joint resolution, for assurance that it is along the same lines as those on which I am arguing. Otherwise, I do not take any credit or discredit for it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts. I certainly would not abuse his confidence by reading into the RECORD anything except what I think supplements and adds even greater strength to his argument on the facts and the law which he has so ably presented for the RECORD.

The quotation is from the opinion of Mr. Justice Blatchford, in the Supreme Court case of Manchester against Massachusetts, decided March 16, 1891, and is based upon the specific statute which the Senator from Massachusetts has read into the RECORD.

> The extent of the territorial jurisdiction of Massachusetts over the sea adjacent to its coast is that of an independent nation; and, except so far as any right of control over this territory has been granted to the United States, this control remains with the State.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now that the Senator from Florida has read from the decision in the Manchester against Massachusetts case, would the Senator from Massachusetts think that the Senator from Illinois was intruding upon the desired sequence of his speech if he asked some questions in order to bring out the nature of this particular decision? I do not wish to intrude.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. I would say to my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, that I want him to join in the debate. I desire to make the debate as clear as it can be made. I do not wish to confine the debate to Massachusetts, because I do not consider myself an authority on the subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The case from which the Senator from Florida read did refer to Massachusetts, but is not the Senator aware of the fact that it referred to Buzzards Bay, where Grover Cleveland went fishing? I believe the area referred to starts at Woods Hole and continues northward up through the Cape Cod Canal. Buzzards Bay has always been regarded as an inland water. So in the case cited by the Senator from Florida, it was not at all a question of ownership rights or dominance in submerged lands extending under the marginal sea beyond the coast, but the case dealt with inland waters of the United States. To listen to the quotation, it sounds convincing; but, like the flowers that bloom in the spring, tra la, it has nothing to do with the case.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield so that I may reply to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield for the purpose of permitting the Senator from Florida to answer the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the opinion does relate to fishing for menhaden in the waters of Buzzards Bay, as was freely stated by the Senator from Florida in the course of his argument the other day. However, the statute relied upon and quoted in the decision, and already quoted by the Senator from Massachusetts in his able argument, is the precise statute which the Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned, and provides, in its first sentence, that the territorial limits of this Commonwealth extend one marine league from its seashore at low-water mark. It includes, as one of its basic arguments, a fundamental statement of the law of the United States of America, as affecting the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, namely, the paragraph which reads:

> The extent of the territorial jurisdiction of Massachusetts over the sea adjacent to its coast is that of an independent nation; and, except so far as any right of control over this territory has been granted to the United States, this control remains with the State.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. He is characteristically gracious. If the Senator from Massachusetts would permit me to say so, I simply desire to say that as applied to offshore lands the quotation read by the Senator from Florida evidences the confusion that has existed throughout this debate and throughout public discussion of the issue, namely, the confusion between boundaries and ownership. It does not matter what the boundaries of the State of Massachusetts are seaward from the low-water mark. The existence of those boundaries out beyond low-water mark does not provide to the coastal State the ownership of the submerged lands beneath those waters. This is the clear holding of the Supreme Court in the offshore oil cases, and the Court expressly distinguishes the Manchester case on the grounds I have stated.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and other Senators, in arguing as if boundaries and ownership mean the same thing, are committing a logical and legal error.

The State of Massachusetts does not own all the land within its land boundaries. It is divided, with some in private ownership and some in municipal ownership. For instance, the mere fact that the boundaries of Massachusetts touch New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, Rhode Island, and Connecticut along given lines does not mean that within those boundaries the State of Massachusetts owns all the land. Not at all. Massachusetts owns only a very small fraction of that land.

Similarly, the fact that its boundaries have been placed at sea, does not mean that Massachusetts owns the submerged lands out to such a line. That is the issue, and it is very important to keep that distinction in mind.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his graciousness.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that this case dealt with a criminal offense against a Massachusetts law regulating fishing? In the particular case referred to, the offense was committed on Buzzards Bay, an inland water. I believe that is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Alabama that I should like to permit the Senator from Florida to answer the question. I do not claim any particular knowledge of that case.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Massachusetts. It is very true that the Manchester case does deal with a criminal statute of the State of Massachusetts, and that the charged violation of the statute, upon which was based a conviction which was upheld, took place in the taking of menhaden from the waters of Buzzards Bay. It is also true that the court took occasion to review State history in connection with the claim of Massachusetts, just as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts today took occasion generally to declare what are the rights of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in and to its waters. Senators are completely at sea if they think that no question of property rights came up, because one of the assertions of the case is as follows:

> The principle had long been settled in this court that each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction, unless they have been granted away; and that, in like manner, the States own the tidewaters themselves and the fish in them, so far as they are capable of ownership while running.

So the Senator need have no fear in relying upon the fact that this case, while it has never been claimed by the Senator from Florida to be precisely on all fours with every feature of the Texas,

California, and Louisiana cases, is nevertheless a case in which the Supreme Court of the United States, the court of last resort, found occasion to examine the question of the rights of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the seas adjoining its boundaries, and to make a general declaration in connection therewith, which will be very hard for our distinguished friends of the opposition to ignore as valueless in the present discussion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have tried to put out that, in my opinion, beginning in the year 1629, Massachusetts was granted title to these lands and to the seacoast 1 marine league out from the shore.

If the paramount interest of the United States overrides the claims of Texas, Louisiana, and California to their oil reserves, why may it not also override the claim of Massachusetts to its humbler natural resources? If, as Dean Pound has cogently argued, the Supreme Court has confounded sovereignty and ownership, it has confounded ownership of clams equally with ownership of oil. True, the Supreme Court has never, as I have already pointed out, passed on the claim of Massachusetts, but that is no reason for us who represent Massachusetts to wait until the Federal Government challenges our claim before taking action to protect it.

Besides its fishing, and shellfish industries, Massachusetts has extremely valuable resources in its beaches and harbors. Every year scores of thousands come to Massachusetts to enjoy its beaches and to sail upon its waters. Can we take steps to improve our beaches below the low-water mark only at the sufferance of the Federal Government? The answer, of course, should be "No," but it is not the answer I get from reading the Supreme Court opinions in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases.

In addition to the interests of Massachusetts in resources now submerged under its coastal waters between low-water mark and 3 miles offshore, Massachusetts and Massachusetts citizens have hundreds of millions, even billions, of dollars invested in property resting upon what was once submerged land. Between one-half and three-fourths of the city of Boston rests upon filled or reclaimed land. Our public library, our public gardens, both our railroad stations, our airport, and our largest business office building stand upon filled land. Across the Charles River in Cambridge some of the buildings of Harvard College and of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology are upon filled land. The same is true of the Statler Hotel, most of the downtown business section, and all the residential buildings along the Charles River.

The threat to the title of these buildings created by the decisions of the Supreme Court is not a mere figment conjured up by those who have a stake in the exploitation of oil reserves. The most respected conveyancers in the Commonwealth have concluded that there exists a genuine question as to the validity of these titles, and I have been assured by Mr. William J. Speers, Jr., chairman of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce's committee on national affairs, that Judge Fenton, of the Massachusetts Land Court, shares these doubts. Many other respected Massachusetts lawyers have recorded themselves to the same effect. Among them are Nathaniel B. Bidwell, who testified before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which reported Senate Joint Resolution 13, and Frank W. Grinnell, secretary of the Massachusetts Bar Association.

In further corroboration of the substantial nature of this concern, I have a letter from Messrs. Rackemann, Sawyer, & Brewster, one of the oldest and most reliable conveyancing firms in Boston.

I may add that I suppose this firm has in its files titles to more Boston real estate than any other single firm in Boston, and possibly even more than the Land Court of Massachusetts. The letter to which I refer seems to me to describe the situation so well that I should like to quote from it at some length. At the conclusion of this discussion I shall place the entire letter in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. The letter reads in part as follows:

> Massachusetts has a substantial and vital interest in the passage of Federal legislation to set at rest the doubts caused by the tidelands decisions. Although there is some language in the decisions which indicates that the Court was trying to avoid decision as to title to the fee of submerged land, it seems to us reasonably clear that the decisions deny to States the rights to license and otherwise control the use of such land.
>
> Since the earliest colonial ordinances it has been recognized law in Massachusetts—at least until these decisions—that private ownership extends to the low-water mark but not more than 100 rods from the high-water mark, and that the Commonwealth could convey the land beyond and license fill and structures both in such foreshore and beyond. Very extensive areas along the Massachusetts seaboard have been filled or built upon under such grants or licenses from the Commonwealth. The value of such land and structures undoubtedly runs in the billions. For example, most of the waterfront of Boston Harbor and most of the Back Bay consist of filled land beyond original low-water line.
>
> There is naturally an aversion among title attorneys to take any stand on the question of such titles which would amount to an admission that all outstanding title opinions with reference thereto were in error. It has, however, become a fairly general practice to qualify current title opinions, where it is apparent that the question might be involved, by adding a proviso to the effect that the titles are subject to the rights, if any, of the United States under the current tidelands decisions.

The public officials of Massachusetts certainly have not been lax in claiming the Commonwealth's share of national resources, but year after year Massachusetts has sent its officials to Washington to testify to their concern about the status of our fisheries and our filled-in land. In 1939 Assistant Attorney General Daniel J. Doherty appeared. In 1945 Clarence A. Barnes, then attorney general, and Hirsh Freed, assistant corporation counsel for the city of Boston. In 1946 Ernest W. Barnes, of the department of conservation, and George Leary, special assistant corporation counsel of the city of Boston. In 1948 Mr. Nathaniel B. Bidwell made an earlier appearance as special assistant attorney general, and George Leary submitted a statement as special assistant corporation counsel of the city of Boston.

Most recently, on February 17 of this year, John B. Hynes, mayor of Boston, wrote to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter in which he said:

> Federal legislation is urgently needed to quiet the titles to this land; and I trust that this honorable committee will recommend the passage of such legislation by the present Congress.

I know it may be said that we do not need to give away oil to protect claims or to quiet land titles. I know, moreover, that bills have been proposed which, while confirming the claim of the United States to offshore oil and gas reserves, would make an exception in favor of Massachusetts and other States for shellfish and filled lands. Perhaps the proponents of such measures might even be persuaded to include beaches. But how can we justify legislation which would protect the claims of some States to their natural resources while denying those of others? How can we draw a line based solely upon the comparative value of the resources at stake? How can we ignore the possibility that States whose offshore resources now seem comparatively unimportant may later discover deposits of enormous value? Must we then enact legislation turning over to the Federal Government property which the States were permitted to have only so long as its value was unknown?

It seems to me inevitable, if we pass legislation making exceptions for things which are known today, that future discoveries will have to be the subject of further legislation. That way lies endless doubt and uncertainty.

These, then, are my reasons for supporting Senate Joint Resolution 13. I believe that the claim of Massachusetts to the submerged lands between low-water mark and 3 miles off its coast is a valid claim attested to by the only kinds of evidence which are appropriate to the testing of titles.

I believe that Massachusetts has interests in its submerged lands and in property erected on what were once submerged lands that the Federal Government has no business to exploit or to control.

I believe that it would be unfair and unwise to make an exception in favor of the interests of Massachusetts while denying protection to the interests of other States which at the moment seem more valuable.

For these reasons I am in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. First I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the entire letter, from which I read in part, from Rackemann, Sawyer & Brewster, dated April 8, 1953.

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

RACKEMANN, SAWYER & BREWSTER,
Boston, April 8, 1953.

Re tidelands legislation.

The Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: William J. Speers, Jr., Esq., chairman of the committee on national affairs of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, has today given us a copy of his memorandum on the above subject dated March 27, 1953, of which we understand you have a copy, and has informed us of a call he received last evening from Elliot L. Richardson, Esq., informing him of your desire to have some more definite expression from this firm as to the effect of the tidelands decisions on Massachusetts titles.

We confirm the statement in Mr. Speers' memorandum that Massachusetts has a substantial and vital interest in the passage of Federal legislation to set at rest the doubts caused by the tidelands decisions. Although there is some language in the decisions which indicates that the Court was trying to avoid decision as to title to the fee of submerged land, it seems to us reasonably clear that the decisions deny to States the rights to license and otherwise control the use of such land.

Since the earliest colonial ordinances it has been recognized law in Massachusetts—at least until these decisions—that private ownership extends to the low-water mark b t not more than 100 rods from the high-water mark, and that the Commonwealth could convey the land beyond and license fill and structures both in such foreshore and beyond. Very extensive areas along the Massachusetts seaboard have been filled or built upon under such grants or licenses from the Commonwealth. The value of such land and structures undoubtedly runs in the billions. For example, most of the waterfront of Boston Harbor and most of the Back Bay consist of filled land beyond original low-water line.

There is naturally an aversion among title attorneys to take any stand on the question of such titles which would amount to an admission that all outstanding title opinions with reference thereto were in error. It has, moreover, become a fairly general practice to qualify current title opinions, where it is apparent that the question might be involved, by adding a proviso to the effect that the titles are subject to the rights, if any, of the United States under the current tidelands decisions. There is also a general feeling that the attorneys cannot be held responsible for errors of opinion on questions of such broad import so contrary to the law as generally understood and accepted prior to these decisions, and we doubt that very many of the titles are insured.

How far the value of the real estate in question has so far been affected is difficult to assess. In the absence of any immediate threat of dispossession, or of imposition of any license charges or like restrictions, business will naturally go on, and there will be a market for such properties. Any move by the Federal Government actually asserting such control would, however, have revolutionary effects here. Even now purchasers having a choice of properties between those affected by the decisions and those not, would naturally prefer the latter, although there is some complacency based on the feeling that the Federal Government would not be likely to take steps so radical, and to no small extent on the hope and expectation that the Congress will act to quiet such title doubts. Such legislation would certainly be in the public interest so far as Massachusetts and her citizens are concerned.

We have not seen the text of the current House Resolution 4198, nor Senate Joint Resolution 13, but from the summaries thereof in the Legislative Daily of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States assume that they would accomplish this purpose since, so far as we know, none of the property concerned extends more than 3 miles seaward.

Yours very truly,

HENRY HIXON MEYER.
EDWARD C. THAYER.
ALBERT L. PARTRIDGE.
ROGER B. TYLER.
WILLIAM L. PAYSON.
ALBERT B. WOLFE.
AUGUST R. MEYER.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks two letters, dated March 2 and March 23, from Frank W. Grinnell, addressed to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], chairman of the committee.

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

MARCH 2, 1953.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I understand from Mr. Bidwell, who testified before your committee the other day, that members of your committee would like professional opinion from Massachusetts in regard to the effect of the so-called tidelands opinions. I submit my opinion for your information.

With the greatest respect for the Court and appreciation for its problems and responsibilities, I know, as all lawyers know, that even the ablest judges sometimes make mistakes, and, in my judgment, the majority opinion of 6 to 2 in the California case and that of a bare 4 to 3 in the Texas case are extraordinary and erroneous. I submit that they weaken the structure of our Government, under which we have grown great and strong, and that they have clouded the title, not only to submerged lands, but as the minority of justices said, the reasoning of the majority applies to all the property in the country, and especially in the Original Thirteen States, of which Massachusetts is one of the oldest.

In writing this letter I am not attacking the Court. I am simply discussing two opinions of great public importance, as I have done repeatedly in print, because it has always been part of the function of American lawyers to discuss such opinions, not only in court, but before legislative bodies and in legal periodicals, when serious questions are raised relating to the Government of the Republic.

We are not interested in oil here, as we have no oil, but we are concerned with our ancient rights of property, which date back to 1629, which were recognized by the courts and everyone else, without question, until these strange opinions. I am aware that the people of the United States and many lawyers do not yet fully realize what the Court did to them and their ancient rights by those opinions, but the bar generally is gradually waking up to the fact that more than oil is involved.

Not one of the Original Thirteen States was a party to the proceedings. Massachusetts has never had her day in court in support of her ancient title. The story of that title from the Charter of 1629 was told in detail in the Massachusetts Law Quarterly for March 1950, a copy of which was sent to all the Members of Congress at that time. I enclose a copy for the information of your committee. I also enclose a copy of the Quarterly for July 1952, containing my answer to President Truman's veto message of last year.[1] Yet the majority of the Court said that Massachusetts and her citizens did not own their sea land without hearing or discussing her muniments of title, in a case to which she was not a party, and in spite of the grants in the Royal Charters, the famous foreshore ordinance of the Colony in 1647, the story of land claims in the Continental Congress under the Articles of Confederation, the confirmatory clauses in the Constitution of the United States, the volume on Massachusetts land titles published in 1801 by James Sullivan, a former Supreme Court judge, later attorney general and governor of Massachusetts, the leading supporter in Massachusetts of Thomas Jefferson, and the first President of the Massachusetts Historical Society, founded in 1791, and the subsequent affirmance of his statements as to the treaty of 1783, by Mr. Justice William Johnson, for the Court, in *Harcourt* v. *Gaillard* (12 Wheat. 524 (at p. 526)), a case which was not ever mentioned (and perhaps not known to the Court) in the California and Texas cases.

The first 10 amendments were first proposed in the Massachusetts ratifying convention of 1788 to accompany ratification, and I say without qualification that, as a matter of historical fact, Massachusetts would never have ratified the Constitution except for reliance, especially, on what became the 10th amendment. If anyone doubts this, I suggest that they read the debate in the Massachusetts convention of 1788, the largest of all the conventions—containing about 364 members. The debate is printed in a separate volume now before me, and also in Elliott's Debates. The Massachusetts men believed in their rights of property; we still believe in them here and we think the American people believe in them and do not yet know what the majority of the Court has done to them.

As Roscoe Pound said, "We have to take our law from the Court but, thank God, not our history."

Almost 100 years ago, Massachusetts defined its territorial limits as one marine league from extreme low-water mark. That was not an extension, but a limitation of the ancient title seaward.

Having made the dictum that the original States which existed before the United States was born had no title, although none were parties, the majority of the Court then lifted itself by its bootstraps and said, therefore, the later States had no title because they came in under the equal footing clause. I respectfully submit that the majority opinion is based on mistaken facts, mistaken law, and mistaken vision, and that it would split a marine league from the unquestioned property rights of the people of Massachusetts. I think that everything should be done as soon as possible to correct this unfortunate error of the Court.

I consider it the professional duty of every lawyer to warn every purchaser or mortgagee of property of the Federal cloud which the Court has suddenly created by an opinion based on an invented doctrine of "Federal need" in the minds of Federal officials—a doctrine which would apply, as the dissenting Justices suggest, to all property—iron or other mines, etc., and the crops in Iowa, if some future Federal officials or Congress so decided, so that they could take it without compensation. The Constitution was framed and ratified to put reasonable restraints on the inevitable human itch for power and more power in the Central Government, and the majority of the Court has now done exactly what the Massachusetts men in the Convention of 1788 feared the Central Government would do and which they intended to restrain by the 10th amendment. The 18th century Founding Fathers in the ratifying conventions were more conscious of the

[1] See also 36 M. L. Q. No. 1, p. 13, May 1951, and Mr. Waits' article, p. 17, and No. 2, July 1951, pp. 29–37.

dangers of power and thought more deeply about them than people do today when they dislike all restraint and seem to think the Founding Fathers were mossbacks except for the purpose of political, or post-prandial, oratory. People in this country in recent years have been drifting on slogans rather than thinking for the long haul and posterity as the Founding Fathers did.

Pardon the length of this letter, which expresses strong convictions. If I am considered a reactionary or an extremist, so be it; I don't mind, but I suggest some thinking about what and who is reactionary or extreme.

The house of delegates of the American Bar Association and the executive committee of the Massachusetts Bar Association, composed of thoughtful lawyers, have consistently supported the bill to reaffirm the titles of the States.

Yours respectfully,

FRANK W. GRINNELL.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEAR SIR: Supplementing my letter of March 2, as to the cloud on the title of submerged lands of Massachusetts, I submit the following discussion of the majority opinions of the Supreme Court.

If A has a house and land under a clear title, running back for 300 years, no court or anyone else can take it away and decide that he has no title without having him before the court as a party to the suit with an opportunity to prove his title. In other words, the court must have jurisdiction of A and his property before it can decide the question. Without such jurisdiction, a decision or statement by a court on the question would seem unwarranted and illegal, so far as A and his title are concerned. Otherwise, no one's property would be safe.

If that is so as to an individual, how can the Tidelands opinions be legal as to the titles of the Original Thirteen States when none of them were before the Court with a chance to prove their titles?

The Court began in the California case by saying:

"We cannot say that the Thirteen Original Colonies separately acquired ownership." (See 332 U. S. at p. 31.)

In later opinions, still without having any of those States before them as parties, they expanded the "we cannot say" to more definite statements that they did not have title, and that, although the United States did not have title, yet as part of their doctrine of Federal need and of "paramount dominion" the United States had all the rights which make up title. These statements, made by the majority in the face of the repeated dissents, first of two Justices in the California case and then of three in the Texas case, seem unwarranted and not binding on any of the States that were not parties to the suits. Each can legally challenge their binding force in any court in which the question may arise.

With all due respect to the Court and its members, the action of the Government and of the majority of the Court seems a very peculiar proceeding in the name of law, with all the symptoms of arbitrary rather than judicial action, following what I believe to be mistaken reasoning and interpretation of the facts of our constitutional history. The result is that a cloud has been created which it will be the duty of each State government to contest on behalf of its citizens when, as, and if, the Government brings suit against it. Any individual land owner affected can also contest the cloud.

On the American Forum of the Air yesterday, Senator KEFAUVER said, as others have said, that Members of Congress were trustees of Federal land and could not give them to the States, but reaffirmation of the historic boundaries of the States which have been clouded in the manner above described would not be giving away anything belonging to the United States. I respectfully suggest that Members of Congress are also trustees of the great trust of the glorious heritage of our constitutional Government. When, by a mistaken judicial dictum not binding on the States and the American citizens of those States, a cloud has been created on their property, it seems a part of their function as trustees, to remove the cloud which, if not removed will hang over those States and their people for many years to come. This seems to be a condition which can, and should, be cured by Congress—not by a compromising statute but by an unqualified recognition of the historic boundaries of the States which were respected by the United States ever since the Federal Government was created in 1788, until these strange majority opinions.

Yours respectfully,

FRANK W. GRINNELL.

MARCH 23, 1953.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is the Senator from Massachusetts familiar with the fact that under all decisions, apparently, inland waters belong to the States?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I so understand.

Mr. ANDERSON. And historic bays, of which Massachusetts Bay is a perfect example?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to my colleague from New Mexico that I am not certain as to that. From Provincetown Harbor to Boston Harbor, from Boston Harbor to Gloucester, and from Gloucester to Newburyport there are three large bays, all a part of Massachusetts Bay. It is not my understanding that Massachusetts claims title to the entire area within a line drawn across the mouths of those bays. We claim title to 3 miles around the shore.

Mr. ANDERSON. If Massachusetts were to take the land under Boston Bay alone, that would certainly protect all of downtown Boston, would it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What I have tried to say is that the city of Boston is built on land which was formerly submerged and has been filled in. If the recent decision of the Supreme Court stands, titles to all the buildings located on that land, and, indeed, titles to more than half the city of Boston, may become involved.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did not the Massachusetts Institute of Technology recently build a dormitory along the Charles River?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; I think that is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was that done after the Supreme Court decision?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was; and, as the distinguished Boston firm of title lawyers has stated, lawyers of that city are now placing in all their titles a certain form of proviso in case this decision may be held to affect such titles.

Mr. ANDERSON. They did not insert such a proviso up until 18 months ago, did they?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. ANDERSON. We tried hard to find one single conveyancer who up to 18 months ago was putting anything of that kind in a deed. We asked that such an instance be produced, and the Senator should see the replies the committees received.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico what I said to the Senator from Illinois, that I want Massachusetts to have what she had in 1629, what she continued to possess when she joined the Union of the States in 1788, and has possessed since that time. I am not asking for anything more, and I hope Massachusetts will get nothing more. Perhaps, being a Yankee, I should not go that far; but I am willing to let the Federal Government have what Massachusetts did not have title to when she came into the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the banks of Boston, which are notoriously careful, continue to lend money on real estate regardless of this alleged cloud on the title. Conveyances are passed. A few words may be added to the deeds, but they have not refused to approve loans.

The Senator mentioned the Statler Hotel. Those who own that hotel do not seem to be excited; I wonder why we should be.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall quote one more sentence from the letter of Rackemann, Sawyer & Brewster, the firm I previously mentioned. They say:

> In the absence of any immediate threat of dispossession, or of imposition of any license charges or like restrictions, business will naturally go on, and there will be a market for such properties.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should think so, because even under the most restricted application of the report of the special master in the California case, the line indicating the property owned by the State of Massachusetts is far from downtown Boston, miles at sea. So how anyone can contend there is any real reason for fear of a cloud on the title I have never been able to understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I presume the Senator understands the reason why the distinction is made between bays and historic bays. It is because there has been an attempt on the part of some representatives of the State Department to set certain standards by which they would define a bay. When they find that what has been regarded as a bay will not meet this standard, for instance, Chesapeake Bay, they say it is a historic bay.

I assume the Senator realizes that the Federal Government cannot be bound by such declarations. For instance, in the case of California, when the Federal Government wanted to enforce its laws beyond what might have been the 3-mile limit, it recognized certain indentations along the coast of California as being bays, so that it could extend its authority. But when oil was discovered, it refused to recognize its own pronouncements, and when California asserted that the Federal Government had previously recognized the land as being beneath inland waters, then the Federal Government successfully took the position that it could not be bound or stopped by the action of its agents.

I assure the Senator that there is doubt about historic bays. Many of us do not know with certainty what is a historic bay, although I have always felt, as many other have felt, that not only did Massachusetts own the water within its bays, such as Cape Cod Bay, or Massachusetts Bay, but also the territorial waters going out into the seas, to the extent it exercised jurisdiction at the time it won its independence.

As a representative of one of the States which came into the Union after the independence of this Nation was established, the junior Senator from Louisiana is very happy to have the support of a Senator representing Massachusetts, where the first shot was fired for the independence of the Colonies. The junior Senator from Louisiana, representing a State which came in on an equal footing with the original States, had always felt that the original States at one time had fought for and acquired for themselves complete independence and sovereignty. He had felt that only the powers given to the Federal Government under the Constitution belonged to the Federal Government, and he had felt that States like Massachusetts had been very careful to see that they had not given more powers than were expressly provided in the Constitution.

It is because of that fact that he does believe that a dangerous precedent was set, both in the California case, and the case before that, United States against Curtiss-Wright Export Corp., upon which the Court in the California case relied.

I find this language in the California case:

> From all the wealth of material supplied, however, we cannot say that the Thirteen Original Colonies separately acquired ownership to the 3-mile belt or the soil under it, even if they did acquire elements of the sovereignty of the English Crown by their resolution against it. Cf. *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* (299 U. S. 304, 316).

The significance of the second figure, "316," is to refer to what was expressly said on page 316 of that case, from which I now read:

> As a result of the separation from Great Britain by the Colonies acting as a unit, the powers of external sovereignty passed from the Crown not to the Colonies severally, but to the Colonies in their collective and corporate capacity as the United States of America.

Further on we find this statement made, even more expressly on that point:

> It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality.

I submit that that statement contains ill-advised dicta, for the State of Massachusetts at one time was an independent nation which fought for its independence and gained it, and then gave to the Federal Government only limited powers.

I made a speech on the floor of the Senate about a year ago in which I placed in the RECORD a message by President James Monroe, in which he discussed the theory in connection with a veto message, that the Federal Government had powers other than those given to it by the Constitution. President Monroe clearly pointed out that all sorts of mischief could possibly come from such a doctrine. We in Louisiana have lived to see the wisdom of that statement demonstrated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his statement. I would only say, in reply, that I have pointed out in my brief statement how Massachusetts derived her title. When she ratified the Constitution she felt that she had title to the submerged lands along her seacoast.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. There was a good deal of testimony on this point. It became so interesting to me to hear about the Statler Hotel and other buildings being out in the bay that I requested the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey to prepare a map of the Boston Harbor area, and to mark on the map the narrowest strip of inland waters they could have under any possible construction.

On page 808 of the hearings it is shown that that line runs from Nantasket Beach to Marblehead. Will the Senator tell me how many of the buildings in Boston lie seaward of that line?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What was the line?

Mr. ANDERSON. A line from Nantasket Beach to Marblehead.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say no buildings.

Mr. ANDERSON. Everything within the line is in State hands, and if we follow the line, or use the historic basis as used by the Solicitor General, the line is still miles beyond that, seaward, but if we use the most limited construction, it runs from Nantasket Beach to Marblehead. I do not know of a single large structure that is outside that line.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who has been many times in Boston, and we hope he will come there again, that on Boylston Street, very close to Trinity Church and the Copley Plaza Hotel, is a building called the New England Mutual Life Insurance Building. When I was Governor of Massachusetts, I used to walk across the crossing there every morning, on my way to the statehouse. The excavation for the foundations of the New England Mutual Life Insurance Building went into the ground approximately 40 feet. I became very friendly with the police officer at that crossing. One morning he said to me that he would like to make me a gift of some clam shells or oyster shells which had been dug up at a depth of 40 feet at that point, when the foundations of that building were being dug, and the next morning he gave me a large box full of oyster shells which had come from 40 feet below the surface of the ground at Boylston and Clarendon Streets; perhaps 3 miles, or at a conservative estimate 2 miles, from the seacoast.

Let me also say in this connection that when for 20 years I lived with my father on Baystate Road in Boston, I found that the only house on that entire street that was not built on piles was our house, because it was built on what was formerly an island, whereas all the other houses on that street were built on piles, because they were built in places where formerly the tide rose and fell.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the zeal of the Senator from Massachusetts, and I wish to make it possible for him to begin to sleep at night. So I say to him that if he will examine the map which is on its way here, from the files of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I believe he will find that the map will ease his worries. Furthermore, if that map can be displayed to the conveyancers in Boston, who are extremely conservative, I am sure, they may be assured that in the future not a single skyscraper constructed in Boston will be built outside the line to which I have adverted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I know the Senator from New Mexico is an excellent historian and I know he has a very fine library of which he is justly proud. If he will read again about the early life of John Adams, the Senator will find that in the early days John Adams rode into Boston over the old causeway across the narrows; and from those old accounts the Senator from New Mexico will learn how cold and windy it was in that area. Yet all the land in the vicinity of that old causeway and the narows is now a part of the city of Boston.

Mr. ANDERSON. Similarly I can point out that in the State of Texas the Senator from Massachusetts and our other colleagues can be shown places where oil now is obtained from areas as far from the seacoast as Midland; and in those areas, when the drills reach depths of a number of thousand feet, the drillers have found soil which was once a part of the sea bed. However, all that area belongs to Texas, in the same way that the land referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts belongs to Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to reassure him further on this point, so that he may have undisturbed sleep?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say—if the Senator from Illinois will permit me to make a remark which I hope is not facetious, even though it may sound so—that I will always sleep well if I do not feel that I am helping to give away something belonging to Massachusetts which I was sent here to protect. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was going to reassure the Senator from Massachusetts on that very point.

If he will examine the classic case in this matter—namely, the Pollard case—he will see that it deals with a situation almost identical to the one he has been describing. The Pollard case referred to land in the city of Mobile, which formerly had been washed by the tidewaters of the Mobile River and perhaps partially had been washed by the tidewaters of Mobile Bay, although in the course of time that area became filled land. The Court ruled that this filled land, previously washed by the tides of an inland waterway, belonged to the State of Alabama or to a civil subdivision thereof.

The Boston case to which the Senator from Massachusetts has been referring and the Pollard case are identical in nature. The Pollard case still governs and still applies. So, as a result of the decisions of the Court, the conveyancers in Boston need not worry.

On the other hand, since we know that they are somewhat nervous persons, in order to allay their doubts and fears and uncertainties we have included in the Anderson bill paragraph (a) of section 11, reading in part as follows: "or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this act."

So the Senator from Massachusetts has a perfect out. If he wishes to protect the residents of his State and the interest of the people of his State in the filled land, all he has to do is support the Anderson bill. It is not really necessary for him to do so, because the matter is already covered by court decisions; but if the Senator wishes to nail the matter down and fasten it tight, all he has to do is to support the Anderson substitute.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, without extending the argument, let me say that I would remind my colleague, the Senator from Illinois, that, as I understand, the Anderson bill applies to the past. We hope that much more land in Boston will be filled in, as the Senator from Illinois and others permit us to get more business there.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that paragraph (b) of section 11 of the Anderson bill grants to political subdivisions of the States the rights to future filled-in land developed for public purposes on the open sea; and it grants to civil subdivisions and private persons the rights to filled-in land on interior waters or inland waters or in bays or on tidelands. So the fruits of future development are open to Boston, in the same way that the past has been.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, or I shall yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me to say that one of the reasons I have for feeling very greatly opposed to the Anderson bill is the very subsection which has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, namely, subsection (b) of section 11, which permits public units of government to continue in the future to fill out into the waters of the sea, and provides that their titles as to the surface, at least, of the filled lands is good, but withholds such right from private owners and private enterprise, notwithstanding the fact that the greatest part of the 5,000 miles of waterfront of our coastal States is privately owned.

I feel that any such differentiation or discrimination as between a public right or public interest, on the one hand, and the right of an American citizen who is a property owner, on the other hand, would not appeal to the Senator from Massachusetts as being a sound part of the system by which we Americans have built our country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Florida, and I also thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it is not a new thing for me to stand on the floor of the Senate and speak in support of congressional action to quiet the title of the States to lands beneath the navigable waters, including tidewaters, within the boundaries of such States. As chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I had the honor to report the first joint resolution having this objective which was ever considered by the Senate of the United States. That was just 7 years ago this month. Earlier, it had been my privilege to introduce the first Senate joint resolution covering this subject matter and having the purpose of quit-claiming to the States the lands underlying the navigable waters within their respective boundaries. That was more than 8 years ago.

The principles involved, Mr. President, have not changed with the years. Right is still right; justice is justice; and the importance of maintaining the integrity of private property rights certainly is no less now than it was then.

It may be of interest to recall that the report of the Judiciary Committee on a resolution of this nature, in April 1946—which was while the California case was still in litigation—spoke of the long line of decisions upholding State ownership of submerged lands, and then concluded with this paragraph:

> In the opinion of the committee, should the Supreme Court reverse itself, the result would be so catastrophic to the economy of the country resulting from the overthrow of long-established rules of property that the Congress would as a matter of equity be forced to enact legislation having an object similar to that of House Joint Resolution 225.

The House joint resolution referred to was the quitclaim resolution reported by the committee in 1946.

Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate with citations of many cases. The report which I filed 7 years ago cited and discussed the 54 major decisions of the Supreme Court, over a period of 100 years, which held that the ownership of lands beneath navigable waters lies in the States and in those to whom the States have granted them. Prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in the California case, there was no contrary decision by any court in the Nation. Whether the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California case, and the Texas and Louisiana cases which followed it, are to be considered as overruling that long line of prior decisions, or should be understood rather as opening up a new line of decisions based on a new philosophy, still remains open to argument. The Supreme Court rested its decision in the California case on a strained doctrine of so-called paramount rights; a doctrine which appears to hold that the so-called paramount rights of the National Government may be matured into a kind of ownership over any lands or resources which the Government needs and claims, without any intermediate steps constituting the exercise of the right of eminent domain, and, in fact, without any vestige whatever of due process of law.

This doctrine of paramount rights is an extremely dangerous thing, Mr. President, even carried no further than the Supreme Court carries it in the California case and the subsequent Texas and Louisiana cases. But efforts are being made, as many Senators know, to carry this doctrine much further. Serious efforts have been made within the past 2 years, and are being continued today, to apply a modified doctrine of paramount rights to water law in Western States where water is the life of communities. My colleagues from California, I know, are acutely aware of this situation, as are some other Senators.

In a case known as the Fallbrook case, involving the use of waters of the Santa Margarita River in California, the Federal Government has sought to overthrow settled water-right law, and to graft onto that body of law a new principle, based on the doctrine of paramount rights in the Government, with respect to whatever the Government needs and claims.

Those of my colleagues who have studied water-right law know that in many of the States of the West the right to the use of water is controlled by what is known as the doctrine of prior appropriation. This doctrine differs materially from the doctrine of riparian rights, which is common in the East. Simply stated, the doctrine of prior appropriation is this: That the man who first diverts and appropriates or uses the waters of a stream for the purpose of irrigating land which he owns adjacent to that stream, or for other purposes having to do with a proper economic use of such land, secures for himself and those taking title to the land under him a right to the amount of water needed for such purposes, in connection with the land, which may be retained as long as there is continued use of that water for those purposes.

Of course, the right is limited, as I have stated the doctrine, to the amount of water traditionally and beneficially used, so long as such use is continued for the purposes properly connected with the land. But in the Fallbrook case, or the Santa Margarita case, as it is sometimes called, Government attorneys have been contending, on the one hand, that the Government, when it acquired riparian land, was entitled to the water it

needed or wanted without regard to the doctrine of prior appropriation; and, on the other hand, that when the Government acquired land to which certain water rights were appurtenant under the doctrine of prior appropriation, the Government could immediately claim an absolute right in the amount of water covered by those prior rights, and could divert that amount of water to any use to which the Government might desire or see fit to put it. This was under the claim of paramount rights, set up for the first time in the California case and continued in the Louisiana and Texas cases.

Congress sought to stop the advancement of these claims, by providing in the appropriation bill approved last year, that no funds might be used for the prosecution of this case. Certain officials of the Government sought to circumvent this plain mandate of the Congress by the device of having transferred from the Department of Justice to another payroll the attorney who has been largely if not mainly responsible for the development and advancement of these new doctrines. Under his new employment this attorney continued to do the same work he had been doing before; and I understand he has now been returned to the Department of Justice payroll. Of course, such a subterfuge was contrary to law, and it is my understanding the Comptroller General has so ruled. I think it might have a salutary effect if the officials who are found to have been responsible for this attempt to circumvent the plain will of the Congress should be forced to repay to the Government, out of their own pockets, the amount of Government funds expended in violation of the act of Congress to which I have referred.

However that matter may be determined, the fact remains that the doctrine of paramount rights has been urged, and seriously pressed, far beyond even the limits, themselves far reaching, given to it by the Supreme Court in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases. In repudiating this doctrine, the Congress will be protecting the rights of all the people, in all the States. The question here specifically at issue—that is, title to lands beneath the navigable waters—itself comprises many diverse interests affecting many States. Billions of dollars in investments in harbor facilities, industrial, business, and residential improvements by public authorities and private interests, including the facilities of virtually every port and harbor of the Nation, are involved; and, as I pointed out 7 years ago, the value of these developments, public and private, is many times the value of the petroleum deposits which are also involved. In addition, many other natural resources are directly affected—coal, brine wells, gravel beds, oyster beds, mussel shells, shrimp fisheries, diamonds, crabfishing, sulfur, muskrats, marine fisheries, and many other industries. But, Mr. President, the greatest evil of permitting a continuation and a possible extension of this doctrine of paramount rights is the insidious adaptability of the doctrine; the way in which it can be twisted or tailored to cover such a wide range of rights and interests that no citizen of any State could be certain it would never touch him or his property.

This doctrine of paramount rights, Mr. President, enunciated for the first time in all history in the California case, is a doctrine tinged with statism. It is a doubly dangerous doctrine because it can be so glibly defended with the argument that whatever the Government owns, it owns in behalf of all the people, and therefore that Government ownership is ownership by all the people as distinguished from ownership by only a few of the people and a few of the States. That is an argument of surface plausibility, Mr. President, which has satisfied many who have been willing to accept it. They fail to see, Mr. President, that the logic of that argument applies with equal force to any claim of right by the Federal Government against any owner of private property. They fail to see, Mr. President, that if that argument is sound—the argument of paramount rights, as declared in the California case, and followed in the Texas and Louisiana cases—and is followed out to its logical conclusion, the ultimate result will be the ownership of all property by the central state, and the elimination of private property and private ownership in this Nation.

Mr. President, there may be those who will say I have gone afield in my remarks here today. But I hold to the view that the questions bound up in the resolution which is now before the Senate include a question of basic principle which is far more important than the matter of ownership or control of all the offshore oil along our coasts, far more important even than all the other questions of ownership, many of them more important than the oil question, which are here involved; a question of basic principle as to whether we are to have a government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed, or whether we are willing to adopt the concept of a central superstate, allwise and allpowerful, against which individual rights are as nothing. That is the question Congress will be answering when it passes this resolution and sends it to the President of the United States for his signature.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall be glad to withdraw my request for a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may ask unanimous consent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am prepared to address the Senate at greater length than it is possible to conclude today, so I shall spend a little time merely speaking about the bill on this subject which was passed by the House of Representatives and which will be in conference with whatever bill is passed by the Senate of the United States, if one is subsequently passed. I do so only to point out that in handling proposed legislation of this nature we very frequently find very nice questions of language which it is well worth while for the Senate carefully to examine and which I know Congress will want to watch with particular care.

For example, Mr. President, House bill 4198, which was passed by the House of Representatives on the 1st day of April, contains on page 8, subsection (d), language to which I think it is well for us to address our attention. It provides:

(d) Nothing in this act shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control—

And these are the words to which I am particularly attracted—

or the production of power at any site where the United States now owns or may hereafter acquire the water power or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation or to provide for flood control or the production of power at any site where the United States now owns the water power.

Similar language was before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when the draft of the pending measure was being prepared, and I pointed out at that time that the language was well worth watching. It may be filled with possibilities for real trouble.

Under the commerce clause of the Constitution the Federal Government can improve the navigability of a stream and can regulate commerce upon it. In the discharge of these functions it may build a huge dam, and in releasing waters over the dam it may, incidentally, generate power, but the Government may not own the waterpower and is not concerned with the question of title to the waterpower. It does what it does by virtue of the Constitution, and not from some special title to land or water. However, the phrase I have read is an overall limitation which could require the Government always to buy water rights on a stream when its primary purpose is to improve navigability. The phrase was carried repeatedly in that section, and was carried many times in a draft which we were subsequently asked to consider.

It is hard to understand this constant reference to sites where the United States now owns the waterpower, since the authors of the measure must know that that term does not adequately describe a multiple-purpose project. Why is it used, unless the purpose is to limit the scope of the Federal Government's constitutional power under the commerce clause?

I am glad to say that when it was considered by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the committee decided to drop that language

from the resolution and to use other language which, I think, is vastly preferable. I know the decision of the committee was not based upon any opinions which I expressed, but upon the judgment which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and other Senators brought to bear upon it. But, just the same, in the bill which we shall have to consider, which has come over from the House, there are provisions of this nature which are well worth looking at.

For example, in the House bill, at page 14, subparagraph (b), it is provided as follows:

(b) The leasing units shall be in reasonably compact form of such area and dimensions as may be determined by the Secretary, but shall not be more than 640 acres if within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field and shall not be more than 2,560 acres if not within any known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field.

Mr. President, the current system of granting prospecting permits on the public lands permits the Secretary of the Interior to grant such of the maximum size, 2,560 acres; but it needs to be remembered that when it comes to the Continental Shelf—and this statement deals only with areas beyond the historic boundaries of the States which we have assumed in the resolution to be somewhere in the neighborhood of 10½ miles in the case of Texas and the west shore of Florida, and at least 3 miles in other instances—it costs upward of a million dollars, and may cost very much more than that, to drill a wildcat well. No oil firm not now having a lease would undertake such an operation. This provision may be intended to protect those who are now there and to keep everyone else off the Continental Shelf. No firm in its right mind would spend a million dollars in a wildcat test if it did not control more than 640 acres, because even if it had a rich flowing well with several thousand barrels a day capacity and there was no proration at all, it could not possibly get its money back. In fact, it could never get its money back from the limited number of wells it might drill on so small an area.

Contrast that area with the million acres which the Phillips Petroleum Co. is going to explore in Alaska.

That is not the only provision of the House bill to which I should like to invite attention. There is a provision on page 16, line 10, that if a lessee under title III fails to comply with his obligations under the lease, the lease may be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior because of the failure, but the section goes on to provide that before he cancels it the Secretary has to give the lessee 20 days' notice, and if he cures the default, the Secretary cannot cancel the lease. If he does not clear the default, the Secretary may proceed to cancel the lease.

Such a provision is unconscionable. If a man has a lease and fails to do any of the things which he guarantees to do when he gets it as a condition of the issuance of the lease, then flagrantly ignores his promises and commitments to the Government and gets away with murder as long as he can, and is then detected, the Government ought to have the right to cancel his lease. The House bill says that if it is not done, and the Government finally catches up with him, he can smile and say, "I will now agree to do what I agreed to do 4 years ago," and he can get away with it.

Such a provision is unparalleled in oil-lease legislation. Under the Mineral Leasing Act, the Secretary of the Interior can cancel a lease for the lessee's flagrant violations or his failure to comply. The House bill does not give the Secretary a big stick; it merely lets him wave an admonitory finger.

All the way through the bill, in subsequent sections, there are items which I think need a great deal of study. I think it is regrettable that the bill will be in conference and that its provisions cannot be fought out on the floor. I think the decision to leave out of the Senate joint resolution any provision of that kind was made very wisely by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. I only wish to say at this time that I believe it is important that Senators interested in the provisions of the House bill should look carefully at them, to see what needs to be done.

For example, there is a provision for interpleader, which is an innocent-looking provision. It is in section 17, page 25, line 6, and it provides that a lessee who has from a State a lease on a certain area on the Continental Shelf can file a certificate with the Federal Government, and it is then saved forever. The Federal Government can then recover from the State, but it can never thereafter recover from the oil company. The ordinary rule of business is that if I pay my rent to the wrong party, I still am liable to the rightful owner. In order that everyone may understand that the rightful owner of the Continental Shelf is the Federal Government there should be an estoppel by the United States of America against the payment of rent to the wrong party. This section would indicate that strange proceedings are talking place. Texas has tried to extend its boundaries out to the end of the Continental Shelf. An oil operator who took a lease in the area where Texas has tried to extend its boundaries would come squarely within the provision of section 16 (a) (ii), because he would be in doubt as to whom he should pay his rental. He could then merely file his certificate, sit back, and be secure forever.

I hope, whatever the Senate finally passes, Senators will be aware of the fact that there are in the House bill provisions which need very careful scrutiny.

In connection with this discussion, I wish to spend a few minutes on definitions.

By "tidelands" we mean land covered and uncovered by the ebb and flow of the tide: The land adjoining the shore as far seaward as the low-water mark. This much of the land belongs to the States. Their ownership is not and has not been challenged.

By "submerged lands" we mean all the land in the sea beyond the low-water mark: All the land beyond the tidelands.

Reference will be made constantly to "marginal seas." By "marginal seas" we mean the ocean, or the Gulf of Mexico, for a distance of 3 miles from the shore line, excluding harbors and bays, if the bays are not more than 10 miles across their mouths, and if they are not historical bays, such as the Delaware Bay and the Chesapeake Bay. The marginal seas are within the primary jurisdiction of the Federal Government; the Federal Government has paramount rights in and full dominion over the submerged lands of this marginal belt of open ocean, according to international law as well as by decisions of the Supreme Court.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. When the Senator says that a body of water which was not more than 10 miles across at its mouth would be considered a bay, can the Senator give any logical reason why one indenture along the coast should be considered a bay if it is less than 10 miles across from one headland to the other headland, while another body of water, of precisely the same shape, but measuring 11 miles across, could not be considered a bay?

Mr. ANDERSON. I can only say that in every type of operation, it is necessary to establish standards. One might ask why, if a man steals $2, he is subject to one law, but if he steals $200 he is subject to another law.

It was thought necessary to make some division, and the division in this case has been made generally at 10 miles. That decision may work hardships in particular instances; in other cases it may not. I am not able to say. I know that, after long study, the Coast and Geodetic Survey felt that where the mouth of a bay was not greater than 10 miles across, it was proper to be described as a bay. If the distance were more than 10 miles across, the Coast and Geodetic Survey would study the case to determine if the body of water was regarded as a historic bay. I would not attempt to give the logic as to how such a decision was arrived at.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator positive that it is the Coast and Geodetic Survey which takes that position? Might it not have been the State Department which urged that position?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe the State Department has urged that position. I shall not attempt to answer the Senator's question as to whether the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the State Department first conceived the idea. The idea is old enough so that both Departments seem to be following it. I think probably the State Department has followed it more religiously than has the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. LONG. The Senator realizes that such a definition is not contained in the Holland joint resolution as it now stands, because that joint resolution does not use the term "bay," so far as I am able to determine. It refers only to inland waters.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I think the Senator from Louisiana is correct.

In defining "inland waterways," we mean rivers, lakes—including the Great

Lakes—streams, bays, and harbors. The land beds underneath these inland waters undoubtedly and undeniably belong to the States. We also mean other bodies of water along the Atlantic coast, such as Long Island Sound, although not falling precisely within the definition cited above, which have been judicially determined to be inland waters; their land beds thus, likewise, belong to the States.

By "Continental Shelf," we mean submerged lands, beyond the low-water mark, which represent a gradual sloping off of the North American Continent, to the point of the sharp drop to the ocean floor, usually at a depth of from 75 to 100 fathoms. The extent of the Continental Shelf is considerable on the Atlantic coast, and in the Gulf of Mexico, but is sharply limited on the west coast opposite California. In the North Pacific, abutting Alaska, the Continental Shelf is again vast and expansive.

The entire Continental Shelf abutting the United States and its continental Territories, such as Alaska, but excluding the tidelands, is domain in which the United States has certain paramount rights, whose nature and extent are subject to assertion in the international field. Whatever rights do exist obviously pertain to the National Government, since these rights, whatever they are, are incidental to national external sovereignty.

Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Massachusetts can give any idea of how long he intends to keep the Senate in session. I dislike to begin my next subject unless I might continue for an hour.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senate convened at 11 o'clock this morning and has now been in session about 3 hours more than it was anticipated it would sit today. It was my thought to suggest that a recess be taken in a very few minutes; perhaps at a point which the Senator from New Mexico would consider a good stopping place. My thought was to have the Senate recess at quarter after five. If this is a good stopping point, we might recess now; or if the Senator from New Mexico would prefer to continue for another 10 minutes, that would be satisfactory.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have long realized that a good stopping place happens to be wherever one is at the moment. However, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has suggested that since my next point is one on which I had intended to speak at some length, I might stop now.

I appreciate the courtesy of the acting majority leader.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator from New Mexico asks unanimous consent that he may resume speaking at the opening of the session of the Senate at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning?

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to claim the floor at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If such request is made I shall have no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. I so request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF LONGER SESSIONS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, under the unanimous consent agreement the Senate will convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. The majority leader [Mr. TAFT] has suggested, as I stated at the opening of the session today, and as I repeat for the RECORD, that it is his thought that the Senate should remain in session for longer hours during the next 3 or 4 days, possibly running into the evening. I wish to give notice of that intention.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) 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. The amendments relate to the mineral rights of the public-land States. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table, and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 10, line 7, insert before "this joint resolution" the following: "Titles I and II of."

On page 19, line 14, insert before "this joint resolution" the following: "Titles I and II of."

At the end of such joint resolution insert the following:

"TITLE III—MINERAL RIGHTS IN PUBLIC LANDS GRANTED TO STATES

"SEC. 12. Subject to the provisions of section 13 of this joint resolution all minerals and mineral rights in deposits in the public lands belonging to the United States, including (1) land temporarily withdrawn or reserved for classification purposes, and (2) lands within grazing districts established pursuant to Public Law No. 482, 73d Congress, approved June 28, 1934, as amended (commonly known as the Taylor Grazing Act), except any such lands forming a part of a national forest, are hereby granted to the several States within the territorial boundaries of which such lands are situated. Such minerals and mineral rights and the proceeds derived from the sale, lease, or other disposition thereof shall be used for such purposes as the respective legislatures of such States shall determine.

"SEC. 13. (a) The provisions of section 12 of this joint resolution shall not apply (1) to any public lands with respect to which any entry has been made, or any right or claim has been initiated, under the provisions of law in force on the date of acceptance by the State of the grant made by such section except that upon the relinquishment or cancellation of such entry, application, right, or claim such lands shall become immediately subject to the provisions of this section, or (2) with respect to deposits of materials essential to the production of fissionable materials reserved for the use of the United States under Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

"(b) The grant made by section 12 of this joint resolution shall take effect with respect to the lands within a particular State whenever the legislature of such State (1) enacts legislation providing for the location and development of mineral deposits in the public lands of such State, corresponding to the laws then in effect relating to the location and development of mineral deposits in the public lands of the United States, (2) assumes in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior all obligations of the United States with respect to any valid claims, rights, or privileges existing upon the date of acceptance by the State of the grant, and (3) by resolution, accepts the grant and deposits a certified copy of such resolution with the Secretary of the Interior. Upon receipt of a certified copy of a resolution of acceptance from any State and an instrument evidencing the assumption of such obligations, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be delivered to the proper officials of such State such maps, records, books, and documents as may be necessary for the enjoyment, control, use, administration, and disposition of such lands.

"(c) Upon the acceptance by any State of such grant as provided in subsection (b) all laws and regulations relating to mineral rights and deposits in the public lands shall cease to be applicable to the public lands within such State, but such laws shall continue in force with respect to the lands and deposits excepted under this title.

"SEC. 14. As used in this title—

"(a) Subject to the provisions of section 12 of this joint resolution, the term 'public lands' means the public domain, surveyed or unsurveyed, unappropriated lands, and lands not held back or reserved for any special governmental or public purpose.

"(b) The term 'State' means any State of the Union."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution 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; to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries; and for other purposes."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the debate has been proceeding for some time, and it seems as though it might continue for a few more days, on the question of whether or not known minerals in the public lands, the seabottom lands, will be deeded to the States.

For almost a century it has been the established policy of the Federal Government to withhold known mineral rights whenever public lands were deeded to the States or to individuals. The facts are clear that these seabottom lands are public lands. The situation is glossed over by the statement, "We did not believe they were public lands."

No one will deny that the Congress has the authority to deed the public lands to States or to individuals. All this is being made clear as the debate progresses. However, if Congress is going to exercise its authority and break this century-old precedent, and the mineral rights in public lands, that is, the seabottom lands, are to be deeded to the States, then all States must be treated equally and this amendment of mine is designed to treat all the public land States alike. If this

amendment were accepted as a part of Senate Joint Resolution 13 and the joint resolution should be passed and approved by the President, the mineral rights in the public lands would be deeded to the States wherein such public lands were situated.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR DIRECT HOME AND FARMHOUSE LOANS BY ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to expand and extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1621) to expand and extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a few minutes in explanation of the bill I have just introduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the bill I have introduced would continue the life of the veterans' direct loan program which Congress first authorized in the Housing Act of 1950.

I hope that this bill will receive the wholehearted support that it deserves. It is the only way that the GI loan benefits of the GI bill of rights can be made possible for many of our World War II and Korean veterans who live outside of large metropolitan centers.

It is important to distinguish between the regular GI loan program of the Veterans' Administration and the supplemental direct loan program which is confined to the small towns and rural areas. The "regular" GI-loan program of the Veterans' Administration is the program under which private mortgage capital supported by the VA guaranty has made available the advantageous terms of GI financing to more than 3,000,000 World War II and Korean veterans. These are loans made by private banks, savings and loan associations, and insurance companies, and the loans are partially guaranteed by the VA.

The protection of the VA guaranty has encouraged lenders to make loans at 4 percent interest and on very liberal terms. Most of the regular GI loans have been made with no down payment or with a much smaller down payment than that normally required, and the typical maturity has been for 20 years or 25 years.

VA's direct loan program—with which my bill is concerned—was set up by the Congress in 1950 as a necessary supplement to the regular VA-guaranteed GI-loan program. The reason that Congress authorized the direct loan program is simple. We had found that ever since the GI-loan program was first authorized in 1944, veterans who lived in many of our small towns and semirural communities had been unable to find private lenders willing to make GI 4-percent loans. In many of these areas the only lending institution is a small country bank which just does not have sufficient capital to make long-term mortgage loans. The primary business of these country banks is to supply the commercial and farming credit needed by the community and it usually has very limited funds available for long-term mortgage loans.

Recognizing this basic inequity which in effect denied to veterans living outside of urban areas the benefits of the GI loan law which Congress intended to be available for all veterans, the Congress authorized the Veterans' Administration to make loans direct with Government funds in those areas where private lenders were unable or unwilling to make GI loans.

The sum originally made available to VA for the direct loan program was $150 million—a relatively small amount when compared with the nearly $20 billion which private lenders have made available for GI loans with the VA guaranty. Congress extended the direct-loan program again in September 1951, and authorized $150 million to be used as a revolving fund which permits the VA to make new loans as outstanding loans are repaid or sold to private investors. Later, in April 1952, when VA funds for additional direct loans were exhausted, Congress authorized an additional $125 million to be made available to the VA in quarterly installments. Under existing law the final $25 million allocation was made available on April 1. The VA's authority to make additional loans will expire on June 30 of this year.

If we do not extend the life of VA's direct-loan program and provide additional money, we shall have to face the brutal fact that the GI-loan benefit will be nothing more than a hollow mockery to those veterans who do not happen to live in the larger metropolitan centers. I do not want to see that happen, and I am confident that the other Members of Congress do not want to see it happen either.

My bill would provide a total of $200 million for the year beginning July 1. However, the $200 million would not all become immediately available but, following the present pattern, the money would be made available to the Veterans' Administration in four quarterly installments of $50 million each during the next fiscal year. Also, as under the present arrangement, the $50 million quarterly allotments would be reduced by the amount of sales of loans to private lenders made by VA in the preceding quarter.

Note that my bill would call for quarterly allotments of $50 million or double the $25 million which VA has been receiving each quarter over the past year. I propose that the quarterly allocation be increased, for the very simple reason that the $25 million allocation has fallen considerably short of meeting the demand for GI loans by World War II and Korean veterans in the smaller towns and rural areas. VA statistics show there are more than 25,000 veterans now on the waiting lists hoping to receive GI loans and it is estimated that if the program expires on June 30, the unsatisfied waiting list would still number at least 10,000 to 20,000 veterans. The increase to $50 million should help to reduce the size of that waiting list substantially and more effectively meet the loan demand by veterans in the coming fiscal year.

Please note also that the effect of my bill would be to raise the maximum size of the revolving fund from $275 million to $475 million. If the mortgage money market begins to loosen up later this year—as many financial observers predict—I would hope that VA's efforts to sell its loans would be more successful and that the total fund would revolve more effectively in the future so that more and more veterans in our rural areas can be accommodated with direct loans without a further increase in the revolving fund.

To further the revolving fund feature of the program, my bill proposes an amendment which I think will help VA in its efforts to sell the loans it has already made. Under existing law eligible purchasers must be private lending institutions. My bill would remove that limitation so that VA could sell to charitable funds, to pension funds, and to private individuals as well. Since, when VA sells a direct loan the purchaser is guaranteed against loss just as in the case of a regular GI loan, I am hopeful that my amendment will broaden the market for VA's existing direct-loan portfolio.

Some may oppose the VA direct-loan program on the grounds that it is competitive with private enterprise. Such opposition may have relevance to some other program, but it can have no validity when applied to VA's direct-loan program. It simply is not competitive with private enterprise. It is instead a necessary supplemental program which is designed to supply a need which is not being met by private lending institutions in the areas where VA's direct-loan program operates.

First, it should be emphasized that VA will make direct loans only in areas which it declares eligible. Those areas are confined, as Congress intended, to the smaller towns and semirural areas of our Nation. The larger urban centers are not eligible for VA direct loans—in the continental United States no city of over 50,000 in population is eligible.

In the second place, the law and VA's procedures prevent the making of a VA direct loan whenever a private lender is willing to make the loan. The veteran must show that he is unable to obtain a VA-guaranteed loan from a private lender in his community.

In view of those basic safeguards, I do not see how anyone can argue that the program is competitive with private lenders. It just is not so. In fact some

of the country bankers themselves are the first to admit that the direct-loan program is supplying a real need in their communities, which would otherwise go unsatisfied.

It may be interesting to note here that I was prompted to introduce the original bill setting up this program by a very strong appeal from a banker in northwest Alabama. He told me how he and his bank had tried to take care of the worthy veterans but simply had not been able to do it with the limited lending ability the bank had. I found this to be true in many parts of the United States. Thereupon, I introduced the bill, the enactment of which started this program which has filled a real need.

I know that has been the case in my own State of Alabama. Under the program more than 1,500 direct loans have been made in the smaller towns and rural areas of Alabama. Without the aid of direct loans I doubt that any of those 1,500 World War II and Korean veteran families would have been able to start on the road to home ownership with the beneficial terms of GI financing. It is my fervent hope that we shall continue to make it possible for more families like them to enjoy the same benefit.

The veteran must repay, and repay with interest. And the veteran is doing just that in a most commendable fashion. I know you will share in my pride when I report that out of almost 30,000 direct loans made to date, only 26—or less than one-tenth of 1 percent—have defaulted to a point that the Veterans' Administration has had to acquire the property. I doubt that any housing program past or present can point to such an outstanding record.

Bear in mind that the Government is receiving a substantial net income from these loans. The Veterans' Administration pays the Treasury 2 percent for its direct-loan funds, but it receives 4 percent interest on the loans it makes. That spread will be more than sufficient to cover the administrative costs of the program and in addition to set up reserves against future losses so that in the long run the program will not cost the Government a dime, and may very well show a tidy profit.

I realize, of course, that a serious economic depression could cause the program to lose money. But in that eventuality so would everything else, and in any case I believe that is an eventuality we are all willing to do our utmost to prevent.

In short, I am proud to be the sponsor of a bill which, to my mind, should be a must on our legislative calendar this session. When I offered the original bill it met with much opposition. However, when the later extensions and amendments were offered experience had demonstrated how badly the program was needed and how well it had worked to such an extent that they passed without a dissenting voice or vote. I hope the same may be true with this bill, which represents an improvement of the program.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Felix Edgar Wormser, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward W. Scruggs, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona, vice Frank E. Flynn, resigned;

Lloyd H. Burke, of California, to be United States attorney for the northern district of California, vice Chauncey F. Tramutolo, resigning;

Leo A. Rover, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia, vice Charles Morris Irelan, resigning;

Clifford M. Raemer, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois, vice William W. Hart, resigned;

John F. Raper, Jr., of Wyoming, to be United States attorney for the district of Wyoming, vice John J. Hickey, resigned;

Robert W. Ware, of California, to be United States marshal for the southern district of California, vice James J. Boyle;

William J. Littell, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois, vice Robert Grant, removed; and

Bernard A. Boos, of South Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota, vice Theodore B. Werner, resigned.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph Ira Kincaid, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone, vice John E. Hushing, resigned.

By Mr. WELKER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Stanley N. Barnes, of California, to be Assistant Attorney General to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward L. Scheufler, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the western district of Missouri, vice Sam M. Wear, resigning; and

Omar L. Schnatmeier, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri, vice Otto Schoen.

RECESS TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 14, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 13 (legislative day of April 6), 1953:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Ralph H. Demmler, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1957, vice J. Howard Rossbach, resigned.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Jerome K. Kuykendall, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1957.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. John Ernest Dahlquist, O7120, United States Army, for appointment as commanding general, Fourth Army, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Harry Reichelderfer, O7547, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Frank Albert Allen, Jr., O7415, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. David Ayres Depue Ogden, O12051, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Arthur William Pence, O12042, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Bernard Linn Robinson, O12652, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Eugene Ware Ridings, O15230, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas John Hall Trapnell, O16782, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Leander LaChance Doan, O16839, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Charles George Holle, O12612, United States Army.

Col. Cranford Coleman Bryan Warden, O14699, United States Army.

Col. Frank McAdams Albrecht, O15131, United States Army.

Col. Edward Gilbert Farrand, O16788, United States Army.

Col. Normando Antonio Costello, O17764, United States Army.

Col. Roy Ernest Lindquist, O18125, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Archibald William Stuart, O18130, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Tom Victor Stayton, O18417, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edwin John Messinger, O18503, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edwin Anderson Walker, O18552, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Brice Crawford, O19215, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant generals in the United States Air Force, under the pro-

visions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Samuel Egbert Anderson, 92A, Regular Air Force, to be commanding general, 5th Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., 387A, Regular Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frank Fort Everest, 366A, Regular Air Force, to be Director, the Joint Staff, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose loving care and sure control are the coming in and the going out of all our days, may we now be sensitive and responsive to the presence, the promptings, and the persuasions of Thy holy spirit as we bow together in the fellowship of prayer.

Grant that Thy servants may be blessed with the assurance and joy of divine guidance and grace as they again assemble in this Chamber to legislate for the highest welfare of our beloved country and all mankind.

We penitently confess that our finite minds are so frequently perplexed and confounded by the frustrations and tensions of life, its mysteries and dilemmas, its tragedies and tribulations, its dangers and difficulties.

May we accept the challenge of every national and international problem with the unwavering confidence and courage that Thou art willing and able to place at our disposal all the strength and wisdom we need to save our civilization from destruction and despair.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 2, 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. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 4, 1953, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 759. An act for the relief of Hisami Yoshida;

H. R. 861. An act for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski;

H. R. 3062. An act to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3073. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress;

H. R. 3658. An act to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; and

H. R. 3659. An act to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on April 2, 1953, examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4130. An act 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 SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, April 2, 1953, he did on that day sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H. R. 4130. An act 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

APRIL 13, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith an envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the office of the Clerk at 3 p. m. on April 7, 1953, and said to contain a message from the President on reciprocal trade agreements.

Respectfully yours,

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

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 38)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In my state-of-the-Union message I recommended that "the Congress take the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act under immediate study and extend it by appropriate legislation."

I now recommend that the present act be renewed for the period of 1 year.

I propose this action as an interim measure. As such, it will allow for the temporary continuation of our present trade program pending completion of a thorough and comprehensive reexamination of the economic foreign policy of the United States.

I believe that such a reexamination is imperative in order to develop more effective solutions to the international economic problems today confronting the United States and its partners in the community of free nations. It is my intention that the executive branch shall consult with the Congress in developing recommendations based upon the studies that will be made.

Our trade policy is only one part, although a vital part, of a larger problem. This problem embraces the need to develop, through cooperative action among the free nations, a strong and self-supporting economic system capable of providing both the military strength to deter aggression and the rising productivity that can improve living standards.

No feature of American policy is more important in this respect than the course which we set in our economic relations with other nations. The long-term economic stability of the whole free world and the overriding question of world peace will be heavily influenced by the wisdom of our decisions. As for the United States itself, its security is fully as dependent upon the economic health and stability of the other free nations as upon their adequate military strength.

The problem is far from simple. It is a complex of many features of our foreign and domestic programs. Our domestic economic policies cast their shadows upon nations far beyond our borders. Conversely, our foreign economic policy has a direct impact upon our domestic economy. We must make a careful study of these intricate relationships in order that we may chart a sound course for the Nation.

The building of a productive and strong economic system within the free world—one in which each country may better sustain itself through its own efforts—will require action by other governments, as well as by the United States, over a wide range of economic activities. These must include: adoption of sound internal policies, creation of conditions fostering international investment, assistance to underdeveloped areas, progress toward freedom of international payments and convertibility of currencies, and trade arrangements aimed at the widest possible multilateral trade.

In working toward these goals, our own trade policy as well as that of other countries should contribute to the highest possible level of trade on a basis that is profitable and equitable for all. The world must achieve an expanding trade, balanced at high levels, which will permit each nation to make its full contribution to the progress of the free world's economy and to share fully the benefits of this progress.

The solution of the free world's economic problems is a cooperative task. It is not one which the United States, however strong its leadership and however firm its dedication to these objectives, can effectively attack alone. But two truths are clear: the United States share in this undertaking is so large as

to be crucially important to its success—and its success is crucially important to the United States. This last truth applies with particular force to many of our domestic industries and especially to agriculture with its great and expanding output.

I am confident that the governments of other countries are prepared to do their part in working with us toward these common goals, and we shall from time to time be consulting with them. The extension for 1 year of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will provide us the time necessary to study and define a foreign economic policy which will be comprehensive, constructive, and consistent with the needs both of the American economy and of American foreign policy.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 7, 1953.*

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 13, 1953.*

ADDRESS OF FORMER PRESIDENT HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. JENKINS. 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. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday night former President Herbert Hoover, the man whom I think is the greatest living American, made a great speech in Cleveland, Ohio. He discussed his subject as a statesman, as a former President of these United States, and as one of the world's greatest engineers.

He discussed a very timely subject which is growing more and more important every year. His subject was The Socialization of Electric Power. The producers of electric power of the country have for the past few years been putting up a strong fight against the encroachment of the Federal Government. Just recently 15 of the leading producers of electric power in the country pooled their forces and are erecting two giant power plants in the Ohio Valley to provide the power to operate the great atomic energy plant being constructed by the Government in southern Ohio, within a few miles of my home county. One of these great electric plants is being constructed in our congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks to include therewith the speech which Mr. Hoover delivered last Saturday night.

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

There was no objection.

SOCIALIZATION OF ELECTRIC POWER

(Address by Hon. Herbert Hoover at the diamond jubilee of the Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland, Ohio, Saturday evening, April 11, 1953)

This is a celebration of the founding of a great institution dedicated to scientific research and the training of engineers and scientists. You seek to sharpen their abilities and initiative for a climate of freemen. It is an appropriate time for discussion of some of the forces in our Federal Government which have been destructive of such a climate.

In the field of Federal electric power we have an example of 20 years of creeping socialism with a demonstration of its results.

Three years ago the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, under my chairmanship, made an investigation into the Federal activities in electric power. As the Commission was not dealing with public policies, its recommendations were confined to administrative reforms. Even these have not been carried out. The highly critical reports of our staff of accountants and engineers amply illuminated the results of this Socialist invasion.

And at once let me state that the present administration is not responsible for this situation; they inherited it on January 20, 1953.

WHAT IS THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE?

Before I go into more detail I wish to say something as to what the American way of freemen really is.

The Socialists, with their ideas imported from Europe, totally misconstrue the unique structure of American life. They envisage it in terms of European societies.

Ours is a system of freemen and free enterprise in which our concepts have steadily departed from those of the Old World in two directions.

We have conceived that, to have freemen, we must be free from the economic tyrannies which were nurtured in Europe's laissez-faire, dog-eat-dog system of economy.

Freemen can no more permit private economic power without checks and balances than governmental power without checks and balances.

The great enterprises of production and distribution can be used for economic oppression. To prevent this oppression of freemen, we originated Government regulation unique in the world. We regulate rates and services of natural monopolies such as the electric power utilities. We insist upon freedom from trade monopolies and the enforcement of constructive competition. We adopted this economic philosophy 70 years ago in a revolution from European concepts and practices.

And in another departure from European social structures we have developed a far greater expansion of free cooperation between men in community interest. Its extent is without parallel in any other country. It gained force from the necessities of a pioneer people where cooperative action was vital to their existence. Today, I dare say, we have a million nongovernmental organizations for cooperative action in our country. They include thousands of health, educational, sports, musical, social, business, farmer, and labor organizations. They have been created without the aid of bureaucrats. In some aspects we could add to these our insurance and savings banks and our corporations in general.

And we hold 10,000 annual conventions of them and survive unending speeches and banquets.

This cooperative system is self-government of the people outside of government. It is the most powerful development among freemen that has taken place in all the world.

The Old World, however, went on with its lack of effective economic safeguards for freemen and its dearth of cooperation in the American sense. One result was the rise of socialism as a protest.

I emphasize this unique structure of our American economic and social life because it is into this system, far divorced from the old world, that our fuzzy-minded socialists are striving to inject ideas foreign to our concept of life.

And they have made progress with these adulterants. They intrude into many avenues of American life. And they threaten a new oppression of freemen greater than the old dog-eat-dog economy.

Tonight I shall appraise the aspects of creeping socialism in the electric power industry by the Federal Government only. Rightly or wrongly the State and municipal governments do engage in electric enterprises. But at least their activities respond to the will and scrutiny of local government.

Nor do I include the Rural Electrification Administration in this discussion although it receives great Government subsidies. It has worthy purpose, but that operation is so small a percent of the electric power in the country that it cannot eat up the private industry.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN ELECTRICITY

In the electric field there are certain transcendent facts.

First. Under the initiative of freemen we developed the technology and use of electricity far beyond any other country.

Second. Stemming from private enterprise, we have created a per capita supply of electrical power for our people 3 times that of the combined Western European nations and 11 times the average of the whole foreign world.

Third. Private enterprise could keep in pace with demand, and could have more advantageously distributed the power from Federal water conservation projects.

Fourth. With our advancing technology and individual initiative, the average price of household electric power is sold today by our private enterprise utilities at one-third of the price of 30 years old—and that is while most other commodities and wages have increased by 50 percent to 100 percent. There is no such parallel in any other commodity.

Despite these results from a free economy these concepts of freemen were abandoned 20 years ago when the Federal Government entered into the socialization of electric power in a big way.

THE METHOD OF SOCIALIZATION

The device by which our Federal bureaucracy started to socialize this industry was through the electric power from our multiple-purpose water conservation dams. We needed these dams. And we need more of them. They were built to serve navigation, flood control, irrigation and domestic water supplies and to provide electric energy. However, the central question here is not the creation of this electric power but using it to promote socialism. The first step toward socialization was taken when the Federal Government undertook itself to generate and distribute this electric power from multiple-purpose dams. And now the Federal Government has taken further socialistic leaps by building steam and hydroplants solely for the generation of electric power.

Up to 20 years ago we avoided socialism by selling the energy at the dams to private utilities and irrigation districts. The Government received a return without incurring operating expenses.

Let no one misinterpret my views on water conservation. I have been for 30 years an ardent exponent of multiple-purpose dams. I can claim some credit for the first gigantic

multiple-purpose dam in the United States. That one is in the Colorado River.

But again on the Colorado we avoided socialism by stipulating that before construction began the energy should be leased to the private utilities and municipalities. And we contracted to sell it at a rate which provided for interest on the Government investment and the complete repayment of the investment within a period of 50 years. The consumers over these 17 years since have found no cause for complaint from that arrangement.

THE MARCH OF SOCIALISM

Do not think these Federal electric enterprises are small business.

Twenty years ago the total generating capacity of electric power from Federal dams was about 300,000 horsepower. It was about two-thirds of 1 percent of the total electric generating capacity at that time.

As some people are confused by the technical terms "kilowatts" and "kilowatt hours," I have translated them into horsepower.

By the middle of 1953, the Federal Government will have a generating capacity of about 15 million horsepower. That is about 12 percent of the utility generating capacity for sale to the public. Federal power is already being sent into 27 States.

But far beyond this, there are Federal generating plants in construction or authorized by the Congress, making a total of over 200 plants which will bring the total up to about 37 million horsepower. If completed the Federal Government would be furnishing somewhere from 20 percent to 25 percent of the electric utility capacity of the Nation. The cost in capital outlay to the taxpayer will be about $10 to $11 billions, plus some great deficits in promised interest and other returns.

But that is not all. Further projects have been recommended to Congress. And still more are contemplated in Government reports. If they were all undertaken, it would bring the total to about 90 million horsepower.

This bureaucracy now employs 33,000 persons and is increasing every day. And if all these dreams were realized, their employees on the Federal payroll will likely exceed 200,000.

But even this is not the whole story. Lest anyone thinks this is good for us, I may point to some of the already evident consequences of socialized electric power.

EXPANSION BY DURESS

Under the irresistible nature of bureaucracy and the backing of the Socialists every one of these Federal enterprises becomes a center of encroachments upon or coercion and absorption of the private industry. For instance, by the threat of WPA gifts and low-interest rates on loans to municipalities, private enterprises were absorbed at less than their worth.

Great duplicate transmission lines have been built and more are contemplated.

Some of these Government enterprises are given the power of eminent domain by which they could seize transmission lines and substations of competitors and, if the owner refuses their price, he can pay lawyers for years to fight for compensation in the courts. Free enterprise never had such a privilege.

Some part of the heavy taxes on private utilities goes to build up and support their Federal competitors.

Private enterprises have been prevented from undertaking certain hydroelectric developments in favor of the Government agencies.

These manipulations and powers threaten and weaken the ability of many private concerns to finance their needed expansions.

Indeed, some of them with these guns pointed at them have already thrown up their hands.

Socialization in other directions has been injected into these projects. For instance, the provision that water will not be supplied to farms of over 160 acres in some of the California Central Valley operations. Apparently all others are Kulaks. Also, some of these Federal power enterprises, with cheap Federal capital and subsidized power, are engaged in manufacturing business in competition with private enterprise.

FREEDOM FROM TAXES

These Federal enterprises and their distributing allies pay no taxes to the Federal Government and comparatively little to the local governments. In the last fiscal year the private-enterprise utilities paid over $750 million taxes to the Federal Government and nearly $470 million to the State and local governments. The actual Federal electric enterprises paid less than $5 million toward State and local taxes.

Obviously there is here a huge burden thrust onto every taxpayer throughout the Nation. It will be much greater if the 37 million horsepower program is completed.

Nor is this all of the burdens thrust upon the nationwide taxpayer as I will show you in a few moments.

UNKEPT REPRESENTATIONS TO THE CONGRESS

In many cases the cost of constructing these projects has been woefully underestimated. For instance, the Colorado-Big Thompson project was originally estimated at about $44 million, but is costing over $160 million. The Hungry Horse project originally estimated at $39 million will cost over $109 million. Work has been started on the Oahe project. It was originally estimated to cost about $72 million. It is now estimated that it will cost $293 million.

Some of the increased cost has been due to rising prices but such an excuse by no means explains the degree of underestimate. Some of this underestimation is possibly due to presenting the Congress with a modest project and then hugely edging it up.

Another variety of underestimation is such as the case of the Cumberland River development where the proposals were justified to the Congress on a valuation of the power which was subsequently sold for less than one-half that amount. Whether these are devices to persuade and commit the Congress or just incompetence, I do not know.

In any event such methods would break any business except government.

UNKEPT PROMISES AS TO RETURNS

The original New Deal promises assured Congress that these enterprises would pay 3 percent interest and pay back, that is, amortize the Federal investment over 50 years. This formula has either been abandoned, sadly ignored or juggled.

First. The cost of a multiple-purpose water project must be divided among its several functions, such as navigation, flood control, irrigation, community water supply and hydroelectric power. The interest and amortization of the Federal electric power investment can be decreased by assigning more capital cost to flood control and navigation. The reports of the Federal Comptroller General have protested that such favors have been done.

Some of the Federal enterprises do not include interest on their capital cost during construction, which, again, decreases the payment of interest and amortization on the Federal taxpayers' capital invested. All of which thereby decreases the claimed costs.

But these practices again subsidize the rates to a minority of consumers at the expense of the nationwide taxpayers.

Second. Taking these enterprises as a whole, comparatively little interest and amortization have been paid to the Federal Treasury on the Government investment over all the past years. There is a huge accumulation of this deficiency which should be repaid. Some of these Federal enterprises do not take into account interest and amortization in their costs and thus lower the rates they make their consumers. Some of them do not even enter such a charge in their books.

Some of them do not include the pensions to their employees which, under civil service, are partly loaded on the taxpayer.

Further, a question could also be raised as to the method providing for the costs of depreciation and provision for obsolescence.

Third. Our Federal Reorganization Commission employed Haskins & Sells, one of the leading accounting firms in the United States, to investigate the finances and accounting practices of a large part of these Federal electric power activities. They applied the yardstick of 3-percent interest and amortization in 50 years to the acknowledged Federal investment in power in many of these Federal enterprises. They found many of them would never be able to make the return which was at one time promised to the Congress.

STILL FURTHER BURDENS AND LOSSES TO THE NATIONWIDE TAXPAYERS

And there are more burdens thrust on the taxpayer from this program of socialized power. He has to furnish by taxes the huge capital being invested. Also, as these Federal enterprises have not paid the promised interest, the taxpayer has had to pay it on Government bonds. And the nationwide taxpayer will have to stand all the deficits from mistakes and underestimates.

Under these present methods and practices, this burden and losses to the nationwide taxpayer is not small change. It will run into billions.

And from another angle, if the price of power from the Federal enterprises were placed at a level which would include tax equivalents and all the other nonincluded costs, their rates generally would be equal to, and in some cases higher than, the rates of neighboring private utilities.

THE OPERATING BALANCE SHEET

We can appraise what all this means in actual figures. I have received from the Federal Budget Bureau a statement of the gross receipts and gross operating expenses of these Federal enterprises taken as a whole for the fiscal year 1952, and the estimates for the year ending June 30 of this year. This statement shows an apparent surplus over operating expenses of about $100 million for each of these years. Here, however, come in several great buts.

If the omitted interest, the omitted amortization, and the refunding the accumulated deficiency of these items and other costs I have mention were included, this so-called surplus would turn into a deficit.

And I do not include in this deficit any equivalent for taxes—another large sum.

Also, I am advised that the operating recepits for 1952 could have been $75 million greater had this power been sold at the market price.

ACCOUNTING

Our reorganization commission accountants condemned many of the Federal power financial and accounting methods and estimates. They found the true construction and operating costs to be obscured. They proposed many reforms which have not been adopted. The Comptroller General of the United States, as late as 66 days ago, commented on accounting deficiencies.

The Federal power enterprises do not even keep their accounts or present their statements in the intelligible manner which the Government requires of private enterprise. They do, however, emit a host of propaganda figures in press releases.

I recommend to anyone interested in bureaucratic action to see whether he can add up the sums, past and present, involved in Federal electric enterprises from among the 4 million words and sums in the Federal budget.

OTHER EFFECTS ON CITIZENS

All this affects the citizen in many ways aside from the injustice of huge losses and

tax burdens which result in subsidized power to favored groups and communities.

There is a constitutional question involved in these enterprises which must concern the citizen. No one can even attempt to defend many of these activities except on the welfare clause in the Constitution. Under that interpretation, the Federal Government could take over about everything except elections and the churches.

And there is a further important question to the citizen. There is here being erected a sort of Federal regional control in which State governments have some nominal representation but without authority. The people in these regions may get power at the expense of the nationwide taxpayer, but they are surrendering the control of their resources and energies to a Federal bureaucracy.

REMEDY

However, I do not believe in criticism without remedies.

Over 20 years ago I recommended to Congress the transformation of an ex officio Commission into a full Federal Power Commission with regulations which had teeth in them. The purpose was to control the oppressive empires then growing in the private electric utilities. The transformation was made but without the teeth. My successors set up the Securities Exchange Commission to do this de-empiring. Now, however, it is the Federal Government itself that urgently needs the same de-empiring.

The first steps should be:

1. The Congress should cease to make appropriations for more steam plants or hydroelectric plants solely for power. If they are justified, private enterprise will build them and pay taxes on them.

2. The Congress should follow the precedent of the Colorado project and make no more appropriations for new multiple-purpose projects unless the electric power is first leased on terms, the standards of which I will describe in a moment.

3. The Congress should, jointly, with the President, set up a temporary Commission on reorganization of this whole Federal venture with resources to employ technical assistance.

(a) This Commission should investigate and recommend proper methods of accounting and a revision of the division of Federal investment in these projects between electric power and other purposes, and recommend proper practices for the future;

(b) The Commission should report on the actual cost of, and the prospective returns from, each of these major enterprises;

(c) The Commission should formulate the methods and standard terms for leasing generating plants, transmission lines, and the electric energy to private enterprise or to municipalities or to the States or to regional authorities that may be set and managed by the States. These standard terms should provide for payment of interest and amortization of the Federal investment, the refunding of arrears in these items and also some contribution in lieu of taxes. The latter would not need apply in cases of private enterprises as they pay their own taxes.

(d) The Commission should develop methods by which non-Federal agencies can share cooperatively in the cost of future capital outlays on the electrical part of multiple-purpose dams.

WORKING OUT THESE POLICIES

Some of these projects could be disposed of so as to return these standard terms to the Federal Government. Others, due to excessive cost, may need concessions, and the Federal Government would need cut its losses.

Others of them, pending disposal, will need continue to be operated by the Federal Government. In these cases the Commission should recommend what rates they should charge their customers so as to make the standard returns. They should recommend methods to compel such payments to the Federal Treasury instead of their diversion to other purposes. Such action would test the value of these enterprises and, in some cases, indicate what losses may need be cut.

The objective of the whole proceeding should be to get the Federal Government out of the business of generating and distributing power as soon as possible.

In any event, the consumer at all times can be protected by regulation of rates by the State or Federal authorities.

THE RESULTS

It is my belief that, if these proposals be carried out, the ultimate result would be a substantial return to the Treasury without consequential operating expense or bureaucracy.

Moreover, the agencies to whom these projects were leased would undertake or cooperate in their own expansions.

It is my belief that if these things be done, the Federal Government ultimately could reduce its annual investment in power enterprises by at least $600 million per annum.

This program would begin the end of Federal bureaucratic regional control of the States and their people.

Above all, we would rescue free men from this variety of creeping socialism. The American people have fought off socialized medicine, but here is a hole in the dike of freemen that is bringing a flood.

There are those who shy away from the use of the term "socialism," or the name of Karl Marx, in connection with what is going on in the power field. But, excepting those who desire socialization, they are blind to the facts. Socialism has become the world's nightmare. It is not the American dream.

The intellectuals who advocate these Federal activities carry a banner on which they falsely inscribe the word "liberalism." There is one thing I can say beyond any measure of doubt. It is a false liberalism that expresses itself by Federal operation of business in competition with the citizen. It is the road not to more liberty but to less liberty. True liberalism is found not in striving to spread bureaucracy, but in striving to set bounds to it. True liberalism seeks all legitimate freedom, in the confident belief that without freedom, all other blessings are vain. Liberalism is a force truly of the spirit coming from a realization that economic freedom cannot be sacrificed if political freedom is to be preserved.

RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tomorrow to file reports.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVING THE ADMISSION TAX ON MOVIES

Mr. MASON. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, some 5,000 moving-picture theaters closed their doors this past year. One-third of those still operating are in the red; one-third are just breaking even; and one-third are making a fair profit. Each theater in the red paid Uncle Sam from $8,000 to $12,000 admission taxes last year for the privilege of operating at a loss; each theater that broke about even paid from $10,000 to $15,000 for the privilege of doing business without profit; and each theater that made a profit paid from $15,000 to $18,000 in admission taxes and, in addition, a heavy business tax upon every dollar of profit made.

Mr. Speaker, we believe it fair and proper to tax business profits, but we do not believe it either fair or proper to tax business losses. H. R. 157, a bill to repeal the admission taxes upon movie theaters, is scheduled for public hearing on Monday, April 20.

Every Member of Congress who has heard about the situation confronting the moving-picture industry, as it pertains to his district, will be given an opportunity to appear and testify on April 20th, or to file a statement testifying to the need for the repeal of this admission tax upon the moving-picture industry. Next Monday is the day. That is your opportunity to protest this unfair and improper tax.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX REDUCTION

Mr. REED of New York. 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 York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members all realize that the two major parties had a political campaign last fall, and the candidates of both political parties went before the people and in the great majority of instances I am sure promised the people that if their party came to power they would reduce individual income taxes; I know I made that statement, and it was published widely over the country. I want to say that I cherish the good name and character of my party and of the other Members in this House. I want to feel that the men who went out before the people asking a chance to represent them here in this body are men of character, men who are going to carry out the pledge they made in order to come to power.

I introduced on the first day of the Congress a bill, H. R. 1, to reduce personal income taxes by 11 percent. Other Members have introduced similar bills. Other nations all around us are reducing individual income taxes, countries we have helped, and it is time we took action in this body. It will not hurt the Treasury one iota or prevent us from having a balanced budget; I know, for I went all through this in the twenties. This is something the people expect and to which they are entitled. If the membership is not honest with the voters now, what will the people do at the next primary and election?

I have placed on the desk today a petition which you can sign to square yourself with your constituents and bring this bill, H. R. 1, before this House for consideration.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on April 15, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. BYRD. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess Members of Congress who represent coal areas had an opportunity to return home and witness at first hand the economic misfortune that is resulting from importation of too much foreign residual oil. I found some of our mines in West Virginia closed tight, with many others operating only 1 or 2 days a week. These are mines whose output would be going into east coast electric utilities and other industrial plants if it were not for the prevailing deluge of cheap residual oil that is being dumped into those markets.

Our miners and their families, as well as employees of railroads and business houses who are dependent upon a healthy coal industry for their own survival, are extremely discouraged, and they are becoming bitter about the failure of our Government to protect its own citizens against the ravages of a foreign waste product. When I told one of my miner friends about the Trade Agreements Act and the favored nations policy, he said to me: "Congressman, I just wish that the United States could get on this Government's 'favored nations' list."

I assure you that there is a highly urgent need for action. This need transcends all political considerations, and it is indeed encouraging that the crusade to limit residual oil imports has the support of Members of both sides of the House.

Shortly before the recess of this legislative body I told President Eisenhower about the current deplorable economic conditions existing in the coal mining areas of West Virginia, and I expressed my belief that these conditions are being caused by excessive importation of residual oil. Apparently it had not been brought to his attention previously, and I cannot believe that the administration will object to legislation necessary for the welfare of such an important and deserving segment of our populace, legislation which is imperative if the coal industry is to remain strong in a period of accelerated defense production.

I am hopeful that the Congress will quickly adopt the quota limitation bill to curtail the flow from foreign refineries. Our coal miners, their wives, their children and neighbors will be grateful; and you may be sure that the many railroad employees who have been deprived of full-time jobs through loss of coal traffic, and the many businessmen who are suffering because of the recession in trade will be deeply appreciative if we take this means of restoring to them the opportunities that are rightfully theirs.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAXES

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. REED, who has just spoken in regard to his bill, H. R. 1, which provides for the reduction of taxes. From the beginning of this session, Mr. REED has worked vigorously for a reduction in taxes. He believes that the Congress should carry out the campaign pledges made by a majority of the Members of Congress that taxes would be reduced. He is to be congratulated for the interest he has taken as chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means and his bill should be given consideration at the earliest possible moment.

While Mr. REED's bill will reduce taxes, I have introduced House Resolution 52, which, if adopted, will be a powerful step toward balancing the budget. I believe that these two bills will be effective formulas for the reduction of taxes and at the same time balance the budget.

My House Resolution 52 simply provides that record yea and nay votes be required on all appropriation bills and on amendments to such bills. It is based on the conviction and principle that all taxpayers are entitled to know how their representative votes on measures which authorize the expenditure of billions of tax dollars.

A yea and nay vote is a personal thing and if Members know they have to go on record they will consider and take a closer look at every appropriation. Such a procedure might save billions, and thus balance the budget.

Under the present practice only rarely are appropriation bills passed by a yea and nay vote. Other voting procedure used is the voice or division vote and the taxpayers are unable to know how their Congressman votes to spend their money.

My House Resolution 52 is now pending before the Rules Committee and I am hopeful that the Rules Committee, under the leadership of the distinguished chairman from Illinois, Mr. LEO ALLEN, will report this bill out favorably so that the Members of Congress can express themselves thereon, and as to whether or not they are willing to let their constituents know how they vote to spend their tax money.

EXTENSION OF PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permission I received on March 19 for two insertions in the RECORD may be continued.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have been summoned to appear before the people's court at Hagerstown, Md., on April 11, 1953, at 10 a. m., in connection with an alleged traffic violation. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the summons.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the summons.

The Clerk read as follows:

Summons, Maryland State Police. No. S2 70886.

Defendant: CLARE E. HOFFMAN. Street No.: Marshall Street. City: Allegan. State: Michigan.

Operator: License No. [redacted] State: Michigan. Owner.

Tag No.. HG 5982. State: Michigan. Oldsmobile coupe.

Notice to defendant: Failure to obey this summons will result in a warrant being issued for your arrest.

Charge: Ex 50 MPH.

Section 176. Violation date: 4-2-53. Time: 12:05 a. m. Barrack area: B.

Place: Rt. #40-SD MT.

Nonaccident.

Driver's date of birth: 9/10/75. Color: W.

Date of trial: 4-11-53. Time, 10 a. m.

Address: Before magistrate People's Court, Hagerstown.

Trooper: J. W. Hardy.

I hereby accept service of this summons and agree to appear as herein specified, under protest.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

On this date the above-named defendant posted $26.45 collateral with the undersigned, to assure his appearance at the time, place, date, and before trial magistrate above named to answer to the charge hereon specified.

Date 4/2/53.

Sgt. JOHN S. DIVINE.

Name and title of person authorized to accept collateral.

Address: Hag. Md. Police Dept.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in that connection I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 202) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN, a Member of this House, has been served with a summons to appear as a defendant before the Peoples Court at Hagerstown, Md., on the 11th day of April 1953, on a charge of violating traffic rules; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear in response to a summons of a court, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN is authorized to appear in response to summons No. S2 70886 of the Peoples Court at Hagerstown, Md., at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the summons of said court.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the charge in the summons being one of the violation of a traffic regulation, not one of a capital crime, the

hour granted me under the rules of the House will not be used to give the facts which brought about the issuance of the summons just read, nor will your patience be exhausted by a plea for support of the resolution which I hope will be adopted.

That an officer, be he ever so efficient, may be mistaken is evidenced by the fact that in the summons which he wrote he gave the license number of the car which I was driving as HG–5982, though the car at the time carried the license number LY–1100 and he drove behind me for, I would judge, 5 miles. At least, it seemed that long to me.

The officer also advised me that my license expired last February. My license expires February 28, 1954. My driver's license expires February 28, 1955. The foregoing is cited only to show that even an officer is not always infallible.

You may wonder why this resolution is brought before the House. There are several reasons.

A certain section of the press, some few writers and commentators, are always, whether justified or not, seeking to belittle the House and Members of the House. In my opinion the privileges of the House and of the Members of the House should be jealously guarded.

We should also be extremely careful not to disregard any law or the regulation of any civil authority. Had I been aware that there was a speed limit of 50 miles an hour on the highway I was using, I would have tried to drive within that limit.

In the House Rules and Manual, 83d Congress, section 290, page 121, will be found a statement of the rule which should govern.

Article I, section 6, clause 1 of the Constitution referring to Members of Congress states:

> They shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during the attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same.

Now, for myself I do not care to claim any privilege as a Member of the House that is not enjoyed by every citizen, and I shall at some future time which suits the convenience of the court before which I was summoned to appear, appear and submit to its decision.

If a fine is imposed, I hope to be able to pay it; if it is burdensome, perhaps some of my colleagues who vote so frequently such large sums of the taxpayer's money for so many purposes will, out of their private funds, contribute to any need I may then have. Should a jail sentence be imposed, and that I do not anticipate, no one will be asked to share it.

There is another reason why Members should not submit to arrest without the consent of the House. Last year two Members of the House, at a point where two roads merge, did not see a stop sign. They were not exceeding a speed limitation; no other cars were using the highway at that point; there was no accident; they passed the sign without stopping, were arrested, on a Saturday, put behind bars, and detained until some one in authority recognized the absurdity of the situation, when they were released. It is evident to everyone, I think, that if Members on their way to a session are to be subject to arrest and confinement at the will of some local officer on occasion, though no doubt not often, a Member might be prevented from casting a deciding vote on vital legislation.

When apprehended I was on what might be termed a through highway, one toward the construction of which the Federal Government had contributed several hundred thousand of dollars. There was no congested traffic. My car was not carrying a congressional tag. I did not have an identification card. I made no claim of immunity as a Congressman. In fact I did not think of doing so until I was advised that I was not privileged to go before a court as I had requested, but on the contrary was told that unless I posted $51 and some cents—later reduced to $26.40—I would be locked up—and a wife waiting in the car. I put up the money, and said I would be back.

If this resolution is adopted, and I ask your support in adopting it, I will, as stated, answer the summons. At some convenient time something will be said about legislation giving those using United States highways for interstate travel if and when apprehended an opportunity to forthwith appear before a court. The possible abuses of permitting a practice to grow up of arresting people traveling on long trips across the country for trivial violations of laws and then requiring a cash deposit while denying a speedy trial is subject to abuse. On this future occasion, it is my purpose to speak on the constitutional guaranty of free speech. It is my hope that my colleague from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN], who so often talks on that subject and who thinks the right is unlimited, will be present.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Were you going past 50 or were you going under 50?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That I shall tell the magistrate if I am a witness. But, in my opinion, I was not arrested for exceeding 50 miles an hour. I was arrested—that again is my opinion—for at the wrong time, at the wrong place, and to the wrong person exercising my constitutional right of free speech.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1530) to supplement the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2029), relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, in the State of Florida.

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

Mr. HERLONG. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement about this bill because it has been passed over without prejudice on two occasions.

There is some misunderstanding between the park service and the historical society on the one hand and the city authorities of the city of St. Augustine on the other.

What I should like to do is get the committee to assist us in the preparation of an amendment that will resolve these differences. I had a conference with the mayor of St. Augustine and the president of the historical society last week. I believe they will agree now on an amendment which will definitely describe the land sought to be purchased, provided the park service will permit certain lands which they now own across the street from the fort, to be used for parking automobiles of people visiting the fort. Over a half million people visit this fort annually and there is quite a traffic bottleneck right around the fort as it is also located on United States Highway 1. I see the author of the bill standing. I wonder if he would have any objection to the consideration of such an amendment.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I would have no objection to that. However, the amendment could be put in the bill in the Senate, if the gentleman desires the bill to go forward.

Mr. HERLONG. I would rather it would be put in in the House, if the gentleman will permit that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was not objection.

BUREAU OF PRISONS EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 395) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of employees and former employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, for compensation for the time they were required to work, in violation of the Saturday half-holiday law of March 3, 1931, during the period beginning March 3, 1931, and ending May 1, 1943, in excess of 4 hours on Saturday without being allowed compensatory leave on some other workday. Any suit hereunder shall be instituted within 2 years after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after "act", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

LOUISIANA PURCHASE SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1917) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase, there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 5 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par, and only upon the request of the Louisiana Purchase 150th Anniversary Association.

SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by banks or trust companies selected by the Louisiana Purchase 150th Anniversary Association, and all proceeds therefrom shall be used for the purposes of such association.

SEC. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for security of the coin; or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein directed.

SEC. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued in such numbers, and at such times as shall be requested by the Louisiana Purchase 150th Anniversary Association and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins: *Provided,* That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of the 5-year period immediately following the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase, there shall be coined by the Secretary of the Treasury in the mint of the United States at Philadelphia not to exceed 2½ million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided,* That the initial number of such pieces coined shall not be less than 200,000: *And provided further,* That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage.

"SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par, and only upon the request of the Louisiana Purchase 150th Anniversary Association or the Missouri Historical Society.

"SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by banks or trust companies selected by the Louisiana Purchase 150th Anniversary Association, or the Missouri Historical Society, and the net proceeds therefrom shall be used by such association or society for the observation of the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase.

"SEC. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for security of the coin; or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein directed.

"SEC. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued only during the calendar year 1953, in such numbers and at such times as shall be requested by the Louisiana Purchase 150th Anniversary Association or the Missouri Historical Society and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins.

"SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act a nonprofit historical society of each of the several States that were included in whole or in part within the territory of the Louisiana Purchase when designated by the Governor or legislature of the respective States as an organization to participate in the observation of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase shall be authorized to request, through the Louisiana Purchase 150th Anniversary Society or the Missouri Historical Society, the issuance of said coins. Coins requested in this manner shall be made available to the organization requesting them at par, and such organization shall be entitled to dispose of them in the manner provided in section 3 hereof: *Provided,* That the net proceeds therefrom shall be used solely for the observation of the Louisiana Purchase sesquicentennial."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1936) authorizing the acceptance, for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, of school board land in exchange for park land, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to consolidate Federal holdings in, and to improve, Colonial National Historical Park, the Secretary of the Interior, when he finds that the public interest will be served thereby, is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States from the York County School Board, State of Virginia, the conveyance of any land or interests in land located within the authorized area of the Colonial National Historical Park, together with the structures situated upon such properties, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the school board; and, in exchange therefor, to convey on behalf of the United States to the school board not more than 55 acres of land or interests in land situated within the Colonial National Historical Park.

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.

PRINCE WILLIAM FOREST PARK, PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3380) to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for Prince William Forest Park, Prince William County, Va., for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings therein, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, for the purposes of consolidating Federal holdings of lands acquired for the Prince William Forest Park, Prince William County, Va., is hereby empowered, in his discretion, to obtain for the United States land and interests in lands held in private ownership within the established watersheds and boundaries of said park by accepting from the owners of such privately owned land complete relinquishment thereof, and the Secretary may grant to such owners in exchange therefor, in each instance, federally owned lands of approximately equal value, now a part of the Prince William Forest Park, that he considers are not essential for the administration, control, and operation of the aforesaid park. Any land acquired by the United States pursuant to this authorization shall become a part of Prince William Forest Park upon the vesting of title thereto in the United States, and shall be subject to the laws applicable thereto.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and empowered to grant to any citizen, association, or corporation of the United States, in exchange for the relinquishment of existing easements for utility rights-of-way, perpetual easements across land in Federal ownership within the Prince William Forest Park, such easements to be used for rights-of-way for electric poles, lines, and underground pipes for the transmission and distribution of electric power and gas and for poles and lines for telephone and telegraph purposes to the extent of not more than 75 feet on each side of the center line of such electric, gas, telephone, and telegraph lines: *Provided,* That the said easements shall be conveyed by the United States subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may deem advisable, but no part of the easements granted by him shall be used for any other than utility purposes, and in the event of any breach of this restriction, or in the event that the easements cease to be used for utility purposes, the entire interest herein authorized to be granted shall revert to the United States upon a finding to that effect by the Secretary of the Interior.

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.

QUINCY NATIONAL CEMETERY, QUINCY, ILL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3411) to direct the Secretary of the Army to reestablish and correct the boundaries of the Quincy National Cemetery by the exchange of Government-owned lands in the Quincy-Graceland Cemetery, Quincy, Ill.

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

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Member whose district this bill affects, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MONROE COUNTY, ARK.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 163) to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Monroe County, Ark., to the State of Arkansas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to donate and convey to the State of Arkansas all rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land in Monroe County, Ark., more particularly described as follows:

(1) In the town site of Indian Bay, formerly known as New Warsaw, Monroe County, Ark., all of lots 25, 26, and 34; and

(2) In Cartwright's addition to the town of Indian Bay, formerly known as New Warsaw, Monroe County, Ark., all of lot 1; north half of lot 4; all of lots 11 and 12; east half of lot 15; all of lots 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 42, 48, 51, 55, 57, and 76.

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.

MARION COUNTY, IND.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 233) to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain lands in Marion County, Ind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land located in Marion County, Ind., is hereby released and relinquished to and for the benefit of the lawful owner or owners of such land. Such land, which was acquired by the United States in 1942 and reconveyed to William Ozman on May 16, 1946, subject to a reservation to the United States (pursuant to Executive Order No. 9701, dated March 4, 1946) of all fissionable materials therein, contains approximately 7.1 acres and is more particularly described as follows:

Block A in the Joe Maloof addition, sections 1 and 2, an addition to the city of Indianapolis, Marion County, Ind., as per plat thereof, recorded in plat book 27, page 80, in the office of the recorder of Marion County, Ind.

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.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2347) 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.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of sections 1 (15) and 420 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (49 U. S. C., secs. 1 (15) and 1020), as continued in effect by section 1 (a) (25) and (26) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (Public Law 450, 82d Cong.), and the authorizations conferred and liabilities imposed thereby, 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. 2914, 3 C. F. R., 1950 Supp., p. 71), notwithstanding any limitation, by reference to war or threatened war, of the time during or for which the authorizations or liabilities thereunder may be exercised or imposed.

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.

MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1551) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the author of this bill, or the chairman of the committee, in regard to the bill.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, this bill is for the purpose of transferring title from the Government of the United States to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians to approximately 28,000 acres of land which were purchased by the Federal Government for the use and benefit of the Indians themselves. A similar bill went through the House of Representatives during the 81st and the 82d Congresses, but was not acted upon in the other body. No Federal funds are required. The Indians feel they want to develop this property more fully and to get further benefits from it. But they feel until title is transferred to them, as was originally intended, they cannot risk their own money.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The question I would like to ask the gentleman is: Since this land was acquired by the Government for the use of the Indians in the first instance, and that was many years ago, and since the land has been used for the benefit of the Indians, and they are in possession of it, occupying it, tilling it, and living on it, why is it necessary to transfer title to the land? Why would it not be better to leave it the way it is with the Federal Government?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Because the Indians feel that inasmuch as this land was purchased for their benefit and use, they ought to have title to the land. Secondly, they feel they want to develop this property at their own expense and not at the expense of the Federal Government. In order to do that, they feel they must have title to this land in their name, held in trust by the United States Government. It seems to me that would be the proper thing for us to do to help these Indians get out of the wardship state as quickly as possible so that they may be taught to make use of their own property and expend their own funds and not have the Federal Government continuing to do this.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As the title is held at present, and has been since the land was first purchased for the benefit of the Indians, have all improvements that have been placed thereon been paid for by the Federal Government or have the Indians paid for them themselves?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I cannot answer that question definitely. I believe part of the improvements have been placed on the property by the Federal Government, or part of the upkeep has been paid for by the Federal Government, but a great portion of it, as I understand from the testimony, has been furnished by the Indians themselves. But they feel they cannot go further in furnishing their funds until they have some definite assurance that this land is theirs and held in trust by the Government.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Do I understand from the gentleman then, that in the event this bill is enacted into law, in the future all improvements on this property will be paid for by the Indians themselves and not be an expense to the Federal Government?

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. That is my understanding.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title to the lands and interest in lands, together with the improvements thereon, and proceeds from rents and sales therefrom, which have been acquired by the United States under authority of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 200), the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115), and of section 55 of title I of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 750, 781), lying and situate within the State of Minnesota, administrative jurisdiction over which has heretofore been transferred by the President from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive Order No. 7868, dated April 16, 1938, is hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States of America for the use and benefit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to proclaim such lands as an addition to the White Earth Indian Reservation.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

"That title to the lands and interest in lands, together with the improvements thereon, which have been acquired by the United States under authority of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 200), and subsequent acts, lying within the White Earth Indian Reservation, Minnesota, administrative jurisdiction over which has heretofore been transferred by the President from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive Order No. 7868, dated April 15, 1938, as hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States of America for

the use and benefit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota, and such lands shall constitute an addition to the White Earth Reservation.

"SEC. 2. Any rents previously collected for the use of said lands are hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States of America for the use and benefit of said tribe."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

LAC COURTE OREILLES BAND OF LAKE SUPERIOR CHIPPEWA INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1834) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title to the lands and interest in lands, together with the improvements thereon, which have been acquired by the United States under authority of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 200), and subsequent acts, lying within the Lac Courte Oreilles Reservation, Wis., administrative jurisdiction over which has heretofore been transferred by the President from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive Order No. 7868, dated April 15, 1938, is hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States of America for the use and benefit of the Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin, and such lands shall constitute an addition to the said reservation.

SEC. 2. Any rents previously collected for the use of said lands are hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States of America for the use and benefit of said band.

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.

PAYMENT OF SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF OFFICIALS OF THE KLAMATH TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3406) to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, or such official as may be designated by him, is hereby authorized, until otherwise directed by Congress, to advance to the tribe or to pay out of any unobligated tribal funds of the Klamath Indians in the Treasury of the United States salaries and expenses of tribal officials or representatives (except the Klamath Loan Fund Board) at rates and/or limitations to be designated in advance by the Klamath General Council, or any governing body to which it may delegate such authority: *Provided,* That the length of stay of representatives serving the tribe at the seat of government shall be determined by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

SEC. 2. The act of June 25, 1938 (ch. 710, 52 Stat. 1207), as amended August 7, 1939 (ch. 519, 53 Stat. 1244), as amended May 15, 1945 (ch. 123, 59 Stat. 167), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "limitations", strike out the words "to be."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "Council" and insert "Council" and a comma.

Page 2, line 2, after the word "authority", insert "and approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "Commissioner of Indian Affairs" and insert "Secretary of the Interior."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

CONVEY CERTAIN SCHOOL PROPERTIES TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1242) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, is hereby authorized to convey to State or local governmental agencies or to local school authorities all the right, title, and interest of the United States in any land and improvements thereon and personal property used in connection therewith heretofore or hereafter used for Federal Indian school purposes and no longer needed for such purposes: *Provided,* That the consent of the beneficial owner shall be obtained before the conveyance of title to land held by the United States in trust for an individual Indian or Indian tribe. Any conveyance under this act shall reserve all mineral deposits in the land and the right to prospect for and remove such deposits under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, shall require the property to be used for school or other public purposes, and shall require the property to be available to Indians and non-Indians on the same terms unless otherwise approved by the Secretary of the Interior. If at any time the Secretary of the Interior determines that the grantee of any such lands, improvements, and personal property has failed to observe the provisions of the transfer agreement and that the failure has continued for at least 1 year, he may declare a forfeiture of the conveyance and the title conveyed shall thereupon revert to the United States. Such determination by the Secretary of the Interior shall be final.

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.

BAD RIVER BAND OF LAKE SUPERIOR CHIPPEWA INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2130) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title to the lands and interests in lands, together with the improvements thereon, which have been acquired by the United States under authority of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 200), and subsequent acts, lying within the Bad River Indian Reservation, Wis., administrative jurisdiction over which has heretofore been transferred by the President from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive Order No. 7968, dated April 15, 1938, is hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States of America for the use and benefit of the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin, and such lands shall constitute an addition to the said reservation.

SEC. 2. Any rents previously collected for the use of said lands are hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States of America for the use and benefit of said band.

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.

MAILING OF SMALL FIREARMS BY LAW-ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3367) to amend section 1715 of title 18 of the United States Code to permit the transmission in the mails to certain officers and employees of State, Territorial, District, and local governments of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms capable of being concealed on the person, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1715 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 1715. Firearms as nonmailable; regulations

"(a) Pistols, revolvers, and other firearms capable of being concealed on the person are nonmailable and shall not be deposited in or carried by the mails or delivered by any postmaster, letter carrier, or other person in the postal service.

"(b) Pistols, revolvers, and other firearms capable of being concealed on the person may be conveyed in the mails, under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe, for use in connection with their official duty, to—

"(1) officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, or organized Reserve Corps;

"(2) officers of the National Guard or militia of a State, Territory, or District;

"(3) officers of the United States, or of a State, Territory, or District, or political subdivision thereof, whose official duty is to serve warrants of arrest or commitments;

"(4) employees of the postal service;

"(5) officers and employees of enforcement agencies of the United States, or of a State, Territory, or District, or political subdivision thereof; and

"(6) watchmen engaged in guarding the property of the United States, a State, Territory, or District, or political subdivision thereof.

"(c) Pistols, revolvers, and other firearms capable of being concealed on the person may be conveyed in the mails, under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe, to manufacturers of firearms or bona fide dealers therein, when sent, in connection with their official duty, by officers, employers, and watchmen specified in subsection (b).

"(d) Pistols, revolvers, and other firearms capable of being concealed on the person also

may be conveyed in the mails to manufacturers of firearms or bona fide dealers therein, from one to the other, in customary trade shipments, including such articles for repairs or replacement of parts, under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe.

"(e) Whoever knowingly deposits for mailing or delivery, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail according to the direction thereon, or at any place to which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, any pistol, revolver, or firearm declared nonmailable by this section, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

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.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the bills eligible for consideration on the Consent Calendar.

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.

Mr. BATES and include a radio program.

Mr. D'EWART and include a letter.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN and include a petition.

Mr. WOLVERTON in four separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLSWORTH and include a speech.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN in two instances.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and include an article by Anne O'Hara McCormick, appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in four instances.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in four instances.

Mr. NORRELL and to include an article.

Mr. DAGUE and to include an editorial.

Mr. PHILLIPS and to include certain statistics.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 2, 1953, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

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.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HESELTON, for Tuesday and Wednesday, April 14 and 15, on account of official business.

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for week of April 13 to 18, on account of Government business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 14, 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:

607. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 124); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

608. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 125); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

609. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 23, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the Ohio shoreline of Lake Erie, Sandusky Bay, Ohio, appendix IV, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 126); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

610. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 23, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the Ohio shoreline of Lake Erie, Sheffield Lake Village to Rocky River, appendix XIV, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 127); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with six illustrations.

611. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the eighth report concerning the Yugoslav emergency relief assistance program, covering the period September 16, 1952, through December 15, 1952, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 897, 81st Congress (the Yugoslav Emergency Relief Assistance Act of 1950) (H. Doc. No. 128); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

612. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the prevention of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of February 1953, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

613. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter and memorandum regarding the certification as to adequacy of soil survey and land classification as required by the 1953 Appropriation Act, Boulder Creek Supply Canal, Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, pursuant to Public Law 470, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

614. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to retrocede to the State of Oklahoma concurrent jurisdiction over the right-of-way for United States Highway 62 and 277 within the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

615. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of organizations requesting loans from the Navy Department of obsolete ships' bells under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 649, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

616. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on a survey and review of the Alaska Road Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Government Operations.

617. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of investigation by the General Accounting Office, covering the sale of Government-owned timber by the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

618. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I., pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

619. A letter from the speaker, First Guam Legislature, transmitting a copy of the Statutes and Amendments to the Codes of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

620. A letter from the executive secretary, American Chemical Society, transmitting the annual report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1952, pursuant to section 8 of Public Law 358, 75th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

621. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting two copies of the opinion, findings of fact, and recommendation of the court in re Otho F. Hipkins and others, pursuant to the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1087), as amended by the act of June 25, 1948 (28 U. S. C. 1492 and 2509); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

622. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation and a list of persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948, Public Law 863, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

623. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence in the United States, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

624. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to provide for the completion of certain projects for flood control and related purposes in the Columbia River Basin"; to the Committee on Public Works.

625. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 2, 1953,

the following bill was reported April 7, 1953:

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4004. A bill to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes; with amendment (Rept. No. 259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted April 13, 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. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 270. A bill to provide for the control and extinguishment of outcrop and underground fires in coal formations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 444. A bill to amend the act of May 19, 1947, so as to increase the percentage of certain trust funds held by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation which is to be distributed per capita to individual members of such tribes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1244. A bill to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds and other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 4479. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4480. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase from $75 to $150 per month the amount which may be earned without loss of old-age or survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4481. A bill to authorize enrolled members of the Gros Ventre and Assiniboine Tribes of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., to acquire interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 4482. A bill to grant price support on certain wool of the 1951 clip; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 4483. A bill to provide compensation to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of Indians for certain lands of the Riverton reclamation project within the ceded portion of the Wind River Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4484. A bill to amend section 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of assets of a decedent's estate for funeral expenses; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4485. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to publication of partnerships; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4486. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to forcible entry and detainer; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4487. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as further amended by an act of April 19, 1920 (title 20, ch. 1, sec. 116, District of Columbia Code 1951), relating to continuing decedent's business; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4488. A bill to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 4489. A bill to provide a method by which committees of the House of Representatives may compel the testimony of witnesses, in certain cases, notwithstanding a claim of privilege against self-incrimination; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 4490. A bill to place individuals who served in the temporary forces of the United States Navy during the Spanish-American War in the same status as those individuals who served in the Army during that war and who were given furloughs or leaves upon being mustered out of the service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 4491. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4492. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 55 the age at which insurance benefits become payable in the case of widows who do not have minor children and in the case of dependent mothers of deceased insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4493. A bill to amend section 3250 (1) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a person entitled to drawback with respect to certain nonbeverage products may elect to receive such drawback on a monthly instead of a quarterly basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4494. A bill relating to unemployment insurance coverage for seamen employed on certain vessels operated for the account of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 4495. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 4496. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain lands to the Board of Education of Prince Georges County, Upper Marlboro, Md., so as to permit the construction of public educational facilities urgently required as a result of increased defense and other essential Federal activities in the District of Columbia and its environs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 4497. A bill to amend section 32 of the Fire and Casualty Act, so as to provide that an agent or solicitor may secure a license to solicit accident-and-health insurance in the District of Columbia under that act without taking the prescribed examination, if he is licensed under the Life Insurance Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4498. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Beaver Creek watershed, in Oklahoma, for purposes of runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4499. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to construct certain works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention, on the Beaver Creek watershed in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 4500. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4501. A bill to modify the plan of improvement for the Vicksburg-Yazoo area, Mississippi, authorized by subparagraph (o) under the title "Lower Mississippi River" in section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 4502. A bill to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4503. A bill to amend section 402 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide more definite standards for determining who is entitled to exemption from part IV of that act as an association of shippers or a shipper's agent; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4504. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 4505. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 4506. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law prohibiting the use of funds of or available for expenditure by any Government corporation or agency for certain payments of annual leave accumulated by a civilian officer or employee thereof; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 4507. A bill to amend and extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4508. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. PATTEN: Memorial of the Arizona State Legislature, memorializing the Congress to take favorable action on H. R. 1972, authorizing the Forestry Service of the Department of Agriculture to expend 10 percent of its revenue from national forests, not to exceed $5½ million, for the improvement of facilities in our national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Arizona State Legislature, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take whatever action is necessary to continue in operation the excellent military installation at Fort Huachuca, Ariz.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the maintenance of Fort Huachuca; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States recommending the amending of Public Law 552 of the 82d Congress, so as to permit the examination of longwall mines at any time during every working day, etc.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation supporting the prices of basic farm crops at 100 percent parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the appropriation under Public Law No. 731, so as to provide and secure a larger allotment of funds for FHA direct farm-ownership loans in North Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to return to the original landowners mineral rights acquired by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation requiring lands from which parcels described by metes and bounds have been condemned or purchased for dam construction to be surveyed and platted to determine descriptions and acreage of remaining tract; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to discontinue Federal taxation of motor-vehicle fuel and to reserve such source of highway revenue to the several States; 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 to pass legislation requiring investigations of Federal income-tax returns to be conducted within 2 years from the time such returns must be filed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation necessary to retire the Federal Government from the field of taxation on gasoline and to discontinue the diversion of other highway-user taxes to any purpose other than road and highway construction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds and otherwise provide for the construction of campgrounds, parking areas, necessary access roads relevant thereto, outdoor fireplaces, and other related public-recreation facilities along the highways of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the Congress of the United States to make a sufficient appropriation to complete those harbor projects which have already been approved for Alaska by the United States Army Engineers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting an appropriation enabling the construction of a combined courthouse, jail, post office, and general Federal office building at Valdez, Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the benefits of section 512b of the National Defense Housing Act of 1950, as amended, until July 25, 1957; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging that the congressional act (48 U. S. C. A. 484, 63 Stat. 58) be amended to provide for mortgage loans to individuals through the Alaska Housing Authority, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting immediate passage of S. 225, amending the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, so as to prevent interruptions to ocean transportation service between the United States and its Territories and possessions as a result of labor disputes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of legislation suspending the requirements for the performance of annual labor upon unpatented mining claims in the Territory of Alaska during the national emergency, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging that an immediate appointment of a general manager of the Alaska Railroad be made, and that an investigation of the past operations of the Alaska Railroad be conducted; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting provision for the relief of Edward C. Searle; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that immediate action be taken to investigate and prevent the threatened destruction of the salmon and crab fisheries of western Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to direct the Department of the Army and the Chief of Army Engineers to construct a breakwater in the harbor at the city of Kodiak and to make an appropriation for the construction thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States opposing any reorganization of the Veterans' Administration such as recommended by the Booz, Allen Hamilton report; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 4509. A bill for the relief of the Rupert Diecasting Co. of Kansas City, Mo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 4510. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Kon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4511. A bill for the relief of Conrad Joseph LaMendola, Benoit Gary LaMendola, and Michael Pasteur LaMendola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4512. A bill for the relief of Ettli Zylberfuden, also known as Ettl Zylberfuden, and Becalel Zylberfuden, also known as Robert Zylberfuden, and Michael Zylberfuden, also known as Michal Zylberfuden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4513. A bill for the relief of Ronald Herbert Hoorn (Hawel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4514. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Sabahattin Giz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4515. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Asaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4516. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Papalexatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4517. A bill for the relief of Baldo Vasile (also known as Valdo or Baldassare Vasile); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 4518. A bill for the relief of Harry John Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4519. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Government-owned burial lots and other property in the Washington Parish Burial Ground, Washington, D. C., and to exchange other burial lots; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 4520. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 4521. A bill for the relief of Heinz Erb and Ingeborg Erb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 4522. A bill for the relief of Petrus Van Keer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 4523. A bill for the relief of Sung Ryun Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4524. A bill for the relief of the Union Oil Co. of California and the Matson Navigation Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4525. A bill for the relief of Paul Laisaar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4526. A bill for the relief of Henriette Knowles, also known as Henriette Schulz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4527. A bill for the relief of Carlos Figuera Cawaling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4528. A bill for the relief of Robert Jose Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4529. A bill for the relief of Wong Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4530. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 4531. A bill for the relief of Lyman Chalkley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4532. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Caulk; 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:

139. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Missoula Chamber of Commerce, requesting that the Congress of the United States deed Fort Missoula to Missoula County, Mont.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

140. Also, petition of the Provincial Secretary, Province of Batanes, Republic of the Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolutions No. 61 and No. 110 of the Provincial Board of Laguna, supporting the move for a grant of $200,000,000 additional war-damage compensation from the United States Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

141. Also, petition of Buichi Okada, and 349 other Japanese, of Kumamoto Junior College, Kumamoto, Japan, requesting release of the Japanese people who are serving prison terms as war criminals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

142. Also, petition of the chairman, board of directors, Schenectady Taxpayers Association, Inc., Schenectady, N. Y., expressing approval of H. R. 2341, a bill to protect the public health from the dangers of fluorination of water; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

143. Also, petition of the chairman and commissioners, Public Service Commission of Wyoming, urging the Congress of the United States to reject and defeat any legislation providing for the repeal or amendment of the long- and short-haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

144. Also, petition of the county clerk, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., requesting the appropriation of adequate funds to provide the National Cemetery of the Pacific with permanent white crosses; to the Committee on Appropriations.

145. Also, petition of Mrs. Emily S. Pearson, of Minneapolis, Minn., with reference to the estate of Nels Pearson decedent's estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

146. Also, petition of the general secretary, Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee, Wis., opposing the passage of any proposed legislation which would obviously circumvent the decision of the Supreme Court, raise Federal taxes, injure our peacetime oil reserves, and jeopardize the defenses of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

147. Also, petition of the secretary, National Sojourners, Chapter No. 17, San Antonio, Tex., supporting the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Naturalization Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

148. Also, petition of Mrs. L. D. Glenn and others, St. Petersburg, 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.

149. Also, petition of R. B. Springstead, 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 Comimttee on Ways and Means.

150. Also, petition of M. S. Warren, and others, 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.

151. Also, petition of J. K. Carr, and others, 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.

152. Also, petition of Buddy Hays, and others, 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.

153. Also, petition of Alfred B. Hunt, 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.

154. Also, petition of Buddy Hays 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.

155. Also, petition of W. H. Endrley and others, of Orlo Vista, 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.

156. Also, petition of Mary Kittering 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.

157. Also, petition of J. C. Michael 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.

158. Also, petition of Albert Cornelius 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.

159. Also petition of Rev. R. W. Dickut and others, of Holly Hill, 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.

160. Also, petition of Frank G. Newhart, 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.

161. Also, petition of Mrs. Mary Pickles, 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.

162. Also, petition of Mrs. T. J. Langford, 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.

163. Also, petition of Ruth E. Henry, and others, of Winter Park, 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.

164. Also, petition of Beula Hunt, 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.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Luther Holcomb, pastor, Lakewood Baptist Church, Dallas, Tex., offered the following prayer:

O God, I stand in this sacred place as an humble servant of Thine, grateful for the privilege of offering this prayer unto Thee.

Help us, our Father, to show other nations an America which constantly conveys the spirit of the words on our coins "In God we trust."

May Thy will be done here, and may Thy program be carried out, above party and personality, beyond time and circumstance, for the good of America and the peace of the world.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 13, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 163. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Monroe County, Ark., to the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 233. An act to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind.;

H. R. 395. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice;

H. R. 1242. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies;

H. R. 1551. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe;

H. R. 1834. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin;

H. R. 1917. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase;

H. R. 1936. An act authorizing the acceptance, for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, of school board land in exchange for park land, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2130. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin;

H. R. 2347. An act 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;

H. R. 3367. An act to amend section 1715 of title 18 of the United States Code to permit the transmission in the mails to certain officers and employees of State, Territorial, District, and local governments of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms capable of being concealed on the person, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3380. An act to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for Prince William Forest Park, Prince William County, Va., for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings therein, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3406. An act to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe.