

with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 10 (legislative day of July 6), 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Stuart Rothman, of Minnesota, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

FEDERAL MEDIATION CONCILIATION SERVICE

Whitley P. McCoy, of Alabama, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Guy Farmer, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, for the remainder of the term of 5 years expiring August 27, 1955.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Eldon Claggett Upton, Jr., of Louisiana, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the term of 4 years, expiring June 30, 1957.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JULY 10, 1953

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast blessed us with the priceless gift of a beautiful new day, may there be nothing in our thoughts, words, and deeds of which we shall be ashamed when the sun has set or at the eventide of life when Thou dost call us to Thyself.

Inspire us with a loftier conception of the dignity and sanctity, the meaning and mission of life and may we have a clearer vision of its glory and greatness and peacefulness when spent in being good and doing good.

Grant that on the battlefields of life, as we struggle for the sovereignty of high ideals and principles, we may never become discouraged or despair of the reality of goodness and the triumph of righteousness.

Help us to feel that it is far better and nobler to fail in the right than to succeed in the wrong.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of Our Salvation whose strength is invincible and whose kingdom of love and peace will some day be gloriously victorious. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930 AND RELATED LAWS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 327, Rept. No. 761), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5877) to amend certain administrative pro-

visions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6200, Rept. No. 762) which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON reserved all points of order on the bill.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Armed Services Committee be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1953

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 5710) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 85]

Barden	Gamble	O'Neill
Bates	Gwinn	Patten
Beamer	Hagen, Minn.	Powell
Blatnik	Hardy	Reed, Ill.
Bonner	Hébert	Rivers
Buckley	Hess	Shafer
Byrd	Hinshaw	Sikes
Celler	Johnson	Tuck
Cunningham	Kilday	Whitten
Dawson, Ill.	Lucas	Wigglesworth
Dolliver	McVey	Williams, Miss.
Durham	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Calif.
Ellsworth	Mollohan	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Moulder	
Fogarty	Nelson	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eighty-one Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

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

EXCESS-PROFITS TAX EXTENSION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 326 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5898) to extend until December 31, 1953, the period with respect to which the excess-profits tax shall be effective. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, early in the year the President of the United States, the membership of his entire Cabinet, his financial advisers, the Republican leadership of both the United States Senate and House of Representatives held that in order to safeguard our national security and financial stability, there should not be any reduction in individual income tax; and that the excess-profits tax should be extended until December 31 of this year.

At long last a bill for the extension for 6 months of the excess-profits tax is before us for consideration. Without question it is before us by the way of orderly procedure. The Ways and Means Committee reported this bill by a vote of 16 to 9.

On yesterday, members of the Ways and Means Committee of both the majority and the minority appeared before the Rules Committee and without exception asked for a closed rule with but one motion to recommit. The Rules

Committee has given the Ways and Means Committee the type of rule that they have requested with but one exception. They asked for 6 hours of general debate, and this rule provides but 4 hours. I believe I should mention that this is the identical type of rule that has been given in every instance on tax legislation during the 17 years that I have been a member of the Rules Committee.

Therefore, I trust that no one will take the floor and say that this is an extraordinary rule, that this is an unusual procedure, that the Rules Committee is usurping power of the standing committees, that it is attempting to tear down the foundations of our democracy, that it is trying to destroy our constitutional government.

I am pleased that the bill is before us in the way it should be, at the request of the Ways and Means Committee, under the type rule they have requested. This gives all of us the opportunity to vote as our conscience dictates.

Before the close of day, it is my sincere hope that the excess-profits tax is extended for 6 months.

When I assumed the chairmanship of the Rules Committee, I did not do so with the purpose of thwarting or hindering the program of President Eisenhower or our Republican leadership on Capitol Hill, of which I am justly proud. There are two requisites for good leadership.

To be a leader, one must know where he is going, and he must have followers.

I know our President has these requisites, and I know JOE MARTIN, CHARLIE HALLECK, and LES ARENDS possess these requisites.

To my Republican colleagues I desire to say, in a most friendly spirit, that today we are testing our loyalty to an extremely popular President and to an equally popular House leadership.

While I readily admit that I am a novice when it comes to politics, nevertheless it appears to me that, individually and as a party, if we Republicans are to be successful in the 1954 election, our salvation lies in following Republican leadership.

To be more specific, when the 1954 primaries and elections come around, I want my people to know that I have not been fighting President Eisenhower, but that I have been playing on his team with the hope and with the expectation that we can solve the gigantic problems before us.

Like tens of millions of others, I am also a taxpayer and sincerely believe our taxes are too high and should be reduced at the earliest possible moment consistent with our national security and financial stability. I do not relish paying high taxes any more than anyone else.

The 1952 Republican platform advocates that there be "a reduction of expenditures by the elimination of waste and extravagance so that the budget will be balanced and a general tax reduction can be made." To this I fully subscribe.

During the Republican 80th Congress, 1947-48, under the congressional leadership of Senators TAFT, BRIDGES, and MILLIKIN, who were joined by Senators BYRD, GEORGE, and others; under Speaker MAR-

TIN, Majority Leader HALLECK, Chairman TABER, of the Appropriations Committee, and others, taxes were reduced 15 percent across the board; the budget was balanced; and there was a surplus of nearly \$7 billion which was used for the reduction of the national debt.

The leaders of the 80th Congress are the leaders of the present Congress. I have great confidence in them and I expect to follow their leadership.

I urge the adoption of the resolution. Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Would a motion to recommit with instructions be in order under this rule?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is a matter for the Speaker to decide.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, my beloved chairman [Mr. ALLEN], and while I disagree with him in this matter this morning, I want to say for him that he is one of the fairest chairmen I ever served under. He is forthright; he knows his duty; he undertakes to do it fearlessly, and I am proud of his stand, because I know he is doing what he thinks is the right thing to do as far as the leadership is concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule and I am opposed to the bill which it proposes to make in order.

I think I should say at the beginning I feel reasonably sure, in connection with the parliamentary question propounded by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that there will be an opportunity under this rule to submit a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to corroborate the statement of the gentleman. I am very sure that that is the situation, and certainly we would not want it otherwise.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been an advocate of Government economy, a balanced budget, and a sufficient levy of taxation to accomplish that purpose. I think my record in the House is well known on that. So, on this bill, with all its ramifications before the Committee on Ways and Means, before the Committee on Rules, and before the House, I delved around for some justification for supporting it. I thought that after all that had happened, the Committee on Ways and Means would come forth with a fine argument as to why this bill should be enacted and why this tax should be continued. I thought it would be full of clear and cogent reasons for this bill. So I got the report of the majority of the committee on this bill, and when I looked at it I tried to find out where the reasons were. It is contained in about a half a page, and there is not but one pertinent section in the report as to why you should vote for this bill. So I am going

to read you just a few lines that will give you the reasons of the Ways and Means Committee and the reasons of the President as to why you should support this piece of legislation. This is very brief. It says:

Though the name suggests that only excess profits are taxed, the tax actually penalizes thrift and efficiency and hampers business expansion.

I suppose that you are expected to assume that is a good and cogent reason for supporting the bill. But the reasons go further. It says:

Its impact is especially hard on successful small businesses which must depend on retained earnings for growth.

There is a second reason why you are urged to support this bill.

These disadvantages of the tax are now widely recognized.

Widely recognized. Everybody knows that it is bad. Therefore, you must support it.

I would not advocate its extension for more than a matter of months.

Now, that is not the language of the Ways and Means Committee. Those cogent reasons for voting for this bill are a quotation from the message of the President sent to Congress advocating the continuance of the tax.

So having received very little aid and comfort from the committee's report, and not being convinced by those very cogent reasons myself, I thought I would go a little further into the matter, so I looked into the hearings. I thought we ought to hear from the Secretary of the Treasury on this, and I found in the hearings that we had heard from him, and at great length. So let us see what he says about it. I will just quote briefly a few sentences. At the beginning of his remarks, the Secretary of the Treasury says:

It should be clear from the President's statement that we disapprove in principle of so-called excess profits taxation—

"We disapprove in principle." So he asks the House to rise above principle and vote for this admittedly unfair and wholly bad bill.

We disapprove in principle * * *. I shall not elaborate on the disadvantages and bad effects of this form of tax. They are familiar to all of us.

We all know it is bad, therefore, we are urged to vote for it.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course, I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman, I take it, is reading from the message of the President which is contained in the report. Of course, the Members can find there the reasons why the President felt that in spite of these things to which the gentleman referred, the extension of this tax is desirable.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Oh yes, he said it was desirable, and he enumerated these things I have read to you.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman be good enough to yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I could not fail to yield to my colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. SCOTT. I do appreciate that, sir. I think the gentleman would want me to call attention to the fact that in his very entertaining summary of the reasons why and why not on this bill, he stops short of reading the actual reason stated by the President, which is in the very next sentence after the gentleman ceased quoting. The President said:

However, under existing circumstances the extension of the present law is preferable to the increased deficit caused by its immediate expiration or to any short-term substitute tax.

I know the gentleman would want me to bring that out.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Oh, yes; and I realize that he said we need the money. I do not want to draw any invidious comparison, but you know if a highwayman held me up at the point of a pistol and said, "Now, give me your wallet, I know I ought not to do it. I know I ought to go to jail if I do it, but I need the money, and I give you my solemn assurance—I give you my solemn assurance that after this one offense I promise you I will never do it to you again." But that is the situation here.

But I wanted, when I was interrupted here, to try to justify this bill on the basis of the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury. I want to read you another little extract. The Secretary of the Treasury said:

The significant point to me from these figures is that though the tax is a very serious barrier to growth for rapidly expanding small companies, it does not affect the vast majority of companies.

Now, that is a good reason to vote for this legislation, because it only affects a few. They say it does not affect the vast majority. This is a new theory of taxation to me. It is all right to put on an unjust and unfair tax if it only cripples a few people—the vast majority are not damaged by this tax, and, therefore, it is all right to go ahead with it.

Now let us take another part. He says this:

I want to be sure that my position on this point is clear. The present distribution of the corporate tax burden is bad because of the tax barriers to growth and the tax penalties on efficiency.

Therefore, we should vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I quote again:

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think the excess-profits tax very definitely tends to limit the growth of small companies.

The chairman said:

And you also believe, do you not, that it tends to prevent business expansion and increases in the standard of living for all?

You see, it prevents increases in the standard of living.

Then Secretary Humphrey said:

I think it does, Mr. Chairman.

Now, there is another alleged good reason why you ought to vote for this bill.

Then I will quote from his testimony with this extract from the hearings, in which the chairman says:

I understand Senator TAFT was quoted as saying the other day that the excess-profits

tax was a vicious tax. Do you agree with the Senator?

Secretary Humphrey said:

Yes; I think I would say the same thing.

You see, it is a vicious tax. You know the old common-law theory was that a dog was entitled to one bite. If a vicious dog bit you once, it was all right, but he could not bite you twice. But here this vicious dog is going to be given two bites at the people. That certainly is a new and strange philosophy.

Then I thought I would see what somebody else said about it, and I turned to the communication from the Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this time?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to ask the gentleman if it was not the Congress under the control of his party that imposed this tax on the people in the first place; and I would like to ask him further if he does not believe that the overwhelming majority of the Members on his side are going to vote for this extension?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I answer both questions in the affirmative. I even voted for it, myself. It was not the first mistake I have made since I have been in Congress and it may not be the last one.

Returning to the Under Secretary; the Under Secretary said that they knew this was bad, and they tried many other things. One of the things they tried was to spread this over all corporations by an increase in the necessary amount of the normal corporate tax. He said the reason they did not do that was that this affected only a small proportion of the corporations and they did not think it was fair to spread it over all the corporations. That was a rather novel theory to me. You know, to put it in common parlance, it looked as though he were saying, "Well, we have got these sheep in the pasture all bound and hog-tied, and we have hardly sheared them. If we shear them close, and nip a little of the hide along with it, we will not need to shear any more of these sheep in the pasture."

So, notwithstanding those cogent reasons that have been given by the administration for the continuance of this tax, I have not been convinced; and, therefore, I do not expect to support the bill.

As to the rule itself, of course, last week we had here the so-called Sadlak bill. That was the fair-haired baby last week. Yesterday in the Rules Committee some of us thought that as long as there was a good deal of interest in the Sadlak proposal to increase the exemption for the small corporations, it would be all right if we approved a rule which would permit an amendment to this bill to be offered, not by just anybody at all but just by a select few. Any member of the Ways and Means Committee could offer an amendment to incorporate the provisions of the Sadlak bill. But no, the Ways and Means Committee did not want that. So the bill that was fine, and was the solution last week, is not even going to be permitted to be voted upon this week.

I thought there were 2 or 3 controversial matters in here that the committee itself could not agree upon, and that therefore this rule should contain provisions so that the House itself might pass upon those matters that were controversial in the committee and which they themselves could not adopt.

One of them was the so-called Camp amendment that would have permitted small corporations or young corporations to pick out their worst year in selecting their base for taxation, a feature which was carried in previous excess-profits tax laws. I am told that that proposed amendment was defeated in the Ways and Means Committee by a vote of only 13 to 11. If it was that close in the Ways and Means Committee, I thought perhaps it would be all right if the House were given an opportunity to see what we think about it.

Of course, we are not given much opportunity to say what we think about Ways and Means Committee bills; and that is all right. I favor a closed rule, the general closed rule, on Ways and Means bills. But there was a specific proposition in which the committee itself was divided, and in which the House was divided, and I thought that the democratic way was to give them an opportunity to vote on it. I thought the same about the Sadlak amendment; that the House ought to have the opportunity to vote whether they wanted the Sadlak amendment or did not want it.

I have always been convinced that the fair way to raise this money, instead of putting this burden on a few corporations—many of them small—the fair thing to do was just to increase the corporate tax by a sufficient amount, and put it on all corporations, spread it over the whole body of corporations. I thought such an amendment ought to be in order, to be offered by some member of the Ways and Means Committee, if they thought well enough of it to vote for it. But no, that was not made in order.

I want the Members to understand that I have to differ with my chairman on one statement that he made here, and that is that this was the usual rule. In my experience on the Rules Committee, I have never yet seen a rule where the Ways and Means Committee itself did not trust itself far enough to ask for a rule permitting the Ways and Means Committee to offer an amendment to its own bill. And yet, when that was proposed, they said they did not want it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a bad rule. I think it is a bad bill. I am not trying to influence anyone else, but I feel, in justification of my own position, that I ought to state how I feel about this matter.

I expect to vote against the rule and the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, after conferring with the author of the bill I think I could suggest one correction to the recent statement by our beloved colleague from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. The Ways and Means Committee were not refused any request made by them for permission to offer amendments on the floor; on the contrary, the members of the Ways and

Means Committee made no request to the members of the Rules Committee for any such amendments by Members, as I understand.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. We requested the Rules Committee to allow any committee amendment but not amendments by individuals.

Mr. SCOTT. Not by individuals; that is the point I wanted to make.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today at Chicago we were nominating a President. We promised in our platform to balance the budget as an essential prerequisite to tax reduction. Under no other necessity could we justify the extension of an unpopular and admittedly burdensome tax. But the President has said to us in his message that even unpopular taxes must sometimes be continued for a few months. He also said:

However, under existing circumstances, the extension of the present act is preferable to the increased deficit caused by its immediate expiration or to any short-term substitute tax.

In other words, the extension is desirable because otherwise we will have a deficit, and until we have met that deficit we cannot meet our promise to the people of this country, which we must in time meet, and which, in my opinion, we will meet, to bring about ultimate tax reduction.

The adoption of this bill is necessary for the second reason given that neither in the Ways and Means Committee nor among the membership of this House has any short-term substitute tax been proposed which would be workable and acceptable to the majority of this House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the adoption of the rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the position of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Under the Constitution, it is this body, the lower House, that the Founding Fathers decided should have the taxing power. The taxing power does not reside in the Executive, but in this House, whose Members are elected every other year. That is one reason these Members must run every other year, because the people want to keep their hands on the taxing power.

Secondly, we should vote good taxes in this House. If it is not, if it is a bad tax, then do not vote it. That is my position. The problem in our present-day economy is that not only is the spending too high and must come down but also the taxes are likewise too high and must come down, for both individuals and corporations.

I agree with Andrew Mellon, of Pittsburgh, who said in a letter to the chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee:

The excess-profits tax is artificial and troublesome. Taxes of this extreme character are clogs upon productive business.

In fact, I am in several small companies. We will meet this next week to decide programs in view of the burden of the excess-profits tax on small expanding businesses with limited capital. Instead of expanding, we are cutting down if this tax on initiative, efficiency, and good enterprise is retained. The Westinghouse Airbrake Co. has advised me of expansions they had planned. Then they received a cablegram and then a telephone call from their president in Italy, saying, "Cut down if the excess-profits tax is continued." That means that business will see the warning given if this tax passes. That means that productive activity will be cut and once the cuts start we then take the risk of their snowballing into a real decline.

Let me tell you that we must cut governmental expenses as the logical alternative to increasing taxes, and keeping a tax which everyone admits is bad, the excess-profits tax. I have been on this floor, as you know, trying to make cuts in the current budget all this year; \$300 million of cuts in foreign aid that were passed by the Foreign Affairs Committee were mine. Part of 2 amendments were mine for \$30 million more cut in administrative employees abroad. Yesterday I appeared before the House Appropriations Committee asking them to cut \$530 million additional from foreign spending, over what the House and the Foreign Affairs Committee had cut. That can be done without hurting the program. Many items of foreign spending this year can be put off until next, because we are in no imminent danger from Russia. We can thus work toward a balanced budget.

It was on June 22, 1941, for example, that Hitler tried to invade Russia with General Von Falkenhorst and General Von Leeb. It was too late in that year. Winter begins in Russia on October 15 and ends in March. On June 24, 1812, Napoleon crossed the Niemen River and tried to go into Russia with an army of 680,000 men. The same limitation applies to invading Russia from the west, as invading the west from Russia. There cannot before next March, April, May, or June of 1954, be any aggression by Russia. Therefore, there is not the danger of imminent aggression. Under these circumstances with the Soviets having serious satellite troubles, we do not need excessive foreign spending. The aid program can be cut, if you will simply recommend to the Appropriations Committee to adopt my recommendation of \$530 million more reductions that I have worked out. The full amount of the amounts of revenue anticipated to be received through extension of the excess-profits tax for 6 months, is more than made up through my own recommendations for cuts that will in no way hurt the mutual-security program.

I went to Europe for 5 weeks this spring to get a sound basis for actions and have spent much time studying our foreign-aid program. Here is the new yacht that Queen Elizabeth in April 1953 has launched, worth \$5 million, complete with swimming pool, special electric kitchens, and the latest conveniences. The yacht is a 4,000-ton, 413-foot ship, with a crew of 220 for long

voyages, 120 for short ones. How can I explain to my taxpayers the British Government is hard up, and we must give them economic aid? I cannot. I show you the Financial Times of London of April 15 in reference to British current tax reductions, a whole list of them on page 4 and page 5. How can the British Government reduce personal income and corporate taxes in this fiscal year when we are told the United States Government cannot?

Here is the Canadian Government that has balanced its budget and has reduced personal income and corporate taxes. They said in April of this year:

The increase in revenues forecast for 1953 after taking into account the proposed tax reductions amounts to \$276 million over those in 1952.

Those are both corporate and income tax reductions, yet they are getting more money in taxes by giving the taxpayers a reduction. We should do the same.

Why should not the Republican Party do the same thing that it did previously in the 80th Congress, reduce taxes, reduce expenditures, and work toward a balanced budget? We will then receive more income for the Federal Treasury in the current year than we ever received, as we did under the Republican policy in the 80th Congress, which I voted for.

I promised to vote for tax reduction for individuals and corporations in my campaign last fall. I promised to vote to reduce expenditures, with responsibility chiefly in my field of Foreign Affairs Committee work. I stated I was against renewal of the excess-profits tax. I promised to work toward a balanced budget. In sincerely carrying out these against renewal of the excess-profits tax, bill which nobody in Congress defends on the merits as a good bill, or a sound tax.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

GAG RULE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this rule gags the Members of the House of Representatives. It is very difficult for me to make up my mind to vote for a gag rule. It is very obnoxious. At the same time, if it is the only way that a Member can cast a vote for a bill to raise revenue to keep the budget from being more unbalanced than it is, I assume it is justified.

The use of a rule like this is the way to gag the Members of the House and it has been enlarged upon too much. For instance, a bill involving taxation and revenue is a very complicated bill, much of it dependent upon expert testimony. For that reason, the Ways and Means Committee usually insists on a gag rule, and the Rules Committee usually grants a gag rule. The result is that the House of Representatives in the Committee of the Whole can talk 4 or 6 hours or a week about the bill, but no amendment

is in order. When time comes to consider the bill, it is not read under the 5-minute rule; it is just read, period. No amendments are in order. One chairman of the Rules Committee a few years ago referred to such a rule as "a very fair rule; it permits no amendments to be offered." The Members are gagged. They cannot present their views or suggestions, worthy, constructive, and helpful as they may be. So the question is voted up or down—either for or against it. In the other body, the United States Senate, Members are not gagged in that way and they always legislate after every Member has a right to present any amendment of any kind that he desires to present, and the entire body passes on it. If a record vote is properly demanded, it is obtained.

UNDEMOCRATIC

It occurs to me that the Members of the House of Representatives are allowing themselves to fall into a practice that is not only harmful to duly-elected Representatives of the people, but is to an extent undemocratic and contrary to fair rules of representative government. This is doubly bad in the case of the Committee on Ways and Means because that committee has unusual constitutional privileges that no other committee has. It is the only committee in the House or Senate that can originate revenue bills. For that reason, it seems to be more necessary that such a bill be considered freely and openly on the floor

HARD MONEY—HIGH INTEREST

Estimated annual interest cost of carrying Federal debt of present size and structure at interest levels prevailing in 1947 and today

	Debt outstanding, June 30, 1953	Computed average rate, June 30, 1947	Recent and current rates, June 30, 1953	Estimated interest cost under rates prevailing June 30—	
				1947	1953
				Billions	Percent
Marketable issues:					
Bills (91-day).....	\$19.7	0.382	12.107	\$75.3	\$415.1
Certificates.....	15.9	.875	2,500	139.1	397.5
Notes.....	30.1	1.448	1,754	435.8	628.0
Bonds.....	81.2	2.307	3,250	1,873.3	2,639.0
Nonmarketable	76.5	2.593	2,691	1,983.6	2,058.6
Special issues.....	40.5	2.510	2,677	1,016.6	1,084.2
Special issues, noninterest.....	1.6				
Total	265.5			5,523.7	7,122.4

1 Average rate on issue of July 2, 1953.
 2 Rate on 8-month certificate issue of July 6, 1953.
 3 Computed rates estimated from Treasury Bulletin, June 1953.
 4 Rate on latest bond issue of May 1, 1953.
 5 This is \$1,600,000,000 increase on an annual basis.

WASTE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY

An examination of this table will disclose that the pattern of interest rates that was fixed on long-term bonds recently of 3¼ percent will cost the taxpayers, when all the long-term issues are refunded on a basis that is comparable to 3¼ percent interest, approximately \$800 million more per annum, just on long-term bonds, than the taxpayers would have been compelled to pay prior to the increase in rates on long-term bonds May 1, 1953. It will also be noticed that there is a considerable increase in interest charges on notes, certificates, and bills. All of these increases are not chargeable to the present administration, but the increase on long-term bonds is chargeable to this administration. As further proof that the present administration should be charged with

of the House. The argument that the bill is technical and is dependent upon expert testimony is easily answered by the fact that printed copies of the hearings are available, including the testimony of all the witnesses—those giving technical, expert opinions as well as others. If members of the Ways and Means Committee can understand and properly interpret what should be done after hearing this testimony, the question is, Why cannot other Members of the House do likewise? All during World War II, when the price- and wage-control bills came before the House, the Banking and Currency Committee did not ask for a closed or gag rule. We presented these bills every year under the general rules of the House which left them wide open to any amendment without any gag or closed rules of any kind whatsoever. Such a bill also required expert and technical knowledge and information to support it and the House always managed to legislate on these bills and come through without too much trouble without depriving any Member of his right or gagging him in any way.

INCREASE IN INTEREST CHARGES ON NATIONAL DEBT

I am inserting herewith as a part of my remarks estimated annual interest cost of carrying the Federal debt of present size and structure at interest levels prevailing in 1947 and today. It is as follows:

the increase on long-term bonds, I invite your attention to the fact that the computed average return November 30, 1952, on long-term bonds was 2.320 whereas the recent return and the current return, which was established May 1, 1953, is 3.250. The estimated interest cost under rates prevailing November 30, 1952, on the \$81,200,000,000 long-term bonds is \$1,883,800,000 annually, whereas the rate on \$81,200,000,000 long-term bonds at 3¼ percent will cost the taxpayers, on an annual basis, \$2,639,000,000. It is the one increase in interest rates that the administration is definitely responsible for 100 percent; it was also unnecessary and wasteful. It is just as bad to waste taxpayers' money on interest rates as it is any other way. Here is a policy that has been set by the present administration that will cost approximately \$600

million extra just on the long-term obligations. This increase has done something else; it has reduced the prices of the bonds held by individuals, trust funds, pension funds, and others, based upon a lower percentage of interest on the bonds held by them. Examining authorities throughout the country are requiring trust companies and others to charge off the costs on Government bonds by reason of reductions in the price of the bonds held by them which were used by increased interest.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD GUILTY

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System—which I prefer to refer to as the Federal Reserve Board because it only requires 3 words instead of 8, and everyone knows who you are talking about when you say Federal Reserve Board—has been guilty of refusing to back up and support its Government in one of its greatest times of need.

The Federal Reserve System is a public institution, supported by public funds, including the Government's credit, the people's credit. It is an agency of this Government. It is ridiculous for this great agency to sit idly by and permit selfish money lenders to take advantage of the Government by unnecessarily increasing interest rates and do absolutely nothing about it.

VACANCY ON BOARD

The Federal Reserve Board is composed of 7 members—each appointed for 14 years. At this time there is a vacancy. This vacancy has continued for a long time. Under the plain letter of the law—as I interpret the law—it is mandatory on the Executive to fill a vacancy on the Board whenever a vacancy occurs. It is my hope that this vacancy will be filled soon, and I also hope that consideration is given to some person to fill the vacancy who is not definitely tied up with the banking and moneyed interests of the country.

Many occupations and professions have never been represented on the Federal Reserve Board. I doubt that a real farmer has ever been on the Board; that is, one who is engaged in agriculture for a livelihood, and I am quite sure that there has never been a representative of labor on the Board. After all, these two groups represent the people who make the country prosperous if they are able to buy, and they represent the groups who are the first to suffer under hard-money and high-interest policies. Therefore, consideration should be given to having a representative of each of these groups on the Board.

DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Each of the 12 Federal Reserve banks has 9 directors. They are known as class A, B, C—3 each.

Under the law, class A directors are chosen by and are representative of the stockholding banks and are bankers.

The class B directors are elected by the stockholding member banks and must be actively engaged in their districts at the time of their election in commerce, agriculture, or some other industrial pursuit; also a class B director should not be an officer, director, or employee of any bank—a stockholder is not prohibited.

The class C directors are appointed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and while such a director shall not be an officer, director, or employee or stockholder of any bank, it is very necessary under the law that he be well informed on banking business.

As of May 12, 1953, in the 12 Federal Reserve banks, the class A directors, all 36—3 in each bank—were bankers; the class B directors, 6 of them were representatives of agriculture, and 30 were of industry and commerce; of the class C directors, 7 represented agriculture; 1 the legal profession; 7 education; and 20 industry and commerce.

DIRECTORS OF BRANCHES OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

There are 24 branches of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. Each bank has either 7 members or 5 members. In either case a majority of the members is appointed by the Federal Reserve bank which is controlled by a board, a majority of whom are private bankers, and a minority appointed by the Board of Governors.

As of May 12, 1953, the directors of these branch banks appointed by the Federal Reserve banks, 84 were representatives of banking, 1 of education, and 2 of industry and commerce. The minority members that were appointed by the Board of Governors, 20 of them represented agriculture; 1, the legal profession; 9, education; and 33, industry and commerce.

Congress should take another look at the Federal Reserve System and do it right away.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I begin by suggesting and emphasizing that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] was only trying to be helpful to you in the very splendid statement he has just finished making.

I oppose this resolution making in order the so-called excess-profits tax bill. I do so for many reasons which I deem to be sound and justified. It is customary, and rightfully so, for the House to give much weight to resolutions from the Committee on Ways and Means which involve tax legislation. That does not apply to the present proposed measure for I do not believe it may properly be said that this is a committee bill. The committee has acted at the request of the President, yes, at the insistence of the President, so we must say that this is the President's way and that the committee was simply the means by which he has forced this bill to the floor.

Need I remind you that in a very unusual procedure only a few days ago the leadership forced out of the Committee on Rules—or should I say, influenced the Committee on Rules, at least the majority, to take away from the Committee on Ways and Means, without its consent and over its most vigorous protest a bill introduced a few days before by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK]. That bill, too, was a proposed extension of the excess-profits tax for 6 months. It provided, however, for changing the

exemption from \$25,000 to \$100,000, retroactive to January 1 of this year. That resolution was not called for consideration. Instead, now we have a bill by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] which is a flat extension of the excess-profits tax for 6 months. This is an entirely different approach and is not at all the bill that was introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK]. It comes to the floor under an unusually closed rule. True, as my distinguished chairman has said, it was a rule proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] for the committee. Nevertheless, I emphasize that it is not the usual rule for normally, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], has told you, the rule provides that a committee may offer such amendments as it shall direct.

During all of the controversy over this type of legislation it has been repeatedly argued that the House must have a chance to work its will. I strongly favor that principle. Such arguments were made to support the action bringing forth the Sadlak bill. Such arguments are presently being offered to support the Kean bill. I tell you that it is not possible for the House to work its will under this proposed resolution. It can consider no alternate, no substitute, no amendments.

If this resolution is adopted the House will be put in a position of summarily passing upon a decision which was made by the President of the United States. The truth is that under this rule we are reduced to the position of judges in a popularity contest, a popularity contest between the very distinguished President and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman knows that the minority has the right to offer a motion to recommit. The gentleman is a member of the minority. If you want the Sadlak bill or any other sort of a proposition on a straight motion to recommit, that is within the province of the Members on the minority side. So, certainly, there is no different situation here than has existed time and again with respect to rules that have been before us.

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

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. I would like to make it clear to the gentleman from Texas, whom I have a very high regard for, that the inference that the President forced the Committee on Ways and Means to vote this extension 16 to 9, is a very moot question. As far as I myself am concerned, the President has forced me to do nothing. I chose in relation to my own judgment, and facing the cold, real facts of the fiscal situation of this country, to support a 6-month extension of the excess-profits tax without the assistance of the President or anyone else.

Mr. LYLE. I am certain that the fine and distinguished gentleman votes his convictions.

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

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I want to say this, that 12 of the 15 Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means were polled early in this session, and they stood 12 to 3 against, and the gentleman who has just gotten through speaking was 1 of the 3, so there was no need for any pressure upon him.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I would not for a moment reflect upon any distinguished Member of this body, nor do I want to leave the impression that I think the President is wrong in advising the Members of Congress. That is both his right and his responsibility. What I would like to emphasize is this: Last year your party and your President and you Members went throughout the Nation and condemned before the voters this tax which you now propose to extend. Why now in honor and in fairness to the trust placed in you by the American people do you not take the responsibility forthrightly and bring to this floor an honest tax bill that you can commend to the House and to the people instead of insisting upon the extension of one that you have found it necessary to condemn, and successfully so, and one which you have asked us to swallow again? That is the point which I should like to stress.

You have known since last November that you were to have the responsibility. We have been in session 6 months. There is nothing to keep us from remaining in session another 6 months. With that in mind, would it not have been the wise course for the President to come before the Congress and recommend a Republican tax policy? Why cannot the Committee on Ways and Means consider, and why has it not considered a tax policy it can be proud of?

Do we need revenue? Of course we need revenue, and I tell you in all sincerity that I will stay here and help raise needed revenue. But I want to do it in an intelligent, straightforward manner. I do not intend to stand around and apologize with you for legislation which you have convinced me is unjustified, wrong, and unfair.

The entire record of this Republican Congress—and you must be judged upon it—is that you have reenacted, with little exception, previous Democratic measures which you have condemned. Naturally you are in an uncomfortable position, particularly on this legislation. I have not contributed to this, for I have urged time and time again that needed revenue be raised through new and better-considered legislation.

Under this resolution you will have 4 hours to excuse your uncomfortable position. You can lay the blame on the President, you can take the personal credit for it, you can lay it on the so-called Democratic mess, but you cannot intelligently escape logic that demands a different course. I would have been pleased to join you in a sound approach to needed revenue. I am denied this opportunity. It seems to me that the time is here when this Congress must stand up and with courage and forthrightness and wisdom discharge its own responsi-

bilities. We, too, along with the President, were elected by the American people. We, too, have a duty to perform. I make this statement, and you know that it is basically sound, with no intended unkindness. I make this statement because I feel a great responsibility as a United States Representative to my people and my State and my country, and I do not like, nor do I think it necessary, to be caught in the position I am in today. I do not want to be a judge in a popularity contest. I do not want to be, nor do I want you to be in a position where you are tied so that you may only say "Yes" or "No." I have too much respect for you and for myself.

If this bill passes and goes to the Senate, any Senator may offer any germane amendment. Are they more intelligent or to be better trusted? Have they more judgment than a Member of the House? I do not think so.

Several members of the Committee on Rules did their best to bring in a resolution that would have given you some intelligent choices. It was not a party effort. Nevertheless, we failed. A bill considered under this resolution gives you no choice. If you are to have one, then you must vote down this rule. I do not enjoy asking you to do that, and I have asked it very few times since I have been a member of your Committee on Rules. But if the House is to function as a legislative entity, if it is to take an independent and intelligent position, if it is to be honest with itself, then it has but one choice to vote down this resolution.

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

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

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the distinguished gentleman from Texas, my good friend, think that the President of the United States is now thwarting the will of the American people in asking this extension on the part of the Congress?

Mr. LYLE. I would not say that. I did not say that.

Mr. CANFIELD. Then why is the gentleman so concerned about what we do here today?

Mr. LYLE. I am concerned because the President and every responsible person I have read after has said that this tax was inequitable, that it was wrong, that it was unfair, that it just was not a decent tax. Now, do you want him to put his arm around me and say in the face of such statements, "You make the American people eat it for 6 more months"?

Mr. CANFIELD. The American people, I contend, want the tax extended. My letters indicate that. My letters today are chiefly from men of business, big business and small business.

Mr. LYLE. Of course they are big business, because they do not pay any tax on excess profits, and if they should, it does not seriously affect their financial structure.

The gentleman from New Jersey is a splendid Member of this body. He has contributed a great deal. He does not vote on measures by the few letters he gets on controversial legislation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Nor does the able gentleman from Texas, whom I admire very much.

Mr. LYLE. The gentleman makes up his mind on facts—that is why I honor and respect him—and not upon a few letters he might get from somebody.

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

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. I do not want to embarrass the gentleman, but I am trying to clarify a fact. Does the gentleman from Texas contend that big business does not pay any of this excess-profits tax?

Mr. LYLE. No.

Mr. HOLMES. Did not the gentleman say that big business did not pay that?

Mr. LYLE. Yes, but I should not have said that without explanation. I meant that many of them do not pay taxes on excess profits.

Mr. HOLMES. As to big business, the excess profits tax on automobiles alone pays better than one-third.

Mr. LYLE. Your report says that United States Steel did not pay a dime, and neither did the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. I am taking the report from your committee. Too, I am told that many escape such taxes.

Mr. Speaker, this tax controversy has placed an undue hardship on my distinguished chairman, the very able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. He has taken much undeserved abuse. Particularly is this so, I think, since H. R. 1 was voted out of the Committee on Ways and Means and came to the House for clearance. I think it would be in the spirit of fairness for the Committee on Ways and Means, now that they have decided they cannot cut taxes at this time, to formally request that their application for a rule on H. R. 1 be withdrawn. They should not leave undeserved pressure on the gentleman from Illinois.

I sincerely believe that the House of Representatives would take the honorable course by voting against this resolution. Then the Committee on Ways and Means would be in position to bring to the floor a commendable approach to the tax problem.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is fair to say that facetiousness and levity always tend to lighten the burdens of service in the House of Representatives. Ordinarily, my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE], in times as serious as these, when we are dealing with tremendous problems at home and abroad, do not resort to levity. I trust that as we consider this very important measure, because it is an important measure, we may lay aside the levity and recognize our responsibilities. May I say parenthetically to my friends on the right, these are responsibilities which in large measure we have come to inherit since the first of the year because of cer-

tain activities that have gone on in previous years when the Government was under your control.

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

Mr. HALLECK. No, I would like to proceed for a moment.

Mr. DINGELL. Do not kick us in the teeth, Charlie, if you want this bill to go through.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, I did not yield to him and as far as I am concerned partisanship ought not to have any place in this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Right.

Mr. HALLECK. The fact of the matter is it came out of the Committee on Ways and Means by a vote of 16 to 9 with 7 Democrats voting for it and 9 Republicans.

Mr. DINGELL. We are helping you out.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, of course you are and that is all right and I am not unappreciative of that, but let us keep it that way.

If I may make just one suggestion at this point, I do not think it came with very good grace to charge that the President dictated the action of the seven Democrats on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DINGELL. You bet he did not.

Mr. HALLECK. There is nothing unusual about this rule. Some suggestion has been made that the rule fails to carry a provision which is frequently contained in such rules, that the committee itself might offer amendments, but so far as I have been able to discover there is no inclination on the part of the committee to offer such amendments.

The gentleman from Texas made one serious observation. He did not follow it up, but he suggested perhaps we ought to defeat this rule. I do not know whether he meant to defeat the rule and the bill or what he expected to do. But, I know this, that on both sides of the aisle those of us who serve on the Committee on Rules and those of us who serve on the Committee on Ways and Means know—and this has been true since I have been here at least—this is the type of rule that has been granted on tax bills coming from the Committee on Ways and Means. So I would not anticipate that either the Democratic members of the committee, and I see my friend nodding in agreement, or the Republicans want this rule to be anything other than it is. As I attempted to point out, the gentleman from Texas would have it appear there was some indecision and some confusion because 1 day it was the Sadlak bill and 1 day it was the Kean bill. Well, if he will recall, I appeared before the Committee on Rules to ask for a rule on the Sadlak bill, and if I remember correctly he and his colleagues on his side voted against that rule. Yet, here today, they are pleading that that is the bill we ought to have. I trust that no one is going to be misled by that sort of tactics no matter how facetious it may be.

The suggestion has been made that this whole matter of taxation ought to be worked over. Let me say again, and I trust this will not step on anybody's

toes politically or in any partisan way, I think we will all agree on both sides of the aisle that for years and years now our whole tax structure has been a hodgepodge development. I think on both sides of the aisle we have hoped and expected that inequities which exist, not only with respect to the excess-profits tax but in respect to many other places in the tax structure, would be worked out; the inequities eliminated in order to make the burden fairer, make it more equitable.

It may be said to the credit of the great Ways and Means Committee that some days ago they initiated hearings to accomplish that very worthy objective, and in that accomplishment I am sure they will have the support of the administration and the support of those of us here who believe that the whole tax structure should be gone over carefully, recodified, and developed in an orderly manner.

As I say, that is what we propose to do. But the only thing that is in issue here is whether or not this temporary extension—and it is a temporary extension—should be voted, and there is no question about how that vote is going to come out. It will be about 3 to 1 when the smoke clears away. It will be a demonstration of the support of the position taken by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee and by the leadership, as pointed out by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], in both the House and the Senate, and the position taken by the administration.

Something was said about the defeat of this extension proposal being to the profit of big business. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] normally has the facts. He spoke of how this proposed relief would not help any of the big corporations. Would it interest him to know that 40 percent of the corporations paying this excess-profits tax in 1950—and it follows on through 1951—were in the \$100,000-a-year-net-income bracket or above? They paid 95 percent of the tax; 5 percent of the tax was paid by the 60 percent below \$100,000.

In other words, if I may make the suggestion, there ought to be a little more light and a little less heat and a little less levity on this very important matter.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. I think there ought to be a little more responsibility on the party in power to bring in a tax that they can commend and not condemn.

Mr. HALLECK. We have taken up as rapidly as we could a great many of the matters that we inherited. May I say to the gentleman that on many occasions he helps, and for that I am appreciative because, after all, it is not alone the responsibility of Republicans or the Republican administration; it is the responsibility of all of us; and I do not care on which side of the aisle anyone sits.

That is the reason I say that this revision of the whole tax structure is long overdue. Instead of criticizing us for not moving in and doing the whole job

in a few months, you should be commending us for making a start, and may I say again that that will be a process in which I know the able members of the Ways and Means Committee on the Democratic side will contribute.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] speaks of this bill and its inequities. When the bill passed in 1950 there were just 20 stalwarts who voted against it. I just looked at the RECORD. But the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], offered a motion to recommit—to remove most of these inequities and hardship situations about which you presently complain. Thank God, we have an administration now that recognizes them. When that roll was called most of us on our side voted to alleviate those hardships and do away with those inequities. I voted for it. But on your side, sir, you did not vote for it.

I trust that this rule will be adopted. I will have something to say on the merits of this matter a little later on. But that is all I have to say at this moment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5898) to extend until December 31, 1953, the period with respect to which the excess-profits tax shall be effective.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5898, with Mr. MCGREGOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule general debate is confined to the bill and may not exceed 4 hours. It is the understanding of the Chair that the time will be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill does one thing and one thing only. It extends the excess-profits tax for 6 months, without amendment, as recommended by President Eisenhower.

The House, I am sure, will hear plenty today about the evils of the excess-profits tax. I do not deny that it is a bad tax, but there are many other bad taxes now in effect.

Certainly the personal income tax which only allows a \$600 exemption for dependents in spite of the fact that the cost of raising a child has increased tre-

mendously in the past few years, is a bad tax.

Certainly it is bad to place a 20 percent excise tax on certain industries when other businesses pay but a 10 percent tax, and others pay none at all.

Certainly the present high liquor tax is a bad tax for it has been shown to encourage bootlegging.

And any tax which takes away 92 percent of all of an individual's income beyond a certain figure is a bad tax because it destroys initiative and really reduces the revenue for it prevents capital from being used for productive purposes.

The Internal Revenue Code is full of bad taxes and the Ways and Means Committee, under the leadership of Chairman REED, is now studying the whole field in the hope that Congress may remove or alleviate as many of them as possible in the tax bill which we hope to pass next winter.

Under this bill the excess-profits tax will expire next December 31 and Secretary Humphrey has pledged that he will oppose its renewal.

The chief impact of its passage will be that when certain corporations with high earnings file their tax next March they will pay an additional tax on earnings above those in their base period at a 30 percent rate for the calendar year 1953 rather than at the 15 percent rate which they would pay if this bill does not become law.

Why is it that we have the disagreeable necessity of renewing this tax for 6 months?

First, and most important, is the necessity of maintaining a sound dollar and preventing a further rise in the cost of living.

There seems to be general acknowledgment that we should not lower taxes on corporations without at the same time doing something for the individual taxpayer.

We do not want to give special favors to a little group of stockholders in corporations which are prosperous, while we do nothing for the great mass of long-suffering taxpayers.

Thus the choice which has faced us is between passing H. R. 1 now and letting the excess profits tax expire as scheduled, or postponing the expiration of this tax until the same time as the individual income tax reduction goes into effect—January 1.

Best estimates seem to be that there will unhappily still be a deficit, in spite of the administration's efforts toward economy and the passage of this bill, of \$5,600,000,000 in the 1954 fiscal year.

If we did not follow the administration's proposals and we let both tax cuts take effect this month, the deficit for the fiscal year which we are just entering would probably be \$8 billion.

I doubt if the most valiant efforts of Secretary Humphrey and his Treasury staff could prevent a further rise in the cost of living with such a deficit.

The second reason why we should accept the Treasury's program is that under the best financial practice this is not the psychological time to cut taxes.

To have the best effect, on maintaining a stable economy taxes should be cut

from 6 to 9 months before there is to be a sharp cut in Government spending.

Such a cut places in the hands of the public money saved from taxes which they can spend as they see fit for civilian goods.

This spending by individuals will then take up the slack caused by a reduction in spending by the Government.

Now, when is this slowing up of Government spending going to occur as a result of President Eisenhower's and the Congress' efforts toward economy?

Certainly there will be little reduction in the next 6 months, for there must be unavoidable heavy spending owing to the obligations entered into by the past Administration.

Estimates are that spending for the fiscal year 1954 will amount to \$74,100,000,000—only \$500 million less than was spent in fiscal 1953; this in spite of the cut in current spending of \$4,500,000,000 made by the administration below the Truman estimates.

It will only be toward the end of the present fiscal year and in fiscal 1955 that the projected 10 billion cut in appropriations will show its effect in actual heavy reduction in current spending.

Certainly to add to the purchasing power of the general public just at this time when Government expenditures are at their peak would not be the soundest financial practice.

As we should lead the cut in Government spending by from 6 to 9 months in order to have the best effect, next winter seems to be the soundest time for starting to cut taxes.

If we should make these cuts now and further stimulate spending by both Government and individuals in this time of unparalleled prosperity, there would be no opportunity to reduce taxes without greatly unbalancing the budget at a time when the stimulation of tax cuts is needed to keep the economy on an even keel.

The result of immediate tax cuts at this time might well be "boom and bust."

On December 31, under this bill, the excess-profits tax will die—for good and all I hope—for no one has ever been able to devise a tax which really succeeds in taxing profits which are excessive and I doubt if anyone ever will; and it is not only the hope for those profits which the law now calls "excess" profits which impels an individual to risk his capital and use his energy in a new business enterprise? And is it not this incentive which has brought the production which has made the United States the most powerful Nation in the world and made us that Nation which has the highest standard of living in history for the average citizen.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are several considerations which lead me to urge that the excess-profits tax be extended for an additional 6 months, even though I readily agree that this form of tax is not desirable under normal circumstances.

The main consideration which leads me to advocate an extension of the excess-profits tax is the fiscal stability of the Nation. The basic problem for our consideration here is our military and

economic security, as well as the military and economic security of the free world. A sound currency is the heart of economic stability. We are now in a period of the highest employment and production in our history. We have not yet reached a peak in expenditures for national defense.

The simple choice with which we are faced in this period of high prosperity is an increase in the existing deficit, with the inflationary effects of such an increase, or the continuation of this tax for 6 months, which will increase our revenues by \$800 million.

It is an obvious economic fact that the larger the deficit, the greater will be the inflation during this period of high prosperity. It is estimated, on the basis of the first quarter of 1953, that consumer expenditures for the full year will run at the rate of \$226 billion. Simple mathematics proves that a 1-percent increase in general price levels, as they affect these consumer expenditures, will cost consumers \$2.26 billion.

I am not claiming that the \$800 million in revenue which will be produced by a 6-month extension of the excess-profits tax will stop inflation; however, I am saying that it is a factor which will tend to control inflation.

Not only is a large deficit anticipated for fiscal year 1954, but, according to information released the first of this month the deficit for the fiscal year 1953, is \$9,400,000,000, compared to an earlier estimated deficit of \$5,900,000,000. This further emphasizes the necessity for continuing the excess-profits tax for another 6 months.

Another important consideration which we must bear in mind is that to not extend the excess-profits tax will be to grant relief to corporations ahead of granting relief to individual income taxpayers. I am opposed to relieving corporations from the tax imposed on their excess profits arising out of the present emergency ahead of granting relief to individuals.

There has been some talk about alternative sources of revenue in lieu of an extension of the excess-profits tax. I can think of no fair and equitable alternative source which would be preferable to an extension of the excess-profits tax. It has been suggested that it would be preferable to increase the regular corporation-tax rates, rather than extend the excess-profits tax. I would like to point out that, of the 424,000 corporations reporting a net income in 1950—the latest year for which final figures are available—only 50,200 corporations paid an excess-profits tax. If, for instance, the normal tax on corporations were increased to make up for the loss of revenue which an extension of the excess-profits tax would bring in, it would mean that, on the basis of the 1950 figures, 374,000 corporations who paid no excess-profits tax would have their tax burden increased. A great majority of these corporations are small corporations.

I would also like to point out that, on the basis of the 1950 figures, of the 50,000 corporations paying an excess-profits tax, by far the greatest amount of this tax was paid by large, profitable corporations. Five and one-half percent, or

2,700 corporations with net incomes above one million dollars paid over three-fourths of the total excess-profits tax.

It has been said that the excess-profits tax is driving many new, small, and growing corporations out of business. There is no doubt but what the excess-profits tax is a very heavy burden on many of these corporations. I would like to point out that there is a ceiling of 18 percent on the excess-profits tax, which means that no corporation pays more than 70 percent in taxes overall; and also, in the case of new corporations, during the first 5 years of their existence, there is a ceiling on their excess-profits tax ranging from 5 to 14 percent.

I do not believe that the extension of this tax for 6 months will be as serious as some would have us believe in its effect on corporations. Even if the tax were not extended, corporations will now have to pay a 15 percent excess-profits tax rate on their excess-profits net income for 1953. An extension of the tax for 6 months would mean that these corporations would pay the tax at the rate of 30 percent rather than 15 percent. There were several witnesses who appeared before our committee during hearings on the proposal to extend the excess-profits tax for 6 months, who, while believing that this tax is an undesirable tax under normal conditions, urged that it be extended for 6 months as proposed in the pending bill, due to overriding considerations of a reduced deficit.

The Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce has recommended that the budget be balanced before taxes are reduced.

Although the committee had brought to its attention several suggested amendments which appeared to be meritorious, the Secretary of the Treasury informed the committee that revenue considerations dictated that the excess-profits tax be extended without amendment or modification.

I was very sympathetic to many of the pleas presented to our committee, and if the tax were being extended for a period greater than 6 months, I would not be in favor of the extension without making some of these deserving amendments. However, since under present law corporations subject to an excess-profits tax will be paying it for the year 1953, I feel that since the extension really amounts to an increase in rate only, in most cases, the revenue considerations of the Government are overriding.

To not extend the tax would mean only a moderate reduction in tax rates at the expense of sound governmental fiscal policy. The Treasury Department assured us that there would be no request for an extension beyond the 6 months. In light of considerations of high defense spending, prosperity, and employment, and the fact that to not extend this tax would mean a reduction in taxes for highly profitable corporations ahead of the reduction in taxes which are scheduled for individuals on December 31 of this year, I am supporting the requested extension. I believe the extension is necessary so that we will be in a position of providing fair,

sound, and timely tax reductions when we are not faced with an increase in the deficit of the Government. High priority should be given to a reduction in individual income taxes which will benefit all of the economy, due to the fact that such reductions will be immediately felt by placing additional income at the disposal of consumers.

So in closing I would like to emphasize the point, as I see it, it would be unfair to allow this excess-profits tax to expire now and to continue the increases of the individual income taxes until December 31 of this year. I think this extension here meets the essential elements of fairness and equity when we consider the overall tax program of the Government and the overriding necessity of making this contribution toward a reduction of the recently announced deficit of nearly \$9½ billion in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk today about the basic cause of why we are here considering this tax. We are here with this job because the Congress of the United States has lost control of the purse strings. Any effect that we have upon the money that goes out of the Treasury of the United States is distant and remote. We have lost immediate and direct control.

Congress is awakening to the fact that 67 percent of the budget of \$78 billion proposed by the outgoing administration is relatively uncontrollable. In other words, the expenditures for a given year are fixed by prior appropriations and by existing legal or moral commitments which authorize activities. The uncontrollable areas in the budget are as follows:

First. Almost one-half of all estimated expenditures for the coming fiscal year consist of carryover funds previously appropriated. The executive branch began this fiscal year with \$100 billion of unexpended balances. These funds are uncontrollable so far as the Congress is concerned. Money does not flow out of the Treasury when Congress passes an appropriation bill. Money flows out of the Treasury at the time the expenditure is actually made, and on that basis you have a deficit or a surplus.

The second area of uncontrollable expenditures is this. There are certain permanent appropriations, both definite and indefinite, that constitute uncontrollable expenditures. The largest item in this category is the interest on the national debt, which is over \$6 billion.

Third. There are annual appropriations required that are permanent, unless there is a change in substantive law. An example of this recurring expense is the deficit in the Post Office Department.

Fourth. The next large area of relatively uncontrollable expenditures is the number of fixed charges, including contributions to trust funds, retirement payments, payments on claims, payments in conformity to judgments, and payments in conformity to treaties. Once these commitments have been made by

statute or by treaty, there is little that a subsequent Congress can do about it.

Fifth. Another large area of relatively uncontrollable expenditures might be described as open-end programs. These include aid to agriculture, veterans' programs, aid to States, and so forth. For instance, the money that will flow out of the Treasury this next year to maintain agricultural supports is not subject to the control of Congress. It depends upon the weather, the volume of production, the open-market price. Those factors will determine how many dollars will have to go out of the Treasury to maintain the price level of farm products.

Likewise, the amount of money that the States raise for highway purposes determines how much the Federal Government will have to spend under that existing long-range matching law.

Congress has in the past authorized the executive branch to borrow money from the Treasury for recoverable expenditures or to finance Government corporations. Some of these ventures end up in losses and then at that point we have to make it up out of the Treasury. The committees of Congress can control the administrative expenses of Government corporations, but they cannot control the program expenses.

Sixth. There has developed the idea that there is a sort of moral obligation on the appropriating committees to provide funds for programs that are initiated and authorized by Congress, and those new programs move into the position of being uncontrollable in the years that follow. Many a time the Appropriations Committee has in granting an item for \$100,000 initiated something that costs \$100 million.

Expenditures are not something that can be turned off and on like a water faucet.

Now, you ask why is it that in the 80th Congress the fine work of the Appropriations Committee could cut spending and reduce taxes. I will tell you why; there are two reasons for it. Most domestic nonmilitary programs had been frozen during World War II and the momentum of uncontrollable expenditures had not got going, and your military expenditure commitments and new starts were cut way down. The 80th Congress is to be praised for moving in and reducing instead of increasing, but its task was different from the problem that we face now.

Today we face a situation where unless the legislative committees and the Appropriations Committee do something about authorizing new starts, we are in a whirlpool that we will not be able to do much about. Few people realize that the amount of money that the Government will spend in this fiscal year which began on July 1 was largely determined by decisions not made last year but made 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 years or more ago. Let me illustrate this: Suppose a group of cities in 1950 decided to avail themselves of the Federal airport matching program; they debated it locally, they may have held a bond election, they finally decided to do it; they picked a site, they named a local board, they hired an engineer, they got their plan approved and then finally they let a

contract for their airport, and perhaps in this next fiscal year money flows out of the Treasury for the first time, by reason of a decision made by Congress more than 7 years ago. The House this year denied new money for airport construction, but they still have \$10,500,000 in unexpended funds and at the other end of the Capitol there is an argument going on to give them more.

This Congress has lost control of the purse strings. Only in the long range can we do something about it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], to whom this country owes much, who no doubt has done perhaps more than any other man to save us from bankruptcy by preventing hundreds of billions of dollars from going through his House, has cut appropriations by 25 percent, yet expenditures will go up 12 or 15 percent. Why? Because the only control you have left is a long-range control. The appropriation cuts made this year will reduce spending for future years, but not much in the coming year.

Now let us take a look at the dollar volume of these uncontrollable expenditures, relatively uncontrollable, I mean: \$37.6 billions are expenditures from obligatory authority of prior years; \$7.9 billions are expenditures under permanent and indefinite authorizations; \$178 million is expenditures out of receipts from revolving and management funds; \$864 million as contributions to trust funds, payment of claims and payments in conformity to treaties and international agreements; \$5.2 billion as expenditures under open end and other relatively uncontrollable programs; \$1.3 billion as expenditures under existing grant programs, representing commitments legally controllable, but it will take a little while to do so.

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

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, what can we do to regain control of the purse strings? First, the chairman of the Rules Committee can bring in a rule, a permanent rule, providing that every authorization and every initial appropriation, every new item in appropriation bills, must carry in the committee report a budget estimate of the probable expenditures for the next 5 years. You will know then whether you are committing \$100,000 or several hundred million dollars. Such a reform would be a lasting monument to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Second. The executive branch can extend their budget control down to the lower levels, into every bureau, division, section, and unit. We have 100,000 supervisors in our executive branch of Government, 95,000 of them do not know what the budget for their unit is. They should be told at the beginning of the year: Here is your budget, so much for printing, so much for salaries, so much for telegrams, so much for travel. Here it is. Your promotion and your pay increase will depend on how much you can save in your unit budget. We could then say to these supervisors: you will be rewarded for efficiency and economy—you may be fired for waste and inefficiency.

Such a plan will put an end to deficiency appropriations. This idea is not new so far as budget breakdowns are concerned. It was first presented by a writer for the Washington Daily News at some length not so long ago.

In the third place, we have to repeal some basic authorizations of Federal programs. We have more Government than our private enterprise economy can stand. It is killing business today, it will continue to kill business. Some of these programs ought to be discontinued, others should be returned to the States. We need to reexamine the basic policies of all our programs, both foreign and domestic.

Fourth. The Congress should assume the responsibility of once during the year voting on the entire budget, all of the expenditures.

Fifth. The executive branch can bring about a great reduction by a mere stretching out or slowing down the programs. If they take all programs and schedule the spending so we do in 13 months what was intended to be done in 12 months, it may save us from a deficit.

The sixth and last point is one that is most important. We must have some civil-service reform so that the heads of these departments can control them, which they cannot do at the present time. We need a reform of civil service so that there can be a genuine housecleaning. We need to get rid of the loafers, wasteful, and unneeded in the bureaus. The taxpayers are entitled to an honest day's work for a day's pay. We must reduce the number of Government payrollers. How long must we wait for this reform?

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I find myself here under rather unusual circumstances. I would not want the House to misconstrue the position that I am taking. I have nothing but the finest feeling for every person in this House. But, as I say, I am here under peculiar circumstances.

When it was moved in committee to report H. R. 5898 favorably by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], it was provided that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], should use all the parliamentary procedure necessary to obtain its passage. I always comply with the rules. So I want to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], for his courtesy in extending me the time. I did not feel I should accept it from my side under that rule.

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

Mr. REED of New York. No, I prefer not to. I want to make the RECORD here.

I may say also, before I get into this, that something has been said here in regard to the Sadlak bill.

I have a letter here from the Secretary of the Treasury which was handed to me on July 7. It says:

Your letters dated June 26, 1953, requesting the views and recommendations of the

Treasury Department on H. R. 5898 and H. R. 5899, were received yesterday, July 6. In line with the recommendations of the President as made in his message to the Congress on May 20, the Treasury Department favors the extension of the excess profits tax as now drawn for 6 months, through December 31, 1953. H. R. 5898 accomplishes this purpose. The Department, therefore, favors this bill. H. R. 5899 would extend the excess profits tax through December 31, 1953, and increase the minimum credit from \$25,000 to \$100,000 for taxable years ending after June 30, 1953. If your committee decides not to report 5898 favorably, this department would offer no objection to H. R. 5899.

H. R. 5899 is the Sadlak bill. That, of course, was put to a vote and the entire membership of the Committee on Ways and Means was present. The vote was supported by just 3 men and the author of the bill. So, we are here with this bill.

Mr. Chairman, today this House is to have an opportunity to vote on one of the most important issues in its history. Technically, the question before the House is whether or not to enact H. R. 5898 which would extend the excess-profits tax until December 31, 1953. Actually, the issues involved here are those of morality against immorality, principle against political expediency, intelligence against unintelligence. Involved here is the question of whether this Congress is to retain its independence or abdicate to executive dictate. Involved here in a very real sense is the economic security and well-being of our citizens' future. All of these considerations demand the defeat of H. R. 5898.

My position on this score is well known. But what is, apparently, not well known, either by the majority of the Members of this House, or by the country, is the history of this legislation and of the almost unbelievable chain of events which have led up to my standing before you today to oppose the leadership of my party, which I have served in this body longer than any other Member.

Lend me your attention then while I go back to the early days of this session to a meeting of the Ways and Means Committee on February 17, 1953. On that date our committee met to decide what could and should be done to carry out the will of the people, which was so clearly demonstrated in the last election, to ease this crushing tax burden. And let me say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that I am not just referring to the Republican victory. Many of my Democratic friends are here today because they fully recognized the demands of their constituents that Federal expenditures and Federal taxes be drastically reduced.

The members of the Ways and Means Committee recognized that the first step was to make some reduction in individual income tax rates, particularly for lower income taxpayers. We recognized the necessity of balancing the budget and the difficulties which the new administration would face, initially, in cutting down on Government expenditures. But we also recognized that a small cut in individual income tax rates was necessary, not only to give tax relief, but to keep faith with the American people who had trusted us with stewardship over their affairs. Consequently, we voted

in favor of H. R. 1, a bill which would make what was in reality no more than a token reduction in individual income tax rates.

The second question was what to recommend to this House concerning the expiration of the Excess Profits Tax Act on June 30, 1953. It was decided to recommend that it not be extended. After listing our reasons against extending the tax we said:

Your committee believes that the excess-profits tax should be allowed to expire on June 30, 1953, as scheduled.

The vote on H. R. 1 and its report was 21 to 4.

The third step in our program was a general overhaul and recodification of our antiquated and disorganized Internal Revenue Code. The present code is a veritable maze of inconsistencies. Cross references are piled upon cross references, exceptions upon exceptions. The foremost tax experts in the country are baffled by many provisions of the law. The ordinary taxpayer is, at best, bewildered. It is not too much to say that the growth of our economy is, to a large extent, impeded by the uncertainties of our tax law. To work out a reasonably clear, equitable and consistent Internal Revenue Code is an enormous task. This work is now being undertaken by our staff and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in close cooperation with the staffs of the Treasury and the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Our committee has undertaken public hearings on 40 of the most important tax issues so that all taxpayers may have an opportunity to present their views. This mammoth revision job is immensely difficult and time-consuming. But I believe that, if it is successful, it will be one of the most constructive and useful jobs that this or any other Congress could do to help our people.

This, then, was our tax program. It was greeted with unanimous approval by all the groups interested in the field of taxation and, as far as I know, by all our taxpayers. The administration, at first, did not have a word to say against it, at least to me.

Then, gradually, it became apparent that there was some opposition to our program. Despite my conviction that the great majority of the Members of this House were anxious to fulfill their obligations to their constituents by voting for at least a small cut in individual income taxes, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee has refused even to schedule a meeting to consider granting H. R. 1 a rule. H. R. 1 has been bottled up in that committee since February 17, 1953.

The Ways and Means Committee having overwhelmingly recommended against the extension of the excess-profits tax, I saw no reason not to express my own convictions on the matter. On the floor of this House, in the press, on the radio, and on television I have explained during this session the reasons which compelled me to oppose this extension. Certainly, my position was well known to the administration. But the administration's program remained shrouded in a veil of mystery so thick

that it was not until the eve of the President's message to Congress on May 20, 1953, that I, or any member of our committee, had any inkling that an extension of the tax would be demanded. Following receipt of the President's message, our committee scheduled 10 days of public hearings to consider the proposal. I might say right there that there was no bill before us to consider. These hearings were held out of courtesy to the demand of the President. Of course, you all know the results.

The testimony of the witnesses, most of whom represented small businesses throughout the entire country, was a clear and compelling indictment of the tax. Of the total of 111 witnesses appearing before the committee, only 6 were in favor of the tax. I commend to the attention of the Members of this House a summary of the testimony of these witnesses which appears in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, starting on page A3822. It reveals how in specific case after case even a 6-months' extension of the tax would do serious damage to the future ability of American industry to expand and care for an increasing labor supply, would discriminate unfairly against small, new, and middle-sized businesses, would enhance the possibility of a serious economic recession, and would result in very little, if any, increase in revenue.

I might say right here there is a vital problem concerned with our free economy in this country. There are something like 600,000 to 800,000 new laborers coming into the market every year. They need jobs. They have to have jobs or else you will have a great relief program. You will have bitterness on the part of your college graduates, your high-school graduates, and all the boys and girls that are coming into the labor market. There you will have a solid core on which the Communists can work. This very thing is going to restrict the development of payrolls. I have a vital interest, and you all do, in the on-coming Americans. As we fade out of the picture, and we will, as you know, in the history of things, it is the younger element that is coming along to take over the problem of our preserving and enjoying the virtues of this Republic. That is one of the big issues.

Then there is another question, if I may interpolate here a minute. Do you realize that if we as the Congress, and if the President can say that we should enact iniquitous laws, as they are proposing, what do you think the teenagers and the others coming along with them—and we have all this crime that is going on—what are they going to say, and naturally, just as naturally as can be? "Well, what of it. What do these laws amount to anyway?" When the men at the head of the Government who make the laws say, "Well, here is an iniquitous law, but it will produce some revenue," what kind of citizens are we going to build up under those circumstances I tell you, you want to do some thinking on this proposition here today.

This, then, was the record which our committee had before it. But the word from downtown was that we should ignore the record. The Secretary of the

Treasury wanted a straight extension of the tax. The only amendment he would accept was embodied in H. R. 5899, the Sadlak bill, which would raise the minimum credit under the tax to \$100,000 but was extremely deficient from the technical point of view and would have discriminated viciously between fiscal year corporations on the one hand and calendar year corporations on the other. Almost unbelievable pressure was imposed on the members of the committee, and most of all on myself. The whole House knows the story of the almost hysterical atmosphere of emergency that was created, of how the members were told in plain disregard of the facts that legislative action must be completed on June 30 or all the revenue from the tax would be lost. The whole House knows how we received a summons before the Rules Committee and of how that great committee, without deliberation and in plain and open violation of the rules of the House and of every historical precedent, gave a closed rule to the Sadlak bill without, I am sure, realizing its technical deficiencies. The whole House knows how, when we were all assembled and prepared to vote on this rule, I demanded such a vote. Why was this vote not permitted by the leadership? Was it the desire to keep the rule hanging over the heads of the members of the Ways and Means Committee to insure that orders would be obeyed? My deep respect for the distinguished majority leader compels me to the contrary assumption that his refusal to allow a vote on the rule was due to a wholly warranted fear of impending defeat.

It was my hope that, after the tax expired on June 30, the committee would be allowed to consider the whole problem of the extension with due regard to all the facts in the calm and deliberate manner which is traditional with the Committee on Ways and Means. I wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury to secure information as to how the tax is affecting competing corporations of various sizes. Together with other Members, I gave thought to whether it would be desirable to incorporate certain relief provisions to eliminate some of the grossest inequities of the tax. But when the committee met last Wednesday, and the members voted to consider the excess-profits tax, there was no deliberation. The fact that the committee did not have before it the information requested from the Secretary was considered inconsequential. Relief amendments offered by several Members were not even given careful consideration. There was no discussion of any more equitable way of raising additional revenue. The decision had been made downtown that a straight extension of the excess-profits tax was what the doctor ordered and that any discussion or consideration of alternatives by your committee was, therefore, superfluous. In substance your committee was ordered to abdicate its constitutional legislative function. I must add also that the fact that most all of the members who were required to vote in favor of the extension had expressed themselves in exactly the opposite sense a few months

before made this extraordinary procedure rather cruel. But it worked.

At this point, I believe I should clear up two other misconceptions concerning my position. One is that I have attempted to use my authority as chairman of the committee to defeat the bill by the expedient of not calling a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means. This is viciously untrue. I canceled certain meetings prior to June 30 so that the committee would not have to meet in the carefully created atmosphere of crisis, fostered by misunderstandings as to the legal effect of the approaching expiration of the tax. I have also seen it alleged that I made some kind of deal with the leadership to call the committee together on July 8, 1953. I made no such deal with anyone. The Ways and Means Committee has too heavy a schedule of important legislation to have permitted the fight over the extension of the excess-profits tax to interfere for any considerable length of period with the committee's smooth functioning. Otherwise, I most certainly would not have called the committee together until the members were in a position to exercise their own judgment on the matter.

Mr. Chairman, it will be apparent from what I have just said that many members of the Committee on Ways and Means who supported H. R. 5898 did not do so willingly.

As for myself, I believe that as representatives of the people in Congress we have the duty of casting our votes as our own independent judgment demands after a thorough consideration and study of all the relevant facts. This belief is apparently shocking to some people. I noted an editorial in yesterday's Washington Post which said with reference to me and to my opposition to an extension of the excess-profits tax:

It would be a healthy precedent if he would now resign his chairmanship in recognition of the fact that he is out of sympathy with the program of his party.

Let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I will vote in the future as I have in the past to repudiate any legislation which I believe to be unsound and not in the interest of the welfare of our country, and I will continue to do so irrespective of who suggests such legislation and irrespective of the amount of political pressure that is brought to bear on me personally. Let me say something further to those who say that my position is not in accordance with the program of my party. I reject the idea that the program of the Republican Party is not in accordance with its principles. There is no legislation which is more diametrically opposed to the principles of the Republican Party than the excess-profits tax. I think I have been here long enough to know what the Republican Party stands for. We went to the people last fall on our pledge to reduce taxes, to cut expenditures, and to balance the budget. I believe that we have a duty to do all three of these things and to do them now. The excess-profits tax expired by operation of law on July 1, 1953. The business community expected it to do so. When we pledged throughout the campaign to reduce taxes do you think

that they realized that we were advocating a reenactment of the excess-profits tax? The truth is that we all know that the business community had every reason to believe that the sums they had set aside for payment of the excess-profits tax could properly be committed to plant expansion, improvements, the development of new products, and the purchase of new machinery. Many of these funds have been so committed and many have already been spent. Mr. Chairman, if we take the unprecedented action of extending this tax, we are repudiating our responsibility to the business community and to those whose wages are derived from that community.

But we are doing worse than that, Mr. Chairman. If we should vote to extend the excess-profits-tax law, we would be ignoring the economic danger flags which, as almost every economist has pointed out, are already flying. Let me just mention here an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune yesterday. Mr. Lawrence is editor of the U. S. News & World Report. He said:

The Republicans on the House Ways and Means Committee and the Democrats who helped them to report out a bill to extend the excess-profits tax may have unwittingly voted to make the next depression the worst in American history.

Let us get down to the fundamentals of the issue which is before the House which you are asked to reenact as a perfect example of what John Marshall had in mind when he said:

The power to tax is the power to destroy.

We know this tax is hampering small business. We know this tax is hurting expansion, development, and initiative. We know this tax is causing waste and extravagance. We know this tax is promoting inefficiency. We know this tax is creating an unfair competitive position between small and middle sized corporations and large businesses. The Secretary of the Treasury knows this. The majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee know this. The witnesses who appeared before our committee know this. If you vote for this bill, you will be voting to adopt such a tax. The effect of such a vote at the very minimum will be to hold the economy back for at least another 12 months. And what would you gain by such a vote? You would be taking the worst sort of a gamble. Even the proponents of the bill will concede that "the so-called \$800 million gain in revenue" could well be equaled, if not exceeded, by a stimulation of business due to the expiration of the tax. We all know this is a bad tax. The Secretary of the Treasury knows it is a bad tax. From a revenue standpoint, we know that the yield from the tax is dwindling. Many large corporations which paid substantial excess-profits tax in 1950 and 1951 have not reported any excess-profits tax for 1952 and will probably not report any excess-profits tax for 1953. One of the many vices of the excess-profits tax is that the large corporations are able substantially to increase their excess-profits-tax credits each year by adding to their base large retained earnings

or additions to capital. New and growing corporations are unable to do this and must, therefore, continue to bear the full impact of the tax. For this reason they are never able to reach the level of their larger competitors. Our tax laws should not be used to drive small and medium-sized corporations to the wall. A bad tax can destroy our economy. A bad tax can destroy little and medium-sized businesses. A bad tax can bring on a recession. The Secretary of the Treasury and proponents of the bill admit that the excess-profits tax which they desire to re-enact is bad. And they admit that the badness in the tax cannot be eliminated. They say if you eliminate the badness in the tax you will not receive any revenue. How can we who are pledged to reduce taxes vote to reenact such a monstrosity, as the present excess-profits tax admittedly is, upon the country? I urge you to stand up and vote to reject this vicious tax.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we should balance the budget. I believe in a balanced budget just as deeply as anyone in this House. I want to balance the budget as much as does the President or the Secretary of the Treasury. But Mr. Chairman, tax collections are at the rate of \$65.2 billion, the highest in our entire history. Let me repeat that tax collections are already at the highest rate in our entire history. Why should we now raise our taxes? Why should not we instead cut our spending? Why should we have spent \$14 million more in 1953 than even Mr. Truman estimated would be necessary? What's the matter with us? Can not we do better than Mr. Truman? On the last day of last month we spent \$1.5 billion. During the last 3 days of last month we spent over \$3 billion. This kind of spending is not the road to a balanced budget. It is the road to economic disaster. It is by cutting down on our spending that we will balance the budget and not by increasing our taxes. To reenact this tax would merely encourage the kind of reckless spending that we have had in the past and which we are all dedicated to eliminating in the future. With all my heart, I request the defeat of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have just one more word. This has been a hard fight. Feelings have run high. I have stood by my principles and by my guns.

I shall continue to do so. Win or lose, I will have no regrets. The Members of this House know me well enough to realize that I have harbored no bitterness toward those who have disagreed with me. I believe that on this vital issue they are terribly wrong and I am right. But disagreement among men of good will does not imply lack of mutual respect. This Congress and this administration have a great opportunity to help all our people in many ways toward a better way of life. This opportunity may never come again. I for one intend to do my part in helping make the most of it.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I assure you it is not by prearrangement that I have been given this opportunity to follow my distinguished chief on this discussion but it is coincidental. I am proud of that opportunity, of that designation, because I have been following him now for some time as my chairman and I have not found any fault in him. I feel that if Mr. REED's advice had been followed at the first of this session of the Congress we the Republicans would not be in this trouble that we find ourselves today. Let me outline to you just briefly what Mr. REED had in mind. When the gentleman from New York came back here to Washington at the opening of Congress he already had some plans with reference to what he thought ought to be done about taxes and how the Republicans should proceed with their tax program. He had the assistance of the best tax expert anywhere in the United States, and I refer to Mr. Colin Stam, who is the chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation consisting of 5 Members of the House and 5 Members of the Senate, and is considered the best informed on tax matters around the Capitol. These two gentlemen, Mr. REED and Mr. Stam, have as much capacity to decide what is best in the tax field as anyone in this country.

Mr. REED and Mr. Stam agreed on a program, not that they were trying to force it upon anybody, but they advanced it as a suggestion. And here it is: They said in effect that our party had promised that we would reduce the personal income taxes of all the taxpayers of the country and that we would also permit the excess-profits tax to expire on June 30, 1953.

So they decided to advance this program and Mr. REED introduced H. R. 1 which provides relief for the private individual taxpayers. This would have fulfilled all the promises in this respect from a political standpoint as well as from the standpoint of simple justice and the next thing to be done was to do something to relieve corporate tax by permitting the vicious excess-profits tax to expire on June 30.

When that had been accomplished they had another big job set out for Congress to do and that was to codify the whole tax structure which has not been codified for many years. The Ways and Means Committee is working on that now. If Congress had adopted H. R. 1 back at the beginning of the session and proceeded right immediately to let it be known to the country that this excess-profits tax would be allowed to die, not reenacted again, there would have been a solidification of public sentiment which we do not have now and the lack of which we may feel later. I would have been glad to have followed the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] with the advancement of this program. Now we find ourselves in a very uncertain position. I mean we Republicans. We are being laughed at and joked about by people who probably will want to take advantage of it in the next election in a political way. We find it difficult to explain our position as a party.

I daresay that practically all of us on both sides of the aisle are glad to get rid

of this legislation which we are now considering and hope that we might be able to finish it today. There is one thing about this legislation that has been very unusual. Never in my time of service in Congress have I seen so much cross-purpose work on the part of Republicans.

In nearly every session of Congress I see some things that impress me distinctively. I have seen something in connection with this legislation that has impressed me indelibly, and I will never forget it. In fact I don't think I have ever seen anything that impressed me as much. I am not responsible for it and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is not responsible for it. Here is what I mean. I saw the Rules Committee of this House of Representatives go through a farcical parliamentary procedure about a week ago that was not ethical and that was unprecedented. Without precedent, without anything like it ever having been done in the parliamentary history of the country, the Rules Committee sought to bypass the Ways and Means Committee by taking up for consideration a bill that had never been considered by the Ways and Means Committee and which bill had only been introduced a day or two before the committee took it up for assignment to be voted on by the House.

The Rules Committee called the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and, I think, called every member of the Ways and Means Committee to come before the Rules Committee to consider whether the Rules Committee should put the Sadlak bill on the calendar to be immediately considered by the Congress. The Ways and Means Committee for 3 weeks had been holding hearings on the very proposal that the President had sent to the Congress by special message. The committee, Republicans and Democrats, loyally every day for about 3 weeks had been holding meetings on this subject. We heard about 120 witnesses who came from all walks of life and from all sections of the country. While we were getting ready to do something by way of deciding to permit the excess-profits law to die or to bring in a bill of some kind, the Rules Committee takes it upon itself to do what I think was little short of a farce. I think the conduct of the Rules Committee was arrogant and unprecedented. In spite of this unusual attempt to usurp authority, I want to pay my compliments to the personnel of the Rules Committee. I say that individually it ranks with the best of any committee of the House in intelligence, in patriotism, and in Republicanism. Being a member of the committee on committees, I had the pleasure of assisting in their selection. But, in spite of their ability, they did something that I maintain they had no right to do. What was the reason for this unprecedented action? I leave that to you.

On the same day that the Rules Committee called the members of the Ways Committee before it to consider giving a rule on this bill that the Ways and Means Committee had not seen, the Rules Committee granted a rule and in a day or two the House calendar showed that the rule would be called up for passage in the House and that if the rule

would be adopted then the House would immediately consider that bill. On the day set for the consideration of the rule and the bill for passage, the chairman of the Rules Committee was in his accustomed place and a large membership was present because this strange procedure had been extensively advertised among the membership.

But lo and behold! The chairman of the Rules Committee, who is a fine gentleman, to the surprise of all failed to take the initiative as he usually does, but instead of that the Speaker recognized the Republican leader, Mr. HALLECK, and Mr. HALLECK took over. His role was a most unusual one but he announced that after much consideration with other leaders they had decided not to press the rule that day. He gave as his principal reason that they did not want to do anything rash or disruptive and for that reason they had called off the matter although they felt that they had the votes to carry out their previously planned program and Mr. REED thereupon challenged the majority leader to go ahead and call for a vote and thus a very unusual incident came to a close. I repeat, this was an unprecedented effort as to what the Rules Committee had the right to do.

Now then, let me talk about the bill before us today for just a minute or two. Here we are. My friends, who are interested in this bill? Who are most interested in this bill? I will tell you who they are. They are the hundreds of small manufacturers and businessmen who must pay excess-profits taxes. About 110 of them came before the committee and testified. They came from all parts of the country and represented all kinds of business. They are intelligent and interested citizens. And, how many of them testified for the extension of the excess-profits-tax law? Only 5 out of the 110. Let us see who they were. Follow me closely and get this history right, and if I am wrong I stand to be corrected.

The Secretary of the Treasury came in and testified in favor of extending this legislation, as did a gentleman from, I think, the Budget Bureau. He came in and gave us some figures. Two other gentlemen came in. I was not there when one testified. I think he was a representative of a labor organization, probably the CIO. I did not hear him. Then another man came along who represented the Americans for Democratic Action. And he seemed to be a very nice, smart gentleman. I was then presiding over the committee and I said, after he talked a little while, "Do you pay any taxes upon which the excess-profits tax is levied?" He said, "No." I said, "Do any of these organizations that you represent pay any taxes under this provision?" He said, "No." Well, of course, I did not need to say any more. And he did not need to say very much more after that, did he? No; he did not have very much more to say after that. His speech was about over with when he admitted that neither he nor any of his clients were subject to the excess-profits tax.

Now let us see who these 110 were. Someone asked us today, "Well, now, is

it not true that the big fellows are not subject to this excess-profits tax? And is it not true that it is altogether a tax on the small fellows?"

While this excess-profits tax applies to some of the big-business concerns it applies mostly to the small, new business concerns. Many of the larger concerns do not pay a penny of excess-profits tax.

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

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. I am sure the gentleman wants to include among the distinguished people before us, John Biggers, president of Libby-Owens Glass.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; I am glad the gentleman mentioned him.

Mr. HOLMES. Sitting on the President's Advisory Committee.

Mr. JENKINS. I probably know more about him than the gentleman does, as far as that is concerned, and as I understood it, he did not come primarily to testify on this matter; he came for another purpose. But actually, he got into the discussion, and being an administration man, he was loyal to the administration. He is a fine gentleman always. There is no better man anywhere than Mr. Biggers.

Who are these big fellows that do not pay any tax?

I have a long list which do not pay any excess-profits tax. I shall give you the names of a few that you will recognize. Here is the list:

American Brake Shoe, American Can, American Cyanamid, American Telephone & Telegraph, Borden Co., Celanese Corp., Colgate-Palmolive-Peet, Commonwealth Edison, Distillers Corp., Seagram, Gulf Oil, Hudson Motor, Johns-Manville, Jones & Laughlin, Liggett & Myers, Montgomery-Ward, National Distillers, Pennsylvania Power & Light, Socony-Vacuum, Standard Oil of California, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Studebaker Corp., Texas Eastern Transmission, United States Steel.

I am not opposed to any of these big companies that do not pay any excess-profits tax. They are big because they deserve to be big. They made themselves big. Nobody wants to impute dishonesty to them. But the sad fact remains that many of them escape while most of the small concerns that have striven to be successful are taxed beyond endurance in many cases and they go out of business because of the excessive tax.

I say again, who is interested in this legislation? It is the struggling, little, prosperous business fellows. It was really pitiful in some of the cases that came before the committee. Here are three young men down South somewhere, right out of the war. They took the money they got when they got out of the war and put it together in a concern and came along and were doing well, and here came this tax. They came in to testify, and it looked as if they were going to the wall. They deserved to succeed. Another man came who was already in receivership. Practically all the whole 110 were having a tough time simply because they had worked hard and risked their money and energy

against a ruthless governmental tax. Of course, we would have had thousands more come to testify if we had asked them to come, but we did not do it.

I do not want to take up a great deal of your time but I would like to read you just a little of the testimony of one or two of these people who came. I have referred just casually to this one. Mr. SIMPSON asked this man a question, and I am giving you the question and answers:

Mr. SIMPSON. I was wondering, sir, since we all agree that the tax is no good, recognizing it is inflationary, in part is that one of your objections?

Mr. THOMSON. That is right.

Mr. SIMPSON. Why would we not accomplish the same purpose by making a cut in the budget of the \$800 million, if we could make such a cut? Would that not excuse us from passing an inflationary tax for another 6 months?

Mr. THOMSON. We feel very definitely that if you had been able to cut the budget to the extent required, that the excess-profits tax should go off June 30.

Mr. SIMPSON. I want to get it specific. If we cut the budget \$800 million, would you then be willing not to pass the excess-profits tax, which admittedly is inflationary?

Mr. SIMPSON. We have not had one man come before the committee who said it was a good tax.

Mr. THOMSON. I agree with you. That is part of your problem. I agree with you.

Mr. SIMPSON. That pretty well settles it in my mind. If nobody can say a good word about a tax, why do we want to extend it? Now another question: In the President's program, there is the item of old-age insurance taxes, asking for the postponement of 1 year of scheduled increases. Are you for that or against that?

Mr. THOMSON. In our statement, the full statement you have before you, we did not take a position on that.

In another place in the hearing before the committee Mr. SIMPSON makes a very clear statement during his questioning of Mr. Humphrey. Here is the statement:

Mr. SIMPSON. I have in my district an industry that employs maybe 1,500 people. They are not going to shut down. They will survive it. But those people in there are more interested in the welfare of that particular company providing jobs for them, not alone in the next 6 months but right along and expanding, I think, than you give them credit for. I cannot understand why Mr. Humphrey or anyone else objects to—in the event the tax were continued, which I hope it is not—why they object to relieving an industry making a meritorious case? You have not persuaded me.

There is one argument made in favor of this bill that is not absolutely true. I mean clearly and unqualifiedly true. That is when the Secretary of the Treasury says this law is going to save \$800 million. There are a whole lot of people who do not agree with him on that. I do not agree with him on that, and we had some people to testify before us who did not agree with the Secretary of the Treasury.

The chambers of commerce quite generally were against this extension. They appreciated the unfairness of the law and apparently agreed with Mr. Humphrey, who said that the law was both an "inequity and an iniquity."

An attorney in Columbus, Ohio, who has been coming before our Ways and

Means Committee for years, and who I think is the best taxman I know of next to Mr. Stam, was before us, representing whom? Not the little fellows, but the Chamber of Commerce of Ohio, which is the biggest State chamber of commerce in the Nation, I think. He also represented the Chamber of Commerce of Missouri, and the chambers of commerce of several States in the Middle West. His name is Mr. Clarence Laylin. He knows statistics and tax trends as well as anybody. He makes the positive statement that we will not lose any \$800 million. We will not do it at all. It will be more like \$500 million, and you can find people who say it will be three or four hundred million dollars. But anyhow, what is three or four hundred million dollars when a proposition of truth and honesty and decency is involved? That is nothing as against honesty. To unjustly tax one so as to provide money for another is unfair and dishonest.

You know that if the program of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] had been adopted and then followed up as it was by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] with his program of reduction of appropriations, we all could have said, "We have reduced the taxes and we have reduced the expenses and we are now balancing the budget." What a fine effort the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and his committee did make, cutting out \$3.5 billion in one bill, and \$2.5 billion in another bill, and \$1.5 billion in another bill. I think we have done well in this respect.

Summing up, therefore, my colleagues, I will say that I have spent many days of hard work in trying to find out what is the right thing to do with refusal to continuing this unfair excess profits tax. I say with Mr. Humphrey, "Do not make any mistake about it, the excess profits tax is an inequity. It is an iniquity as well as an inequity." But I fail to agree with him that we must keep such an iniquitous tax on our books. I shall vote for what I know is for the best interests of the deserving American businessman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall speak very briefly. For the RECORD I do want to refer to Monday, a week ago, June 29, to that so-called victory which was heralded as such throughout the Nation by the Republican press of the Nation and attributed to the President in the White House. I am constrained to comment that it was such a great administration victory that the Republican leadership called off the fight without firing a shot because they did not have the votes, they just turned tail and retreated when they came to the battle line and ran away from the fight. They ran away from the fight, I repeat, because there were not enough votes for the proposed rule in this House at that time, and the Democrats were not going to help them put it across. So the Republican leadership pulled away from combat when we Democrats on the rule were all ready to give them a fight. If it was a victory for anybody it was DAN REED's victory and a shameful defeat for the President and for the Republicans.

Now today there will be a victory as regards the sensibleness of exacting the last dime that it is possible to get from profits gained from preparedness or rearmament expenditures, and we Democrats, in an orderly way in accord with the rules once again, are going to help fish President Eisenhower out of the soup. That is going to be largely a victory for the Democratic Party because the percentage on our side who voted to bring this bill out of committee is larger than the percentage of the Republicans, but together our action shows up very well. Out of the 25 votes in the committee, the vote was 16 to 9 for reporting the bill out favorably. The proportions as regards Democrats and Republicans are as follows: We, Democrats, out of 10 votes delivered 7 for the proposal, and the Republicans produced only 9 out of 15. I want to remind the Republicans as I did my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] the distinguished majority leader of the House that we Democrats, having helped them out, as we have in many instances in this session, do not like to be kicked in the teeth for helping the President out of a bad situation. But whenever we do, it seems a common practice that whenever Republicans start talking about a proposal, instead of commending us, they ungratefully kick us in the teeth. We never did that when we were in the majority, whenever we got any assistance from the opposite side, we were grateful for it and not ungrateful. So I just want to state that clearly, this victory, whoever may claim it, is going to be due largely to the efforts of the Democrats supporting the Republican administration and there will be no personal victory for the President nor for the Republicans for that matter. It is a matter of principle with those of us who voted as we did in committee and as we are going to vote on the measure here in the House.

The President or anybody else can claim victory for and take such personal satisfaction out of today's expected result as he desires, but I insist that we Democrats are impelled to support the extension of the excess-profits tax, because of the situation which exists and because we consistently supported measures bearing upon the solvency of our country and for no other reason.

We were not whiplashed to change our minds nor did we do so because of any inducement.

The excess-profits tax should be extended for an additional 6 months and longer, if necessary. The fiscal stability of the Government demands this. Not only that, but the very reason for the imposition of the tax in 1950—that is, the accrual to corporations of excess profits due to the present emergency—still exists. Defense expenditures have still to reach their peak.

There is another very important reason why I would like to see the tax extended, and that is the deficit facing us in the fiscal year 1954. I have a very strong suspicion that the Treasury Department is going to recommend the imposition of a general sales tax, the most regressive, uneconomic, and distasteful tax that was ever devised by mind of

man. I have forewarned Secretary Humphrey that he is going to meet with my strenuous opposition in the event he recommends a general sales tax to the Congress.

There are many people who would like to see the excess-profits tax not be extended, for the one and only reason that it would give them a better chance to argue for a national sales tax for reason of a larger deficit.

An excess-profits tax, it is generally agreed, is not always an equitable tax; however, regardless of its inequities in some instances, it is designed to accomplish a basic purpose and on the whole, does accomplish this purpose. By far the larger percentage of this tax is paid by highly profitable corporations, and only about 1 corporation in 16 pays an excess-profits tax. For 1950, 50,200 out of 660,000 filing returns.

I would like to here and now remind the Republicans that had they not played politics to the hilt, and had they had more of an interest in the welfare of the country, they would not be in the very embarrassing position, after all of those wonderful promises we heard last fall, of having to in effect impose additional taxes. That is what a continuation of the excess-profits tax means.

In 1951, President Truman requested of the Congress \$10 billion in additional revenue. Despite the best efforts of the Democrats in the face of Republican opposition, the Revenue Act of 1951 at the time it was passed was estimated to produce only about \$5.7 billion. The difference between the request at that time and the revenue the bill was designed to raise is about 5 times what the extension of the excess-profits tax for 6 months will bring in.

I urge that this tax be extended as requested by President Eisenhower.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I want to serve notice beforehand that I shall not yield for interruptions.

I have been warned by some of my very close friends that I should not make this speech because of physical difficulties, but I shall make it.

THE WORST TAX ON THE TAX BOOKS

Mr. Chairman, the majority of our citizens voted last fall for a change—a change of administration, a change in our "giveaway" program, a change in our foreign policy, a change in our Federal squandering habit. The majority of our citizens wanted a change, they voted for a change, and they expected a change. Did they get a change?

The Truman-Acheson team established our foreign policy. So far as anyone can determine, that foreign policy has become the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy. We are still being urged to give away our taxpayers' hard earned dollars—and we are doing it. We are still being urged "to spend and spend and tax and tax," and the majority of our Members seem to be willing to do it. The same old New Dealers are still occupying important policy-making positions in our Government, giving council, advice, and recommendations to the

heads of our Federal departments, and Mr. Baruch still sits behind the scenes pulling the strings and running the show.

We have had a change of administration, yes, but the same old show, the same old merry-go-round still operates in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, with that as an introduction, now let us take up the proposal before us, namely, the extension of the worst tax on the tax books; a tax that has done and is doing fearful damage to our economic life and prospects, the so-called excess-profits tax.

We are told that unless this tax is extended the budget cannot or will not be balanced. We are told that the Eisenhower administration will lose control of Congress if this tax is not extended. I say that if this iniquitous tax is extended, that the budget will still be unbalanced, and the Eisenhower administration will most certainly lose control of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, why do I say this?

I know, and you know, that there are some 40 or more seats, now held by Republican Congressmen that are borderline seats, where the Congressman was elected by a very narrow majority. Will these men be reelected if they violate their campaign promises and undermine the faith and confidence their constituents placed in them? Can they count upon reelection on the ethereal popularity of President Eisenhower in the face of specific material promises broken. If I know anything about the average American voter, the answer is "No." By their records will they be judged, not by ethereal popularity of someone in the White House.

Mr. Chairman, the President in his recent tax message estimated that the deficit for next year would be \$6.6 billion. He proposed as a partial cure for the situation that the excess-profits tax be extended for 6 months; that the reduction in the corporate tax rates, due next April under present law, be vetoed by legislation, and the 52-percent rate continued indefinitely, and that the increases in the excise taxes made in the 1951 tax bill, due to end April 1, be also vetoed by legislation, and present excise tax rates be extended until such time as the administration can get around to revalue and readjust all excise tax rates. In view of this request of the President, I want to ask two questions:

First. Will our leaders press for the extension of these other two taxes as they have pressed for the extension of the excess-profits tax?

Second. Are they going to guarantee a balanced budget next year?

Next year is election year, and if we extend these 2 taxes at the request of the President, as we are extending this 1 today, what will the voters think?

Mr. Chairman, what is this excess-profits tax that we are asked to extend for 6 months? Is it a wartime measure to take the profits out of war? Of course not. Many, if not most of the smaller corporations that are forced to pay it have not had any war contracts, and do not expect to get any. If a few of them have had war contracts the renegotiation

law will take care of them, and squeeze all extra war profits out.

The base period for the present excess-profits tax is the period covering the years 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949. The average profit made by a corporation during that base period is considered the standard normal profit for that corporation, and all profits that corporation makes now above that so-called normal profit is considered excess profits, subject to the excess-profits tax, which takes as high as 82 cents out of each excess-profits dollar made.

In theory the excess-profits tax is equitable and sound. In practice, however, the excess-profits tax is an unjust, unsound, and inequitable tax. It robs the new, small corporations that are struggling to establish themselves, and favors the large, well-established corporations.

Practically all large, well-established corporations, such as General Motors and Ford, made high rates of profits during the base period. Therefore, their established normal profits are so high that they now have actually little or no excess profits to pay taxes upon. On the other hand, all new or small corporations struggling to establish themselves made little or no profits during the base period; therefore, their established normal profits are either very low or nonexistent. So, nearly all the profits they make now are excess profits—over and above what they made in the base period—and subject to the heavy excess-profits tax.

Under these circumstances these corporations naturally drift into a what-is-the-use attitude. They reason about as follows, "Uncle Sam is going to take 82 cents out of every dollar I make, why struggle to make dollars for Uncle Sam? Why not carry on a heavy advertising campaign, charge the same to costs, and reap the benefit of the advertising when the excess-profits tax expires? Why not bid high for the raw materials I need? Why not have my salesmen stay at the most expensive hotels and run up excessively high expense accounts? Why object to a demand for higher wages? Eighty-two cents out of every dollar I spend that way will come out of Uncle Sam's pocket anyway, not out of mine."

Mr. Chairman, the Ways and Means Committee held 2 weeks of public hearings on the President's request for the extension of excess-profits tax. During that time 111 witnesses appeared, 105 testified against extension, and only 6 testified for extension. The testimony of every witness who testified in behalf of a small, young, struggling industry can be summarized in the statement, "Remove the shackles the excess-profits tax has placed upon us, give us a chance to expand and create new jobs, and we will pay into the Federal Treasury 5 or 6 times as many dollars next year, in regular corporate taxes, for every dollar we expect to pay if the excess-profits tax is extended for 6 months." Let me give you a concrete example.

Herbert Laube, president of Remington Co., Auburn, N. Y., said that his company, if allowed to expand as planned, would pay into the Federal Treasury next year \$100,000 more in corporate taxes than they do now, and \$180,000 more in

excise taxes than they do now, because of their increased output, a total of \$280,000 for the Treasury in lieu of \$40,000 they expect to pay in excess-profits taxes if extended.

Mr. Chairman, the testimony presented to us during those 2 weeks convinced the majority of the Ways and Means Committee that the name "excess-profits tax" is a misnomer; that under that name the Federal Government has been crucifying every small, young, struggling corporation, and favoring every large well-established corporation such as: United States Steel, Standard Oil of New Jersey, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Union Pacific Railroad, Zenith Radio Co., Skelly Oil Co., Seaboard Air Line Railroad, Great Northern Railroad, Santa Fe Railroad, Cities Service Co., West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., and many others that could be listed—all of which earned from \$9 to \$20 per share, yet none of which pay one cent of taxes on excess profits.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman, that our witnesses called the excess-profits tax a variety of colorful names, not one of which was complimentary? The following are the descriptive names or designations that the witnesses used in speaking of the excess-profits tax: (a) "a job-killing tax," (b) "an antigrowth tax," (c) "a penalty tax on progress," (d) "a tax that soaks the man who works hardest," (e) "a tax that encourages waste and extravagance," (f) "a millstone tax hung around the neck of the efficient," (g) "a tax that strikes hardest upon the well-managed concern," (h) "a hangman's noose around the neck of every young, fast-growing corporation."

When Mr. Humphrey, the Secretary of the Treasury, was before us pleading for the extension of the excess-profits tax, I asked him the following questions:

First. Mr. Secretary, have you given any thought to new sources of revenue, not now taxed, as a method of making up the revenue that you will lose if the excess-profits tax dies at the end of June?

Secretary Humphrey gave no satisfactory answer.

Second. Mr. Secretary, what about selling Government-owned businesses, now competing with privately owned taxpaying businesses, such as our Government-owned powerplants, transmission lines, RFC equities, Mississippi Barge Lines, synthetic-rubber plants, and hundreds of other Government-owned businesses? According to Charles Wilson, former head of General Electric, the Government-owned powerplants and transmission lines alone could be sold for \$27 billion. If Government-owned businesses were sold and the money applied to the national debt, it would, at a conservative estimate, do three things:

(a) Reduce the national debt by \$30 billion.

(b) Save the Government two-thirds of a billion interest payments each year.

(c) Bring in under private ownership \$1½ billion in new tax revenues each year.

Secretary Humphrey said:

I favor such a program, but it will take time.

Third. Mr. Secretary, what about taxing the untaxed, as proposed in H. R. 1559—mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, credit unions, cooperatives, and so forth, now competing with taxpaying organizations, yet paying little or no Federal tax? Our experts say that H. R. 1559 would bring in about \$800 million of new revenue each year.

Secretary Humphrey replied:

We are giving that problem consideration and will report our findings next January.

Fourth. Mr. Secretary, have you explored the feasibility and the desirability of levying a national manufacturers' sales tax to make up for the loss of revenue that will take place if and when these automatic cutoffs provided for in the 1951 revenue bill take effect? Our tax experts say a 5-percent national manufacturers' sales tax would bring in about \$5 billion and that it would do little or no injury to our national economy—not one-tenth as much damage as the excess-profits tax is now doing.

Secretary Humphrey said:

We are considering the pros and cons of such a tax and will report our findings next January.

Fifth. Mr. Secretary, have you considered increasing the regular corporate rate from 52 to 54 percent to make up the loss in revenue when the excess-profits tax expires on June 30? This would spread the added tax burden equitably over the 400,000 corporations instead of at present loading it upon some 40,000 corporations, most of which are small, struggling to get a foothold and to expand.

The Secretary gave no satisfactory answer.

Mr. Chairman, when we vote on the proposal before us, to extend the worst tax on the tax books; a tax that even those urging its extension admit is a terrible tax; a tax that has a very harmful effect upon our national economy; a tax that cannot be justified or defended even in wartime; then we should stop, look, and listen, because we are voting life or death to thousands of young, struggling corporations, we are preventing the expansion of these small, struggling industries, preventing the creation of new jobs for the 800,000 new workers that enter the labor field each year.

Mr. Chairman, when our leaders ask us to vote for the extension of this excess-profits tax, they are asking us in reality:

First. To crucify every small, young, struggling industry in our district.

Second. To do exactly the opposite to what we said we would do during the campaign last fall.

Third. To destroy the faith, the respect, and the confidence our constituents have placed in us.

Mr. Chairman, I personally think this is the most important vote we will be called upon to make during this session—at least from its bearing upon our chance of reelection. I know not what

others may do, but as for me, I shall vote my own convictions.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, every Member of the House is familiar with what has occurred here in relation to this bill for the extension for a period of 6 months or until December 31, 1953, of this "iniquitous" excess-profits-tax law. I have placed quotation marks around the word "iniquitous" because that is what the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury, who are advocating the extension of the provisions of this law, have called it. The only reason they give for extending this act is the unbalanced budget and the need of the Government for the revenue it brings in.

I fervently believe that in this day of high taxes, the burden should fall equally and impartially on all alike, and that there is no place in our tax law for any measure which discriminates against as many people as does this unfortunate law. The Government needs the revenue, but it does not need it as badly as that. We would not justify robbery on the ground that the robber is penniless and needs the money. Neither can we justify an unjust or iniquitous tax because of an unbalanced budget.

I yield to no Member of the body in my earnest desire to cut Federal expenditures, practice economy in the Government, and to balance the budget. Indeed we must do these very things. There must necessarily be high and burdensome taxes in order to accomplish this, but it is the duty of this Congress to assert every effort in its power to see that these heavy burdens of taxation fall evenly and justly upon our people.

This bill which is before us today has not had the careful and expert consideration it deserves and which the great Committee on Ways and Means is really capable of giving it. You know the reason why it has not had such consideration. It would serve no useful purpose for me to relate the influences and pressures which have prevented the committee from bringing to you today an example of its usual careful and splendid work. I have been a member of the Ways and Means Committee for more than 10 years. I believe you will forgive me for speaking in a complimentary way of the usual careful work of our committee. Not only does the committee work long and arduously, but it has on its staff and among its membership some of the outstanding experts on taxation in this country. The staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation which serves this committee and the corresponding committee in the other body is composed of some of the best trained men of any committee in the Congress. They are economists and tax experts, and while I do not wish to appear as apologizing, I wish to say that I regret exceedingly that the committee has not had the time to amend the excess-profits-tax law so that it may not work so great hardships on so many new and expanding businesses in this country.

In the first place, the law is misnamed. All of us are opposed to excessive, unreal, and unconscionable profits in such a period of time as we are now experiencing. Those who do not understand the law may be under false impressions regarding it. When the Communists of this country organize one of their subtle and subversive front organizations, they usually give it a highly patriotic sounding name, one that contains the words "liberty," "patriotic," or "American," thereby confusing many good people in believing it to be a patriotic organization. In just such a manner, many people are confused by the name, "excess-profits-tax law." When the Excess-Profits Tax Act of 1950 was passed, I opposed it for the reason that relief provisions of the first excess-profits tax act had been eliminated from it. Under the old law, there was a section, section 722, which provided that new corporations or those who had suffered some particular hardship such as a strike or a fire or flood might petition the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for special consideration and study of the particular case. This action prevented most of the hardships which are now complained of under the present act. It is true that when the act reached the other body some relief provisions were placed there by amendment and these were agreed to in the conference, but these agreed provisions were not sufficient and much harm and distress has resulted from this law.

Thousands of small new corporations were organized immediately after the close of the Second World War, a great majority of them by returned veterans, and these new businesses did not have a normal experience during the base period provided in the law. In fact, many of them had no base period at all, having been organized as late as 1949 and having not really begun production.

Under the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, income over and above a prescribed excess-profits credit is subject to an excess-profits tax. One method of computing the base of this credit is to take an average of the corporation's net income during its base period. Section 435 defines the base period as the 4 calendar years, 1946 to 1949, inclusive, and permits the corporation to eliminate whichever of the 4 years was its poorest year. Thus, in effect, corporations which commenced business prior to January 1, 1946, will have as their base for computing excess-profits tax the average earnings of their 3 best years during the 1946-49 period.

As a measure of relief for new corporations, section 445 prescribes an alternative method of computing the excess-profits credit. If a corporation commenced business after January 1, 1946, it may take as its average base period net income a return on its total assets equal to the average rate of return on total assets attained by its industry during the base period years 1946 to 1949. This rate of return is determined and published by the Secretary of the Treasury from data obtained from all the tax returns filed by members of the industry for the base period years 1946 through 1949. Section 447 (b) provides that the base period rate of return shall be ob-

tained by aggregating the net income of all members of the industry for the 4 years and dividing the resultant sum by the aggregate of the total assets of such members for the 4 years.

Under these provisions, any corporation which commenced business in 1946 or thereafter, and which must look to the relief provisions for its excess profits credit, will have a credit equal to the industry's average experience during the 4 years, whereas existing corporations will have their credit based on the best 3 out of the 4 years. To illustrate the discrimination of this provision, the base period yearly and average rates of return in the textile manufacturing industry, as published by the Secretary of the Treasury, were as follows:

	Percent
1946.....	24.0
1947.....	23.2
1948.....	20.6
1949.....	9.5
Average.....	19.0

Thus a member of this industry operating throughout the base period with, say, \$1 million of assets and with a rate of return equal to the average for the industry would have a base of \$226,000 obtained by averaging the 3 years 1946, 1947, and 1948, as follows:

1946.....	\$240,000
1947.....	232,000
1948.....	206,000
Total.....	678,000
Average.....	226,000

On the other hand, a new corporation starting in 1946 or later and having the same \$1 million in assets would have as its base only \$190,000, approximately 16 percent less than the established members of the industry. Similar discrimination will exist to a greater or lesser extent in all industries, depending upon the extent to which the poorest year in that industry fell below the average for the other 3 years.

The congressional committee reports and general legislative history of these provisions give no indication that the discriminatory consequences noted above were considered or intended by the Congress. In order to alleviate the discrimination described above, I proposed an amendment to section 447 (b) to provide for basing the industry average on the 3 best years rather than all 4 years. My amendment is embodied in H. R. 6100, which I proposed as an amendment to H. R. 5898 when the committee last met. Thirteen members of our committee of 25 voted against the amendment, but I am convinced that had the bill been considered under normal circumstances, many would have supported my amendment. Therefore I expect to file a motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Ways and Means and that it be reported forthwith to include the amendment set forth in my bill H. R. 6100 which would give these new corporations which must take the industry average as the base-period exemption to use the average of the 3 best years of their respective industries and to eliminate the worst or less profitable one. This right has been accorded to every

other industry with respect to their own base period and should not be denied the new ones.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. BROWN of Georgia. How much will the Federal Government lose under the gentleman's amendment, as compared with the amount it would lose under the Sadlak amendment?

Mr. CAMP. I did not have time to get a Treasury estimate on that. I had time only to consult those who I thought could figure it out. They told me it would be \$63 million. That is a small amount. The amount involved in the Sadlak bill would have been far more than that; and the Sadlak bill would have been more discriminatory. My amendment is not discriminatory. Any new corporation that has no base period experience has the alternative of accepting the industry average. But he does not have the right to eliminate from the industry average that one bad year which the old established companies have the right to do in taking their average.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As the gentleman's amendment is drawn, I understand it will not require any refund whatsoever to any corporation. In other words, it would give relief for 1953, this year.

Mr. CAMP. Yes. It begins January 1, 1953.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And would require no refund to any corporation.

Mr. CAMP. You are right. There would be no refund.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, if we renew this tax even for 6 months, we should afford people who are small and who are not able to hire a tax lawyer—we should afford them that much relief at least; and I ask the House to do that.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, probably no Member of this House could find himself in a more unexpected position than that in which I am placed today in urging your support of the bill now before the committee. I have been opposed to excess-profits taxes many times in the past. I have helped our very distinguished chairman in his fight against the tax, and it can be truly said that I left him at what in his viewpoint was the critical moment. No one could have been more surprised than I at finding it necessary to reverse the field, and I urge the passage of this extension of the excess-profits tax. To say that I do so under pressure is correct. It was not, however, the pressure against which individual freedom cringes; it was the result of a forced realization on my part that without the extension as a practical matter we would be \$800 million worse off as a Nation than with the

tax, and our chances for personal income-tax reduction next year would be gone. It was because of my serious objection to the rule which would have been before this body the first part of this week; it was the fact that I recognized that a majority of my committee wanted to consider excess-profits taxes and because I believe that perhaps two-thirds of the Members of this House desires also to vote on the issue. Further, it was because I believe that perhaps the price of \$800 million is not too great a price to pay for the definite and positive commitment on the part of the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and others, to the effect that this will be the final and permanent elimination of excess profits.

It is not easy to make a decision to reverse the field and to support this bill for which I have no love; it is at all times hard to differ with a friend and with a friend who has aided, encouraged, helped, shown confidence in, and stood by and in every respect assisted you to a position of responsibility and trust. It is doubly hard to differ with him. The distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New York, Hon. DANIEL REED, has been and I pray is such a friend of mine today in spite of our differences on this bill, differences not as to the merit of the legislation, but as to its expediency.

At great risk, a risk only I can appreciate, I took that chance; and the greatest satisfaction I have come this afternoon in the statement made by the gentleman from New York a few minutes ago that he has no animosity toward any member of his committee.

I hold no man in higher personal regard, I hold no man a better fighter to the end than I do DAN REED. I respect him in his position today; and, finally, illustrating his great character and his lack of vindictiveness, I state to this body that in the several days since our committee action on this bill he has helped me legislatively as he would have done under happier circumstances. He is a man.

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

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, during the past few weeks much has been said in Congress regarding the pressure placed upon individual Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means to persuade them to vote one way or another on the extension for 6 months of the excess-profits tax. At the beginning of my statement I want to emphasize the point that I have never been subjected to pressure of any kind by any Member of Congress or of the executive branch of our Federal Government regarding this matter. On the contrary, I have diligently sought all available information on this issue entirely on my own initiative. I have consulted many Members of Congress and members of the executive branch, and especially I have consulted with the people of the First Iowa District whom it is my privilege and responsibility to represent here in Congress. My decisions have been my

own, based upon these consultations and upon my own research and analysis.

The excess-profits tax should be ended as soon as our Federal budget permits, but huge deficits make it necessary to extend this tax for 6 months or until December 31, 1953.

The fiscal year just ended brought with it a deficit of \$9,300,000,000, and the deficit for the next fiscal year is estimated from \$5 billion upward, notwithstanding economies and cutting of appropriations by the Eisenhower administration and by this Congress since they took control in January. Congress literally has been deprived of immediate control of the Nation's purse strings through the accumulation of \$102 billion of unspent appropriations during the past few years. Most of this vast accumulation from extravagant appropriations made by the Truman administration has been fully obligated for future spending and cannot be rescinded by Congress today without impugning the integrity of our Federal Government.

This 83d Congress has made a grand record in putting the brakes on extravagant appropriations. In fact, they will have cut \$10 billion from President Truman's estimate for the present fiscal year. Just as soon as the accumulated obligations of the Truman administration are paid off the reduced new appropriations will help us tremendously in balancing the budget and bringing about some measure of tax reduction.

During the years the New Deal and Fair Deal were in power the spenders and wasters were in control. They are responsible for the financial straits in which we find ourselves. They piled up our tremendous national debt, refusing during World War II to levy the pay-as-you-go taxes which would have held it down, taxes which the American people would willingly have paid. They deliberately exposed us to the dangers of inflation and cut the purchasing power of our dollar in half. Deficit spending was the accepted policy, only temporarily interrupted when the Republican 80th Congress balanced the budget for the first time in years and reduced the debt by several billions.

We Republicans are pledged to reduce expenditures, to balance the budget, and then to ease the burden of heavy taxes which all of us bear. We are making headway. Needless and wasteful spending is being slashed by this administration and by this Congress. As we go on and bring order out of the chaos which we found when we took over the Government last January we will restore financial stability to our country and end the danger of inflation.

The people of the United States want their taxes reduced, but the overwhelming majority of them do not want them reduced until it can be done without imperiling our whole national economy. The Republican Party promised economy, sound government, and lower taxes. These pledges will be kept.

During the past months much has been said regarding promises made during the course of the general election campaign of 1952. To keep the record straight in my own case, I quote herewith part of a letter dated November

13, 1952, which I received from Mr. Cy Douglas, chief of the bureau of the Associated Press at Des Moines, Iowa. Mr. Douglas wrote me as follows:

The Associated Press is undertaking to poll all Members of the Congress on a few of the outstanding issues they will confront next session.

We would greatly appreciate your cooperation in this project, which we regard as of great public value.

To that end, we'd like to have your answers to the questions listed below, attributable to you if possible and preferably without use of your name if you do not want it the other way.

The questions:

3. Individual income taxes are bringing in \$33½ billion. Corporation taxes nearly 25 billion and excise taxes nearly 10 billion. How much do you think can be cut from each category, if any?

We'd appreciate your reply sent here as soon as possible. You have our thanks in advance for your interest.

In reply to question No. 3, I included the following statement in my letter to Mr. Douglas under date of November 18, 1952:

3. It is impossible to promise an immediate reduction in taxes beyond the reductions that will result from the automatic expiration of the temporary increases made in the 1951 revenues laws. Last winter estimates of Federal revenue for fiscal year 1953 ranged from \$68.3 billion to 71 billion. Estimated reduction of Federal revenue because of expiration of temporary revenues provided for in the Revenue Act of 1951 is \$1.8 billion in fiscal year 1953 and 7.97 billion in fiscal year 1954. Any additional tax reduction will give rise to continued deficit financing unless Federal spending is cut down far below present levels of such spending.

As soon as total Federal spending can be reduced enough to permit further tax reduction without giving rise to deficits, I favor a combination of further tax reduction and reduction of our outstanding Federal indebtedness.

With the Federal deficit for fiscal 1953 increased to \$9.3 billion and with a prospect of a deficit of more than \$5 billion for the present fiscal year, I submit that my decision to support the 6-months extension of the excess-profits tax is not in conflict with the position I took in the 1952 campaign. It is my sincere hope that the load of outstanding obligations of the Truman administration can be met at an early date so that we can demonstrate to the people of America a sound fiscal policy combined with tax reduction.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and six Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, on June 1 of this year the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, in opening the administration testimony in behalf of the extension of the excess-profits tax, made this initial statement:

Secretary HUMPHREY. The immediate problem is the extension of the excess-profits tax for 6 months through December 31. I am here to urge this extension in spite of the

fact that I dislike the excess-profits tax and think that it is a bad tax.

Thereupon Mr. Humphrey went on to outline to the members of the committee the fiscal position facing this Government at this time. The Secretary pointed out what was well known to the members of the committee, to the members of the Committee on Appropriations, and to the Members of the House of Representatives, that for the fiscal year 1953 we were spending approximately \$74 billion, and at that time our anticipated revenues were about \$68 billion. Since that time we have learned that our anticipated revenues were not \$68 billion, but were actually about \$65 billion. So that a deficit that was estimated to be about \$5.9 billion turned out to be a deficit of nine-billion-some dollars.

Then the Secretary pointed out the fact that the previous administration had asked for about \$78 billion for fiscal 1954, and that using the identical tax structure now in existence, namely, a continuation of the excess-profits tax, a continuation of the existing individual income-tax structure, a continuation of the existing 52 percent corporate tax structure, and a continuation of the existing wartime excise-tax structure, our estimated revenues would be about \$68 billion, leaving a deficit of about \$5 billion. But if we failed to extend the excess-profits tax, which the Secretary and all who accompanied him said was bad, vicious, unjust, unfair, immoral, and wrong, our deficit would be increased by a matter of \$800 million.

He did not pretend for one moment that by a 6-month extension of the excess-profits tax this Government would attain fiscal stability. He did not maintain for one second that under the program which he was advocating before that committee, his so-called sound-money policy, would actually be put into effect and that there would be an end of deficit financing in the United States of America.

What then do we really have before us today? Here is one of the outstanding Members of this body, the chairman of this great committee of ours, the Honorable DAN REED.

If I may divert for one moment, may I say that I have known the chairman of my committee well and intimately for a great many years. I have traveled about the world with him, and I know Mr. REED and his wife and his family. I say without any thought of contradiction that there is no more high-principled man in this body. I have not agreed with Mr. REED on many occasions. Some of the best fights I have had in the Ways and Means Committee have been with DAN REED, and I am sure I will have some more.

But let us really see why, let us try to analyze this thing and try to come to some conclusions on the matter of pillorying this man, of going to the unprecedented step of bypassing the Ways and Means Committee, and then taking it back to the Ways and Means Committee and saying, "This is it or else."

Having done all that, and having made certain that this bill is going to pass, and it is going to pass, what is going to be the net effect of it? What is the net of doing something where the very advocates themselves will say, "What we ask you to do is wrong. The tax that we advocate is immoral. The tax that we are for is unjust, unfair, and discriminatory. But because we have to balance the budget, you have to do what your conscience tells you is wrong."

Let us see what happens after you do that. You vote today to extend the excess-profits tax. You provide, they say, \$800 million in revenues. Maybe you will not. Revenues are falling off. I am sure that some of the Texas cattle growers are not going to be paying any excess-profits tax this year, and neither are a lot of farmers who had corporations on the basis of this new sound-dollar policy—the taxes will be reduced, but they will be reduced because they will not have the income to pay the taxes on—but let us see what happens. You will have voted for something you know is wrong. Will you balance the budget? Will you be establishing a sound fiscal policy? If the basis for extending the excess-profits tax for 6 months is to balance the budget, and come January 1, 1954, and the budget is \$6 billion out of balance, is it not logical and should you not assume that Mr. Humphrey will come back on January 1 and say, "Well, the unbalanced budget still is not balanced and we are going to have to extend it for another 6 months, or 6 years or indefinitely?" Because if the argument is that this is wrong but you must do it for the sake of expediency and because the means justifies the end, the means do justify the end on July 10, 1953, with an unbalanced budget, and when your Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, and your Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Folsom, in their testimony say it is going to be unbalanced yet on January 1, then is it not just as logical to extend it beyond January 1?

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. Would the gentleman be willing to admit that it would be helping toward balancing the budget?

Mr. BOGGS. That is an interesting question. It is a question of being asked to do something that you think is immoral when the best you can say for it is that it might help in a situation, and when you know it does not cure the situation.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it any more immoral now than it was 2½ years ago when it was enacted and all but 20 Members of the House voted for it?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes; I think perhaps it is because we have had more experience with it and we know more about it. We have learned more about it from what you gentlemen have said about it, and some of you have convinced us about it. As you study it, it is obviously immoral. Let me show you how immoral it is. I

hold in my hand "What every investor ought to know about the excess-profits tax" put out by one of these investment services.

Here is the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. Reported earnings per share for the year 1952, \$10.43. Excess-profits tax paid, nothing—0.

Here is the Reynolds Tobacco Co. Reported earnings per share for the year 1952, \$2.90. Excess-profits tax per share, \$1.07—or about 50 percent.

Here is Liggett & Myers, making another kind of cigarette. Reported earnings per share, \$5.11. Excess-profits tax per share, 0—nil—nothing.

Here is Seaboard Airline Railroads. Reported earnings per share, \$20.16. Excess-profits tax paid, 0—nothing. Here is the Sperry Corp., which reported earnings of \$6.75 per share. They paid an excess-profits tax of \$4.48 per share, or about 75 percent.

Do you gentlemen know why they are going to vote for this tax? Because the situation we are in today is that under the law as it is now written the excess-profits tax expires on June 30, but not until January 1 does the increase on individual personal income taxes expire. Is this valid? Is it not possible to substitute a just tax?

The only businessman who came before our committee in behalf of this tax, despite all the pressure to get the United States Chamber of Commerce and the other business organizations to change their minds, was a man named McCabe. He is a toilet paper manufacturer. He used to be here on the Federal Reserve Board. I have been told that he wants to become an ambassador. He was the only one who came before the committee who was in favor of this tax. And he said it was bad.

That is why you gentlemen are voting for it. That is exactly why you are voting for it, and there is no other reason. You know you are not balancing the budget. You know you are not even trying to balance the budget. If you wanted to balance the budget you would come in here with an honest tax program saying, "We are going to spend \$74 billion and we need \$74 billion to balance this budget."

Are you doing it? No, sir. Why are you not doing it? Because you went all over this great United States of America—and DAN REED is right; I heard you, and I saw you on television—and you were saying, "We are going to cut out this waste and extravagance. We are going to reduce your taxes. We are going to change this policy of tax and tax and spend and spend."

Where are you now? You are confronting the realities of government. And next year, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], you are going to come in here and ask us to vote for some more taxes. You have got to do it. You have no alternative. You are just finding out what it is to have to assume the responsibility for government.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, since he has just referred to me?

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

Mr. HALLECK. Let me say, with very little help on the other side, when we wind up this year we will have cut \$12 to \$13 billion out of the Truman estimated requested appropriations; and if we are given a little time we will get this budget in balance, without having to raise any more taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. May I say to the gentleman that even if he does reduce appropriations by \$12 billion—and I doubt that he will; the Senate has not acted yet on most of these measures—but even if he does, if he maintains the current interest rate policy, this sound money, or, as somebody has said, hard-money policy, he is going to come in here next year asking us for \$10 billion to service the national debt alone.

I know it is hard medicine to take. I know it is tough to have to face the realities of government, after being on the other side for 20 years.

I am in the minority now and I find it is much easier. But I am glad to see that you are facing up to your responsibilities.

So far as I am concerned, I have as much concern about the fiscal stability of this Government as any man on this side. But I am not going to vote for a tax measure that does not balance the budget, that does not do what it is said to do, and that every man who has said anything about it says is wrong, unjust, unfair, immoral. And if it be politically wrong to vote against it, I am still against it.

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

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, first let me very briefly state my position with regard to the extension of this tax: I am "agin" it. I voted against it in the committee in December of 1950. I voted against it on the floor of this House in December of 1950, when it was put on the statute books. I shall certainly vote against any extension of it today. I must confess to you that I will be mighty pleased when this day is over, and this particular problem is no longer confronting the Ways and Means Committee and is no longer confronting this House. I think we will all admit that there have been many unfortunate circumstances connected with it; in fact, I am inclined to believe that the importance of the tax and the importance of the revenue involved have been magnified in the last month and a half way beyond their real importance.

In spite of opposition to the bill, I must say that 6 more months of the tax is not going to kill any business, assuming, of course, that at the end of those 6 months it will be terminated; and I believe most sincerely that the Secretary of the Treasury and the President will stand by

their word given to the Committee on Ways and Means and also given to the House of Representatives and the country that they will not under any circumstances ask for its extension beyond December 31. That is a happy note.

On the other hand, the revenue anticipated from its extension, \$800 million, is certainly not a life or death matter to this Congress. I think that, too, has been magnified way beyond its importance. We all know that this House only 2 days ago increased an authorization for appropriations in excess of \$200 million over what the administration asked for. You will recall not long ago when we were voting the extension of the Mutual Security Act the great resistance there was to any cut. Amendments were offered to cut that by at least a billion dollars and we know that that program can be cut by that much without doing any real serious injury and yet the amendments were defeated. If the money is the important aspect of this bill, then why was the administration and the leadership not more conserved on the money aspects of the appropriation bills and the authorization bills that have been before the Congress?

Mr. Chairman, there are some real important principles involved in this legislation that is before us today; in my judgment there are two fundamental principles. The first one deals with the question of who is responsible for writing tax laws. Shall it be the Congress or the Executive? The Constitution says it shall be the Congress. The Constitution further says that tax bills shall originate in the House of Representatives and the rules of the House provide that the Ways and Means Committee shall have sole jurisdiction.

We all know where and how this particular tax bill was written. I am not going into all of that. There is one aspect though, that does concern me. We on the Republican side are told that this vote on the extension of this tax will be the test of our loyalty to the President. To me that kind of argument has no place in the debate in this bill, and yet it was advanced by the Chairman of Rules Committee when presenting the rule. He said that this vote would be a test of your loyalty to the President. To me that type of argument does the President a great injustice.

It infers that the President of the United States would ask Members of Congress to vote against their good conscience and their own convictions in the matter simply because he has asked for a certain proposal. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that that is the kind of a man or that that is the kind of President we have today in President Eisenhower. I am convinced that the President believes in constitutional Government and that the President is convinced that we should stand up to our individual principles and vote our convictions and not vote on the basis of expediency. So the charge that the President expects each and every one of us, no matter what our feelings are or what

our convictions are, to go along with him, does him an injustice.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say that I agree with the gentleman, I do not think we have that kind of a President. May I also say to the gentleman that I have talked to the President about this many times and I never heard him say that anyone should not vote his convictions if that is what he wanted to do. He did request that a meeting of the committee be called to consider this very important matter and I think he had a right to make that request.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I was not alleging that the President was making this claim. I was saying that those who advance the argument that this is a test of loyalty to the President, those people who are making that argument are doing the President an injustice. The gentleman has stated the President's position rightly. But you heard the chairman of the Rules Committee in arguing for this rule say that this is a test of your loyalty to the President. That is the kind of argument I am referring to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. To keep the record straight, we held hearings for 10½ days. One hundred and ten witnesses appeared. That was done at the request of the President. There is the record of it in print for each Member of the House to read and to draw his own conclusions as to the merits or demerits of this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss briefly the second principle that is involved in this bill. That is the matter of whether it is sound taxation or not, whether we are justified in enacting it into law, whether we are justified in extending it. I gave some of my reasons for opposing the tax and said I thought the tax was bad during debate in this House on December 5, 1952, and I am not going to repeat that argument at this time.

I am going to give you one example of how this tax works, then I will leave it up to you to determine whether you think that a tax that leads to these results is a tax you will put your stamp of approval on. Much of this debate has been in general terms. We say the tax is bad, it is inflationary, it is this, that, or the other thing. I would like to be specific. Here is how it works today in practice among a group of seven manufacturers. They are manufacturers of cigarettes, and, incidentally, may I say that I do not have any individual companies manufacturing cigarettes in my district, so I have no interest in any of these companies one way or the other. Here are all of the cigarette manufacturers with published financial statements. Let us see what the results of this tax are when applied to seven

manufacturers all engaged in the same business. I should point out that this is not a defense agency. The profits of these companies are not derived from war work.

Here is a table showing among other things the income of these seven companies before Federal income taxes and their net earnings after Federal taxes for the year 1952:

Income before Federal taxes on income, Federal income and excess-profits taxes and net earnings for the year 1952 of 7 companies that manufacture cigarettes and publish financial statements

Company	Income before Federal taxes on income	Federal income tax	Federal excess-profits tax	Total Federal taxes on income	Percent Federal taxes of income before Federal taxes	Net earnings
W. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.-----	\$90,045,134	\$47,405,258	\$10,690,484	\$58,995,742	64.52	\$31,949,392
The American Tobacco Co.-----	75,468,963	39,335,000	2,065,000	41,400,000	54.86	34,068,963
Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.-----	44,048,526	22,860,000	1(200,000)	22,660,000	51.31	21,448,526
Philip Morris & Co., Ltd., Inc. (year ended Mar. 31, 1953)	21,925,200	11,280,000	1(700,000)	10,580,000	48.25	11,345,200
P. Lorillard Co.-----	11,426,942	5,798,000	1(72,000)	5,726,000	50.11	5,700,942
United States Tobacco Co.-----	5,922,251	2,980,000	390,000	3,370,000	56.90	2,522,251
Benson & Hedges-----	2,594,346	1,319,834	379,899	1,699,733	65.52	894,613

¹ Parentheses () indicates credit.

² After \$60,000 credit for Canadian tax.

You will note that R. J. Reynolds had income before taxes of \$90 million. The American Tobacco Co. was the second largest, with income before taxes of \$75,468,000. Let us see what happened after taxes. Remember now, Reynolds Tobacco Co. made \$14,500,000 more than the American Tobacco Co. before taxes, but with excess-profits taxes what happened? After taxes the Reynolds Tobacco Co. had net earnings of approximately \$32 million, but what did the American Tobacco Co. have? It had net earnings of \$34 million; in other words, earning \$14,500,000 less than the Reynolds Tobacco Co., the American Tobacco Co. ends up with a profit after taxes of \$2 million more than the Reynolds company. Is that equitable? Is that honest? Is it a sound tax law that produces such a result? Of course not.

Here is another pertinent and interesting fact. The heaviest tax burden, in terms of percentage of income subject to tax, fell not on the company with the largest taxable income but on the company having the least taxable income. Benson and Hedges with an income of \$2,500,000 paid Federal income taxes equal to 65.52 percent. The top company, Reynolds, paid 64.52 percent; American Tobacco Co. paid 54.86 percent; Liggett & Myers paid 51.31 percent; and Philip Morris paid 48.25 percent. Is that equitable? Is that honest? Is it a sound tax law that produces such a result? Of course not.

Another aspect of this picture that should be noted is that although this is not a defense industry and all of these manufacturers are engaged in the same enterprise, not all of them pay an excess profits tax. Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co. with income before Federal income taxes of \$44 million paid no excess-profits tax, but, in fact, had an excess-profits tax credit of \$260,000. Philip Morris & Co. with income before taxes of almost \$22 million paid no excess-profits tax but had an excess-profits tax credit of \$700,000. P. Lorillard Co. with income of \$11,400,000 paid no excess-profits tax. The United States Tobacco Co. and Benson & Hedges with considerably less income did pay excess-profits taxes in the amounts shown in the table. Is that

equitable? Is that honest? Is it a sound tax law that produces such a result? Of course, not.

I believe any reasonable person will agree that a tax law that produces results such as those I have just described has no place in the tax system of this country. It has no place in the tax law of any country that believes in justice and equity. The example that I have used covers the manufacturers of cigarettes. I am confident that an analysis of the effect of the excess-profits tax on corporations engaged in other lines of business would produce similar findings of unreasonableness and discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot put my stamp of approval on a tax bill that produces such inequities. I am not willing to admit that there are not brains enough in this House, on our committee, on our staff, on the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and in the Treasury Department to devise a more equitable means of raising what money may be necessary to carry on the operations of our Government. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the additional minority views as filed with the committee report. Those views are as follows:

FURTHER MINORITY VIEWS

We cannot agree to the extension of the excess-profits tax beyond its scheduled expiration date.

The courageous effort of the administration to bring the budget into balance meets with our fullest support. In view of the huge deficit in the fiscal year just ended and the probable deficit in the current fiscal year, it is obvious that revenues, and the level of taxation, must temporarily remain at a high level. We agree that the estimate of expenditures for this fiscal year makes necessary the consideration of ways and means of avoiding the loss of the revenue provided by the excess-profits tax which expired on June 30.

The desire to maintain present revenues, however, offers no excuse for perpetuating a tax which all testimony, including that at the highest level in the administration, condemns as unfair, inflationary, discriminatory, repressive, and inequitable. All tax authorities admit that this tax is not a tax on excessive profits but an arbitrary tax on growth and expansion. It is particularly burdensome to small and growing businesses. The fact that this tax is paid by less than

8 percent of the corporations of this country, in our view, is not a justification for continuing the tax; it is, instead, strong evidence of its arbitrary and discriminatory nature.

The efforts of the administration and the committee should have been directed toward preparing tax legislation which would provide the required revenue in as sound and fair a manner as human intelligence could devise. This was not done. We of the committee were not permitted to consider alternatives.

We are unwilling to admit that the combined brains and technical resources of this committee and its staff, the Treasury Department and its experts, and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation could not devise a tax which would be shared equitably by corporate taxpayers and which would still produce the \$700 to \$800 million hoped for under this legislation. Certainly, by the adoption of almost any other kind of tax than the one proposed in this bill, we would be spared the moral and intellectual stigma of putting into effect a tax which we know beforehand is bad.

JOHN W. BYRNES.
THOMAS B. CURTIS.
JAMES B. UTI.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the country is at war. National defense spending is necessarily at a high level and will be for some time. President Eisenhower has requested Congress to extend the excess-profits tax for 6 months. Whenever I reasonably can I seek to support the President and I shall support him in this instance. I shall vote to extend the excess-profits tax.

Now I should like to mention a tax matter which may appear unrelated to the present discussion. If a corporation makes no excess profits, it does not have to pay an excess-profits tax. If an individual makes no net income, he does not have to pay a personal income tax. Under the law the motion-picture theater owners and operators of our country are suffering from a very serious situation. About 50 theaters in my State have closed since April. They have to pay large sums in admission taxes even though they operate their businesses at a loss, as many of them do. Many small theater owners are faced with financial ruin.

A large segment of the membership of the House appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee some weeks ago and asked that the theater admissions tax be repealed. I think it is desperately necessary that this tax be repealed and that Congress take action. In view of the fact that so many Members of Congress have requested that such legislation be presented to the House for consideration, I would like to know from some authoritative source on the Ways and Means Committee or from the House leadership just what the situation is with respect to the theater tax legislation.

Mr. REED of New York. A bill was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee this morning removing the tax.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman and his committee are to be commended for that.

May I ask the gentleman from New York, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee [Mr. REED] if he feels that a rule will be provided and the House given an opportunity to vote on this bill?

Mr. REED. Do not ask me that.

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

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

Mr. COOPER. Confirming the statement made by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I might say to the gentleman that the bill was favorably reported this morning by a vote of 22 to 3 to remove the admissions tax on motion picture theaters.

Mr. MAHON. I think that is good news to the House. People who are operating their business at a net loss should not have to pay a heavy tax to the Government. I hope this legislation can be acted upon favorably by this Congress. My chief reason for taking the floor at this time is for the purpose of urging upon the Ways and Means Committee and the House leadership the earliest possible action on the bill to repeal the theater admissions tax.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that the House should fully realize that it today is considering a tax bill without the committee to which the bill was assigned for study having adequately performed its duties. The committee report accompanying the bill makes the point very clearly. In essence, the committee report says that the Executive says he wants the bill, although it is a bad bill, because he needs the \$800 million that the executive branch estimates will be gained in revenue, and the increased deficit caused by its immediate expiration is a worse danger to our economy than the extension of this tax or any short-term substitute tax.

These are pretty broad generalities the executive branch of the Government is drawing in reaching its conclusion that the excess-profits tax should be extended. They are pretty broad conclusions upon which to insist that the Ways and Means Committee should disregard its own judgment and studies and simply rubberstamp the matter to the House.

The Constitution, of course, vests the power of initiating tax legislation in the House of Representatives, and the House of Representatives in turn has entrusted this duty and responsibility to its Ways and Means Committee. There are serious questions about every one of the Executive's broad premises, and normally the House would rely on the fact that this committee would go behind these broad generalities to see if the facts and arguments support such conclusions.

First, it is a very serious question whether the anticipated revenue from extending the excess-profits tax for 6 more months will amount to \$800 million. It is entirely possible, in my judgment quite probable, that we would gain more revenue by permitting the excess-profits tax to expire, because more money would be subject to the normal 52 percent corporate tax and would produce

beyond \$800 million in additional revenue. At least, proper procedure indicates that the House would be interested in the judgment of the Ways and Means Committee on this matter.

Secondly, the next premise of the executive is even broader and requires even greater study and judgment, and that is that the increased deficit alleged by the expiration of a bad, vicious tax is a worse danger to the economy than the tax itself. This immediately raised the question. Why is the tax bad and vicious? There are many other adjectives that the spokesmen for the executive branch of the Government have used to describe the wickedness of this tax. What constitutes a bad, vicious tax? Well, a very brief study of the tax will show that it is mainly bad and vicious because it is undermining our economy. It is causing deterioration, if you please, in our tax base. Now, how much deterioration is it causing? Is the deterioration greater than the deterioration caused by being \$800 million—accepting the administration's unsubstantiated figure—further away from a balanced budget? Is not the House interested in knowing why its Committee on Ways and Means had decided contrarywise, at least when they had their own judgment to follow, and what its judgment was based upon?

The third premise, the increased deficit, is a worse danger to our economy than any short-term substitute tax and is the broadest of all the generalities on which the executive has based its conclusion. This was a pure take it or lump it statement. There was little or no attempt to discuss it let alone support it with facts or reason. I am a little shocked that the House seems not interested that its Committee on Ways and Means has not even examined this important point.

Fourth, there is even a further broader generality in the quoted statement of the executive that because the tax would continue the full year and a half at half rate even if the tax were allowed to expire, therefore, its bad effect in penalizing efficiency and in encouraging waste will continue through the year in any event. There was no attempt to support this broad conclusion or to answer the question I posed to the real author of that statement. My question was this: "Is not the viciousness of the tax the rate of the tax itself or the rate of the tax rather than the tax itself?" The answer, I think, is quite obvious. If you reduce the rate of the tax from 30 percent to 15 percent you cut the viciousness of it—if it is vicious—in more than half because as the rate rises, the damage rises not in arithmetical proportion but in geometrical proportion. On this matter too, I would have thought that the House membership would wish to have the study and views of its Committee on Ways and Means. I would pause here and earnestly beseech the membership to consider whether it wants to go ahead and pass a bill as serious as this solely upon the broad generalities imposed by the executive branch of the Government without proper study and consideration of one of its committees, or whether the better procedure would not be to recommend this bill.

I would further state that the problem of balancing a budget includes two considerations. One, we have heard a great deal about cash balance. But the other feature is equally important, the budget must be balanced based upon a realistic income, an income or tax take that does not undermine our economy. A cash balance based upon an unrealistic tax take is not a real balanced budget. So I say the administration having properly dubbed the excess-profits tax a bad tax which undermines our economy, can hardly argue that the reason for extending it is to come closer to a true balanced budget. We must just make an estimate of what our proper income may be, and then adjust our expenditures to that income. Herein lies the only real balanced budget.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. This bill, if enacted into a law, will raise approximately \$800 million. It is very difficult for a Member to make up his mind, I am sure, to vote for a bill like this that is denounced by the highest officials of our Government as the most vicious tax that can be presented.

There is another consideration that disturbs me greatly in this matter. Although I want to vote for every tax bill that the administration recommends, which it believes is necessary to balance the budget, or to go in that direction, to be helpful on fiscal policy, this particular bill is very hard to vote for, especially in view of the hard-money, high-interest policy of the administration, which is permitting interest rates to go up and up, and even causing the interest rates to go up and up, to the point where our expenses of Government are increasing millions of dollars a day, apparently without any effort on the part of the administration to stop this extra cost.

There seems to be no objection to expenses being increased so long as it is for interest rates. I am inserting in the Record today a comparison of interest rates at the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1947, and as of today. And the Members will discover in reading that statement that 91 day bills, back in 1947, were three-eighths of 1 percent. Now they are over 2 percent. Instead of paying \$75 million a year on an annual basis for the \$19.7 billion worth of bills, we are paying \$415 million. And on certificates, instead of paying \$139 million we are paying \$397 million on an annual basis, for the same amount of money.

When the recent bond issue was put out at 3¼ percent, that set the pattern of interest rates on long-term bonds. Those bonds, at 3¼ percent, compared with the going rate before of 2.3 percent, means that the interest rate on the long-term national debt, as it is refunded on a basis not exceeding 3¼ percent, will be almost \$800 million.

So we are not profiting very much by running interest rates up on long-term bonds. It will cost us \$800 million a year. It will not profit us to pass a tax bill for 6 months that will only raise \$800 million. The difference is that this tax bill which is declared to be so vicious and unfair, is only to last 6 months, but the

\$800 million a year increase will go on for 40 years, 50 years, or 100 years.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman does not have time to cover the subject fully, but, briefly, what has become of the so-called hard-money policy?

Mr. PATMAN. As to the hard-money policy, they have been trying to go in reverse lately, it seems. But they are not going fast enough in reverse to make up for the damage that they have already done. This damage has already been done. Furthermore, they are pursuing the wrong method. The Federal Reserve Board could have supported Government bonds at par and helped more than lowering this reserve requirements. It would have helped everybody. We are going to be out \$800 million a year extra on the long-term national debt annually from now on; whereas this bill only collects \$800 million for 6 months, that is all.

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

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

Mr. YATES. And is this one of the things that this administration inherited from the previous administration?

Mr. PATMAN. No; it was not inherited, because as to this tax bill the previous administration set as the dead line on this tax June 30, and any extension of the tax after June 30 is the responsibility of the present administration; because the Democratic administration's tax bill has already expired.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, there may be honest doubt in the minds of Members of this body, even as there appears to be with leaders in the administration, as to the wisdom of making a reduction in the burden of taxes now carried by the people of America. I am sure that those who have these misgivings will readily admit that these doubts and fears are not shared by the taxpayers of the Nation. The overwhelming majority of our constituents have a different viewpoint, and each can sustain it with reason from the special angle of his own economic situation and ability to meet the demands of the tax gatherer. In addition, they recall the promises of candidates, in both parties, during the last presidential campaign. We campaigned and supported the Republican tenets of government last autumn with the oft-repeated pronouncement of our determination to ease the load for those to whom we appealed for support, and did everything we could to impress them with our sincerity of purpose. The suffrage of our party and great numbers of the opposite political persuasion talked with us and spelled out their feelings on this subject. We swung around our campaign orbits listening to these pleas here, there, and yonder; we spoke from many platforms and in many forums, and our moods came to coincide with what the

people wanted. They sold us on what we as candidates were most anxious to know about, and we promised faithfully that we could and would perform in accord with their desires. They trusted us—otherwise we would not be here.

As to the personal-income tax and the excess-profits tax, the day of reckoning was set for us by the preceding administration, the first to expire by limitation at the end of this year, and the second on the 30th day of this month.

Proposals have been made to give simultaneous relief to both classes. This is desirable and must be accomplished at the earliest possible time.

In my State of West Virginia, and in those surrounding it, there is a steadily creeping paralysis in the bituminous coal industry, the proximate cause of which may be ascribed in no small measure to the policies of government adopted and carried out over a long period by the preceding administrations. Thousands of coal miners are jobless, other thousands employed only part time. The consequences go further. I doubt if there is a single coal-mining company or corporation in my State subject to an excess-profits levy. The income is insufficient to bring any of them under its provisions. A great many companies are down—they have quit. Others are in operation only by virtue of economic cutbacks for a period to permit them to survive and extend store credits to employees, hoping for more propitious times and protective measures against a ruinous competition in their markets by imports of foreign residual fuel oil.

Hundreds of other businesses and literally thousands of other wage and salary earners have had their incomes affected by the blight now spreading through the coal fields. It adversely affects the revenues of the State of West Virginia, and thus the operations of our institutions and schools, literally reaching down into counties and magisterial districts. It has been truly stated that 2 out of every 3 people in my State are affected, directly or indirectly, by this deplorable condition.

Tax relief proposed in present measures is not sufficient, but would be enough to give the people of this country an economic lift, a boost in confidence that would do more in the long pull for the fiscal betterment of governmental affairs in the Nation and a balancing of the budget than will be accomplished by a continuance of collection of either or both for the next 6 months' period.

We have been engaged in an effort to bring about some very noticeable reductions in unnecessary and wasteful spending. Much more of this fruitful labor will have to be employed here in the Nation's Capitol, as an indispensable part of a prudent beginning to attain financial sanity for a sound economic base. Once we attain it, the integrity of the dollar will come back.

A further result of doing a thoroughly proper job on the curtailment of public spending will be to reduce, at the same time, the need for more revenue than is required to get down to that pay-as-we-go basis so much to be desired. If we show consistent progress toward this end we will not have to disappoint those back

home who have trusted and elected us to do the job.

Nobody wants to throw a good dollar after a bad one. No corporation or other business organization has the least desire to strike into new ventures, except with its own resources in capital. Borrowing costs in interest. Hence, those concerns coming under the excess-profits tax are handicapped by it in accumulating capital backlogs with which they can expand their businesses and plants or open and operate branches. The result is a slowing down of the wheels of industry, a general letup of enterprise and investment of risk capital.

Some of our economists have stated that about the middle of this present year a recession is due to begin. They have arrived at this conclusion from a study of industrial expansion and the apparent lag in this field of human action in America. If this should happen, part of it may come from the known fact that we are and have been financing the productive plants of foreign nations, to make them self-sufficient for self-defense, through the United Nations fiscal machinery and otherwise, the bulk of the money being furnished by Uncle Sam from revenues supplied by American taxpayers. As I have pointed out, the bituminous coal industry has already been overtaken by this prognosis, and it could happen to other domestic industries as well.

The American working force is being augmented year by year when some 800,000 young people emerge from scholastic pursuits into active competition for jobs and positions. Free private enterprise must be depended upon to absorb and make useful this tremendous addition to the productive labor force of the country. Since it takes from ten to eleven thousand dollars to finance a single job, it can be seen that a tremendous investment is required to keep employment at high levels. For this one reason, discounting all others, business and industry ought to be relieved of some of the burden of taxation so that adequate provision may be made to properly finance industrial plants and accommodate the annual accretion to the labor force.

Of course, I appreciate the fact that disabled and retired employees, provided for under the social-security system, will increase proportionately. But the trend of employment will be ever upward during the unforeseen future. However, I insist, if we hope to maintain a nonsocialistic form of government, under a reduced scale of taxation, the number of people employed in Government service cannot be maintained on the scale prevailing throughout the last two administrations.

Also, for maintenance of the social-security system, the tax drag upon productive enterprise and the wages of workers engaged therein, must be at the minimum percent possible of the gross value of such production. This premium percent can be arrived at by factors to equate work forces, retired workers, cost of living, and other indices familiar to labor and industry. The social-security system is not a reward, per se; it is only an insurance system to adequately pro-

vide for old age and retirement of those who have been but are no longer productive.

Moreover, employment is essential to the happiness and prosperity of our people. Unless we trust and protect our domestic industries to provide the tools and plants to absorb the ever-increasing supply of workers, and to exist as one of the media through which revenue can be secured to bear the cost of Government, then Government itself will resort to the pattern of Socialist action of putting money into the right hand of the citizen and then insisting upon his return of the greater part of it with the left hand. "Oh," you say, "That cannot happen here." Well, it is happening now in the outstanding Socialist government of our time. The New Zealand Government now pays 50 percent of its entire national income in welfare benefits, which means that the average citizen gives back to government in taxes one-half of his wages, or profits, or welfare checks. And believe me, in that country there are few human activities that are not regulated by government decree.

Exorbitant taxes have preceded the downfall of every nation, democratic or otherwise, since the days of ancient Greece. Unless America reverses the process she will be no exception to the rule.

I find no fault in giving needy people the supplies we ourselves are unable to use. But does it make sense to overtax and destroy the credit of American citizens for the purpose of creating in other nations the industrial capacity to produce competing merchandise in quantities and at lesser costs, and then open our markets to them and destroy our own industries and labor standards?

It is high time for us to begin reading the handwriting on the wall, strive to reverse our foreign policy and its big aid program with a view to easing our existing tax burden, and resort to measures that promise some support for our own industries and the payrolls they create.

Just a couple of weeks ago, a manufacturer in my district brought to my attention an instance affecting his concern, wherein he had submitted a bid for an item in quantity to be used in the implementation of Government produced electric power. His company was second low bidder, the lowest being a foreign concern. This latter company enjoys an advantage of getting in on the business because of a 25-percent leeway provided for by our own laws. The domestic concern in my district pays taxes, and in this way contributes to the construction of the Federal project where its products could now be used. His government should protect him and his employees.

I have lived through unemployment depressions since the days of Grover Cleveland. I have seen the morale of the American worker and businessman sink to distressingly low levels. Unless we return to a commonsense economy, balance our Federal commitments with a scale of taxation designed to preserve initiative and a fair return on investment, I can see ahead nothing other than an unemployment depression im-

measurably worse than anything we have yet seen.

To what source then, I ask, can we look for revenue to sustain the Government's obligations to pensioners, unemployed citizens, and all those we have led to believe would be secure under social security?

The American people want less government. They demand reduction of taxes. By cooperative effort of the executive and legislative branches this end can be attained. Whether the much desired reductions are accomplished this year or next should not be the main consideration, since it is apparent that past commitments plus current appropriations will in any event exceed anticipated income. The national debt, after all, is our sacred obligation. Repudiation by whatever means would break the strongest tie that binds the patriotic citizen to his Government. Continued deficit spending means repudiation by inflation. It follows then that Government operations, defense spending, and mutual foreign aid must not only be brought within the limits of tax revenues, but must be so radically revised as to permit some relief from present burdensome taxes, yet provide something for debt amortization. At best it will be a long hard pull, and will require plenty of belt tightening. But the American people have never yet failed when fully informed and confronted with the plain truth. Let us hope that our leaders will successfully guide us back to the road that will lead us once more to sanity and solvency.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, the short time that has been allotted to me to express myself relative to the extension of the excess-profits tax is greatly appreciated.

We the members of the Ways and Means Committee, who have jurisdiction over all tax matters before the Congress, were faced with the question of the recommendation of President Eisenhower to extend the excess-profits tax for a 6-month period. After careful consideration of the issue, which is somewhat evil, as all taxes are bad not good, and I know of no good tax, it must be remembered that a balanced budget is a must if you do not want to face the question of raising the national debt limit beyond the \$275 billion limit fixed by the Congress as of today. As a Member of this Congress, I do not believe this evil should be permitted to project its ugly head and its iron claws to a position to even come close to adding an additional billion dollars to our national debt. As one Member of Congress, I have been faced with the question of compromising my personal views on the question of the extension of the excess-profits tax. This I have done without any pressure from anyone or from the administration. I might state that I have had letters from corporations back in my district, who told of how vicious and discriminatory the Excess-Profits Tax Act is, but ended their letter by saying they were willing to live with the tax for another 6 months. I commend

these corporations for their broad views when they put their Nation's welfare ahead of their own desires.

Our Committee on Ways and Means had been assured by Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, that they will not request any further extension beyond the 6-month period, and would vigorously oppose any extension after December 31, 1953. With all of these statements before me, I feel justified in the compromise of my own views which were opposed to the extension and will now support the extension of the excess-profits tax for an additional 6 months.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I think most of the Members realize that I have been a hearty supporter of the excess-profits-tax measure. When hostilities broke out in Korea in 1950 I was one of the sponsors of the proposal and I supported it at that time very strenuously. Of course at that time you will remember there was a lot of scare buying, there was a lot of inflation right in the offing, and it was considered as not only a measure to stop profiteering in time of emergency, but it was also considered as a sort of control measure to keep down inflation; and the situation at that time was much more critical in my opinion insofar as those factors are concerned than it is today.

I always thought an excess-profits-tax measure was a good measure because it sort of took the cream off the profits of those who were trying to take advantage of an emergency and rising prices, and aside from the fact that the Government annually get about \$2.5 billion in revenue. I never realized quite fully, I may say frankly to the committee sitting here this afternoon, how many inequities were present in the bill; in fact I did not know very clearly that there were so many bad features, so many injustices in the bill until the Secretary of the Treasury came before us and very frankly told us how terrible this tax was; in fact, it was practically un-American to assess such an unjust, unfair, and inequitable tax, and he certainly vigorously assailed the tax. His philosophy of justification seemed to be to the effect the need of revenue was so great that any means justified the end. I am not supporting the bill on the same basis that the Secretary of the Treasury is; I am supporting the bill because I think there are some business concerns making inordinate profits because of the economic situation and the emergency. I am only sorry some amendments to the present extension bill were not carried to the committee.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] offered an amendment in the committee which I thought was fair in every way, an amendment which took away some of the inordinate hardships that are apparent in the present statute and will be present unless we amend it to that extent. The proposition advanced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] lost by two votes. The vote was 13 to 11. Of course, there were other considerations entering into that

vote that the worthiness and the value of the gentleman's amendment, I understand he is going to offer a motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate his amendment.

That amendment will simply give to those businesses which commenced late in the year 1945 or since, the same advantage of selecting for their base period the best 3 years; in other words, he wants to give these new businesses the same proposition of selecting a base period as is given to old established businesses, as is given to businesses that have been established prior to 1945. It is just and fair in every respect and, in my opinion, it should have been in the original bill. I hope the committee will give consideration to the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Georgia. It will take away especially the injustices in the bill that are being inflicted upon the new and smaller business concerns. His amendment cannot in any respect affect the big corporations. It will only affect the corporations that were lately established, mind you, giving the same advantage to them as is given to those businesses previously established and have a base period.

If the amendment is adopted, the measure will escape much of the criticism that is leveled at the present time at the law as it now stands.

I want to say also, Mr. Chairman, I know that politics perhaps is bound to enter into a question of this kind, and this may be just another instance where the Republican administration finds it necessary to follow the lead taken by the Democrats 3 years ago.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of regret that I feel impelled to take the floor in opposition to a proposal of my own party, but I cannot sit idly by, without stating my position, with the profound hope that some of you will do a little soul searching, and see if your conscience will permit you to vote against your profound convictions.

I have no argument with those among you who are honestly convinced that this legislation is proper, but I do have some reservations as to those who are yielding to pressure to submerge their logical reasoning beneath sophistication. This is the primrose path to dictatorship.

You are here asked to vote for legislation under a closed rule; you have no chance to offer alleviating amendments. The experts in the Treasury cannot even give me the amount of excess-profits tax-credits allowance in 1951 and 1952, but I can tell you as a matter of record that the Standard Oil Co. of California paid excess-profits taxes in 1951 of \$6,700,000 and got it all back in 1952; United States Steel paid \$90 million in 1951 and paid none in 1952 and got back \$15 million of what it paid in 1951; Monsanto Chemical, the largest chemical company in the world, paid \$7,871,000 in 1951 and got most of it back in 1952. I could give you hundreds of such cases. That shows you that the big corporations know how to avoid it, but the little ones do not.

One point that is too generally overlooked, is that in the effort of corporations to avoid the 30 percent penalty tax, the Government not only loses the 30 percent but also the 52 percent normal and surtax so that most companies, by elimination of waste and inefficiency, would pay more money into the Treasury under the normal and surtax than they do today under the 82 percent tax.

Now I invite your attention to another facet of this matter. Can any man or woman among you return to your district and defend your position for voting for an increase of 15 percent on income of certain companies who happen to fall within an arbitrary and capricious formula? The only argument presented is that there is an 800-million tab to pick up to cover the reckless spending of an improvident Congress so that certain foreign countries now receiving foreign aid can reduce their own taxes and use our foreign counterpart funds to pay off their national debt. How stupid can we get?

History will record this as one of the darkest days for the Republican Party. Never before in history has our party proposed, sponsored, or passed such iniquitous and evil tax legislation. Where is the principle, the honesty, the integrity, the morality of the Republican Party which we prated about at campaign time? Is this the product of our warped thinking? It is a boomerang which will return with greater speed and with more deadly effect than you can now contemplate. I warn you, you cannot sow a whirlwind and harvest anything but destruction. You cannot gather grapes from thorns nor figs from thistles.

The component parts of this resolution are evil, iniquitous, immoral, arbitrary, and capricious. How then can you mix these parts together and come out with anything resembling good? Let me remind you that anytime, either in law or in equity, you can prove an arbitrary or capricious act on the part of any court, board, or commission, you can get a reversal of judgment and, if this legislation is passed, eventually public opinion will reverse you.

Yes, we just have to have the money. Let me remind you that our jails and penitentiaries are full of embezzlers and misappropriators who just had to have the money. To get it they broke the law, both legal and moral. Here we are asked to pass legislation that will legalize this taking of money which does not belong to us, so that the Collector of Internal Revenue will not have to go to jail for taking it. I recognize that this Congress has the authority to make this misappropriation legal, but I submit that this Congress, nor anybody under heaven possesses the power to make an immoral act, moral.

I ask you, where is your conscience? Where is your moral stamina, that it should be seduced by popular leadership? Remember that seduction brings forth sin, and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death. What would the great men of the past say to you? Would Lincoln, Jefferson, or Washington even suggest that you stultify yourselves to pass admittedly bad legislation? I will tell you what George Washington admonished

his people to do. He said: "Strive to keep alive within your breast that celestial spark of fire called conscience." That is the essence of statesmanship.

This vote will separate the statesman from politician.

I am willing to compromise an economic principle for expediency, but as long as I am a Member of this Congress, I shall not compromise a moral principle for the sake of political expediency, so help me God.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I want to pay my personal tribute to two distinguished Members of this House, with one of whom I have neglected to become personally acquainted and friendly but, with whom I have been associated here in the House and have learned to admire and respect. I refer to the gentleman from New York, the Honorable DAN REED. I think if a freshman Member of this body needed any inspiration to make him stand alone on his own feet and think individually, independent of any pressures that might be brought to bear upon him, that would come from the stand taken by this admirable giant of a man in this House a week ago last Monday and the stand he has taken today. He is, certainly, deserving of all the tribute all of us can pay him.

The other gentleman is my distinguished friend and colleague from Georgia, the Honorable SIDNEY CAMP, who took time to so painstakingly explain to you the real viciousness of this law, the extension of which we are today debating.

Since you have already heard from him and from many others the figures that are involved in this matter, I shall talk to you about something which may sound elementary. If it does sound elementary then that is as it should be, because we need to get back to the elementary, the fundamental things.

I reside in a county in Georgia which is one of five that voted for General Eisenhower last November. Why did that county in Georgia, one of only 5 in 159, vote to unseat a Democratic President? Why did it vote in favor of General Eisenhower? Simply because you people sitting over here on this side, the Republican side of the aisle, told them from about 1936 up until last year that this Congress was gradually becoming a rubberstamp. They believed it. You made out your case. Last fall when they went to the polls they said, "We know this body up there that we have called our Congress has become a rubberstamp, so we are going to change this thing and put another administration in power." It took lots of Democratic votes in a Democratic State to take a county of north Georgia for General Eisenhower. The Democrats aided you because you promised them that you would do away with the mess in Washington.

The mess in Washington is not necessarily limited to the so-called "five percenters." It is not necessarily limited to the grafters and the individual wrongdoers. The mess in Washington, the

greatest mess in Washington, is the mess these rubberstamp Congresses have made in, among other things, letting lie upon the people such iniquitous tax measures as this tax we are discussing today. And today you, the leaders of this administration, roll over and play dead while apologizing for your action in asking for the continuation of a law you admit is viciously un-American. What greater example of rubberstamping could there be?

Those people who call themselves friends of labor say that we have to extend the excess profits tax in order to protect the laboring man from the lordly corporate interests. I tell you that you are taking away from that workingman by extending this tax the very right to work, because in my country the great majority of employment is furnished by the small corporate interests, the small businesses that employ 20, 30, 40, 50, and maybe sometimes 100. The only way they can expand their business and furnish employment to more high school and college graduates is for you to leave them their profits so that they can pour them back into the business.

I hope you will keep faith with the American people by defeating the most un-American tax measure ever devised by a United States Congress.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I would like first to associate myself with the remarks just made by my colleague from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] in general and specifically with that which he has said regarding Mr. CAMP and Mr. REED of New York.

Mr. Chairman, after hearing all the campaign promises made last year by those who now control the legislative and executive branches of this Government, I was led to believe that I would be afforded the opportunity this year of voting for measures that provide for tax relief for the citizens of this country. Although not specifically pertinent to the measure currently under discussion, I was also led to believe that there would be a new and better approach to the problem of excessive Federal employment and that we could look forward to a new approach to the problems presented on the international front.

To date the same policy of expediency that was followed by the Truman administration in the field of foreign affairs has been adopted and followed by the present administration. This is mentioned merely to show that your presently proposed departure from the program the Republican Party presented to the American people last year insofar as taxation is concerned is not a unique deviation.

A good example of the deviation from campaign policy is found in the field of Federal employment. You said, while seeking election, that you would economize in this field and yet you perform on this promise by, just this week, passing H. R. 5228 which grants to a Fed-

eral employee a \$17,500 pension with the only requirement being that he shall have served a minimum of 10 years. In this case the employee is not required to pay one cent into the Treasury as a contribution to his retirement fund. I did not vote for this bill since I heard no justification for its passage other than statement to the effect that the incumbent has done his duty and therefore should be rewarded. This, of course, left me to wonder if we have reached the place where men must be given a bonus of special consideration for doing his duty in a Federal job?

To the matter instantly under consideration, it is remarkable that, campaign promises by the Republicans to the contrary notwithstanding, you here propose to extend a tax program which has been described by even its most ardent advocates as being vicious, inequitable, unfair, unjust and immoral. The further imposition of this tax can perhaps be justified by some of my Republican colleagues by them saying that they have already, on Tuesday of this week, passed House Resolution 314 which provides the tax relief they were speaking of during the last campaign. In all fairness, I must admit that you did, without the aid of my vote, pass a tax relief measure this week by granting a 4-year deferment on tax payments due the Government by the whisky distillers of this country. Is this the kind of tax relief you were promising last year?

No, Mr. Chairman, in spite of all the apologetic argument I have heard today on this bill, I cannot support a bill which, by definition of its own sponsors, legalizes immorality. As has been so well expressed by my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], who in his first session here has distinguished himself as being among the ablest and most sincere Members of this House, it is admitted that the extension of this iniquitous tax will not balance the budget but will simply provide additional money to be wasted by those who seem to have ignored the fact that the only way to balance the budget is by reducing expenditures.

I realize that the term "excess-profits tax" has been popularized in this country as that which soaks the rich and makes it unnecessary to tax the little fellow quite as much as would otherwise be necessary. Columnists, commentators, and others who have prostituted the press to propagandize the political predilections of the perpetrators of political perfidy, have popularized this tax which is now described by its advocates as being immoral.

In spite of its popularity or the popularity of those who advocate it as a matter of expediency, I shall not vote for it. If the present administration had exhausted every possibility of reducing expenditures and still found it impossible to balance the budget, I would have voted for an honest tax bill that would have increased corporate taxes across the board to a reasonable degree.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Republican Party really plans to come forward with a plan of its own during this administration which will approximate fruition of the glowing promises made

to the electorate last year? To date, all the Republicans have offered is continuation and extension of the very programs that they criticized during the last campaign and which they have been criticizing for the past 20 years. This is another good example here today.

I am constrained to believe, after watching the new leadership operate for the past 6 months, that they have decided that the Democratic Party stayed in power for 20 years by following a policy of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect, and that such a policy can be made to work for the Republicans. You seem to be afraid of taking any course other than that which the Democrats have proven to be successful from a practical political standpoint. It is my sincere hope that the more intrepid spirits among the Republicans can prevail on the leadership to give this country something different from that which we have had for the past 20 years.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, taxes are always an unpleasant subject to discuss and are even more unpleasant to pay. However, in order to keep the record straight, I think the following factual information should be given to the American people. The following facts and figures were taken from a UP story by Lyle Wilson:

When the books closed on 20 years of New Deal-Fair Deal government financing, Harry S. Truman had broken all records for collecting and spending the people's money.

He had 8 years, less 2½ months, in the White House. Truman budgeted the collection of more than \$373 billion in taxes and the spending of, roughly, \$400 billion. His records should stand for all time.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was not even a good second. Most of World War II spending is charged to FDR, but he laid out only \$375 billion of the people's money in 12 White House years. His tax take was a mere \$162,500,000,000, although it seemed to be quite a package when it was being extracted from the public's pockets.

The books closed on F. D. R. and H. S. T. at midnight June 30 when fiscal 1953 ended. The budget for fiscal 1953 was presented to Congress by Truman in January 1952. When the Republicans began to take over a year later the tax and spending pattern for fiscal 1953 was fixed.

Some effort was made by the new administration to reduce the flow of money in and out of the Treasury in the expiring fiscal year. President Eisenhower and his aides concentrated on remodeling the Truman budget for fiscal 1954.

We have not achieved enough so far to prevent another big budget deficit next June 30 when fiscal 1954 ends. The Treasury announced Wednesday that the 1953 fiscal deficit was a staggering \$9,389,000,000—unmatched in any previous peacetime year. The national debt had soared to \$266,071,000,000.

The Government spent \$74,607,000,000—also a peacetime record. The eye-popping figure among those released by the Treasury was the 12-month tax take in fiscal 1953. The taxpayers contributed \$65,218,000,000, which is the greatest sum ever extracted by the Government from the people in any previous year, peace or war.

The combined Roosevelt-Truman tax collection over 20 years to the end of fiscal 1953 was \$535,500,000,000. They spent about \$775 billion, which is an approach to the place where billions no longer would be big enough to describe the sum involved.

The deficit left by the 20 years of New Deal administration is \$239,500,000,000, and this added to our previous debt leaves the American taxpayers owing a deficit of nearly \$266 billion. These figures speak for themselves and show that this administration has inherited a deficit which will of necessity force them to levy excessive taxes for years to come.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN] as he may desire.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who have felt that the excess-profits tax ought to go off the statute books on the date scheduled for its expiration; that it is an unfair and unjust tax and is an impediment to the sort of business expansion which has always been so important an element in making this country strong and prosperous. And that view has been held by a majority of the Committee on Ways and Means.

But when it appeared that the fiscal year just ending would bring the national deficit to \$9.4 billion instead of an earlier estimate of \$5.9 billion and that the deficit for the next fiscal year is likely to be \$5 billion, I was one of the first members of the Ways and Means Committee to let it be known that I should support the recommendations of the President and vote for an extension.

Hearings are now in progress by our committee inquiring into many phases of our tax structure and I am confident that as a result we will be able to recommend to the second session of this Congress substantial changes in our tax laws which will remove many existing inequities. In the meantime, until an intensive study can be completed and our whole tax structure reviewed and amended so as to eliminate part of the tax burden on our people and provide for a more equitable distribution of the balance of the burden, I feel that those corporations which will be affected should be willing to live with this law for another 6 months and allow the Treasury to have the benefit of \$800 million in revenues as a contribution toward a balanced budget and future tax reduction. And we have the assurance of Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey that no further extension of this tax will be requested.

In the interest of the financial stability of the country and the maintenance of a sound dollar, I shall vote for the extension of the excess-profits tax for 6 months in support of the fiscal program of President Eisenhower.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I seldom come down to the well of the House as reluctantly as I am doing at this time. I do not enjoy differing with the President and my party leadership. However, I felt impelled from my own convictions on this subject to come down here to briefly explain why I am going to vote against this bill. Let me express at the outset, however, my great admiration and affection for my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from

New York [Mr. REED], who has so courageously stood by his convictions, and shown the course which the House should be taking.

Mr. Chairman, I am against this bill not because I am opposed to a balanced budget, but because I am in favor of a balanced budget. This bill accomplishes nothing and proves nothing unless it proves that the Presidency packs a more powerful political punch than the Committee on Ways and Means. It solves nothing because it does not balance the budget. The President, in his message, announced that he anticipated a deficit in the neighborhood of \$6,600,000,000. This bill, he says, will yield \$800 million. Does that balance the budget? Of course not. It still leaves \$5,800,000,000 of deficit. So that in substance all we are doing by extending this admittedly iniquitous tax is to pour more money—more tax money extracted from the people down a bottomless pit with no assurance whatsoever that it is going to result at any future time in a balanced budget, and a sound fiscal foundation for the United States. If this bill carried enough tax increases to promise a balanced budget in the visible future, I am rather inclined to think I would vote for it, but this proves nothing—this gets us nowhere and when we get all through voting on it and when we have increased the taxes as almost our first major act in this Congress, we will still have an enormous deficit to face—the inflationary spiral will be going steadily onward with no end in sight.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that until this Congress puts a limitation on spending, an overall limitation on spending, it will be perfectly useless to go on raising taxes because it will be pouring money down a bottomless pit with nothing to show for it in the end. I say, therefore, that we should not vote now for any more tax increases of any kind or character. We should not extend any additional taxes until we can be sure of the relationship between those taxes and a balanced budget. You cannot have that until you have a limit upon expenditures.

That is the big job for this Congress to accomplish. If we do that we may get somewhere. Only Congress can accomplish it. In a letter of May 26, to Chairman Hoffman of Government Operations Committee, the Budget Director declared that he was opposed to limiting expenditures to an amount that does not exceed revenues in any given period. As it stands today the United States is dangerously overextended militarily and economically all over the world. There is not the slightest chance of a balanced budget until we begin to reduce our commitments, until we reduce our farflung military garrisons, until we reduce the amount we spend each year for foreign military and economic aid. When we do that, when we face up to the realities of the situation, then we may ultimately have some hope of getting a balanced budget and providing a sound dollar, and protecting the people of the United States from the evils and dangers of continued inflation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER].

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, in the debate on the rule in the early afternoon, we heard the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] state that he looked for cogent reasons in the report why he should vote for this bill, and he could find none.

I have turned to the minority report and examined the "further minority views" filed in the House this morning for cogent reasons why negative votes should be cast on this bill, and I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that I find none. And that is what makes a horse race.

Permit me for a moment to read 2 or 3 sentences from these minority views:

All tax authorities admit that this tax is not a tax on excessive profits but an arbitrary tax on growth and expansion.

I shall come back and comment on that in a few seconds. The next sentence:

The fact that this tax is paid by less than 8 percent of the corporations of this country, in our view is not a justification for continuing the tax; it is, instead, strong evidence of its arbitrary and discriminatory nature.

Mr. Chairman, is a general sales tax implied there? I do not know. Is that implied as a good substitute, on the theory that everybody would have to pay, no matter whom it hurts and no matter whom it gets? I ask the further question: Would a general sales tax eliminate discrimination? What is behind that statement?

Now I refer you to this statement:

When there are signs that a recession is in the offing, it is no time to increase the economic burdens.

Mr. Chairman, I heard a lot of talk this afternoon about how unfair this tax operates on some corporations but frankly I cannot get exercised over the tax problems of Reynolds Tobacco, American Telephone, Liggett & Myers, Standard Oil, and the rest of the corporations whose financial statements were read. I say, let us not shed a lot of crocodile tears for these corporations, some of which were, in my humble opinion, wrongly described as small corporations.

Let us not shed any tears over big industry and the big corporations who are compelled to pay this excess-profits tax. The time to have cried was in the last Republican administration when corporations lost over \$3 billion.

Now let me give you some facts and figures about these poverty-stricken corporations who are suffering from the—and I want this to be put in quotations—from the alleged "growth" and "expansion" and from "discrimination."

Mr. Chairman, do you realize that corporation profits for the year 1952 were \$39.7 billion—almost twice the average profits of \$22.6 billion for the war years 1942 to 1945? Profits after taxes were about \$18 billion—slightly short of double the average profits after taxes for the war years. Dividends in 1952 exceed \$9 billion—about double the average for war years. Business expenditures on new manufacturing plants and equipment were about \$12 billion, which is greater than in any prior year and is

about three times the figure for the year 1945.

From this would it appear, Mr. Chairman, that business must still think that the prospects for the future are pretty good. Do these figures indicate as this minority view would have us believe, that a recession is in the offing? Do you want me to cite more figures and more proof as to how badly off our corporations are? Let me just refer to one or two more important facts. The Federal Reserve index of industrial production for May 1953 was reported at 242, and that was three points higher than the highest wartime annual average of 239 attained in 1943.

I want to emphasize that though the industrial production index is higher than the wartime average, corporate profits both before and after taxes were approximately twice the wartime average. Further, the stock price index of the Securities and Exchange Commission climbed to an all-time high of 207 on January 3, 1953, as compared with a 129 average for 1949.

Do you still think we ought to repeal the excess-profits tax? Do you still think we ought to let these big corporations continue to accumulate unprecedented profits at the expense of the Nation's economic well-being? Back in 1950, the House Ways and Means Committee observed that one of the major objectives in imposing the excess-profits tax was to reach corporation profits which have been swollen by the increased tempo of our economy. That observation is just as true today as it was 2½ years ago. Through the medium of this tax we are restraining the profiteering and the greed of these corporations, and we are helping to stabilize our economy. Abolish it, and you will permit a resumption of profiteering in a big and unconscionable way.

Mr. Chairman, repeal of the excess-profits tax would have an adverse effect on our efforts to reduce inflationary pressures. One way to reduce the trend toward higher prices is to make it less profitable to increase such prices. At the present time, the excess-profits tax does that for corporations subject to its provisions. If a corporation realizes that it can keep only 18 percent of whatever profit it makes from raising prices, it is going to give a little more thought to raising prices than it otherwise would. While it is true that an excess-profits tax does not completely stop price rises, it puts a real damper on them. Certainly we cannot expect labor to sit by and watch the cost of living continue to rise and corporate profits go even higher than they are now. As you know, wage hikes follow price rises rather than lead them. Repeal of the excess-profits tax would be the cue for everybody to start grabbing for everything they can get.

So, in the face of all this, and with all the earnestness at my command, I urge the Congress to continue the excess-profits tax on our statute books, at least for the next 6 months, and possibly later too. Financial common sense demands it, practical economics shows its need, the Nation's welfare will best be served by it. Eliminate this tax on excess profits

and you will make possible another giveaway from which only the very rich stand to benefit.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, in the early days of this session I was under the impression that the administration was making a sincere attempt to balance the Federal budget. I was convinced at that time that it was my duty to the Nation to assist the President and the administration in balancing the budget and to go along with the extension of the excess-profits tax. However, some 2 months ago when it came to my attention what the "other hand" was doing in the administration, I determined that the administration was not sincere in its announced policy of reducing our deficit wherever possible. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has pointed out to you how the new high interest rates forced on this country by this administration will cost the taxpayers, and will add to the present deficit, some \$800 million a year.

On the bonds issued in May of this year the interest rate was increased from 2.3 to 3.25 percent. This added to the taxpayers' burden, if you please, \$7,500,000 a year. The Public Affairs Institute recently compiled a table of increased cost to borrowers on certificates issued at the new high interest rate by the administration up until May 19 of this year. It shows that such increased interest rates on Government financing up to May 19 of this year will cost the taxpayers an additional \$132 million a year. If any of us in Congress proposed adding \$132 million to the appropriation for some worthy function we would be denounced as obstructing economy. Yet here today we have a bill before us seeking to impose what the administration admits is an iniquitous tax on the American small-business man. Why? So that we can finance the increased cost to the taxpayers of this new high interest policy.

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

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

Mr. LANHAM. Does the gentleman mean to say this \$800 million, when it is collected, will be turned over to the big bankers?

Mr. LANTAFF. In effect that is exactly what we are doing. I thank the gentleman.

What was the reason for raising the high interest rates on Government bonds? A Treasury spokesman said that that was the lowest interest rate at which the new issue could be sold in the existing market. He said this determination was made after conferring with investment bankers and important investor groups. But the fact that this issue was over-subscribed seven times indicates that such a high interest rate was not necessary. The big New York bankers immediately raised their prime commercial rate to the Government level and this touched off an upward spiral of interest rates.

Immediately after the new issue of Government bonds was put on the mar-

ket at the new high interest rate, the value of previously issued Government bonds dropped immediately to 90. The charge was made on May 10 of this year that the big New York bankers unloaded almost 70 percent of their holdings of these bonds before the price dropped.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the Secretary of the Treasury admitted that representatives from these groups had been consulted prior to the issuance of the new high interest bonds.

How does this affect the average small-business man in America? The money made available for business expansion has practically dried up. Our banks, insurance companies and other lending institutions invest a considerable portion of their reserves in these Government securities. A recent issue of the Wall Street Journal quoted the vice president of one of our major insurance companies as saying that formerly they had raised liquid capital to handle industrial financing by selling their Government bonds. He said that if they sold their bond on today's market their entire surplus would be wiped out. That is the situation that confronts other banks and lending institutions. So we find that liquid capital for industrial expansion has practically dried up.

Let us look at the other side of the picture. The President of the United States in asking us to extend this tax stated: "Though the name suggests that only excessive profits are taxed, the tax actually penalizes thrift and efficiency and hampers business expansion. Its impact is especially hard on successful small businesses which must depend on retained earnings for growth."

So on the one hand the hard-money policy and high interest rates is slamming the door in the face of small businesses who need money for expansion. On the other hand, we are asked to impose an iniquitous tax on this same small-business man so that he cannot retain any of his earnings for possible expansion. In south Florida we have an expanding economy and numerous small businesses that will be faced with bankruptcy when caught between the pressures resultant from such policies.

But let us go a little further on the subject of higher interest. The interest rates for FHA insurance home loans was raised from 4¼ to 4½ percent. Based on last year's volume of FHA loans this will cost the home builders of America a total of more than \$87 million annually. The increase in GI home loan rates from 4 to 4½ percent means that the veterans of America will lose one bedroom in every house they build next year and it will add to their burden \$266 million in the next 20 years. The United States taxpayers will have to pay \$20 million more next year because of the added one-half percent on the first year's interest which the Government pays for all veterans getting loans.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman means \$266 million a year.

Mr. LANTAFF. Over the next 20 years.

It is interesting to note this increase in the interest rate alone has brought about a 2-percent increase in the cost

of living since January. As the conservative magazine, *Business Week*, pointed out:

We are glad to know the brakes work, but we don't want to go through the windshield.

So we come to the extension of this act today. As I pointed out before, through this hard-money, high-interest policy, we have slammed the door to possible expansion for small business. Now we are asked to close the other door.

So, I have changed my mind about voting to extend this tax. I have come to the conclusion that if the motion prevails, to recommit with instructions, so as to provide some relief for the small-business people of America, whom the administration admits are being unduly penalized and stifled by this tax, then I would be willing to go along with the administration in order to provide extra revenue. But, I am taking this opportunity to point out the highly inconsistent position of the present administration which is saying to the small-business people of America, "It is your duty to help us cut down the deficit." Many of these small-business organizations through their chambers of commerce have responded in a truly American way and said, "All right, we will make that sacrifice to help cut down on deficit spending, because we, too, recognize we have to balance the budget." They have not been told, however, and do not know what the other hand is doing in the Treasury Department. They do not know that they will have to pay this iniquitous tax in order to pay higher interest rates to Wall Street and the New York bankers. It is interesting to note that this tax will produce just enough revenue to defray the added annual cost of paying higher interest rates.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Is it not true, aside from the increased interest rates on Federal obligations, that all the private institutions, lending companies, and life-insurance companies are also raising their rates just because of this rise?

Mr. LANTAFF. That is certainly true, and every credit company has done likewise. If the average American goes out to buy an icebox, a refrigerator, a radio for his home, or an automobile, he is going to pay more money for that item if he buys on credit in order to support this high-interest policy.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentlemen.

Mr. Chairman, everyone is familiar with the old saying, "There are two sides to every question," but I wonder if that is necessarily true. I am reminded of When Calvin Coolidge ran for President. A man, who had known him ever since his birth, traveled over the entire United States in a covered wagon in behalf of Coolidge's candidacy. In every town he passed through, this man would

get out on the tail-gate of the wagon, and assure the people that his friend Cal Coolidge would not compromise with evil.

On some questions, I sincerely believe there is only one side to be considered. For me, there is only one side to consider between good and evil. For me, there is only one side to consider between right and wrong. Mr. Chairman, I believe the problem we have before us today—whether or not to extend the excess-profits tax—is as simple as that. The excess-profits tax is either right, or it is wrong. The excess-profits tax is either fair and equitable, or it is unfair and inequitable.

I personally believe this tax to be unfair and inequitable, and therefore I will vote against its extension.

A tax is either fair and equitable or unfair and inequitable, irrespective of who is President, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican.

I do not believe that the politics of any man sitting in the position of President of the United States, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, has any bearing whatsoever upon whether a tax is fair and equitable, or unfair and inequitable. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the problem confronting us today. Nearly everyone, including the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury, admits that the excess-profits tax is unfair, inequitable, vicious, and unreasonable.

In view of this situation, I personally believe it was imperative that the executive branch of the Government present to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives a tax bill which would provide additional revenue, if, in its opinion, it was needed—a bill which would be both fair and equitable—instead of asking the Congress to extend a tax which, it is so universally agreed, should not be on the books.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I wish to pay my respects to the gentleman from New York, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. In addition to being a great American and one of the outstanding patriots of the United States, there is no one, either in the executive branch or the legislative branch of our Government, who knows as much about taxes as does the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. Those of us who have the honor and privilege of serving in this, the greatest legislative body in the entire world, and who have known Mr. REED intimately and have followed his work on tax matters throughout the years, have the greatest regard and highest respect for his integrity and his judgment.

Mr. REED has served his district and the people of the United States in the House of Representatives for 35 years. He has served on the Ways and Means Committee for 20 years. Through all of those 20 years, he has made a study of taxes, and is recognized as the greatest authority on this subject in Government today.

Naturally, anyone who is as independent in his thinking and voting as I am, would not be found following any leader blindly, but I believe I can sincerely come closer to following 100 percent the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee than anyone I know. But it is not my confidence in and high regard for the judgment of the gentleman from New York that places me in the position of opposing the extension of the excess-profits tax today. It is the fact that, in my honest and sincere judgment and opinion, it is wrong, and I cannot under any circumstances make myself vote for something when I sincerely believe, deep down in my heart, that it is wrong. This tax is not fair; it is not equitable. In other words, it is unjust and inequitable.

Mr. Chairman, the excess-profits tax is bad for the following reasons:

First. It encourages waste.

Second. It forces small and growing businesses into debt.

Third. It destroys the value of money.

Fourth. It weakens the ability of a business to resist economic recession.

Fifth. It slows down the introduction of new and better labor-saving machinery—eventually blocking the rise of wages.

Sixth. It limits the growth of production, both for civilian and defense purposes.

Seventh. It tends to interfere with the natural growth and improvement of the standard of living.

Eighth. It fosters monopoly—small businesses cannot reach a size to compete because they cannot use their earnings for growth.

Ninth. It ruins the whole idea of an expanding economy.

Tenth. It destroys incentive.

Eleventh. It is drying up venture capital.

Twelfth. It creates unemployment.

Thirteenth. It deprives government of just revenue.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the excess-profits tax is depriving our Government of additional and much-needed revenues, due to the fact that revenue depends upon income; and increased income depends upon the ability to grow and expand, and to give employment to additional individuals.

The people who are in favor of extending the excess-profits tax use, as a reason for their position, the fact that we need the additional \$800 million in revenue between July 1 and December 31 of this year. There is a possibility that these people will be disappointed, because there is evidence that the extension of the excess-profits tax will not bring in this additional money. On the other hand, if it was not extended, there is every indication that a sum greater than \$800 million dollars would be received in revenue, due to the opportunity industry would have to grow and give employment to people.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see how anyone could possibly vote to extend the excess-profits tax if they would carefully read and study the testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Under permission given me earlier in the House to extend and revise my remarks, I include at this point the testimony of Mr. Walter E. Ditmars, president of the Gray Manufacturing Co. of Hartford, Conn.:

STATEMENT OF WALTER E. DITMARS BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

My name is Walter E. Ditmars. I am president of the Gray Manufacturing Co., formerly the Gray Telephone Pay Station Co. of Hartford, Conn.

Our company manufactures the Audograph dictation machine which I have here beside me, and also other electronic equipment based almost entirely upon our own research and development. This Audograph dictation machine is a post-World War II product.

I appear before your committee today, Mr. Chairman, to ask that you allow the excess-profits tax to expire as scheduled on June 30.

I speak with great reluctance. No one has more sympathy than I with the desire of this Congress and of the national administration to balance the budget. No one wishes more than I to avoid the inflationary pressure of excessive Government spending and a resulting unbalanced budget. I also believe no one is more willing than I, or the board of directors of our company, to accept personally and of the company our fair burden of the Nation's necessary tax load, but the very essence of our tax system is that it shall be fair, that it shall be based upon share and share alike and that it shall be nondiscriminatory.

I might also add that every American wishes taxes to produce the necessary revenue for Government without stifling the sources of income to an extent that the law of diminishing returns asserts itself.

I am here today, gentlemen, to tell you the realistic and graphic story of a corporation that has been injured—to an extent that it crippled initiative—by the excess-profits tax. We have not only been hurt in competing with other organizations in our particular industry; we have also been prevented from retaining earnings which would allow us to expand our production and provide work for more employees. This blow at expansion not only hurts thousands of taxpaying stockholders; it also strikes at labor, since anything that is detrimental to expansion is necessarily detrimental to the working men and women who would share in and benefit from such expansion.

Let me brief you on our situation and then present some detail:

Our company came out of World War II without an established peacetime business. During the war, we did not advance commercially because we were engaged in war production; a period of accomplishment, by the way, during which we were awarded the Army-Navy E three times. After the war we had to develop and produce new products, and we did. When we entered the field, our principal competitors were still selling the old-fashioned wax cylinders. As recently as a year ago, in fact, the Government was still purchasing this type of cylinder equipment. Gray spearheaded the competition and our chief competitors were forced to introduce radically redesigned equipment.

During 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949—the years against which the excess-profits tax credit is calculated, Gray pioneered this new product (incidentally, we have not increased our selling price since 1948). During these years, other companies long established in the industry had earnings which gave them larger excess-profits tax credits. After 3 years of operating losses, from 1946 through 1948, Gray achieved a net-profit position in 1949. Since then, because of good research and a good product, our business has expanded.

The company trend is eloquently illustrated by our sales:

1946	-----	\$789,000
1947	-----	2,713,376
1948	-----	2,565,505
1949	-----	3,096,744
1950	-----	4,243,600
1951	-----	5,848,000
1952	-----	11,253,900

There was a corresponding operating profit-and-loss pattern during these years.

EARNINGS CHART

Net profits after taxes were realized from this growth after 1948 and until the excess-profits tax was reenacted. For example, just prior to the 1950 excess-profits-tax law, our next profit increase was from \$151,800 (1949) to \$400,800 (1950). As soon as excess-profits tax was reimposed, however, we found ourselves on a treadmill. Profits in 1951 were up only to \$406,000 and the 1952 profits were \$409,000.

In other words, our overall sales increased from less than \$800,000 in 1946 to more than \$11 million in 1952. Considering only the years since reenactment of excess-profits tax, the sales increase has been from \$4,250,000 to \$11,250,000, or an increase of 165 percent. The increase in net profits during this same 3-year period was less than 2 percent.

The question may arise in your minds as to how in the face of such excessive taxes Gray has been able to expand at all. The normal healthy way for growth companies such as ours to expand, of course, is by plowing profits back into the business. This, obviously we are unable to do to the extent necessary. Our only alternative was to borrow. In 1950 we had only a nominal insurance loan of \$195,000. By 1952—the second full year of the excess-profits tax—our bank borrowings reached a record high of \$895,000. We financed our Government business without any assistance from the Government.

This is the story of the Gray Manufacturing Co.'s excess-profits-tax experience:

1. Steadily increasing sales based upon our own research and development.
2. A corresponding increase in operating profits before taxes.
3. No significant increase in net profits after taxes.

It has become customary in discussing figures to use charts. I should like to show you one which illustrates the manner in which our company shared with the Government the operating profits of 1952 which were in excess of the previous year 1951.

CHART

1. The Gray Manufacturing Co. virtually doubled its business during the year 1951 to 1952. Sales increased from a gross of about \$5,900,000 to more than \$11,300,000. As a result, our operating profit before taxes was \$232,232 greater in 1952 than the preceding year of 1951.

After we paid taxes, however, we had left only \$2,916 of this \$232,232. In other words, for every dollar of these additional earnings (1952 over 1951), Gray was able to retain only 1¼ cents. The Government took 98¾ cents of that dollar.

2. Now, may I turn for just a few minutes from this demonstration of the burden of the excess-profits tax to a comparison of Gray's situation with that of its two principal competitors—to illustrate the discriminatory effect of the excess-profits tax. Both of these competitors have been far longer established in the dictation machine business than we.

TABLE

This table compares Gray tax status under the present law with its principal competitors. Note that whereas these competitors paid out 57 percent and 43.7 percent,

respectively, of their income before taxes, Gray was forced to pay 69.4 percent of such income, one of these competitors did \$38 million worth of business last year (compared with Gray's \$11 million) and yet paid only \$7,000 more in total taxes.

It is incredible to me, gentlemen, that Congress should seriously consider the prolongation of a tax law which compels 1 of 3 companies in an industry to pay 69 cents out of every dollar in taxes while its 2 longer established competitors pay 57 cents and 43 cents.

Surely it was not the intention of our forefathers, any more than I am sure it is your intention, that the taxing powers should ever be used to penalize and burden industrial growth and progress.

Mr. Chairman, Gray's situation is not unique, at least among the group of growth corporations which are subjected to the excess-profits tax and, like the other growth companies, Gray is being hurt to a degree where even 6 months more of the so-called excess-profits tax will be a very serious burden.

3. The President admits the excess-profits tax is an unreasonable tax. The Senate majority leader terms it "vicious."

Mr. Webster defines the word "vicious" as "defective, faulty, imperfect, and malignant."

Apart from our own small-industry section, I would like to urge upon this committee a weighing of the relative contributions of growth companies and business-as-usual companies to a strong industrial economy.

The international situation we now face is admittedly not short range. Inevitably this country's defense will depend upon our ability to preserve our industrial leadership. In turn that leadership depends upon expansion through new productive capacity and the development of new products and manufacturing processes.

It must be recognized that the ambitious growth corporations spark our progress and prosperity by their willingness to risk capital and earnings exploiting new fields. In contrast, the business-as-usual corporations contribute nothing in this direction.

Yet it is the growth company which is hit by the excess-profits tax. Its earnings have been depressed during the arbitrary base period—the period of abnormally high expenditures and trial-and-error operations. Therefore, this base period is not a fair measure of its earning capacity.

Please bear in mind that the damaging effects of the excess-profits tax on initiative and industrial growth is of special significance in the light of foreign political dangers. The discouragement of commercial initiative is the threatening implication of the excess-profits-tax discrimination. It is the real threat to our industrial leadership and, therefore, to the announced goal of our national administration.

Various former Secretaries of the Treasury have described the excess-profits tax as "the most difficult tax to administer ever conceived," as "putting a penalty on thrift," "wasteful," "inequitable," "discouraging to new ventures and confirming old ventures in their monopolies."

Leon Henderson, the Administrator of price controls in the last war, once testified before your committee that "the accounts have been totaled up and the excess-profits tax has been found wanting."

Mr. Henderson made another very illuminating statement in his testimony. It is more enlightening in the presence of information that has been developed since. In his testimony, Mr. Henderson said, "I would say that the Nye committee was the Bible on the excess-profits tax." Thus Mr. Henderson identifies the Nye committee as the modern day parent—the Bible of this tax, which various Secretaries of the Treasury

have described as destructive of the free enterprise system.

May I recall to your attention that the general counsel of the Nye committee which fathered this vicious tax was none other than Alger Hiss, already engaged in his conspiracy of ruin for America.

And may I remind you, gentlemen, of the conclusion of the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court who spoke feelingly as the Secretary of the Treasury in the reflection of his World War II experiences with the tax. What Mr. Vinson said in 1945 in support of the repeal of the World War II version of the excess-profits tax is fully applicable today. I commend his reasonings and authority to this committee:

"Repealing the excess-profits tax means getting out of the tax system a tax which in its present form has no place in peacetime. It is primarily a wartime control, erratic and inequitable. It is an obstacle to reconversion and expansion of business which is so necessary for a high level of employment and income. An excess-profits tax is capricious, arbitrary, and discriminatory. It encourages wasteful expenditures, penalizes initiative of enterprise and discourages new ventures. It is complex and difficult to administer. It discourages capital formation—the seed corn of our economic life."

Mr. Chairman, may I again express my regret that I have felt compelled to differ with those who propose and support extension of the excess-profits tax. My justification is that the right to protest against oppressive taxation is a patriotic right, sacred to all Americans since 1776. Beyond that, I have a duty as representative of the thousands of share owners and the hundreds of loyal employees of our company to protect the security and strength of the company with which they have cast their lot.

Mr. Chairman, several of my colleagues have informed me that, while they admit the excess-profits tax is unwarranted and should not be extended, they are going to vote for it, because they feel there will be political repercussions among their constituents; that if we do not extend it, we will be criticized for giving relief to corporations, and not to individuals.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], earlier in the debate today, put his finger on the nub of the situation, when he said many votes would be cast for this bill for political reasons.

As for myself, I can honestly say that, in the years I have served in this great legislative body, I have never cast a political vote; and before I ever will, I will resign. It is my personal opinion that the excess-profits tax should be allowed to die at its expiration on June 30 of this year, and I also think the individual should receive a reduction in his taxes as of July 1 of this year, inasmuch as the increase in the taxes of individuals which was put through by the Democrats in the 81st Congress does not expire until December 31 of this year.

I, for one, do not fear my opponent in the coming election, or anyone else, on the question of my vote against this bill to extend the excess-profits tax, for I will not hesitate to debate anyone on this proposition at any time or any place during the coming campaign.

My slogan in the 1952 campaign was "Reduce taxes—Vote Republican," Mr. Chairman. I propose to keep my promise; I propose to do everything I can, as one Member of this body, to reduce taxes.

I sincerely hope the bill (H. R. 5898) to extend until December 31, 1953, the

period with respect to which the excess-profits tax shall be effective, will be defeated.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, in 1945 I was discharged from the Army and took my mustering-out pay and a loan from the bank and started a small business. I have been very thankful for the progress that the business has made. At the present time we have only about 50 employees, but in 1949 I was particularly happy when it looked as though I was going to make about \$50,000 after taxes. The only thing I regret this year is that I will not make enough to pay an excess-profits tax.

When you hear these speeches about the injury that is being done to business because of the excess-profits tax, I wish you would consider this, that no tax from the point of view of the individual or the businessman is ever going to be equitable. When I saw I was going to make almost \$50,000 after taxes, I branched out and opened a branch in Detroit. Expenditures were high. If you want to get to the root of this you can eliminate a lot of unnecessary expenditure when companies anticipate how much tax they are going to pay.

Insofar as the excess-profits tax is concerned, certainly it is inequitable. Every tax is. You cannot make everybody happy. But I for one am going to vote to extend it for the 6-months period. As I said before, the only thing I regret is that this year I will not make enough to have to pay it.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. OAKMAN].

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I listen to the debate on H. R. 5898, the proposal to extend for another 6 months the imposition of corporate excess profits taxes, it occurs to me that possibly many of us are laboring under some misapprehension concerning the real questions at issue.

It has been said, both here and elsewhere, that the excess-profits tax is an immoral and iniquitous tax, subversive of the best interests of the American people.

It has been said that the President of the United States, in recommending and then seeking to insist upon extension of the excess-profits tax, has exceeded his just powers under the Constitution.

It has been said further that he has tried to make the 83d Congress a "rubberstamp" Congress, in the least desirable sense of the term.

But it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that neither the moral status of the excess-profits tax in itself, nor the possibility—which I deny—that the President has exceeded his powers, constitute the real questions now before this honorable body.

Now it seems to me that no man would attempt to defend the excess-profits tax as a fair and just tax, or as a tax well designed to serve the public interest.

The excess-profits tax is an unjust tax, insofar as it bears hardest in many instances on those least able to pay, and insofar as it gives unfair advantage to

large and long-established corporations over growing small and new corporations. By reason of those injustices it is an immoral tax. These things are true, in addition to the manifest fact that the profits taxed are not excess profits in any real sense of the word.

For the most part those profits comprise funds needed by corporations for expansion correlative to our expanding economy. Money which is needed to produce more goods, both civilian and military, and to provide more jobs at higher wages for American workers.

Thus the excess-profits tax is immoral and iniquitous in an economic sense, just as our military draft system is immoral and iniquitous in a social sense.

All of us here must be aware of the fact that some boys are sent to Korea, to fight and perhaps to die, while others, who by accident of birth may be better endowed financially and/or intellectually, are given deferment to continue their education.

Granting then, Mr. Chairman, the essential immorality of any injustice, and hence the iniquity of the excess-profits tax, it seems to me nevertheless that the question now, in this respect, is one of expediency.

Sometimes, as we must admit if we are honest, an injustice over a brief period of time, when that injustice is conceded to be solely a matter of individual sacrifice for the common good, serves to forestall a far greater injustice later on.

Especially is this temporary injustice defensible when those of whom acquiescence is demanded, with few exceptions, freely concede that it is justified under the circumstances.

Certainly the sacrifices in this matter of excess-profits tax extension asked of many American corporations, over a period of only 6 months, is far less than the sacrifice asked of American boys, who sacrifice education, careers, homes, families, and often life itself, for the common good.

Certainly those corporations should be expected to accept the demand for financial sacrifice in a spirit of cooperation for the common good, no less than the spirit of cooperation displayed by the boys who go off to war.

Let me say, then, that I believe extension of the excess-profits tax for 6 months is expedient, and morally defensible, insofar as it will permit the President and the Congress a real chance to balance the Federal budget in the 1955 fiscal year.

Passage of the Kean bill is expedient, and at the same time is morally defensible, because a balanced budget in 1955—or even the definite prospect of a balanced budget in that fiscal year—will make it possible for this Congress next year to provide for a substantial reduction in those personal income taxes which now bear so heavily on so many.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if we should let the excess-profits tax expire, as of last June 30, then we shall be morally bound to grant immediate relief to the 50 million personal income taxpayers of America.

If we permit the excess-profits tax to expire, the Federal Government will lose approximately \$800 million in revenue

during the second half of this calendar year.

If in addition we grant immediately the personal income-tax relief which will come about automatically next January 1, then the loss to the United States Treasury in the last half of this calendar year will reach the tremendous total of \$2.5 billion.

In this connection, let me point out to you that in the present perilous state of world affairs, the American people cannot afford to indulge their desire for tax reduction until a balanced budget is assured. The Communist menace is no less today than it was even 3 years ago.

In view of these facts, it seems to me that we must act solely in the light of that necessity for maintaining the financial stability of our Government which is uppermost in the minds of all thinking Americans. Insolvency of our Government could and probably would destroy what freedom remains in the world today.

Let me remind you at this point that 56 percent of our marketable public debt either is due on demand or will fall due within the next 24 months. A balanced budget would save billions of dollars in lower interest charges over the periods during which this debt must be spread.

No, Mr. Chairman, we cannot now afford to reduce Federal taxes today. We cannot afford to imitate the folly of the British Government in reducing taxes in the face of an unbalanced budget. We must keep solvent and strong.

The best way to do it, at this particular time, I believe is to retain until December 31 those taxes which will help to assure a balanced budget in the next fiscal year.

Then, in fiscal 1955, the Federal Government can be on a pay-as-you-go basis. And should this pleasant prospect become manifest next year, then I believe this Congress should grant the personal income-tax relief which is one of the greatest needs of the American people.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I fully recognize the inequities, injustices, and truly baneful effects of the present excess-profits tax. In normal times such a tax upon our business system, so crippling and stultifying in nature, could never be tolerated. There is grave question in my mind whether it is necessary even in emergency because it forcibly strikes me that there are other tax mechanisms available to the Congress in periods of war or stress which would secure needed revenue without placing discriminatory, onerous, repressive and wasteful burdens upon American business and the great dynamic production system which is, in truth, in our first line of defense as well as an incalculably potent weapon. At the earliest feasible moment I should favor the elimination from the statute books of this unconscionable levy which produces waste, inefficiency and stalemate in so many parts of our business structure.

I am also fully aware of the forthright position of my distinguished and beloved colleague from the great State of New York, Congressman REED, whose ability, patriotism and courage, together with his amiable personal qualities, combine to make him one of the most popular and outstanding Members of the House. He is an experienced legislator with many years of faithful, able, outstanding service in this body. I am sure that I am not alone in sentiment when I state that, while I do not always agree with him, I always give the most careful consideration to his views because I know that he invariably stands firmly by American principles and speaks from rich experience and a keen penetrating mind.

However desirable the elimination of this tax at the present time there are two primary reasons why I think it would be presently unwise.

First, before we end this tax we should make provisions for raising the revenue that would be lost to the Government by its termination. I know that there are some claims made with considerable force and probably with considerable validity that if this tax is eliminated business will get new impetus and enjoy new expansion and that the Treasury will reap resultant tax gains. I think there is much to be said for this view as a long-run proposition.

But our needs for huge funds are immediate and urgent. In my opinion they cannot be delayed, but must be met in the current year. The annual deficit may mount up to probably between nine and ten billion dollars, the prospects for the next fiscal year not much better, and the Congress should not take chances on increasing its size still further.

With staggering defense costs as well as great foreign-policy expenditures and huge unliquidated debt, the fiscal condition of the United States Treasury continues to be alarming to all those who believe in sound and basic fiscal and financial policies and practices. I wonder when the American people and their representatives in the Congress will come to the full realization that the Treasury of the United States is not an inexhaustible reservoir of money nor can it be converted into an establishment of limitless credit and debt.

While it is true that our present situation in the world appears to make huge expenditures necessary, the time must inevitably come—and it is soon—when we must clearly recognize the fact that it is not possible for a nation of 160 million people, constituted as we are, singlehandedly or with as little help as we have been getting from our allies, to underwrite and discharge the tremendous obligation of checking Communist aggression in the world and rendering costly financial support and economic aid to so many other nations.

So long as this situation obtains, so long as the Soviet threat casts its dark shadow over our land, we have little choice about raising revenues sufficient to implement our programs of self-protection and self-defense and of setting up all necessary complimentary forces,

military and economic, that will secure our freedom.

There is another aspect to the elimination of the excess-profits tax at this time which gives me great concern. That lies in the fact that in ridding business, large and small, of its heavy burden, we do not propose thereby to furnish tax relief to the average American citizen, the rank and file. It seems to me that if we move to lift roughly a billion dollars from the national tax levy some substantial, sizable portion of that sum should be lifted from the backs of ordinary people as well as from the backs of those engaged in business activities who can much better afford to bear such levies, however unfortunately they may be required. In not giving tax relief to the people at a time when we are lightening the burdens on business, it strikes me beyond a doubt that we would be setting up another discriminatory situation in our tax structure which I think is unjustifiable and I could not support regardless of my strong disapproval in principle and operation of this unwise tax.

In addition to these reasons which favor the continuance of this tax until equitable adjustments can be made and adequate revenue assured, I am not unmindful at all of the strong arguments on the other side of the case. I especially deplore the manner in which this bill was previously sought to be brought to the floor of the House. I have not checked the RECORD but I am sure that, if not the first, it would have been one of the few times, apart from regular discharge petition procedure, that this method has been used to present a bill for the consideration of the House. I appreciate the time element involved and that the tax was expiring, yet I strongly feel that the great House Committee on Ways and Means with its distinguished, able and experienced leadership and membership should never have been bypassed. There were other ways available, even if a continuing resolution had to be passed, in order to secure time to reach agreement and thus recognize the prerogatives, prestige, dignity, and standing of one of the greatest committees of the House.

This bill is of course, retrospective and retroactive and there could be no question of undue haste in considering it. I believe that in view of the budgetary situation, the committee could have and should have held hearings and devised broad, general tax laws which would insure adequate revenue and at the same time permit equitable adjustment and tax relief for all even if it were minimum.

I am glad, indeed, that the leadership brought the bill to the floor in the regular way.

In the circumstances that confront the House at this moment, however, and the horns of the fiscal dilemma upon which we seem to be impaled, I am left with no alternative but to accept the situation as it is and very reluctantly and with no inconsiderable hesitancy vote to extend the excess-profits tax as proposed by the bill.

In the meantime, it is my hope that the able leadership of the House will zealously seek and soon successfully devise some appropriate measure or measures by which existing burdens, inequities, and discriminations may be dispelled and long overdue relief be extended to our belabored business groups in which the rank and file and the middle groups of the American people shall equitably share.

It is up to the Congress to provide revenues to meet every contingency facing the Nation. But it is also our duty to strive for economy, efficiency, and accountability in governmental affairs and in every way possible accord tax relief, equitable and just, to the entire American people so that they may be relieved to some extent of their very heavy burdens and so that our cherished American standards of living may not only be maintained but steadily improved.

In this perilous time, yes, at any time, the fiscal condition and stability and solvency of the Federal Treasury is and must be of paramount importance. Deficit spending, increased national debt, depreciated currency, point in but one direction—toward destructive inflation and ultimate ruinous deflation. Let this Congress keep our tax structure and our fiscal policies on a firm, sound foundation. To do otherwise is merely to add to our great problems and invite the development of dangerous forces in the American economy that will undermine our security.

The present spending rate is not encouraging, to those who forecast a balanced budget next year. On 1 day, June 30, 1953, the Government spent about \$1½ billion, and during the last week of June just past, expended about \$3 billion.

Much depends upon how much we have to spend next year as tribute to the worldwide Communist conspiracy. So long as conditions remain acute we must lay out enough to provide for every possible contingency, including war. We cannot gamble with the national defense. We cannot pursue huge humanitarian spending for foreign peoples and adopt a retrenching, niggardly policy toward our own people and put economy ahead of strength and national security without seriously and dangerously impairing our freedom, security, and prosperity. Sound, farsighted thinking and acting is surely an imperative in this crisis. Let this Congress embrace and practice it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield this time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote to extend the excess-profits tax temporarily, and urge my colleagues to do so, because no less an authority than the President himself has declared the revenue is vitally needed to continue our national-defense program and provide against a dangerously unbalanced budget. I am also voting for it because the leadership is not permitting any alternative; it is either pass this bill or sacrifice the revenue we must have for our own self-protection.

Along with so many other Members, I very deeply regret that apparently we are not going to be afforded opportunity

to vote on any other tax measures during this session. I would like very much to have had the chance to vote in favor of an overall equitable tax relief measure, about which so many grandiloquent promises were made not so long ago.

Many criticisms have been voiced here today against the excess-profits-tax measure, and it is undoubtedly true that at least the method of collecting such taxes could be much improved. There have also been some eloquent pleas made on behalf of the young struggling corporations with much of which I am in substantial agreement.

However, there has been too little said about the essential need for tax relief to our already overburdened individual citizen taxpayers, and particularly young struggling families in this country as compared to corporations.

Despite the fact that the United States Census Bureau expects the ratio of the increase in the number of new households to get smaller and smaller for the next 10 years, you can search the Internal Revenue Code and its corresponding regulations without finding any section which would give tax relief, such as that granted to beginning corporations, to newly married couples who are about to undertake their period of expansion into family life. Surely the average young married couple must struggle against great financial odds the first years of their common life. I think it would be only simple justice to extend to them, through their first struggling years, the same tax relief aid this Government grants to young corporations.

I am, and I believe most of you are, in thorough agreement that this legislative body should be at least as much concerned about helping young American parents with their growing families as we are in aiding the expansion of small business corporations. Let us not forget that the American family is now, and always will be, the fundamental economic unit in this country.

The whole confusing present tax structure is in urgent need of overhaul. I and many other Members have introduced legislation in this session in an attempt to bring some order out of the existing chaos. I earnestly hope we will be permitted to approve some helpful legislative steps in that corrective direction early in the next session. In my opinion, it should have been done in this session, and I would be willing to stay here all year long if necessary to accomplish it, because I earnestly believe the injustices growing out of this admitted tax muddle are eating away at the morale of the American taxpayers.

We have for years been manifesting great concern over the welfare of a great many other foreign countries, some of whom might well be questioned on American friendship. It is time that we pay some attention to our own tax-harassed people, and I say that time is now.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, as the author of the first, and for a long time, only excess-profits-tax continuation bill in the House, I shall certainly support the legislation before us today. It seems utterly foolish to me for the Congress to try to balance the budget and yet cut out \$800 million revenue at this time. It is apparent that our revenues will not equal expenditures this year and failure to pass this bill will only make that situation worse. This legislation should be enacted.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side and yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank the Members in charge of the time for giving me this opportunity to say something about the matter that is before us, and, if possible, also to say something that might help toward a better understanding of this problem. Let me say that whatever I do say, I say in complete good feeling and with the utmost respect and admiration for all Members of this body. I probably do not need to say again that this whole matter has been for me a burdensome proposition since its inception. It has been difficult. There have been currents and cross currents that have affected all of us on both sides of the aisle who have had primary responsibility concerning it. I suppose that always happens when we have differing opinions as to what should be done—and that is as it should be. I find no fault or have no quarrel with that situation. As has been said before, it is never easy to levy any kind of tax on the people or to extend a tax that has heretofore been levied upon them. But particularly it is an unpleasant thing to extend a tax which so many feel is so inequitable in its application. However that may be, we have this matter before us—and before anyone has any misgivings about it, let me say I hope shortly we can bring this bill to successful passage. I might say parenthetically that in all my service here in the House of Representatives I do not think I have ever been shot at quite as much by so many of my good friends from both sides of the aisle. I have tried to take it all in good spirit because some of it has been just in fun and some of it has been serious. However it may have been, everyone has a right to speak his piece. I must say I was a little amused that the hard money proposition came into the discussion here again. I could launch into a discussion of that. Maybe we will pay a little more interest, but on everything that the Government has to buy we are going to buy it for a cheaper price even as will the consumers of this country who have seen their savings shrink in value as inflation has progressed. But that, as I say, is beside the point. I had hoped that the matter of the action before the Rules Committee might have been considered as water over the dam, and, having forgotten all of that, because certainly it was not

pleasant, we might have gone on to the consideration of this measure as it came from the Ways and Means Committee and then from the Rules Committee. I refer to it only because I want Members to vote for this measure and I do not want them to vote against it because of anything that may have happened in that regard.

Moreover, it has been said that there were no precedents for the action taken by the Rules Committee. I read some precedents to the Rules Committee when I was before them; and when we go back into the House I am going to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a ruling of Speaker Crisp and a ruling of Speaker Gillett, presenting that question squarely, in which they held that action was within the province of the Rules Committee. I mention that only because, as I say, I do not want anyone to vote against this measure because of the more recent action.

Back in 1895 a point of order was raised against a resolution proposing the consideration of a bill which had not been reported from the committee to which it had been referred. Speaker Charles F. Crisp, of Georgia, overruled the point of order and said:

The Committee on Rules has jurisdiction to report a resolution fixing the order of business and the manner of considering a measure, even though the effect of its adoption would be to discharge a committee from a matter pending before it, thereby changing the existing rule relative to the consideration of business. It is for the House to determine whether this change in the mode of consideration should be made as recommended by the committee.

On December 9, 1920, Speaker Gillett held that the Committee on Rules may report a resolution providing for the consideration of a bill which has not yet been introduced. The resolution was agreed to by a vote of 151 to 9. During the debate Mr. James R. Mann, of Illinois, said, in part:

It is quite within the privilege of the Committee on Rules and of the House afterward to bring in and adopt a rule providing for the consideration of a bill that has not yet been introduced. A bill does not have to be reported or even introduced. (8 Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, sec. 3388.)

On June 28, 1922, Speaker Gillett held that the Committee on Rules may originate a resolution for the consideration of a bill regardless of whether the subject matter has been referred to it by the House. In the course of his ruling the Speaker referred to the Committee on Rules as "the executive organ of the majority of the House"—volume 8, Cannon's Precedents, section 3389.

Mr. Chairman, it has been alleged here by certain Members on both sides that the leadership beat a hasty retreat because they did not have the votes. If people want to think that, that is all right with me. It would not make any difference as to what will happen here. I happen to think that we did have the votes. But that proposition was not involved.

I said before the Rules Committee that it would have pleased me more to have this matter worked out in the Ways and Means Committee. I have never

deviated from that position. And when I stood before the House and said to my colleagues that I was convinced that it could be worked out in the Ways and Means Committee, there was corroboration from both sides of the aisle. I meant exactly what I said. And what I said was in absolute good faith. I think it is fair to say that what has transpired since that time is proof not only of the correctness of my prediction but of the correctness of the position that we took; because it was only as a matter of last resort that we sought to do what we did.

I cannot let this go by without saying that the hearings of the committee were closed on June 13 in this matter. Days elapsed when all of these proposed amendments could have been considered. Certainly the failure of the Ways and Means Committee to meet and consider this proposition cannot be charged to the leadership. That is one thing for which we cannot be blamed. There was time, but the meeting was not called. I do not know whether it does any good to say this here or not, except perhaps to keep the record straight, but the Speaker, the leadership, and the administration asked only for a meeting of the Ways and Means Committee to consider this very important matter. Those were the suggestions. The meeting was not called. We did what we did, right or wrong; but, as I say, the matter finally was worked out as I suggested.

Reference has been made to a motion to recommit. I have been led to understand that it will be H. R. 6100 introduced by Mr. CAMP, of Georgia. I have tried as best I could to learn from informed sources what that motion to recommit would be. It might be that form of a motion to recommit, it might be a general motion to recommit, or it might conceivably be the Sadlak motion to recommit. That is entirely in the hands of the minority and I do not quarrel with them about that. I would like to say this, however, that H. R. 6100 as it is now presented would favor or help about 5 percent of the people paying an excess-profits tax, and as it is drafted might provide a great windfall or relief to many people who are paying in the highest brackets.

The Sadlak amendment would help 60 percent of the 50,000 in the lowest brackets, those who come under the \$100,000 limit. And I might say this too, that all of these things are in a measure discriminatory against someone who possibly might not be given relief. All of this might well have been handled in the committee, but here we are. I read the statement that was issued by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] after the meeting when he said that many inequities in the law had been pointed out.

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

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

Mr. CAMP. I have noted what the gentleman said regarding H. R. 6100. I propose to move that the provisions of H. R. 6100 be made effective as of January 1, 1953. It would involve no windfall and no payment of any sum to any-

body. There would be no rebate whatsoever under it.

Mr. HALLECK. All right; then there would not be a rebate. But I take it, it would apply to old companies as well as new companies.

Mr. CAMP. It cannot apply to old companies, because old companies have their own base period experience. It applies only to companies organized after 1946 who have to rely on the industry average. It cannot apply to an old company.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad the gentleman made that explanation. I am not however at all clear about the effect of it. It would seem that his later proposal would further diminish the effect of it; and the ultimate question, if you go into anything that is in some measure discriminatory, is: How far we should go.

Then there is always the question of what will happen to the bill in the other body.

There is one other thing that has been charged here that I just cannot let go: It has been charged by some that those of us who support this measure do it for expediency or because we are lacking in principle, because we are lacking in morality. It is charged that we are breaking faith with the American people. I do not so construe it. Certainly that does not measure my feelings in respect to the matter. I do not like it either. But I just want it understood—and I think I speak for all who are going to support this measure, and I am sure it will be supported overwhelmingly—we do it by reason of the serious necessities of the situation that confronts us.

It is argued, of course, that the administration shrouded its ideas in some sort of secrecy. The message came up on May 20. Hearings were started on June 1 and concluded on June 13. I know some people who were making commitments. I know there were some suggestions made about certain taxes to be reduced and some others to be extended; but, Mr. Chairman, who then could foresee the fiscal situation in which we presently find ourselves?

It seems to me that without any regard to any position that any Member took he must face this proposition now in the light of the fiscal situation of the Government as he can now see it to be, with the appropriation bills practically behind us.

Reference has been made to speeches and to pledges. Mr. Chairman, the Republican platform—and I doubt if the opposition platform was much different—said:

Our goal is a balanced budget, a reduced national debt, an economical administration, and a cut in taxes.

Then we pledged this, saying:

We are for a sound economy, reduction of expenditures by the elimination of waste and extravagance so the budget will be balanced and a general tax reduction can be made.

If it is of any interest, I was chairman of the speakers bureau at the Republican headquarters in the last campaign. I think I know as well as anybody in the country what the President was saying and what our leading speakers around

the country were saying. I do not recall that any of them said that the first order of business when we get into this session of Congress shall be to reduce taxes without regard to whether or not we can balance the budget.

Cutting expenditures first certainly has been my idea; it has been the President's idea all through the campaign, and if I understand it, it is still his idea; and I think it is still the idea of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House of Representatives. Fiscal solvency and fiscal stability? Yes; that is what we must achieve.

Reference has been made to appropriations and a charge that nothing has been accomplished in that regard. I have here a clipping from a magazine which states that House cuts in the Truman budget for 1954 are nearing \$14 billion. The cuts will run twelve, thirteen, or fourteen billion dollars and, as we say out in Indiana, that is not hay. As we struggle with these appropriation bills we all know just how difficult it has been to try to bring down expenditures of Government. You might look at those figures and say: If you can cut that much off the appropriations why do you not terminate the excess-profits tax and pass H. R. 1 immediately?

As the gentleman from Nebraska so ably stated, there is a great lag between the appropriations and the spending; we are therefore caught on the horns of that dilemma and while we make these great savings, they will be reflected only next year, the year after, and the year after that, which will mean probably that in the coming year we will be \$5 billion below the original spending budget.

May I say also with respect to one other thing that has been charged here about the President and the administration. They were called upon in a White House meeting where I sat to come up with their proposals about the tax situation when it became apparent we were going to have another deficit. They were asked to present them on that occasion. I have not been conscious of any undue pressure from anyone in the administration with respect to this whole matter.

Where do we find ourselves as to a fiscal position? We have wound up this year with a \$9.4 billion dollar deficit, threatening us with breaking out of the ceiling on the national debt, threatening us with a continuation of the fires of inflation which we all seek to avoid. With all of the economies that we have been trying to make, and are making, it looks now as if we are faced with a deficit in the coming year of \$5 billion. I do not think it is going to be that much because I have high hopes that the assurances of the people in the executive branch and in the Armed Services will come to pass that as we go through the fiscal year they will find places to save so that we can come out at the end of the year with a balanced budget.

Those who say that we ought to cut off revenue, reduce taxes now, in my opinion take an irresponsible position with respect to the fiscal solvency of the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, cuts have been made. We hope to make more. I am only sorry that we could not make enough cuts for the up-coming spending year to permit this excess-profits tax to expire and to pass H. R. 1. No one would have liked that any more than I. I may say, too, I do not think anyone has struggled any more vigorously than I have or any more consistently than I have to cut down appropriations and to find ways to save so that this very desirable end may be attained.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The cuts that have been made this year will reduce expenditures immediately but the effect of it will be 2, 3, or 4 years from now.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman made a very able statement about that, and I hope those who did not hear it will read it in the RECORD because the gentleman has put his finger on one of our very difficult problems.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. To what extent would the deficit have to be reduced before this administration would recommend a reduction in taxes?

Mr. HALLECK. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri, whose friendship I am happy to have, that this administration by the very action that is proposed today will end the excess-profits tax come January 1 and the last Korea increases will come off come January 1. That is a tax reduction very definitely promised by this administration and will be carried out.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That will be carried out without any action on anybody's part.

Mr. HALLECK. It will be carried out because there has been a lot of action here which involves cutting the cost of Government. That is the reason. If the spenders had continued to have their way, it never would come to pass.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Just one more question. Have not some people high in your party charged that the spending has not been reduced?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. But I cannot be responsible for that. All I can do is refer you to the record, and the records are there.

Reference has been made to the fact that this is an inequitable tax. I have had compiled a list of a lot of recognized inequitable taxes, and they all need to be straightened out, and they are going to be revised, because our great Committee on Ways and Means, with the assistance of the administration and all of us, is moving toward the redrafting, the reconsideration, the restudy of the whole field of taxation, and that is what we are driving for here. We ask only that this tax be extended on through the year, and then it will end. There will also be a reduction in the income tax for the people of the country, and at that time we propose to bring into the Congress of the United States

legislation not only to do away with the inequities of the excess-profits tax, but many others as well.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. During the campaign I heard a very great deal about the iniquity of this excess-profits tax. I am wondering what has happened that would make it less iniquitous now than it was a year ago.

Mr. HALLECK. I would say nothing. That is a good question, and that is as honest an answer as I can make. I need only to suggest to the gentleman that in a Democratic Congress back in 1950 I voted for this tax; I was not happy about it, but I voted for it, and I do not recall that I made any particular point of the excess-profits tax. May I say to my friend that there are only about 50,000 corporations affected by this tax. Believe me, I have solicitude for them. Some people have spoken here who, apparently, have no solicitude for them, and they would have this tax go on and on. I am not in that category. But there has been a lot of political sex appeal, may I say, heretofore, in the idea of doing away with the excess-profits tax before cutting taxes for the individual. Maybe you heard those things in the campaign. You probably were pretty busy making speeches on your side, but perhaps you took in a lot of Republican meetings. In any event, I do not recall that very many people were saying much about the excess-profits tax at that time. I assure the gentleman of the best of feeling and good humor.

Some say, as the gentleman from Louisiana said, that we cannot cut these taxes the 1st of January. I think we can, and I hope we get a lot of help to bring about that very desirable result.

In respect to this particular extension, let us not forget that 82 members of the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers voted to reverse their position here awhile ago as against 46 who voted to sustain it. It takes a two-thirds vote of that board of directors to change their position. They did not have quite the two-thirds, but to me it is significant of an attitude that I say is commendable on the part of business people all over this country who are adversely affected by this tax; that in the interest of the fiscal solvency of the country, in the interest of the overall good, they are willing to put up with it for another 6 months, if at the end of that time they know that that will be the end. It was not so long ago that we had here the matter of the extension once more of rent control. I have not been voting for rent control for a long time, but the situation worked around to where it seemed that a 90-day extension would be all right, so the committee voted a 90-day extension, and, so far as I have been able to discover, there was no great outcry from the landlords who felt themselves aggrieved. They have said, "That marks the end of it and we are done with it," and I think this situation comes in that same category. People have been writing to me saying, "We will make

out." Businessmen have written me saying, "This tax adversely affects me; it is going to cost me money, but I am willing to ride it out for 6 months more in order to promote the best interests of the country." I was out in my home State not so long ago and a group of businessmen waited on me to jump down my throat about the excess-profits tax. I explained what we were trying to do about the excess-profits tax. I recited what we were up against; just how tough a job it was. During this discussion, incidentally, it was very much impressed upon me that they did not want that 52 percent normal tax raised. They said, "You start getting that rate up and you never will get it back down." I think there was a lot of truth in that. But when I got through telling them about this overall situation they said, "Well, I guess it's all right. We don't like it, but we are not going to be too mad about it if you go along with it."

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

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

Mr. COOPER. I am sure that the distinguished gentleman will remember that if nothing at all is done taxes now yielding \$8.5 billion will expire automatically by the 1st of next April.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly do understand that, and I may say to the gentleman that that fact likewise is giving me very considerable concern. I only wish the situation in the world were such that we could say, "Well, we are just going to let them all expire." As of now, I do not know what we are going to do, but we will have to deal with that, I am sure the gentleman will agree with me, when we get to that point.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. All you have to do is bring in a rule to extend them.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly shall expect, if I may respond to that with all humility, that when those matters come along the Ways and Means Committee will deal with them and will consider them.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I have no reason to believe otherwise, because, let me say again, that is the way I would much rather have it handled.

In conclusion, and I have taken too much of your time, I think while there may be a little fun had here and there and a little giggling back and forth about who got us into this debt and who is going to get us out, and what are we going to do about it, there is no one of us who does not believe from the bottom of his heart the fiscal solvency of the Government of the United States is of paramount importance.

We are struggling with a most difficult problem. We have had to cut some appropriations that I did not like to vote to cut, and we are voting for taxes that we do not like to vote for, voting to extend taxes we do not like to extend; but among us and with all of us we have a responsibility to our States, our dis-

tricts, yes, and to our Nation, to put first things first. That is the reason, Mr. Chairman, I hope this measure is adopted.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, there is little doubt that the excess-profits tax extension creates a great hardship upon American industry at this time.

I feel, however, that relief must first be afforded to individuals on their personal income taxes.

I signed the petition to discharge H. R. 1, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] which would give personal income-tax relief. I feel that the administration should get behind this effort to give substantial tax relief to all persons, to individuals as well as to business, at the earliest opportunity.

Individuals, workingmen, businessmen, and everyone needs this incentive to increase the capital wealth of the United States which is threatened by the present crushing burden of taxation.

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

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCGREGOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5898) to extend until December 31, 1953, the period with respect to which the excess-profits tax shall be effective, pursuant to House Resolution 326, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CAMP. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CAMP moves that the bill (H. R. 5898) be recommitted to the Committee on Ways and Means to be reported forthwith to the House of Representatives with the following amendment: "That section 447 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code shall be amended by deleting that section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Base period rate of return: The Secretary shall determine and proclaim for each industry classification in subsection (c) a rate of return (computed to the nearest thousandth) for the base period. Such base

period rate of return for each industry classification shall be obtained by amounts being determined and provided under subsection (a), for the 3 years remaining after eliminating from the 4 years 1946 through 1949 the year determined under subsection (a) to have the lowest rate of return (or the highest deficit rate of return) and dividing the aggregate by the sum of the total assets (determined as provided under subsection (a)) for such 3 remaining years."

This amendment shall take effect January 1, 1953.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 127, nays 275, answered "present" 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—127

Abbitt	Fulton	Rains
Abernethy	Gentry	Reams
Alexander	Gordon	Reed, N. Y.
Andrews	Grant	Regan
Ashmore	Gregory	Richards
Aspinall	Gross	Riley
Bailey	Hagen, Calif.	Robeson, Va.
Battle	Haley	Rogers, Colo.
Bentsen	Harris	Rogers, Fla.
Bishop	Hays, Ohio	Rogers, Tex.
Blatnik	Herlong	Scherer
Boggs	Hollifield	Secrest
Bolling	Ikard	Selden
Brooks, La.	Jenkins	Shelley
Brooks, Tex.	Jonas, Ill.	Shuford
Brown, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Kans.
Buchanan	Jones, N. C.	Smith, Miss.
Burdick	Kee	Smith, Va.
Burleson	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Wis.
Busbey	King, Calif.	Stagers
Camp	Landrum	Steed
Carlyle	Lane	Sullivan
Carnahan	Lanham	Tatton
Church	Lantaff	Teague
Clardy	Lesinski	Thomas
Cole, Mo.	Long	Thompson, La.
Colmer	Lucas	Thompson, Mich.
Crumpacker	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Curtis, Mo.	McCarthy	Thornberry
Davis, Ga.	McMillan	Trimble
Deane	Mason	Velde
Dempsey	Matthews	Watts
Donohue	Miller, Calif.	Wheeler
Dorn, S. C.	Miller, Kans.	Whitten
Dowdy	Murray	Wier
Doyle	Neal	Williams, Miss.
Eberharter	Norrell	Willis
Edmondson	O'Konski	Wilson, Tex.
Elliott	Passman	Winstead
Fallon	Patten	Yates
Fernandez	Pilcher	Yorby
Forrester	Poage	
Fountain	Preston	

NAYS—275

Adair	Bolton	Clevenger
Addonizio	Oliver P.	Coile, N. Y.
Albert	Bonin	Condon
Allen, Calif.	Bosch	Cooley
Allen, Ill.	Bow	Coon
Andersen,	Boykin	Cooper
H. Carl	Bramblett	Corbett
Andresen,	Bray	Cotton
August H.	Brown, Ohio	Coudert
Angell	Brownson	Cretella
Arends	Broyhill	Crosser
Auchincloss	Budge	Curtis, Mass.
Ayres	Bush	Curtis, Nebr.
Baker	Byrne, Pa.	Dague
Barrett	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Tenn.
Becker	Campbell	Davis, Wis.
Belcher	Canfield	Dawson, Ill.
Bender	Cannon	Dawson, Utah
Bennett, Fla.	Carrigg	Delaney
Bennett, Mich.	Case	Derounian
Bentley	Cederberg	Devereux
Berry	Chatham	D'Ewart
Betts	Chelf	Dies
Boland	Chenoweth	Dingell
Bolton,	Chiperfield	Dodd
Frances P.	Chudoff	Dollinger

Dondero Karsten, Mo. Pillion
 Donovan Kean Poff
 Dorn, N. Y. Kearney Polk
 Ellsworth Kearns Price
 Engle Keating Priest
 Evins Kelly, N. Y. Prouty
 Feighan Keogh Rabaut
 Fenton Kersten, Wis. Radwan
 Fine Kilburn Ray
 Fino King, Pa. Rayburn
 Forand Kirwan Reece, Tenn.
 Ford Klein Rees, Kans.
 Frazier Kluczynski Rhodes, Ariz.
 Frelinghuysen Knox Rhodes, Pa.
 Friedel Krueger Riehlman
 Gamble Laird Roberts
 Garmatz Latham Robison, Ky.
 Gary LeCompte Rodino
 Gathings Lovre Rogers, Mass.
 Gavin McConnell Rooney
 George McCormack Roosevelt
 Golden McCulloch Sadlak
 Goodwin McDonough St. George
 Graham McGregor Saylor
 Granahan McIntire Schenck
 Green Machrowicz Scott
 Gubser Mack, Ill. Scrivner
 Gwinn Mack, Wash. Scudder
 Hagen, Minn. Madden Seely-Brown
 Hale Magnuson Sheehan
 Halleck Mahon Short
 Hand Mailliard Sieminski
 Harden Marshall Simpson, Ill.
 Harrison, Nebr. Martin, Iowa Simpson, Pa.
 Harrison, Va. Meader Small
 Harrison, Wyo. Merrill Spence
 Hart Merrow Springer
 Harvey Metcalf Stauffer
 Hays, Ark. Miller, Md. Stringfellow
 Heller Miller, Nebr. Taber
 Heselton Miller, N. Y. Talle
 Hiestand Mills Taylor
 Hill Morano Tollefson
 Hillelson Morgan Tuck
 Hillings Morrison Utt
 Hinshaw Moss Van Pelt
 Hoeven Moulder Van Zandt
 Hoffman, Ill. Multer Vinson
 Holmes Mumma Vorys
 Holt Nicholson Vursell
 Holtzman Norblad Wainwright
 Hope Oakman Walter
 Horan O'Brien, Ill. Wampler
 Hosmer O'Brien, Mich. Warburton
 Howell O'Brien, N. Y. Weichel
 Hruska O'Hara, Ill. Westland
 Hunter O'Hara, Minn. Wharton
 Hyde O'Neill Wickersham
 Jackson Osmer Widnall
 James Ostertag Williams, N. Y.
 Jarman Patman Wilson, Ind.
 Javits Patterson Withrow
 Jensen Pelly Wolcott
 Johnson Perkins Wolverton
 Jonas, N. C. Pfost Young
 Jones, Mo. Philbin Younger
 Judd Phillips Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hoffman, Mich.

NOT VOTING—27

Barden Durham Nelson
 Bates Fisher Powell
 Beamer Fogarty Reed, Ill.
 Bonner Hardy Rivers
 Buckley Hébert Shafer
 Byrd Hess Sheppard
 Celler Kilday Sikes
 Cunningham McVey Wigglesworth
 Dolliver Mollohan Wilson, Calif.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Celler against.
 Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hardy against.
 Mr. Wilson of California for, with Mr. Wigglesworth against.
 Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Hess against.
 Mr. Shepard for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shafer with Mr. Durham.
 Mr. McVey with Mr. Byrd.
 Mr. Nelson with Mr. Mollohan.
 Mr. Reed of Illinois with Mr. Buckley.
 Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Sikes.

Mr. Bates with Mr. Fogarty.
 Mr. Beamer with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. PATTEN and Mr. SHELLEY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 325, nays 77, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—325

Abernethy D'Ewart Johnson
 Adair Dies Jonas, N. C.
 Addison Dingell Jones, Ala.
 Albert Dodd Jones, Mo.
 Allen, Calif. Dollinger Judd
 Allen, Ill. Dondero Karsten, Mo.
 Andersen, H. Carl Donovan Kean
 Andresen, August H. Donohue Kearney
 Andrews Doyle Dorn, N. Y. Kearns
 Angell Eberhartter Keating
 Arends Edmondson Kee
 Ashmore Elliott Kelly, N. Y.
 Aspinall Ellsworth Kersten, Wis.
 Auchincloss Engle Kilburn
 Ayres Evins King, Calif.
 Bailey Feighan King, Pa.
 Baker Fenton Klein
 Barrett Fernandez Kluczynski
 Battle Knox Krueger
 Becker Fino Laird
 Belcher Forand Lane
 Bender Ford Latham
 Bennett, Fla. Fountain LeCompte
 Bennett, Mich. Frazier Lesinski
 Bentsen Frelinghuysen Lovre
 Berry Friedel Lucas
 Betts Gamble McCarthy
 Blatinik Garmatz McConnell
 Boland Gary McCormack
 Bolling Gathings McCulloch
 Bolton, Gentry McCulloch
 Frances P. Gentry McIntire
 Bolton, George McMillan
 Oliver P. Golden Machrowicz
 Bonin Goodwin Mack, Wash.
 Bosch Gordon Madden
 Bow Graham Magnuson
 Boykin Granahan Mahon
 Bramblett Grant Mailliard
 Bray Green Marshall
 Brooks, Tex. Gross Marshall
 Brownson Gubser Martin, Iowa
 Broyhill Gwinn Matthews
 Buchanan Hagen, Calif. Meader
 Budge Hagen, Minn. Merrill
 Burleson Hale Mervow
 Bush Haley Metcalf
 Byrne, Pa. Halleck Miller, Calif.
 Campbell Hand Miller, Kans.
 Canfield Harden Miller, Md.
 Cannon Harris Miller, Nebr.
 Carlyle Harrison, Nebr. Miller, N. Y.
 Carnahan Harrison, Va. Mills
 Carrigg Harrison, Wyo. Morano
 Case Hart Morgan
 Cederberg Harvey Morrison
 Chatham Hays, Ark. Moss
 Chelf Heller Moulder
 Chenoweth Herlong Multer
 Chudoff Heselton Mumma
 Cole, N. Y. Hill Murray
 Colmer Hillelson Neal
 Condon Hillings Nicholson
 Cooley Hoeven Norblad
 Coon Hoffman, Ill. Norrell
 Cooper Holfield Oakman
 Corbett Holmes O'Brien, Ill.
 Cotton Holt O'Brien, Mich.
 Cretella Holtzman O'Brien, N. Y.
 Cross Hope O'Hara, Ill.
 Crumpacker Horan O'Neill
 Curtis, Mass. Hosmer Osmer
 Curtis, Nebr. Howell Ostertag
 Dague Hruska Patman
 Davis, Tenn. Hunter Patterson
 Davis, Wis. Hyde Pelly
 Dawson, Ill. Ikard Perkins
 Dawson, Utah Jackson Pfost
 Delaney James Philbin
 Derounian Jarman Pillion
 Devereux Javits Poage

Poff Scott Van Zandt
 Polk Scrivner Vinson
 Price Scudder Vorys
 Priest Seely-Brown Vursell
 Prouty Selden Wainwright
 Rabaut Shelley Walter
 Radwan Short Wampler
 Rains Sieminski Warburton
 Rayburn Simpson, Ill. Watts
 Reece, Tenn. Simpson, Pa. Weichel
 Rees, Kans. Smith, Miss. Westland
 Rhodes, Ariz. Spence Whitten
 Rhodes, Pa. Springer Wickersham
 Richards Stagggers Widnall
 Richman Stauffer Wier
 Roberts Steed Williams, Miss.
 Robison, Ky. Stringfellow Williams, N. Y.
 Rodino Sullivan Wilson, Ind.
 Rogers, Colo. Taber Wilson, Tex.
 Rogers, Fla. Talle Winstead
 Rogers, Mass. Taylor Withrow
 Rooney Teague Wolverton
 Roosevelt Thornberry Yates
 Sadlak Tollefson Yorty
 St. George Trimble Young
 Saylor Tuck Zablocki
 Schenck Van Pelt

NAYS—77

Abbutt Gregory Reed, N. Y.
 Alexander Hays, Ohio Regan
 Bentley Hiestand Riley
 Bishop Hinshaw Robeson, Va.
 Boggs Hoffman, Mich. Rogers, Tex.
 Brooks, La. Jenkins Scherer
 Brown, Ga. Jensen Secret
 Brown, Ohio Jones, N. C. Sheehan
 Burdick Kelley, Pa. Shuford
 Busbey Landrum Small
 Byrnes, Wis. Lanham Smith, Kans.
 Camp Lantaff Smith, Va.
 Chipfield Church Long Smith, Wis.
 Clardy Lyle Sutton
 Clevenger McGregor Thomas
 Cole, Mo. Mason Thompson, La.
 Coudert O'Hara, Minn. Mich.
 Curtis, Mo. O'Konski Thompson, Tex.
 Davis, Ga. Passman Utt
 Deane Patten Velde
 Dempsey Phillips Wharton
 Dorn, S. C. Pilcher Wheeler
 Fallon Preston Willis
 Forrester Ray Wolcott
 Fulton Reams Younger

NOT VOTING—28

Barden Fisher Powell
 Bates Fogarty Reed, Ill.
 Beamer Hardy Rivers
 Bonner Hébert Shafer
 Buckley Hess Sheppard
 Byrd Kilday Sikes
 Celler McVey Wigglesworth
 Cunningham Mack, Ill. Wilson, Calif.
 Dolliver Mollohan
 Durham Nelson

So the bill was passed.
 The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Barden against.
 Mr. Hardy for, with Mr. Hébert against.
 Mr. Wigglesworth for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.
 Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shafer with Mr. Byrd.
 Mr. Bates with Mr. Mollohan.
 Mr. Beamer with Mr. Buckley.
 Mr. McVey with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Sheppard.
 Mr. Reed of Illinois with Mr. Sikes.
 Mr. Nelson with Mr. Rivers.
 Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Durham.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which

to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4905. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 16. An act to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 252) entitled "An act to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WELKER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FIVE HUNDRED MILLION FOR THE PRESIDENT TO AID THE SUFFERING PEOPLES BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the liquidation of Beria guarantees that the Communist dictatorship which finally evolves will be a bloody regime with which no decent government can live or do business.

It is vital to the peace of the world that we assist the enslaved peoples by more than words in their heroic efforts of self-liberation.

From the time of Dwight Eisenhower's nomination just a year ago until the present, the President has shown a keen awareness of the sufferings of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain with whom many millions of Americans have a close kinship.

The President has long and consistently recognized that the solution of the world's greatest problems of danger of all-out world war III and the present international tensions lies in keeping alive the hope of freedom and the alleviation of sufferings among the peoples behind the Iron Curtain who, if abandoned, could ultimately be molded by the Communists into armies of aggression.

I am pleased to note also that within the past few days the minority whip, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr.

McCORMACK], has expressed his support of aid to the enslaved peoples.

This is a bipartisan issue of the gravest urgency.

I have today introduced a resolution authorizing the appropriation of \$500 million to aid the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, a copy of which I wish to include in my remarks herewith:

Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation of \$500 million and other sums to aid the suffering people of Communist-dominated nations and areas

Whereas fast-moving events giving hope to the forces of freedom have disclosed widespread suffering among the peoples of Communist-dominated nations and areas; and

Whereas the Congress is approaching adjournment and no one can foresee the developments of the immediate future; and

Whereas the President must have reasonably broad discretion for purposeful planning and the timely execution thereof in keeping with the urgent demands of the days in which we live in order that the Government of the United States may play its full role in attaining the common goal of peace and freedom throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That, in addition to the sum authorized for such purposes under section 101 (a) (1) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President the sum of \$500 million and in addition thereto such part of the unexpended funds otherwise appropriated by the Congress for foreign aid as the President deems necessary, to be used in such manner as in the President's judgment will best assist the suffering peoples of the Communist-dominated nations and areas to secure their basic natural rights to which as human beings they are entitled and to enjoy the benefits that only the labors of free men in a free society can acquire.

CAN WE FINANCE ATOMIC ENERGY DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT RFC?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, when the wraps are taken off, and atomic energy is opened up to commercial and industrial development, will there be adequate funds to finance it? Obviously, immense sums will be required to produce this power. This means only a very few, if any, independent corporations can actually develop it, if they have a mind so to do.

One wonders what effect the development of this new power will have on the production and marketing of electricity or other power. Will those in power production be inclined to develop a competitive product, or switch over?

I am disturbed as to what the future of atomic energy development may be, should the Government relinquish control or lose interest in this field. On the practical side, how can this development be financed in a free competitive way without assistance by some such institution as the RFC? In the New York Times, issue of Tuesday, July 7, 1953, an article by Harold B. Hinton from Washington states that a company "that recently advertised its ability to build an

experimental nuclear power plant for anybody for \$10 million—has had no takers yet."

Further light on this situation may be contained in excerpts from hearings before the Treasury Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, during the present session, on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1954. I quote from pages 906-907, Tuesday, June 30, 1953, and include also the article from the New York Times referred to above:

LOANS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Is it possible that the RFC may be the agency private enterprise would come to, to develop atomic-energy projects, once the situation is declassified, so that we can have power produced through atomic-engineering ability?

For instance, in India today, I am told, there is the fear among some, particularly on-the-ground people, that Russia is going to get into India with atomic-energy development and stimulate power, irrigation, and industrial projects of that country and replace us competitively. We, in the meantime, face the necessity of keeping atomic energy, and what it can do in civilian channels, secret on the basis that we are going to give away a vital war secret.

Now, if industry cannot get money from the banks which derive their revenues from the citizens and people in the community, even if Atomic Energy wants a loan, can you see any place it can go today to carry out its research and development other than this agency or the Export-Import Bank, which are both units of our Government?

Mr. CRAVENS. It will not need to. If you let industry participate in the atomic-energy program, as it becomes vital to us, industry will get all the money to take care of the development that it needs. And don't you have any reservations about it.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. That is good, because what puzzles me and makes me ask the question is that United States Steel, through Brazilian interests, negotiated through the Export-Import Bank a few years ago a credit of some \$200 million to develop manganese in Brazil. Now Big Steel is certainly one of the biggest operators in the market; yet, it came to an agency of this committee to obtain credit to develop manganese in Brazil, and certainly we had the private resources and market to develop that.

I ask that in order to let us know and let Congress know whether some big operators can only come here. Your answer, of course, tells me no; they should not come.

Mr. CRAVENS. And should not need to. I am not familiar with the exact circumstances of the loan you refer to; outside the confines of the sovereign United States in another sovereign country is a wholly different animal than asking lenders of this country to put money in this country rather than outside it. You know what happens under foreign governments and the changes in them and so forth. In my opinion, there would be no shortage of capital or money for atomic energy development in this country in the next 30 years.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I am glad to hear it.

[From the New York Times of July 7, 1953]
**ATOM FOR INDUSTRY SPLITS THE EXPERTS—
 JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE GETS
 CONFLICTING TESTIMONY ON BIG OR SMALL
 REACTORS**

(By Harold B. Hinton)

WASHINGTON, July 6.—The Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy today heard experts debate the merits of approaching the production of industrial atomic power through the construction of one large experimental plant as opposed to a series of smaller ones of differing design.

Dr. Walter H. Zinn, director of the Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago, an installation owned by the Atomic Energy Commission, advised construction of a power reactor capable of producing from 75,000 to 100,000 kilowatts of electricity as the minimum size from which constructive lessons could be learned for use by private industry.

Power produced by such a reactor, he told the committee, would probably cost about 10 mills a kilowatt-hour and probably could be sold for 7 mills. Its operation, he estimated, would require an annual subsidy of \$2 million or \$3 million.

The committee is holding public hearings looking to possible legislative recommendations to the next session of Congress. Any extensive experimentation by private enterprise in the field of power production by nuclear fission will require amendment of the Atomic Energy Act.

COST SACRIFICE CITED

Dr. Zinn advised against the development of industrial power by the Atomic Energy Commission alone, despite what he called its good record in using reactors to further our military position.

"Many times, however, cost has been sacrificed for speed or for a guaranteed performance by a certain date," he explained. "What is needed now is experience in getting results in an area where cost is paramount. This experience the private-utility companies have."

Dr. Alvin M. Weinberg of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, another AEC installation, agreed that private concerns should be encouraged in the development of industrial power, but added that such experiments must be considered no substitute for the Government's own effort to demonstrate the feasibility of cheap central station nuclear power.

He estimated that a large-scale plant, able to solve the engineering and other problems involved, would cost around \$100 million, adding that no private enterprise would now be prepared to invest such an amount in the project.

NO TAKERS YET

A different viewpoint was expounded by Dr. Chauncey Starr, director of the atomic energy research department of North American Aviation, a company that recently advertised its ability to build an experimental nuclear powerplant for anybody for \$10 million. He told the committee, in response to questions, that this company has had no takers yet.

"It is our belief," he said, "that a reactor program which would provide pilot plant experience would require approximately 5 years and have a total cost of about \$10 million, including the cost of development."

"Following such a program, it would then be proper to consider the construction of a full-scale plant which could reasonably be expected to compete with the cost of power from conventional plants at that time, to construct and place in operation such a full-scale plant would require probably another 5 years."

Dr. Karl Cohen, vice president of the Walter Kidde Nuclear Laboratories, of Belleville, N. J., and John R. Menke, president of Nuclear Development Associates, of White Plains, N. Y., likewise differed with Dr. Zinn and Dr. Weinberg on the capability of private industry to develop industrial power without Government subsidy, beyond the use of the existing national laboratories and their research conclusions.

And now, Mr. Speaker, from the Evening Star of July 10 we find the following:

DAY OF ATOMIC POWER FAR OFF, TWO BIGGEST CONTRACTORS STATE

(By Thomas R. Henry)

A warning that economically feasible atomic power is a long way off has been

sounded by two of the major business organizations in the field.

The warning was given in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy yesterday by officials of General Electric Co. and Westinghouse Electric Corp., who from the first have been top contractors both of the wartime Manhattan District and later of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Both companies have built atomic submarine propulsion engines, the only application of atomic energy as a source of power yet entirely successful. Westinghouse had made considerable progress toward atomic propulsion for surface ships when the project was suspended by the Navy.

CONTRASTS WITH OTHERS

On the basis of this hard experience, the testimony from the 2 corporations, maintaining 2 of the largest scientific and engineering staffs in the world, was quite in contrast to that from representatives of corporations, chiefly in the public-utility field, whose experience has been limited practically to examining blueprints.

"I certainly would advise any company talking about risking seventy-five to one hundred million dollars of its stockholder's money to take a second look," said Charles H. Weaver, manager of Westinghouse's atomic power division, which has been chiefly involved in the naval projects.

Westinghouse, he said, would not consider putting up any of its own money in an atomic energy plant for providing industrial power. Its previous operations have been entirely financed by the Government. President Gwilym A. Price of the corporation said it actually had made a considerable sacrifice in diverting so much of its scientists and engineering manpower to atomic projects. This has kept it behind on jet engine development and on several purely civilian projects.

COST PUT AT \$100 MILLION

The cost of a plant providing industrial power, it was testified, would run around \$100 million at the least. Power company estimates have run from \$50 million to \$75 million.

In informal discussions among themselves, Westinghouse officials have said that even if the Government guaranteed 100 percent costs, the corporation would hesitate to take on the contract to build such a plant, Mr. Price said.

Still, it was testified, Westinghouse is investing \$2 million in a plant to build equipment for atomic energy power stations, indicating it is not entirely pessimistic about the future.

Testimony of Dr. F. K. McCune, general manager of the atomic products division of General Electric, was little more optimistic.

Mr. McCune said the day of industrial atomic energy might be hastened by release of restricted information and Congress must balance this advantage against slower progress and greater security.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] what the program will be next week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to respond to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader. We expect to adjourn over from this evening until Monday at 12 o'clock.

Monday is District of Columbia day, but I understand there are no bills likely to be reported from that committee for consideration.

We expect to call up the bill H. R. 5877, the customs simplification bill.

A conference report on the MSA authorization (H. R. 5710) has been filed and we expect to dispose of that on Monday after the customs simplification measure is disposed of. I might say in passing it is my understanding that the conference report on the MSA authorization has been unanimously agreed to. There might be some controversy, but at the moment I do not anticipate any.

On Tuesday we have the primaries in the State of Virginia. All of the Members from Virginia expect to be down in their State at that time. We will begin general debate on the supplemental appropriation bill, then take up for final action H. R. 6078, which is the bill giving aid to federally impacted schools for maintenance and operation. If there is any record vote called for on Tuesday on that measure we will carry it over until Wednesday, in view of the situation in Virginia.

On Wednesday and for the balance of the week, first we shall continue the appropriation bill, and then we hope to call up, but not necessarily in this order, bills as follows, on which rules have been reported: H. R. 5740, factory inspection; H. R. 4353, farm credit, and H. R. 116, the fireworks bill. If rules are granted, as quickly as possible we will consider H. R. 5894, Trade Agreements Extension Act, 1953; House Joint Resolution 203, International Trade Fair; H. R. 157, having to do with excise taxes on moving picture theater admissions; H. R. 356, Railroad Retirement Act, amendments thereto; and H. R. 5406, construction of buildings for Federal agencies.

Of course, conference reports are in order at any time. I have been informed that it is expected that several of the appropriation bills that have been passed by both bodies will be gotten to conference, and we trust that conference reports will be coming in starting by the latter part of next week. We hope to call up those conference reports as rapidly as we can. If there is any additional program, I shall announce it as quickly as possible and inform the minority leader about it.

Mr. RAYBURN. I thank the gentleman.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I was downtown on official business during the vote on the excess-profits tax bill. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 6054.

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

There was no objection.

FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1953

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 328, Rept. No. 766), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4353) to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provisions contained in said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 329, Rept. No. 767) which was referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5740) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to protect the public health and welfare by providing certain authority for factory inspection, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House on Wednesday next for 5 minutes and on July 22 for 5 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

FAVORING THE GRANTING OF THE STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) favoring the

granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

- xxxxxxx Affen, Awigdor.
- xxxxxxx Affen, Estera (nee Stowatycka).
- xxxxxxx Affen, David.
- xxxxxxx Ahn, Susanna Mel Sheng.
- xxxxxxx Barenbaum, Sara.
- xxxxxxx Barsan, Vasile.
- xxxxxxx Bejlis, Chaim Juda.
- xxxxxxx Berger, William.
- xxxxxxx Billys, Bachelie Rottenberg.
- xxxxxxx Bomze, Nuchim.
- xxxxxxx Brull, Wolf.
- xxxxxxx Bryzman, Sara.
- xxxxxxx Buranosky, Zora Krizan.
- xxxxxxx Chang, James.
- xxxxxxx Chang, Roland Wan-Chan.
- xxxxxxx Chean, Lui Cheng.
- xxxxxxx Chen, Casey or Kung Chin Chen.
- xxxxxxx Chen, Ching-Chi.
- xxxxxxx Chen, Thelma.
- xxxxxxx Cheng, Theodore.
- xxxxxxx Chiang, Hung-Chi, or Kiang (now Wallace Hung Chi).
- xxxxxxx Chiang Chu-Fang (now Sally), or Kiang.
- xxxxxxx Kiang, Welthy Hsien-Ya, or Kiang.
- xxxxxxx Chih, Tao Chung (nee Wel).
- xxxxxxx Cho, Ling-Chin, or Sister Margaret Cho.
- xxxxxxx Kiang, Tsui-Yun, or Sister Helen Kiang.
- xxxxxxx Chu, Sheng To.
- xxxxxxx Chun, Wong.
- xxxxxxx Chung, Ling Jal-Pao.
- xxxxxxx Chung, Pin Liang Mah.
- xxxxxxx Chung, Jung Yu Chien.
- xxxxxxx Chung, Mamie Yu-Yen.
- xxxxxxx Chung, Josephine Yu-Hstu.
- xxxxxxx Chung, Charlotte Yu Jem.
- xxxxxxx Cohen, Sally Moshl.
- xxxxxxx Czukur, Jolan (Yolanda) (nee Spitzer).
- xxxxxxx Czukur, Sandor (Alexander).
- xxxxxxx Dage, William.
- xxxxxxx Danczger, Hugo.
- xxxxxxx Danczger, Reisel.
- xxxxxxx Dresdner, Lew.
- xxxxxxx Ellenbogen, Zoltan.
- xxxxxxx Fabian, Helena.
- xxxxxxx Fisch, Erwin.
- xxxxxxx Fisch, Marianna.
- xxxxxxx Fischer, Daniel George.
- xxxxxxx Fizman, Josef or Fiszman.
- xxxxxxx Frankl, Samuel.
- xxxxxxx Friedman, Paula Peral (nee Paula Pearl Rosenberg).
- xxxxxxx Friedman, Sandor.
- xxxxxxx Friedman, Hajnal.
- xxxxxxx Friedman, Imre.
- xxxxxxx Friedman, Judith.
- xxxxxxx Ganz, Josef.
- xxxxxxx Ganz, Regina.
- xxxxxxx Hajdowski, Jan.
- xxxxxxx Halpert, Deanis or Denis.
- xxxxxxx Harb, Mufid Wasif or Mofeed Wasif Harb.
- xxxxxxx Hartman, Sandor.
- xxxxxxx Heidrich, Arnost.
- xxxxxxx Heidrich, Anna.
- xxxxxxx Heidrich, Arnost (minor).

- xxxxxxx Herskovits, Sonyl or Sam Herskovits.
- xxxxxxx Hoffman, Aranka.
- xxxxxxx Hrebik, Antonin.
- xxxxxxx Hrebik, Anna.
- xxxxxxx Hsieh, Han Chun.
- xxxxxxx Huang, Mary Feng-Ling.
- xxxxxxx Hwang, Edith Shu-Ai.
- xxxxxxx Hwang, Joseph Cen or Tzu Shang Hwang.
- xxxxxxx Illes, Joseph.
- xxxxxxx Jen, Houg Pao.
- xxxxxxx Jubran, George Abdallah, or George Abdallah Jubran Sarsour.
- xxxxxxx Juzint, Meyer, or Majer Yuzint.
- xxxxxxx Kalish, Ruth (nee Ruchla Perkal).
- xxxxxxx Kantoras, Leiba.
- xxxxxxx Kantoras, Mirjam (nee David-off).
- xxxxxxx Katz, Zoltan.
- xxxxxxx Kejdrowski, Jozef.
- xxxxxxx King, James Tai-Tsun, or King Tai-Tsun.
- xxxxxxx King, Shin-Chien, or Sidney C. King.
- xxxxxxx Klein, Pinkas, or Paul Klein.
- xxxxxxx Klemperer, Eva Zuzana (nee Keleti).
- xxxxxxx Kovats, Gyorgy Nagyajtai, or George F. Tay.
- xxxxxxx Laarents, Toomas.
- xxxxxxx Lee, Anna, or Ping-Li Lee.
- xxxxxxx Lee, Chin Yang.
- xxxxxxx Lepikson, Alexander.
- xxxxxxx Li, Hsiu Chen, or Betty Li.
- xxxxxxx Li, Yi-Sheng.
- xxxxxxx Lin, Chan.
- xxxxxxx Lin, Hui Ching Yen.
- xxxxxxx Liu, Ruby.
- xxxxxxx Liu, Sien Wei, or Liu Sien Wei.
- xxxxxxx Loh, Pei-Fang.
- xxxxxxx Lul, Ming Hang, or Ming Hang Lin.
- xxxxxxx Mach, Emil.
- xxxxxxx Melsels, Bernat.
- xxxxxxx Miciak, Bronislaw or Branislaw or Branislow or Bronslaw or Miciak Bronislaw.
- xxxxxxx Mincer, Jacob.
- xxxxxxx Mincer, Peisach, or Paul Mincer.
- xxxxxxx Moskovitz, Joseph.
- xxxxxxx Moy, Howard R., or Koon Toa Moy or Roger Hoo Moy.
- xxxxxxx Nudelman, Mark or Moishe.
- xxxxxxx Pauker, Guy Jean.
- xxxxxxx Pauker, Mirona (nee Cochinescu).
- xxxxxxx Peng, Benjamin Kun.
- xxxxxxx Perutz, Gertrude Dagmar Zdenka.
- xxxxxxx Petri, Francis or Francis Arnold Alajos Pukl.
- xxxxxxx Piasek, Aranka (nee Gedal-jovits).
- xxxxxxx Pili, Maria (nee Kulikowska).
- xxxxxxx Ponomareff, Serge Alexandre.
- xxxxxxx Potashnik, Raci Tessler.
- xxxxxxx Prochazka, Adolf.
- xxxxxxx Prochazka, Helena.
- xxxxxxx Pyka, Zygmunt Maria.
- xxxxxxx Rachman, Mayer.
- xxxxxxx Rachman, Anna.
- xxxxxxx Rubint, Ferenc.
- xxxxxxx Rubint, Gabriella Vajdik.
- xxxxxxx Ruksc, Henry or Henryk Ruksz.
- xxxxxxx Safer, Josef.
- xxxxxxx Samra, Halim Abdul Nabi Jacob or Halim A. Jacob.
- xxxxxxx Seidler, Klara Von Csorba.
- xxxxxxx Seidler, Stefan Sandor or Stefan Seidler Sanders.
- xxxxxxx Seiss, Aron.
- xxxxxxx Shaya, Ezra Sasson.
- xxxxxxx Singer, Gustawa, or Janet Singer.
- xxxxxxx Sinivee, Arthur.
- xxxxxxx Sofer, Ibrahim Gurji Saiman, or George Abraham Sofer.
- xxxxxxx Steen, Lubove Kotova.

Elgin, Ludmila.
Steinberg, Kalman.
Stoyanoff, Dimitr Pavloff.
Stoyanoff, Kiril Pavloff.
Su, Louise Yao-Hwa or Louise

Tang.

Suttora, Matteo Natale Stefano.
Tcheng, En Lien.
Torgovitsky, Issai.
Torgovitsky, Polina.
Torgovitsky, Rita.
Torgovitsky, Gary.
Tsao, Tsen Cha.
Tsao, Winifred.
Tseu, Heng Sing.
Tseu, Charlotte H. Liu.
Wang, Li (George).
Weinstein, Ernest.
Weinstein, Eva.
Weng, Hsing Ching.
Woszczak, Jozef Apoloniusz.
Wu, Shin Ye.
Yang, William Wen-Min.
Yu, Juliana Shan-Chuang.
Zawada, Maksymilian.
Zeller, Solomon.
Fou, Mary Tsai Dien, or Sister

Mary Fou.

Metsalo, Valentin.
Bluth, Lenke Einhorn.
Feldbrand, Mancl.
Melsels, Naftali.
Kaftanski, Seymour alias Szep-
sel Kaftanski.

Schwartz, Hillel Aron.
Sztachman, Aleksander.
Weiss, Josef.
Joles, Joel Leib.
Neufeld, Josef.
Tai, Gertrude Loe or Hsiao Tso

Loe.

Litynski, Zygmunt Leopold or
Zygmunt Litynski.
Iliescu, Dumitru.
Lin, Chi-Sun.
Lee, Sen Lin.
Szafir, Jerzy Adam.
Kao, Chung Chin.
Niedzwiecki, Millian Zdzislaw.

or James Z. Millian.

Kocvara, Stephen.
Kocvara, Margaret.
Sutt, Mihkel.
Rytkrova-Souckova, Milada, alias
Milada Souckova.

Ho, Betty Lorenza Yu-Lin.
Tsai, Gerald, Jr.
Tsai, Loretta Yung.
Fong, Swi-Chyi alias Lloyd Swi-

Chyi Fong.

Berger, Saje.
Cholewicka, Krystyna Janina.
Juszczak, Stefan.
Knoll, Solomon.
Krack, Jarmila.
Lee, Henry Tuh-Shing.
Mestrovic, Petar.
Pales, Vitall, alias Victor Pales.
Rosenberg, Johan Drumer.
Rosenberg, Israel Drumer.
Simpser, Rose Rubenstein.
Woo, Esther Sun.
Yiun, Chian Hshih or Mrs. Aileen

Pel.

Paneth, Eva Yecheved (nee
Grunzweig).
Cajtung, Seweryn.
Cajtung, Masza.
Cajtung, Ryszard.
Szabo, Gustav Oliver.
Wei, Tsun Dah also known as

Stacy Way.

Hu, Yun Wen also known as
Eleanor Hu Way.
Horvath, Tibor.
Horvath, Agnes (nee Bocskor).
Akos, Lester also known as
Laszlo Reiner.

Akos, Lilla (nee Lilla Grosz-
man).
Akos, Thomas also known as
Tamas Akos.

Reiner, Francisca (nee Fran-
ciska Strasser).

The concurrent resolution was agreed
to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the
table.

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DE-
PORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent for the immediate
consideration of the concurrent resolu-
tion (S. Con. Res. 33) favoring the sus-
pension of deportation of certain aliens.

The Clerk read the title of the con-
current resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to
the request of the gentleman from Penn-
sylvania?

There was no objection.
The Clerk read the concurrent resolu-
tion, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Rep-
resentatives concurring), That the Congress
favors the suspension of deportation in the
case of each alien hereinafter named, in
which case the Attorney General has sus-
pended deportation for more than 6 months:*

Adame-Valenzuela, Jose.
Agoropulos, Demetrios or James.
Alexandra, Nicholas Michael De.
Altadonna, Maria (nee Galati).
Altamura, Francesco or Frank.
Ammirato, Teresa Vincenza.
Anderson, Hjoje, or George

Anderson.

Antonio, Bernardino.
Antonio, Felix San.
Apollonio, Lucinano Antonio.
Amrendariz, Esteban, or Este-
ban Armendariz-Burciaga.
Arredondo, Atilano.
Arrendondo, Antonia Cardiel

De.

Ary, Amin Neto.
Athineos, Nicholas, or Nicholas
Athlneos or Nicolas Athineos or Nicolaos
Athinaios.

Baer, Hilda Syralia, formerly
Hilda Syralia Carlson or Ellen Carlson (nee
Hilda Syralia Wahlstrom).

Ballon, Carmelo Ricardo.
Barba-Garcia, Domingo.
Barreras, Maria Ramirez de, or
Maria Ramirez-Garcia.

Bartelamia, Francesco.
Batchelor, Lillian Violet (nee
Wallis).

Battaglia, Frank or Francesco.
Beadle-Esparza, Henry.
Bicecci, Primo.
Biebornell, Barbara Anna.
Blackman, Clothilda Eudora or
Brewster or Clothilda Blackman.

Boiko, Fred.
Bonilla, Ana Elena Rangel-
Vargas (nee Ana Elena Rangel-Vargas).
Boulos, Hamid Michel alias
Michel Boulios Macary or Hamid Antoon
Boulos.

Borjas-Chaire, David.
Brettler, Isaac.
Brown, Lester Earl.
Burriesci, Lucia.

Calen, Reynold Sandfried, alias
Reynold Sandfried Kalen or Reynold Sand-
fried Peterson.
Calomeris, Muriel Hewitt (nee
Smith).

Campbell, Clarence E. B.
Candelas-Valadez, Jose Rosalio.
Carbone, Mario Vincenzo.
Cardenas, Elvia Rose or Elvia
Rose Cardenas Tweedy.

Cardenas-Soria, Andres.
Casale, Umberto Di or Umberto
De Casale or Albert Casale.

Casare, Antonio alias Di Cesare.
Castillo, Edward or Edwardo
Castillo or Eduardo Alvarado or Edward Cas-
tillo Alvarado or Enrique Alvarado-Munoz.
Ceniceros, Guadalupe Vasquez
or Antonia Resendez Mendoza or Antonia
Resendez.

Ceniceros, Andres Reyes.
Cerundolo, Giovanni Nicola.
Chang, Mao Sheng.
Chao, Che Shen, alias Paul C.

S. Chao.

Char, Wong Tick, alias Thomas
C. Wong.

Chao, Ming-Chang.
Chao, Li Chiah Huang.
Che, Jung Kwong, alias Jung

Daw.

Cheng, Alfonso Chao-Fong.
Cheng, Wen-Yu.
Cheng, Helen Kuomel Huang

De.

Cheng, Chung.
Cheng, Yu Bei Wang.
Cheo, John Keaghlilang or John
Kongliang Cheo or Kong Liang Djou.
Chepanos, Stevan John, alias
John Stevan.

Chew, Ben Foo or Chew Toon
Fou.

Cheon, Chan, alias Chan Chong
or Chin Cheong or Chan Cheong.

Chick, Mak.
Chien, Fung Soong Yuen (nee
Soon Yuen Chien).

Chin, Yen Sheng.
Chin, Yuying Elaine.
Chong, Hee Kee, alias Hee Fook.
Chong, Lazaro Manuel or
Lazaro Manuel Chong y Rodriguez alias
Manny Chong.

Chong, Tom Sing alias Lam
Kam or Lum Kum.

Chow, Eng Yee alias Eng Koon
alias Henry Chow.

Chu, Yo Lu.
Chu, Yi Chiang nee Cheng.
Chung, Chi Lu.
Chung, Po or Chung Bia.
Cohen, Dora or Dora Alvo or

Dora Perez.

Contento, Orfeo Luigi.
Cook, David Hutchison.
Corsi, Natale Gino.
Corral-Castro, Juan.
Corral-Castro, Francisca.
Corral-Castro, Maria Luisa.
Corral, Luis, or Luis Corral-

Guerra.

Csak, Eva Maria.
Cymbberg, Bala (nee Kwalwas-
ser), alias Bala Waldmann.
Cymbberg, Chemia alias Heniek

Waldmann.

Dagnino, Giobatti.
Deblauwe, Ernest.
De Franco, Maria Cervantes
alias Leonor Cervantes De Franco.
Dentrinos, Ioannis or John.
De Paulis, Giovanni alias John

De Paulis.

De Villalon, Micaela Castaneda.
Di Giacomo, Nicolo.
Dolesal, Rudolf.
Douglas, Kenneth Eric, alias
Douglas Jones.

Dousmanis, Constantinos, or
Konstantinos Dousmanis or Gus Dousmanis
or Costas Dousmanis.

Dowdall, Margherita, alias
Margherita Michetti Dowdall.

Duarte, Isabel Maria DeCastro.
Dupre, Percival Edwin or Percy
Dupre or Edwin Louis Gonzaque Percival
Dupre.

Eng, Fook Shew.
Eng, Lon Kong or Eng Lon
Kong or Charlie Lon.

Eng, Sam alias Joe Kee.
Fafalios, George Marcus.

Figuerredo, Alicia Roque nee
Francisco Alicia Roque y Garau.

- Fischer, Wilhelm.
 Foca, Fioravanti.
 Fontes, Jose Da Encarnacao Coutinho.
 Foster, Hubert Peter.
 Fox, Edra Young.
 Francis, Benjamin Alonzo.
 Freeman, Louis.
 Fren, Rosa or Rose (nee Gorra).
 Freniere, Marie Cecile Denisa.
 Fritz, Charles Richard.
 Ganzag, Mary Etta.
 Garcia, Maria Mercedes Martinez (nee Martinez y Perez de Arrilceia or Maria Mercedes or Maria Mercedes Martinez).
 Garcia-Correa, Daniel.
 Garifalos, James Athanasios, alias Demetrios Athanasios Garifalos.
 Gee, Ahmed.
 German, John.
 Gilbert, Bella.
 Glazel, Nelly, alias Nelly Katz Falk.
 Godson, Maria (nee Carter).
 Gomez, Gladys Liduvina.
 Gonzalez de Saldana, Estanislada.
 Goodwin, Isabell, or Isabelle Goodman.
 Goodwin, Wilson or Wilson Goodman.
 Gosco, Francisco Bradley, Jr. Gott, Euyen.
 Groves, Kenneth Samuels.
 Gracia, Carmen or Carmen Gracia-Tesan.
 Guerin, Guerrino Mario.
 Guillotin, Martha, nee Munro.
 Gutierrez-Machado, Celso.
 Guze, Sara alias Susan Guze.
 Hall, Randall Saumel alias Randall Blackwood or Ronnie S. Hall.
 Hall, William John or Frank William Hall alias John Hibbert.
 Hansen, Adele Catherine.
 Harrison, Charles Aston alias Aston Eric Wilmott.
 Hasslacher, Brosl or Ambrose (Ameros) Hasslacher.
 Haszprunar, Ingrid Angela.
 Heinrich, Martin.
 Heinrich, Sally.
 Heinrich, Edeman Howard.
 Hem, Wang Gum or Gum Hem Wang.
 Henriksen, Hans.
 Ho, Ngok or Se Kam Tjoeng.
 Holoszye, Leon alias Hippollt Molla.
 Hong, Richard Y (Yu-Sick), or Richard Hong or Ko In Shoko or Yung Sick Hong.
 Hong, Soon Kamp Lee or Rosalind Lee Hong.
 Huber, Reinhard.
 Huber, Helmur Othmar.
 Hynes, Hanyo, alias Harry Hynes.
 Iaquillino, Nicholas or Nicola.
 Ichioka, Kunio.
 Ichioka, Sei.
 Inamoto, Noboru.
 Jensen, Knud Borge Johannes or Carl Jensen.
 Jew, Bue or Chai Piu.
 Johnson, Lawrence Cardwell, or James Lawrence Johnson.
 Jones, Robert Stuart Hamilton.
 Jordan, Leon George A.
 Jordan, Margaretha Emelle.
 Kalmakliotes, Costas, alias Costas Pavlides.
 Kan, Foo, alias Chan Shuck Gun.
 Kao, Tin-Tsong.
 Kao, Siu Lin (nee Siu Lin).
 Katsingris, Antonios Panagiotis.
 Kennedy, William Thomas.
 Klein, Lillian.
 Koberg, Louise Sophie Marie Schmidt De
 Kobert, Wilhelm Heinrich or William Henry Koberg.
 Koepnick, Bert August or Bert Gust Gwinn.
 Kofefsky, John George.
 Kongsgaard, Sverre.
 Kongsgaard, Dagrun.
 Kontos, Michael, or Makis Kontos.
 Koppl, Klaus.
 Kopelowitz, Aaron, alias Aaron David Kopelowitz.
 Krawczyk, Ryszard, Metody.
 Kuchta, Stanislaw.
 Kuon, Tom Wing or Hon Wing Guen.
 Kyriacou, Anna (nee Philip-pou).
 Laconsay, Maxima Castillo or Maxima Valentin Castillo.
 Ladeira, Joaquin Gomes.
 Lang, Dong Yep.
 Langer, Herman Ernst Heinrich.
 Lawler, Bertha Carrillo or Berta Jimenez or Berta Carrillo Jimenez.
 Lee, Hee or Hay Lee.
 Lee, Nam Bow alias Lee Mum Bo alias Mam Bo Lee alias Moy Yu.
 Lee, Richard Tuh Yu.
 Lee, Julie Tse Chung (nee Julie Tse Fung Chang).
 Lee, Sing Ah, or Sing A. Lee.
 Lee, Yeu Shing, alias James Lee.
 Leija-Luna, Andres.
 Leija, Teresa Tobias De.
 Leontis, John K., alias Ioannis Kyriakou Leontis.
 Lepre, Rudolph.
 Leung, Sai Goon, alias Yeong Yin.
 Lefasseur, Joseph Hector.
 Limatola, Michele.
 Lin, Andrew Damon or Andrew (Ta-Wen) Lin.
 Linderman, Alice H., or Alice Hosana Linderman.
 Lindo, Carlton Sheridan Raphael.
 Ling, George Hule.
 Lio, Mao Lin or Lio Mao Lin.
 Lombardino, Rosalia (nee Fer-mo).
 Lopez, Francisco Soria.
 Cisneros, Emma Soria.
 Cisneros, Consuelo Soria.
 Lopez-Jauregul, Cayetano.
 Lotito, Joseph.
 Louvis, Panagiotis Efstathiou.
 Luen, Liu Chiu alias Li Chiu Luen Chao alias Patricia Chao.
 Mandaat, Jose Ricardo nee Garcia y Roca or Richard Mandatt.
 Marian, Ruth.
 Markham, George Clifford or George C. Malcolm.
 Martinez-De Lira, Felipe.
 Matamoras, Agustin Lopez.
 Matsuno, Tamaki.
 Matsuno, Mitoshi.
 Mastrovincenzo, Francesco.
 Mayon, Tom alias Cemen Marinsky or Samuel May.
 McKen, Keith Neville.
 McKenzie, Basil Levy.
 McHugh, Bethesda Villacorta (nee Bethesda Sequerra Villacorta).
 Mendonis, Andreas or Andrew.
 Merriles, Nancy Hain (nee Seva).
 Miguelucci, Alfredo.
 Millin, Jack.
 Minarovich, Anton, or Anton Minarovic.
 Mitchell, Herbert Louis.
 Miura, Kansiti.
 M'Latamou, Day.
 M'Latamou, Thelma Helen Monica (nee Thompson).
 Mobjohn, William Edmond.
 Mohsenin, Nezam.
 Monaco, Damiano.
 Moore, Dolores Marie Simonne (nee Dubois).
 Mpras, Stefanos.
 Munilla, Jose Antonio, or Jose Antonio Munilla y Razoqui.
 Murillo-Nava, Porfirio.
 Nakawatase, Hideyoshi, or Fred Nakawatase.
 Nansheng, Yee, alias Yen Nansheng.
 Napier, Evelyn Russell.
 Naranjo de Rodriguez, Mercedes.
 Nardone, Ernesto.
 Natal-Hernandez, Jesus.
 Navarro-Arevalo, Juan, or Juan Arevalo-Navarro.
 Nees, Polly, or Polly Nitskansckaea or Nitshansckaea, or Mrs. Barney Sayet.
 Ng, Kim Chow, alias John Moy, or Jung Moy Oi.
 Ng, Woon Nan, alias Stanley Wu.
 Nicolaou, Mihael Hristov.
 Niserakes, Panagiotis Peter, or Paraviotes Peter Niserakes.
 Noriega, Loreto.
 Novak, Betty.
 Obregon-Villanueva, Juan.
 Obregon, Maria Josefa De.
 Ohlsen, Carl Siegfried, or Karl Ohlsen.
 O'Rourke, Samuel Lester.
 Orozco-Ramirez, Rafael.
 Ortega-Madriral, Amador.
 Mejia de Ortega, Paula.
 Ortega-Mejia, Florentina.
 Ortega-Mejia, Zeferino.
 Ortega-Mejia, Delfino.
 Ortega-Mejia, Espedito.
 Osoria-Chavez, Roberto or Roberto Osoria.
 Osman, Ismail Bin or Smalle Osman.
 Ottaviano, Vincenzo Francesco or Francis.
 Palmer, Audrey George alias Ralph Aiken.
 Palomo, Purifico Ymzon.
 Pantelaras, Isidoros.
 Pearce, Enrique Raymundo or Henry Ray Pearce.
 Pelle, Ertedore.
 Peloponissios, John, alias John Pelos.
 Petrini, Erminio.
 Pignato, Vincenza, or Vincenza Bonifazio (nee Cingari).
 Pizzolato, Edonide alias Edonite Pizzalato, alias Giovanni Lamberti alias Pizzolato Edonide.
 Pomaro, Emmanuela Zarcone or Nelly Pomaro or Nelly Zarcone Pomaro.
 Pop, Eugen V. or Eugene Valeri Pope.
 Poulos, Anastasios George.
 Progin, Vera (nee Marichich).
 Puccinelli, Aldo.
 Quelch, Cecil O.
 Quintana-Serna, Alvaro or Alvaro Quintana or Alvaro Quintana-Cerda or Alvaro Quintana-Gamez.
 Quiroga-Escamilla, Ruben or Ruben Quiroga.
 Riddle, Dominga Faustino.
 Rocha-Almanza, Jose Guadalupe.
 Rodriguez, Orlando Hoed.
 Rojas, Francisco Ramon Taveras Y or Francisco Ramon Taveras.
 Rognich, Gajo or Guy Rognich alias Stevan Rognich or Stevan Rognich or "Steve."
 Romney, Eileen.
 Rosenstein, David Leopold.
 Rospel, Michel.
 Rosseland, Sverre.
 Roy, Joseph Louis Noe.
 Roy, Yolande Viola Hermine Stella.

- Rusich, Enrico alias Henry Rusich.
 Sackenreuther, Annemarie.
 Sackenreuther, Marie Luise.
 Saguisin, Jose formerly Jose Cano Perez.
 Salo, Paul or Paul Hirvisalo.
 Samilpa-Galderon, Abraham or Abraham C. Samilpa.
 Samuels, Eric Edward.
 Sanchez, Gloria Telles de, alias Neomi Lopez.
 Schaeffer, Joan Isabelle (nee Campbell).
 Schintu, Giuseppe.
 Schnell, Otto Albert, alias Peter Gynt.
 Sciabassi, Giovanni Bautist, or John Sciabassi, or Joe Volpati.
 Segura, Raul Soto.
 Seltzer, Gertrudes De Castro.
 Shand, Hubert Benjamin.
 Shanner, Arthy, alias Ernest Shanner.
 Sheard, Frederick.
 Sheem, Cheong or Sin, alias George Cheong Sheem.
 Shou-Chin, Wang, or Shou-Chin Wong.
 Shun, Lo.
 Silber, Julius.
 Silva, Ursula Czaika.
 Simor, Ferenc, alias Francesco Simor or Francis Simor.
 Sinclair, Vincent Leslie, alias Byron Summerville.
 Smith, Gilbert, or James Smith.
 Soto, Castor Gonzalez.
 Spitz, Sldonia.
 Stoddard, Nicole Marguerite (nee Dumas).
 Stahl, Ragnar Leonard.
 Stanescu, George Vasili, or Gheorge Stanescu.
 Stanisk, Nikola.
 Steeves, James Herman.
 Stein, Ruth, alias Ruchel Mintzer (nee Marcus).
 Sun, Lee King, alias Lee King San or Lee King Sam.
 Svon, Sung, alias Svon Pan Dang or Pan Dang Svon.
 Teixeira, Manuel Jesus, or Manuel De Jesus Teixeira.
 Thomas, Joseph Anthony Paul, alias Joseph Bugeja.
 Tiberi, Oliviero.
 Torrez-Lopez, Jose or Jose Torres.
 Tsalas, Vasilios.
 Tsao, Eugene You-Chen.
 Tsao, Lian Shu.
 Tsukano, Yoshi (nee Yosi Suzuki).
 Ullah, Rham, alias Raymon Allie or Rahim Ullah.
 Uzep, William Michael or Vasilios Mikel Uzep or William Uzep or Vasil Michail Uzepchuk.
 Valdes, Rene Elio Sosa Y alias Rene E. Sosa.
 Valdivia-Contreras, Marcos or Marcos Valdivia or Jose Marcos Valdivia.
 Vasquez, Angelina or Angelina Ibanez y Valle.
 Vasquez-Gonzales, Luis or Luis Vasquez or Luis G. Vasquez.
 Vavala, Maria Antonia (nee Bruni).
 Vega, Sara Santos De alias Sara Santos De La Torre or Sara Santos or Sara Vega.
 Vidotto, Francesco or Frank.
 Walker, Eileen Mary formerly Palese (nee Tierney).
 Walker, Frederick Sylvester.
 Weiss, Aron.
 Wenas, Hendrik Frederik.
 Westerhausen, Egon.
 Wilkins, Fernando Dudley.
 Williams, Dalsy Tsung-Fuh Shen.
 Wing, Chan or Chin Wing.
 Wong, Check Kwong.
 Wong, King Fong.
 Wong, Kwai Mon alias Mon Wong.
 Wong, Mary nee Mary Yu.
 Wood, George Cyril.
 Wopinsky, Chaim.
 Wong, Sophia Chang.
 Yamaguchi, Ritel.
 Yanes, Virginia nee Ruamero.
 Ybarra-Torrez, Francisco.
 Ybarra, Fidela Beserra de.
 Yerouchalmi, Hadji Hay alias Hay Yerouchaomi alias Yerusalmi.
 Yook, Lew alias Song Chong or Fong Chong.
 Yuen, Char, alias Charles Yuen or Yuen Char or Chas Yuen.
 Zabadija, Dragutin, alias Charles Antonio Zabadija.
 Zarnas, George, alias George Tsarnas.
 Acevedo-Cadena, Elisa.
 Adachi, Selko.
 Adame-Armendariz, Rodolfo.
 Alcaraz-Suarez, Benito.
 Ali Eshad or Eshed Ali.
 Alvarado, Jose Trinidad.
 Alvarado, Petronilo.
 Alvarado, Maria.
 Alvarado, Magdaleno.
 Amaran, Adolf.
 Amato, Guiseppe.
 Angel-Moreno, Jesus.
 Antepara, Carlos Eduardo.
 Arana-Cortez, Vicente.
 Arnold, Brigitte.
 Arpadjian, Garabed, or Charles Howard.
 Arrindell, Albertha Yvonne Maria.
 Arrojado, Americo or Raul De Matos Correia.
 Atalla, Mohamad Mousa.
 Azua, Uvaldo Aguilar.
 Bacoka, Ante or Anton.
 Baptiste, Ronald Phillip.
 Batista, Jose Pereira.
 Beekman, Josephus Antonius Maria.
 Beekman, Olga.
 Bella, Victoria Lopez.
 Berardi, Giuseppe.
 Bernstein, Alberto Selig.
 Bero, Joseph or Joe or Josef.
 Best, Edward Parry or Edward Brathwaite.
 Bijlaard, Tine.
 Bio, Matheos Bin.
 Block, Robert Christian.
 Blumenthal, Anneliese, or Anneliese Gaertner Blumenthal.
 Blythe, Herbert Edwin, or Roy Williams De Valliere.
 Boczko, Murray or Moszko Boczko.
 Bodiya, Naser Georges.
 Bohonowsky, Anton or Anthony or Bohanowsky or Anton or Anthony.
 Boom, Abraham.
 Borghese, Adele Ritoll.
 Bosnos, George Constantino.
 Bosnos, Catalia Cano de.
 Bowen, Herbert Alfired.
 Bradshaw, George Robert.
 Brandl, Elisabeth.
 Braun, Erwin or Erwin Kwiram.
 Broderick, Reynold Alexander or Leslie Broderick or George Graham.
 Brown, Jexblake Wilston.
 Bruers, Victor Martin.
 Buse, Emil Carl, or Rudolf Brandt.
 Bustamante, Jose Guadalupe.
 Calabrese, Joseph Rosolino or Giuseppe Calabrese.
 Callsten, Olga Kaarina.
 Callsten, Sulo Richard.
 Calvera, Carlos Raul.
 Calves, Martinez Antonio.
 Calvo, Alberto Alfonso or Luis Charbonier or Antonio Alfonso.
 Calvo-Camacho, Francisco.
 Campbell, Amos.
 Campos-Rodriguez, Manuel.
 Carrasco-Carillo, Tomas or Tomas Carrasco or Thomas Carasco.
 Carvounis, Ioannis or John Carvounis or John Karvounis.
 Cassas, Fanny (nee Fanny Rocheminor) or Fannie or Fanny Cassas; Casson; Cassus; Kassas.
 Castano, Pedro, or Pedro Manuel Andres Castano Vasquez.
 Cavaliero, Isacco or Isaac Davide or John David Cavalieros.
 Cenatiempo, Raffaele.
 Cereceres, Francisco.
 Cereceres, Ismael.
 Cereceres, Florentino.
 Cereceres, Rosa.
 Cerniglia, Hattie (nee Porlles).
 Cesare, Pasquale Scotto Di or Pasquale Scotto.
 Challenor, Ivan A. or Ivan Lincoln Herlis or Arthur Clarke.
 Chang, Juliet Marie.
 Chang, David.
 Chin, Tai On or Wan Dai or Chin Hing.
 Chong, Jew or Lee You Chong.
 Christie, James Murray or Murray James Christie.
 Chu, Louise Jen-Cheng Wong or Louise Jen-Cheng Wong.
 Chu, Daniel Ta-Kung, or Ta-Kung Chu.
 Chueng, Shui Ming.
 Chun, Leong or Hong Chun Leong.
 Chung, Ng Yee or Jimmy Lee or Eng Yee Chung or Lim Way.
 Clarke, Roy Hubert Wycliffe.
 Cobos, Mary nee Rodriguez or Maria Arza Rodriguez.
 Cojulun, Gregorio Pac or Gregory Cojulun.
 Cona, Carmelo.
 Correya, Thereza Clemente y.
 Cosenza, Mario or Morris Cosenza.
 Cuenin, Frieda Bertha.
 Damonte, Nicholas or Nicola M. Deangellis, Giuseppe or Joseph Deangellis.
 Dellise, Olimpio August.
 Denis, Anna Marie.
 Deutsch, Herman.
 Dickerson, Violet Agatha.
 Domingo, Vincent George.
 Donizetti, Ermenegilda.
 Dorochenko, Victor George, or Victor D. Harper.
 Dovidio, Damiano or Dan Dovidio.
 Duncan, Walter Samuel or Walter Brown or Joseph Newbold.
 Dunner, Lloyd Bertram.
 Duvol, Alfred Wolfgang formerly Naxer.
 Eloquin, Georges Joseph Francols.
 Escobar-Segura, Salome or Segura Segura-Escobedo or Jose Hernandez.
 Espinoza-Garza, Gregorio or Gregorio Espinosa.
 Espinoza-Orozco, Jesus.
 Esposito, Raimondo.
 Estrada, Reginald Nicholas or Reginald Lewis Ronald.
 Ete, Usoro Akapan or Usoro Akapan Ete or Rufus Akapan.
 Evancho, Mercedes nee Ruiz Ortiz or Mercedes Nunez.
 Facchini, Vincent or Vincenzo.
 Falco, Leopold G.
 Fazio, Vittorio Di.
 Fink, Anna (nee Davidesko), or Davidetzki or Anna Finkelstein.
 Fiamos, Elefterios Kyriakos.

- Flores, Eliseo Ramirez.
 Flores, Mariano.
 Fong, Lal or Lal Chung Ming.
 Franco, Maria de Jesus Perida.
 Franklin, Carol Doreen.
 Fraser, Ferdinand Edward.
 Freeman, Pedro Francisco or Pete Freeman or Piet Vriend or Pedro Francisco Vrience.
 Frieze, Henry.
 Fucilli, Michele or Michael.
 Gabrera, Vincent.
 Galimitakis, Zoe Jean (nee Statharakis).
 Galindo-Mercado, Maximo.
 Garcia, Jose Garcia.
 Garcia, Maria Oseguera de or Maria Oseguera or Muggie Rodrigues or Maria Gonzales.
 Garcia-Zapata, Vincent.
 Garcia, Rosa Rodriguez De.
 Garza-Valdovinos, Genaro.
 Garza, Victoria Medina De.
 Giannisis, Elias George.
 Gittens, Lionel Victor, or Lionel Victor Brown.
 Gold, Harold.
 Goldfeld, Yosef Lejwa.
 Gonzalez, Isabelo Lopez.
 Grazioso, Francesco or Frank Grazioso or Francesco Graziose.
 Gрыз, Jan.
 Gudgeon, Patricia or Patricia Josephine Smiley.
 Guerra-Negrete, Maximiano.
 Halvorsen, Otto.
 Hanos, Lorentzo or Louis Hanos.
 Harker, Aramis Alencon or John Constantine Harvey.
 Harrison, Priscilla (nee Garnet).
 Harvey, John Richard.
 Hernandez, Manuela Lopez de.
 Hernandez-Lopez, Tomas Jose.
 Heyka, Antoni.
 Hing, Hoo or Hing Hoo.
 Hoff, Johanna (nee Steigler).
 Hogikyan, Dr. Azat.
 Hollander, Vilma Kahan (nee Vilma Kahan).
 Holligan, George Everton.
 Hsu, Man Goon or Man Kwong Hsu or Hsu Man Kwong.
 Hunte, Clement Dacosta or Jones.
 Ih, Yung Hsiang.
 Inone, Helene.
 Inoue, Kakutarō.
 Jallorina, Maria Laura Monge de.
 James, Margaret Henrietta or Margaret James or Mrs. Octov Jensen or Margaret Henrietta Bailey.
 Jamrow, Hildegarde Paula (nee Hildegarde Paula Willman).
 Joe, Chin, or Joe Chin.
 Josaphat, Max.
 Juriaco, Antonio.
 Kalafatidis, Savas or Savas Kalifitidis or Kalafidis.
 Khouri, Youssif Maroun El.
 Kuzele, Tomo.
 Katsafados, Elias (Louis).
 Keppler, Simon or Koppler.
 Keppler, Vera (nee Erny).
 Kontovaakis, Nicholas or Nick Kontos.
 Kamakarīs, Petros Emanuel.
 Kormadis, Ioannis or John Calos.
 Kovar, Emilia or Emily (nee Skultety).
 Kramer, Klara or Ida Kamenegorsky.
 Kon, Ng or Ing Kon.
 Khachadurian, Kevorak.
 Khachadurian, Alis.
 Kalavrezos, Elias Antoniou, or Louis Anthony Callas.
 Kish, Joseph or Kesh.
- Kwan, Hin or Lee Chong Sing.
 Kunisch, Albert Adalbert.
 Kwan, Cheung.
 Lacenere, Donato.
 Lam, Mon King or Mon King Lum.
 Larsen, Fred.
 Lau, Ah Chun or Lok Shl.
 Lebovits, Rita (nee Rita Caspell), or Rita Lebois.
 Lee, Kenneth Leo or Kock Lieng Lee.
 Leer, Hans Jorg.
 Leino, Karl Aran.
 Leon, Raymon.
 Leone, Philip or Filippo.
 Leung, Solomon Wency or Hum Ho Leung.
 Leung, Ann Hsi or Yu Tsung Hsi.
 Levy, Solomon, or Levi or Bohar Eskinazi or Samuel Beher.
 Levy, Alice or Levi or Maria Lozano.
 Lewis, Wentworth H.
 Li, Te Chuan.
 Lindberg, Lasse Valdemar.
 Ling, Chang Chung.
 Lis, Josif.
 Lisciani, Massimo.
 Livingston, Constantine Premara.
 Lopez, Isabelmaria Lorenzo Rosales de or Isabel Maria Lopez.
 Lopez, Justo.
 Lopez, Luis Alberto.
 Lopez, Teodora Rojo De or Teodora Rojo-Lopez or Teodora Lopez Rojo.
 Lorenzo, Juan or Juan Gualberto Lorenzo-Marti.
 Lua-Garcia, Memesio, or Arturo Lua.
 Macaluso, Calogero.
 Mackie, Otto Jalmar or Otto Maki or Otto Jalmar Lehtimaki or Markie.
 Malo, Frank De or Francesco Saverio De Malo.
 Manetti, Angelo.
 Mangassarian, Babgen.
 Mangassarian, Katharine.
 Markub, Sigrid Carmen or Sigrid Carmen Salong.
 Marron-Escamilla, Ramon.
 Marron, Ana Maria Perez de.
 Marthinson, Sten Olai or Sten Olie Marthinson or Sten Marthenson, or Sten Olai Marthinson or Stein Olai Marthinson.
 Matthews, Josephine or Josephine Cossin or Josephine Verstappen or Josephine Cossin Matthews.
 Maya, Alberto.
 McCree, Cerilla (or Cerilla) McDavid.
 McInerney, John.
 Medal, Daisy Auxiliadora.
 Mejia, George Lucas, or George Lucas.
 Meldon, Maurice William.
 Mezzo, Giovanni Reimondo, or John Mezzo.
 Michopoulos, John Efthimios or John E. Michopoulos.
 Miller, Micheline Claire Lotode.
 Mincin, Balduino.
 Mlotek, Abraham.
 Moncada, Julian Manrique.
 Mong, Ma.
 Montalvo, Herminia Garcia De.
 Montes, Etelvina Ruveltas de.
 Moraities, Stamatios.
 Moy, Helen or Moy Toy Goon.
 Moy, Joe Gee or Joe You or Chow You or Joe Hong.
 Mrwik, Hugo Ludwig.
 Munjee, Amanulla Dostmahamed.
 Munroe, Ekanah Adolphus or Ekanah Munroe or Manuel Rowe.
 Nassar, Muharib Said.
 Navarro, Raul Uribe, or Marcelino Caudillo.
- Neverow, Vassili Arsenievich.
 Ng, Suey Sing or Ng Suey Sing or Chy Yem.
 Nunez, Hugo.
 Akuda, Tsutomu Tom.
 Olivas, Maria Luisa (nee Flores).
 Olsen, Louis Frederick.
 Orto, Mario Dell'.
 Otero, Constante Soto or Constante Soto.
 Pacheco, Lucina Morales de.
 Pacheco-Morales, Dimeteria.
 Pacheco-Morales, Miguel.
 Panico, Vincenzo.
 Panovich, Ante Ivan.
 Pantazaras, Nicholas or Nicolaos Pantas.
 Pappagallo, Michele or Mike Pappagallo.
 Parisi, Carmine.
 Parochoguk, Aniela or Nellie (nee Murawa).
 Pasara, Markijol.
 Passarelli, Giovanni, or John Maria Passarelli.
 Peddie, Ira or Astanley Moulton.
 Pedersen, Leif Helmich.
 Penna, Clementina.
 Penna, Vera Florence or Vera Penna.
 Perez, Francisca Perez De.
 Perez-Perez, Guadalupe.
 Perez-Perez, Micaela.
 Pipinou, Georgios or George Pipinou or Gerogio Pipino.
 Pioussas, Stamos.
 Poo, Wong Zee or Wong Yu Po.
 Poy, Yip.
 Progan, Francois.
 Puertas, Alberto.
 Pulito, Vincenzo.
 Quock, Quong.
 Rabain, Roger McNeill.
 Rafanelli, Ignazio.
 Rafanelli, Marta.
 Rafanelli, Giuseppe.
 Rafanelli, Beatrice.
 Ramirez, Maria Luisa Ramirez de or Maria Luisa Ramirez-Garcia.
 Ramirez, Shirley or Soledad Ramirez.
 Ramirez-Leal, Pedro or Pedro Ramirez or Peter Ramirez or Pete Ramirez.
 Rando, Domenico.
 Ressel, Karl Paul.
 Reynolds, Leslie Augustus or Albert Clark.
 Rezk, Akl Abi.
 Richman, Rose.
 Ridao, Francisco.
 Riley, Maria Geertruide Mulders.
 Rinde, Olaf.
 Rodriguez-Cardenas, Andres.
 Roges, Tomas Abbott.
 Romano, Vincenzo.
 Romero, Daniel Ona or Daniel Romero Ona.
 Romero, Juana Ayala or Juana Ayala-Garcia.
 Roselli, Salminia (nee Spaccatelli).
 Rosenbaum, Isidor.
 Ross, Solomon or Solomon Goldstein.
 Ross, Polly or Polly Goldstein (nee Pesca Gayman).
 Roy, Cyril De or Cyril Randolph De Roy.
 Sacco, Michael or Michelarcangelo Sacco.
 Salleh, Janit Ben.
 Salong, Peter.
 Sanchez-Arvizu, Urbano, or Orlando Sanchez.
 Santalo, Oscar Rosendo, or Oscar Rosendo Santalo y Rosello.
 Schiappacasse, Remo Santo, or Remo Schiappacasse.
 Schimmelpennning, Hanz.

- [REDACTED] Schneider, Celia, or Celina Schneider (nee Klein).
 [REDACTED] Seidl, Josef.
 [REDACTED] Serra, Florida, or Florida Giusti.
 [REDACTED] Shiu, Yip, or Ip Shui.
 [REDACTED] Silasuvan, Choon.
 [REDACTED] Sing, William, or Sing Ah Sing.
 [REDACTED] Smith, Ida Constantia.
 [REDACTED] Smith, Joshua Charisworth.
 [REDACTED] Smith, Lionel Osborn, or Leo Osborn Smith.
 [REDACTED] Smith, Milton De Costa, or Sam Small.
 [REDACTED] Soljanich, Ante.
 [REDACTED] Sorensen, Ansgar Izar.
 [REDACTED] Sorensen, Joan Bjorvik (nee Joan Bergljot Bjorvik).
 [REDACTED] Soria-Vaca, Gilberto, or Gilberto Soria-Baca.
 [REDACTED] Stamos, Despina Rocha, or Lena Stamos.
 [REDACTED] Stephens, Kenneth Roy.
 [REDACTED] Stephenson, Paschal Joseph, or Joscelyn Blake or Paschal Joseph Stevens.
 [REDACTED] Stiller, Alfons Heinrich.
 [REDACTED] Stoeckel, Elisabeth.
 [REDACTED] Storm, Meindert.
 [REDACTED] Sueiro, Jose.
 [REDACTED] Suey, Low.
 [REDACTED] Sullivan, Timothy.
 [REDACTED] Surian, Giuseppe.
 [REDACTED] Tai, Mai or Mar Tai or Mar Lal or Ma Tai.
 [REDACTED] Tatakis, Constantino or Gus Tatakis.
 [REDACTED] Tateosian, Virginia A. (nee Virginia Arakelian), or Mariana Magarian.
 [REDACTED] Thomas, Frederick.
 [REDACTED] Thomen, Luz Trinidad, or Luz Rosa or Luz Moller.
 [REDACTED] Rosa, Jullus or Julio C. de la Rosa.
 [REDACTED] Tirpak, Ladislav, or Ladislav or Leslie John.
 [REDACTED] Tojo, Dr. Hiromi.
 [REDACTED] Tong, Ho, or Ho Toong or Tong Ho.
 [REDACTED] Tong, Kong, or Gong Tung.
 [REDACTED] Torchia, Anna Maria.
 [REDACTED] Trindade, Fernando das Neves.
 [REDACTED] Tsolakis, Charles, or Ysidore Tsolakis.
 [REDACTED] Tsui, Yat Wah.
 [REDACTED] Tung, Kung Liang.
 [REDACTED] Tyrrel, Winnifred, formerly Manning May Drinkwater, or Edith Jack.
 [REDACTED] Vajao, Jorge Batista Goncalves, or George Vajao.
 [REDACTED] Vidal-Solomon, Marta.
 [REDACTED] Vikse, Torkel.
 [REDACTED] Villarejo, Ardenio or Ardenio Villarejo y Mendoza.
 [REDACTED] Volarich, Joseph Anton, or Josit Anton Volaric.
 [REDACTED] Vollrath, Elizabeth Forsythe or Elizabeth Blanchard Forsythe or Betty Vollrath.
 [REDACTED] Wagner, Margaret Anna formerly Gerhardt (nee Hess).
 [REDACTED] Wah, Cheung.
 [REDACTED] Wah, Leong.
 [REDACTED] Walppu, Atte Severi or Valppu.
 [REDACTED] Wang, Percy Hung-Fan formerly Wang Hung-Fan.
 [REDACTED] Wang, Lydia Shui-Chih Yu formerly Yu Shui-Chih.
 [REDACTED] Weber, Frederick Richard formerly Reginald Victor Brophy.
 [REDACTED] Weir, Socorro L. (nee Socorro Larrazabal).
 [REDACTED] Wen, Alfred Yueh Hsiung.
 [REDACTED] Wen, Alma Pui-Hang To.
 [REDACTED] Wey, Jaw Sean.
 [REDACTED] Wilson, Henry Headley Casablanca.
 [REDACTED] Witter, Oswald, formerly Oswald Aston Witter Kong or Oswald Aston Kong.
 [REDACTED] Wolfson, Gisela (nee Klein).
 [REDACTED] Wolfson, Montagu Peter.
 [REDACTED] Wong Mook Pong or Song Lin or Wong Lam.
 [REDACTED] Woodson, Anthony John.
 [REDACTED] Wowsick, Guido Victor or Guido Victor Hartman.
 [REDACTED] Wright, Bertram Jefferson.
 [REDACTED] Wyle, Robert Patterson.
 [REDACTED] Yan, Chong or Chong Hsein or Hsein.
 [REDACTED] Yan, Lui or Lui Choy Chun or Louis Yan or Lewis Yan.
 [REDACTED] Yaqub, Adil Mohamed or Yacub.
 [REDACTED] Yoo, Chan or Chan Soo.
 [REDACTED] Yorsten, Charlotte Elizabeth (nee Estabrook).
 [REDACTED] Yunek, Benjamin.
 [REDACTED] Yunek, Eva or Eva Comtz.
 [REDACTED] Zandieh, Fakhrezeman Matinrazn or Fakre Zandieh.
 [REDACTED] Zolezzi, Bartolomeo or Bartolomes.
 [REDACTED] Zuclich, Pio C.
 [REDACTED] Agrapides, Constantina (nee Nicolls).
 [REDACTED] Amador, Francisco Pelavo Conejo.
 [REDACTED] Amarant, Oswald Leon.
 [REDACTED] Andersen, Lels.
 [REDACTED] Anderson, Carl Tolver Robert or Robert Anderson.
 [REDACTED] Badalamente, Rosalia formerly Bozzo nee Vitale.
 [REDACTED] Bahosky, Bernard Razzouk.
 [REDACTED] Bardho, Spiro Largo or Mike Bardho or Mihallaq (Llago) Bardhi (Bardo).
 [REDACTED] Barkovic, Antonio or Anthony Barkovich or Tony Bartrovich.
 [REDACTED] Basfield, Edward Richard.
 [REDACTED] Bauhuber, Ludwig.
 [REDACTED] Beckett, Peter.
 [REDACTED] Bejar, Luis or Luis Vejar Ogalla.
 [REDACTED] Berkowitz, Signoru Bella (nee Signoru Bella Cohen).
 [REDACTED] Bernardi, Remo.
 [REDACTED] Bienwald, Gabriele (or Gabrielle) (nee Boehm).
 [REDACTED] Black, Elfriede Renner (nee Schulte).
 [REDACTED] Boen, Hie Lo or Louie Boen.
 [REDACTED] Bonelli, Anita Christalia.
 [REDACTED] Bones, Elba Mercedes (nee Troncoso Gaton).
 [REDACTED] Bonhomme, Jean Ernest alias John Green.
 [REDACTED] Borgogna, Vincenzo.
 [REDACTED] Brandon, Robert Jules.
 [REDACTED] Breuer, Joseph or Josef Breuer.
 [REDACTED] Breuer, Berta (nee Falk).
 [REDACTED] Brooke, Paul Peter.
 [REDACTED] Broomfield, Archibald Henry.
 [REDACTED] Brown, Joseph Zechariah.
 [REDACTED] Bue, Lee Wah or Henry Lee.
 [REDACTED] Burfiend, Else Alfrida (nee Olsen).
 [REDACTED] Burnash, Patrick Michael.
 [REDACTED] Burns, Hildebran Patrick.
 [REDACTED] Burrows, Walter Byron alias Walter Fallis.
 [REDACTED] Carrillo, Charles, or Carlos Cecilio Des Lazaro.
 [REDACTED] Carter, Clarence.
 [REDACTED] Castro, Guido Jorge Cordova Y, or Guido Jorge Cordova.
 [REDACTED] Chan, Chuen.
 [REDACTED] Chee, You Park.
 [REDACTED] Chen, Pang, alias Hammond P. Chen.
 [REDACTED] Chen, Catherine Chi (nee Chi Lu).
 [REDACTED] Chen, Samuel Shin Tsai, or Shih Tsai Chen.
 [REDACTED] Chen, Wen Hsien Wan.
 [REDACTED] Cheng, Chu.
 [REDACTED] Cherry, Bertha, or Bertha Richman.
 [REDACTED] Cheung, Nagu.
 [REDACTED] Chi, Hilary Shou Yu.
 [REDACTED] Chiang, Yao.
 [REDACTED] Chien, Charles C. F., alias Chi Foong Chien.
 [REDACTED] Chin, Yuen Hing, or Chin Yuen Hing.
 [REDACTED] Ching, Tong Kin.
 [REDACTED] Chong, Yew Chor or Chong Yew Chor, alias Lam Kwai.
 [REDACTED] Chow, Fu now Mrs. Biau Yang.
 [REDACTED] Choy, Johnnie, or Choy Fook.
 [REDACTED] Choy, Sam Seng, alias Choy Shing.
 [REDACTED] Christodoulou, Christo or John Christ.
 [REDACTED] Chung, Suey.
 [REDACTED] Clark, Enos.
 [REDACTED] Clarke, Vincent Harvey alias Harvey Alexander Clarke.
 [REDACTED] Claxton, Ellen Rebecca (nee Hyndman).
 [REDACTED] Claxton, William Henry.
 [REDACTED] Coppola, Vincenzo alias Vincent Coppola.
 [REDACTED] Costopoulos, Assimina or Assimini.
 [REDACTED] Couto, John Barallobre.
 [REDACTED] Cruikshank, George Mair.
 [REDACTED] Dagrif, Ernest.
 [REDACTED] Damjanovich, Jovo.
 [REDACTED] D'Andre, Patrick Olivier alias Krause.
 [REDACTED] Dang, Florence Eudora, alias Florencia Eudora Low or Florencia Eudora Chong or Mrs. Domingo Chee Chong.
 [REDACTED] Davy, Renal.
 [REDACTED] De Hernandez, Guadalupe Lopez.
 [REDACTED] De Lara, Manuele De La Luz Mejia.
 [REDACTED] De Luzuriaga, Eusebio Ruiz.
 [REDACTED] Dembitzer, Manes.
 [REDACTED] De Vasquez, Carmen Montes De Oca.
 [REDACTED] Diamantis, Nicholas or Nicholas John.
 [REDACTED] Diaz, Albert Rosario.
 [REDACTED] Diaz, Lydia Rodriguez (nee Lydia Rodriguez).
 [REDACTED] Dodson, Mabel Katherine (nee Bell).
 [REDACTED] Dong, Kee Yeow or Dong Kee Yow or Lew Fook.
 [REDACTED] Dung, Lee or Dung Lee.
 [REDACTED] Dunn, Noel Ostwald.
 [REDACTED] Echevarria, Leoncio Bilbao.
 [REDACTED] Edwards, Allan Reginald.
 [REDACTED] Elliott, Arthur Alexander, alias Isaac Bent.
 [REDACTED] Errico, Victor, or Vittoreo Errico.
 [REDACTED] Esposito, Vincenzo.
 [REDACTED] Esposito, Vincenzo.
 [REDACTED] Falcone, Rita Maria.
 [REDACTED] Fang, Henry Ping.
 [REDACTED] Farn, Mario, or Tang Yet Farn.
 [REDACTED] Fat, Lal.
 [REDACTED] Fat, Lam.
 [REDACTED] Feito, Mario Caunedo.
 [REDACTED] Fernandez, Pedro, or Fernandes.
 [REDACTED] Fernandez y Gonzalez, Agapito.
 [REDACTED] Fernandez, Rosalie Boto Y Rodriguez De.
 [REDACTED] Figuredo, Domingo Acosta, alias Domingo Acosta.
 [REDACTED] Fischer, Albert Robert.
 [REDACTED] Flamos, Loukas.
 [REDACTED] Fong, Ah Kew.
 [REDACTED] Forlini, Michael, or Michele.
 [REDACTED] Forti, Attilio Joseph.
 [REDACTED] Fortin, Joseph Albert.
 [REDACTED] Frassetto, Roberto.
 [REDACTED] Freed, Alys (nee Bould), formerly Alys Braman.
 [REDACTED] Friesner, Rudolf Dawid or Rudolf David Friesner.
 [REDACTED] Frost (or Fross), Molly Marie or Mary.
 [REDACTED] Fugmann-Christensen, Gert alias Gerd Fugmann-Christensen or George Schulz.
 [REDACTED] Gallegos-Chavez, Juan.
 [REDACTED] Garcia, Alejandro.
 [REDACTED] Garcia-Rivera, Jose or Joe Garcia.
 [REDACTED] Goitia, Hilda or Hilda Victoria Alveraz.
 [REDACTED] Gonzales, Francisco Javier alias Frank Gonzales.

- Goodson, Joyce (nee Sha).
 Gorostiza, Rusbio Ramos alias Chevo Ramos.
 Grazia, Joseph Di or Giuseppe De Grazia.
 Greco, Joseph.
 Gronfeldt, Arne.
 Guntvet, Severin L.
 Gutierrez-Torres, Pedro.
 Gutierrez, Enequina Fuentes de.
 Hanchar, Adam, or Damlan Hanczar, alias Joe Charny.
 Hastings, Patrick Joseph.
 Healy, Patrick.
 Hernandez, Hortensia alias Hortensia Martino Garcia.
 Hernandez, John Jose.
 Hess, Frederick Cecil alias Jose Hargrave.
 Hewitt, George Lorenzo.
 Hinkson, Thelma Elise (nee Moore).
 Ho, Louie On.
 Hong, Lee Shew or Albert Chung.
 Hong, Wha Sook alias Wha Sook Lee Hong.
 Hwang, Yung-Yuan.
 Hwang, Bertha Samtoy.
 Iwanade, Isao, alias Nicholas G. Johansen.
 Iwanade, Kaoru, alias Eric R. Johansen.
 Tanahashi, Fumio, alias Warren S. Johansen.
 Jaffee, Israel Morris alias Morris Jaffee.
 James, Emanuel or Arthur James.
 Johansen, Karen (nee Karen Johansen).
 Jon, Sophie.
 Kallimanis, Spyros alias Spirpos Kalpinanis.
 Kavurias, Nicolaos or Kavorias.
 Kerner, Salomon.
 Kitofer, Anna.
 Koehler, Emil or Emil Heinrich August Johan Koehler or John Wagner.
 Konter, Ida Hannah (nee Swinbells).
 Krokos, Leonidas.
 Kuun, Arvid Valentine.
 Kwai, Sue Gee, or Sung Ah Fat.
 Kwok, Gun Bew, or Kwok Bew or Ng Hoong.
 Ladendorf, Martha Marie.
 Lai, Chong or Joey Chong.
 Lai, William T. or Lai Pong.
 Lango, Pablo Perez.
 Lavorante, Ciro.
 Ledesma, Genovevo or Genovevo Ladesma-Acosta.
 Lee, Kam Tseung.
 Leo, Ying.
 Leong, Wone alias Sam Wong alias Wone Sam.
 Libby, George Patrick.
 Liebowitz, Alexander.
 Lipman, Ida.
 Lo, Ven Sing alias Lo Ven Sing alias Lowe Sing.
 Locarlo, Daniel Emanuel.
 Lopez-Quintero, Jesus.
 Loy, Suey or Sue Pong.
 Lozano, Edgardo Manuel.
 Lubrano, Mario, alias Nunzio Lubrano.
 (1), Ludwig, Gisele.
 (2), Hagenfeld, Margarete, alias Margarete Hagenfeld Clark.
 Mahkonen, Saimi Aline, or Saimi A. Mahkonen.
 Mailloux, Lucienda Marie Laura (nee Dube).
 Manning, Samuel Lawrence.
 Manning, Melitta (nee Shott-negg-Zinzenfels).
 Manning, Raymond.
 Mar, Benny or Mar Ben.
 Martin, Manuel Pena alias Manuel Pena.
 Mavris, Panagiotis alias Peter J. Mavis.
 May, Cheng or Cheng Mee or Cheng Moy.
 Medina, Doroteo Soria.
 Melchionna, Generoso alias Genaro Melchiorra.
 Mergemekes, Anastasia or Anastasia George Dadakis.
 Miguel, Alberto.
 Millen, Alexander.
 Minikes, Mayer or Major.
 Minino, Ramon alias Ramon Gasamanes.
 Minutolo, Lorenzo.
 Mitchell, Mary Elizabeth or Mary Elizabeth James or Mary Elizabeth Dennis or Mary Elizabeth Bailey or Mary Martin.
 Mon, Lee alias Henry Chung.
 Montello, Genaro.
 Moon, Kan.
 Morelli, Valentine Elizabeth.
 Moreno, Antonio or Tony Moreno.
 Morton, Edith Elva Godsoe (nee Gilbert).
 Mugnone, Oreste or Oreste Mugnone Barattolo.
 Mul, Jak Lim or Sang Moy.
 Nemeth, Margit.
 Newmann, Henry Hugo.
 O'Halloran, Thomas Patrick.
 Ontiveros-Ortega, Jose.
 Org, Amalia, or Amalia Schirmer.
 Palmeri, Francesco, alias Francesco Palmier alias Alberto Sinna.
 Palomo, Eufrosina Vergara (nee Mallari).
 Panis, Ricardo Manalaysay.
 Papadopoulos, George.
 Penn, Enid Louise.
 Penn, Muriel Naomi.
 Penoucos Y Lopez, Daniel.
 Perlmutter, Herbert.
 Peters, Johannes Lambertus Adrianus.
 Peterson, William James.
 Petrolekas, John or John Lekas, Phillips, Frederick Robert.
 Pinson, Lillian May formerly Clarke formerly Myers (nee Fielding).
 Psarlanos, Stylianos.
 Raffaelli, Gino.
 Reyes, Ofelia Candia y, or Ofelia Candia.
 Richardson, Wilfred.
 Ricketts, Allen Donald, or Allen Donald, or Allen D. Reeves, or Sidney Wallace.
 Rivera, Victor.
 Robinson, Nina Yankowsky, or Fatima Nina Robinson, or Nina Stevens.
 Rommel, Johannes Max Gustav.
 Rosenfield, Leah.
 Rosenfield, Louis.
 Rovira, John, or John Rovira Panier, or Juan Rovira Pames, or John Revero.
 Ruber, Peter.
 Ruber, Michael.
 Ruchan, Dotty (nee Dvora Hillman).
 Ruiz-Galtan, Hilario.
 Ruiz-Nino, Antonio, or Antonio Ruiz.
 Ruiz, Manuel Vazquez.
 Salkow, Maria, or Maria Begona Oru or Iturregul.
 Salmon, Leonard Alexander, alias Leslie Chaplain.
 Sandro, Alexander Ilych Petroff Von.
 Santo, Joaquin Joao.
 Sciancalepore, Marino, or Mario Sciancalepore.
 Sen, Lo, or Sin or Sem or Low Sen.
 Shapiro, Irving, alias Izak Szapiro.
 Shaw, John Samuel, or Samuel Shaw or John Brown.
 Shen, Chun Kang, alias John C. K. Shen.
 Shing, Low.
 Shiro, Yasukichi.
 Shui, Chin, or Chen Sul.
 Sibli, Ahmed, alias Manua Sullin or Manue Sullin.
 Silva, Antonio, alias Antonio da Silva alias Sebolo.
 Sing, Chen.
 Sing, Lee.
 Siniscalchi, Matteo.
 Sjogren, Toini Rauha (nee Arvonen).
 Sjkovist, Torsten Stellan.
 Smalic, Krezan, or Chris Smolich.
 Soares, Reginald, or Reginald Suarez.
 Sorensen, Robert.
 Spadafino, Rosa (Rosetta) (nee Reiggiero).
 Stefanatos, Jerry C. or Gerassimos C. Stefanatos.
 Stelatos, Gerassimos.
 Stephens, Maria.
 Storelli, Vito.
 Suey, Sing or Shing Sun.
 Sun, Wong Yat alias Sun Wong.
 Sunn, Mimi (nee Mei-Ta Chang).
 Sze, Mai-Wai Yuen Tsung.
 Tablada, Nina Cabrera.
 Tegeder, Ernest or Ernst.
 Teles, Enrique or Henrique Teles.
 Terilli, Mary Josephine alias Mary Josephine Machado alias Mary Josephine Frisello (nee Mary Josephine Tenna).
 Terrazzer, Lucio.
 Thompson, Frederick Oliver.
 Toth, Stephen.
 Tratner, Israel.
 Tricoglou, Michael or Triokoglou.
 Tsung, Chin Gay, or Gay Tsung Chin.
 Ukmar, John or Giovanni.
 Vadala, Domenico.
 Valdes, Manuel Ortega.
 Vasilaros, Demetrios or James Jim Vasalis or Patakos.
 Ventoso, Jesus.
 Verde, Salvatore or Salvatore John Balente.
 Viera, Victoriano.
 Viso, Giacomo.
 Vito, Tony alias Antonio Tancredi.
 Wah, Yuen alias Wah Yuen.
 Wals, Rafael.
 Weinberger, Bernard.
 White, Elizabeth.
 Wong, Hing or Wong Bow.
 Wong, James alias Chong Yong Wong.
 Wong, Kwai Jimmy.
 Wong, Man-Shun.
 Wong, Florence Kit-Wah Kwan.
 Wong, Sak Sing.
 Wong, Sing Fuh.
 Woo, Yu Tsung (nee Dzung).
 Yee, Moo.
 Yen, Mo alias Haw Kau.
 Ying, Wong or Mok Him.
 York, Au alias Tan Wan Au.
 Young, Chan Kow alias Kow Chin or Chan Kow.
 Yow, Yuen or John Yaun or Yow Yuen or Yen Yow.
 Yuen, Yip or Yip Ying.
 Yun, Yip alias Soo Kun.
 Zamboca, Albert.
 Zamora Y Gonzalez, Armando Eulalio.
 Chuen, Ho Wing, or Ho Ming Ngem or Jose Herrera.
 Galvan-Rivera, Antonio.
 Hernandez De Aguilar, Maria De Jesus.
 Hernandez-Hernandez, Jesus.
 Hernandez-Hernandez, Marciano Emilio or Emilio Hernandez.

██████████ Lopez-Lopez, Ignacio or George Casillo or Jorge Casillo.

██████████ Petito, Guiseppe.

██████████ Sanchez-Hernandez, Luis or Luis Hernandez or Luis Sanchez.

██████████ Tavares, Maria Guadalupe Cauz De or Ester Guadalupe Cauz De Tavares or Guadalupe Cauz.

██████████ Williams, Leon Emanuel or Raymond Williams.

██████████ Wong, Ling or George William. Arendt, Alfred William Peter.

██████████ Aresta, Joao Maria Silva.

██████████ Edgar, Sidney Ellis.

██████████ Fenakel, Nikolas, or Niklos.

██████████ Osle-Aloma, Fausto, or Fausto

Oslo.

██████████ Osle, Irida Rodriguez or Irida Osle (nee Irida Rodriguez Diaz).

██████████ Xerizotis, Constantin or Gust Zotas.

██████████ Carr, Annie Mary or Nan Carr or Annie Mary Thorgersen.

██████████ Halmshlager, Elfriede Elizabeth or Norcross.

██████████ Hsun, Hsiang, Nyl or Nyl Husan-Hsin and Henry Nyl.

██████████ Islas-Casillas, Canute Jesus.

██████████ Islas, Antonia Gomez de.

██████████ Marinidis, Constantine Marino or Constantine Marino Marinides.

██████████ Prieto, Maria Concepcion Panton (nee Conchan Rivas).

██████████ Rieck, John.

██████████ Shek, John Liensheng.

██████████ Shic, Benea or Sih Benea.

██████████ Smollar, Waltraut Wiederhold. Billinis, Costas Alex.

██████████ Vukic, Ante.

██████████ Schniewind, Paul Werner Konrad.

██████████ Schniewind, Maria Friederike Fernande.

██████████ Matarella, Maurice or Mike Matarella.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out the matter as it appears on page 10, line 2.

Strike out the matter as it appears on page 10, lines 6 and 7, and insert in lieu thereof "██████████ Koberg, Wilhelm Heinrich or William Henry Koberg."

Strike out the matter as it appears on page 22, line 15, and insert in lieu thereof "██████████ Bosnos, Catalina Cano de."

Strike out the matter as it appears on page 25, line 1, and insert in lieu thereof "██████████ Correia, Thereza Clemente y."

Strike out the matter as it appears on page 34, line 14.

Strike out the matter as it appears on page 35, line 14.

Strike out the matter as it appears on page 37, line 24.

Strike out the matter as it appears on page 40, lines 1 and 2, and insert in lieu thereof "██████████ Yorston, Charlotte Elizabeth (nee Estabrook)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

██████████ Addad, Encarnacion Javier.

██████████ Alava, Moises.

██████████ Alfonso, Daniel Rafael Ortiz.

██████████ Arguello De Martinez, Amelia.

██████████ Armas, Jose or Armas Jose

Noguera.

██████████ Atkinson, Vance Loyal alias Vance Alistaire Bowman.

██████████ Bley, Ernst Ferdinand Max.

██████████ Brown, William Nicholas.

██████████ Carabelos, Francisco Acebedo.

██████████ Castaneda, Dilia or Dilia Mo-

lena-Suarez.

██████████ Chin, Boon Lup.

██████████ Chu, Chih-Li or Ou Yang Chiyeu Chu (nee Ou Yang Chiyeu).

██████████ Chu, Ou Yang Chiyeu (nee Ou

Yang Chiyeu).

██████████ Davis, Jack Joseph Alexander.

██████████ Dionisos, Nikolaos or Dennis Stefanatos.

██████████ Duffy, Thomas Henry.

██████████ Eleftheriades, Athena.

██████████ Endsley, Susana Tolnay (nee Susana Haydu).

██████████ Enriquez, Carmel Leone alias

Charles Enriquez alias Carmel Leone.

██████████ Feola, Luigi.

██████████ Fernandez, Jose.

██████████ Gero, Ethel.

██████████ Giannoni, Alana (nee Questa).

██████████ Gobell, Margarte Maria.

██████████ Golt, Leah Black.

██████████ Hagen, Arnt Hauen.

██████████ Ham, Wilhelmina Frances.

██████████ Heredia, Maria.

██████████ Hsu, Shih-Yi.

██████████ Hsu, Maria.

██████████ Jensen, Arne K.

██████████ Jesus, Guadalupe Moreno or

Vavina Moreno.

██████████ Johnson, John or John G. Johnson or Ioannis Ioannou.

██████████ Kariofilis, Andrew.

██████████ Kelly, Joslyn Samuel.

██████████ Kiehm, Isaac Sungbalk or Sung Ho or Isaac Sunbalk Kiehm or Kim Sung Ho.

██████████ Klueh, Jacob or Jacob Clue or Jacob Klueh.

██████████ Kosmitas, Manuel Nicholas.

██████████ Koutroulis, Rena (nee Rena Theodorou Tsrircoglou).

██████████ Kum, Wat or Wat Kam.

██████████ Kypranos, Themistocles J. or Kyprianos or Themis John or Tain Themistocles.

██████████ Lampe, Rosa Bradley Lampe (nee Goseco).

██████████ Laurence, Lloyd Archibald Barrington or Lawrence.

██████████ Mallozzi, Rosario alias Ronny Mallozzi.

██████████ Margarit, Primo.

██████████ Matos, Ramon Armando.

██████████ Mauricio, Jose Amador.

██████████ Mayo, Louis or Liezer alias Antonio L. Maya.

██████████ Montana, Manuel Francisco Matalobos.

██████████ Morin, Albert Bertie.

██████████ Navarro-Ochoa, Salvador.

██████████ Nellini, Nunzio Anthony.

██████████ Ngai, Kai Kin.

██████████ Phillips, Herbert Washington.

██████████ Puig, Orlando.

██████████ Quintana y Maestre, Claudio Damlan.

██████████ Raschke, Ralph John or Rudolph Johann Rachke.

██████████ Reid, Gladstone Ewart.

██████████ Reid, Martin L. alias Martin Luther Reid, alias Martin Williams.

██████████ Rosa-Atilano, Sara De La or Sara De La Rosa or Sarah De La Rosa.

██████████ Rosa-Atilano, Noemi De La or Noemi De La Rosa or Malmé De La Rosa or Noami A. De La Rosa.

██████████ Rose, Percival or John Percival McNamee or John P. McNamee.

██████████ Rubio-Rojas, Bernardio or Jose Almazan-Rojas.

██████████ Sanchez De Juarez, Maria Casilda.

██████████ Sanchez, Maria Vicenta.

██████████ Sarkan, Jasnon or Sarkon Jasnon.

██████████ Sassoon, Albertine Yakub.

██████████ Stagner, Trinidad Villamil.

██████████ Stewart, Ada nee Foster alias Ada Cunningham.

██████████ Story, Maria (nee Janzen).

██████████ Tavares, Ignacio.

██████████ Thomas, Leslie Daniel or Robert

Jackson.

██████████ Tong, Chi Yin.

██████████ Tong, Man Fung alias Man Fung Ng.

██████████ Torres de Rodriguez, Alicia.

██████████ Wajc, Oscar or Uscher Waje.

██████████ Waldman, Fela.

██████████ Weiss, Eisig.

██████████ Weiss, Hedwig.

██████████ Weslowski, Erwin Gotthelf.

██████████ Winbert, Henry Raymond.

██████████ Yavorsky, Olga or Olga Snatchko-Yavorsky.

██████████ Yi-Armenta, Juan.

██████████ Aleman, Leonardo or Leonardo Contreras or Leonardo Armendariz.

██████████ Amador-Silva, Juan.

██████████ Asimenios, Spirios.

██████████ Avala, Ezequiel Ambrosio Sano y Perez or Ezequiel Perez.

██████████ Perez, Margarieta (nee Margarieta Pantoja y Perez).

██████████ Ayriss, Alfred Richard.

██████████ Baker, David or David Bubis.

██████████ Baldaeus, Johanna Margarete (nee Gerdes).

██████████ Baronachi, George or George Baronaki or Baronacki or George Barone or Baroni or Barony or George Carmina.

██████████ Barton, Richard.

██████████ Baxevanakes, Theodore or Theodore Vaxevanakes.

██████████ Beltran, Salvador.

██████████ Najera, Jovita.

██████████ Benetato, Evangelo Panagi.

██████████ Blewitt, Harry William or Harry William Lewis.

██████████ Boros, Abraham.

██████████ Boyd, Arthur Ariel or Ariel Boyd.

██████████ Bressant, Albert.

██████████ Brown, Rita Tercias, Jr.

██████████ Burgundy, Theresa Anna or Theresa A. Burgundy.

██████████ Busse, Clara (nee Sage).

██████████ Buzzell, Hilda Susana.

██████████ Candy, Brun Arthur.

██████████ Carballo-Corbeira, Francisco.

██████████ Cordona, Raquel or Raquel Cordona De Leanos.

██████████ Carey, Vincent Andrew.

██████████ Cedillo-Castellija, Mucio.

██████████ Chae, Wu Young.

██████████ Chang, Catherine Margaret or Jui Hsien Chang.

██████████ Chapman, Henry Theodore or Henry Chapman.

██████████ Charleswell, Pedrito Francisco.

██████████ Chi, Nai Chun.

██████████ Cortez-Sanchez, Enrique or Henry Cortez.

██████████ Curbelo, Irene (nee Irene Fernandez y Martinez).

██████████ De Avalos, Consuelo Perez.

██████████ De Berthoty, Paul Charles or Paul Berthoty Murray.

[REDACTED] De Cardenas, Socorro Mora-Gonzalez.
 [REDACTED] De La Chapelle, Gisele Magyar.
 [REDACTED] De La Chapelle, Alain.
 [REDACTED] De La Chapelle, Philippe.
 [REDACTED] Delan, Imre or James Delaney.
 [REDACTED] De Mondoza, Olga Gomez Hurtado or Olga Gonzalez.
 [REDACTED] De Neria, Maria De Jesus Lizarraga.
 [REDACTED] De Ridder, Robert.
 [REDACTED] Dick, Lynston Alain or Lynston Allen Dick.
 [REDACTED] Dieguez, Siddhartha Isidro Iglesias or Isidro Iglesias.
 [REDACTED] Di Miceli, Lucia.
 [REDACTED] Di Santolo, Giuseppe or Joseph Scotti.
 [REDACTED] Elina, Aune or Anne Salonen or Anne Elina Maniec or Nisniec or Anne Namiec.
 [REDACTED] Esquibel-Rodriguez, Gilberto.
 [REDACTED] Esquibel, Maria Del Refugio Zaragosa De.
 [REDACTED] Ferrentino, Antonio.
 [REDACTED] Foo, Wong.
 [REDACTED] Fountoulis, Andrew George or Andrew Fundulis.
 [REDACTED] Fuchs, Sara (nee Izak).
 [REDACTED] Gallardo-Rico, Cliserio.
 [REDACTED] Garcia-Azumulco, Luis.
 [REDACTED] Geldis, Pangiotis or Pete Geldis.
 [REDACTED] Geller, Sara.
 [REDACTED] Gero, Elsie.
 [REDACTED] Gibson, Charles Gladstone or Charlie or Gladstone Gibson.
 [REDACTED] Gimel, Marie-Antoinette de Pradines.
 [REDACTED] Giovine, Nicola.
 [REDACTED] Glyptis, Constantinos Peter or Costas P. Glyptis.
 [REDACTED] Gomez, Jose Maria.
 [REDACTED] Goudjamanis, Georgios Nicholas.
 [REDACTED] Gross, Anna nee Chava Gucho-witzki.
 [REDACTED] Gross, Morris or Moishe Grutz or Morris David Gross.
 [REDACTED] Guirincich, Umberto.
 [REDACTED] Gumbs, Freeman Augustus.
 [REDACTED] Haardt-Ascarelli, Yvonne.
 [REDACTED] Harris, Frank Wilbert.
 [REDACTED] Harris, Roderick.
 [REDACTED] Hernandez-Servin, Avelina.
 [REDACTED] T, Hernandez-Servin, Goyeta.
 [REDACTED] Hillmann, Max.
 [REDACTED] Hozian, Anthony.
 [REDACTED] Hsu, William.
 [REDACTED] Hvidsten, Henry.
 [REDACTED] Iribarren, Jorge Manuel Porta Balbona y.
 [REDACTED] Jacobsohn, Peter Mortan Ralph.
 [REDACTED] James, Agatha (nee Walker) or Violet Edwards.
 [REDACTED] Jepperson, Harold J.
 [REDACTED] Jones, Jeanne Gabrielle Mar-
 [REDACTED] line (nee Marline Aurox).
 [REDACTED] Jones, Linda Diane.
 [REDACTED] Kalle, Hans.
 [REDACTED] Karstens, Alfred Alarich Emiel
 [REDACTED] Karstens or Alfred Alarich Amil Karstens.
 [REDACTED] Kerkhoven, Peter Johannes.
 [REDACTED] Kin, Lam Suey.
 [REDACTED] Koutelis, Demetrios M.
 [REDACTED] Kuderian, John Zarmaven.
 [REDACTED] Kwong, Yeung, or Ip Sul
 [REDACTED] Yeung Kwong.
 [REDACTED] La Form, Mary Patricia or Mary
 [REDACTED] Patricia Burrel.
 [REDACTED] Lake, Ann Louisa.
 [REDACTED] Larsson, Frithjof Bjarne.
 [REDACTED] Leavitt, Antoinette Van Barr-
 [REDACTED] ewijk.
 [REDACTED] LeClerc, Joseph Ernest Alme.
 [REDACTED] Ledee, Joseph V.
 [REDACTED] Lee, Quon.
 [REDACTED] Liplatos, Thomas or Athana-
 [REDACTED] sios Liplatos.
 [REDACTED] Lombardo, Sergio George.
 [REDACTED] Lopez, Guillermo.
 [REDACTED] Loukas, Paul, or Pavlos Spiros.

[REDACTED] Luchetta, Cesare Guadenzio.
 [REDACTED] Lum, Larry Yee, or Lum Ying.
 [REDACTED] Magalee, Ralph Edward.
 [REDACTED] Magallit, Metelo Teodosio.
 [REDACTED] Mihael Eandthia.
 [REDACTED] Mirambeau, Lucien.
 [REDACTED] Moore, Lolita, or Lolita Daneo.
 [REDACTED] Moses, Joyce Violet.
 [REDACTED] Moukios, Evdokia.
 [REDACTED] Munguia-Mercado, Jose.
 [REDACTED] Murua, Luis.
 [REDACTED] Murua, Maria.
 [REDACTED] Murua, Victoria.
 [REDACTED] Murua, Junior, Luis.
 [REDACTED] Necessian, Nishen Leon, or
 [REDACTED] Nishan Leon Necessian.
 [REDACTED] Nesbitt, Calvin William.
 [REDACTED] Nieto-Angeles, Jose.
 [REDACTED] Nieto, Carmen Montoya De.
 [REDACTED] Nieuwendam, Arnold Emile, or
 [REDACTED] Arnold Emile Sallons.
 [REDACTED] Nin, Fon Fock, or Fung Quon.
 [REDACTED] Oel, Jacqueline.
 [REDACTED] Oel, Ing Bian.
 [REDACTED] Oliver, Ellen Charlotte Mar-
 [REDACTED] celled (nee Treyvoux).
 [REDACTED] Olsen, June, or June Marie
 [REDACTED] Allett Kirkerod.
 [REDACTED] Orfanos, Dimitrios or James.
 [REDACTED] Oyakawa, Yoshiharu.
 [REDACTED] Oyakawa, Oto.
 [REDACTED] Oyakawa, Kenichi Augusto.
 [REDACTED] Oyakawa, Keiji Louis.
 [REDACTED] Oyakawa, Mitsuko Yolanda.
 [REDACTED] Palassolo, Vito.
 [REDACTED] Pappas, Philaretii, or Filaretii J.
 [REDACTED] Nee Siotkas.
 [REDACTED] Patrick, Malla.
 [REDACTED] Perez, Angelina Chagollan.
 [REDACTED] Piceno-Mencaca, Procopio.
 [REDACTED] Piceno, Cristina Garcia De.
 [REDACTED] Pintero, Carlos Manuel, or Carlos
 [REDACTED] Manuel Pintero Martinez, or Carlos Manuel
 [REDACTED] Martinez Pintero.
 [REDACTED] Polito, Paolo, or Paul Polito.
 [REDACTED] Pomili, Pasquale.
 [REDACTED] Porto, Luis, or Norberto Rod-
 [REDACTED] riguez.
 [REDACTED] Pozo, Louis Alvarez, or Juan
 [REDACTED] Louis Alvarez or Louis Alvarez or Louis All-
 [REDACTED] very Pozo.
 [REDACTED] Prats, Ana Josefa Martinez
 [REDACTED] Garriga.
 [REDACTED] Prieto, Nicolas Enrique Godi-
 [REDACTED] nez.
 [REDACTED] Radovnikovich, Frank or Frano
 [REDACTED] Andrijin Radovnikovic or Frank Radovini-
 [REDACTED] kovich or Frank Radovnicov.
 [REDACTED] Ramos, Arnulfo Mario.
 [REDACTED] Rietwyk, August Hendrik.
 [REDACTED] Rivera-Garcia, Santos.
 [REDACTED] Roca, Gualberto Alvarada y.
 [REDACTED] Rodriguez, Antonio.
 [REDACTED] Rood, Dramen Hassman or Dra-
 [REDACTED] men H. or Dramen Hassmen Roop or Hass-
 [REDACTED] men Roop or Abulrahmen Bin Hassan.
 [REDACTED] Salice, Elena (nee Roscio).
 [REDACTED] Salice, Enrico or Henry Salice.
 [REDACTED] Salort, Anthony or Antonio
 [REDACTED] Giner Lort.
 [REDACTED] Sanchez-Sustaita, Vicente or
 [REDACTED] Vincente San chez.
 [REDACTED] Sanchez-Rodriguez, Ernestina
 [REDACTED] or Ernestina Sanchez.
 [REDACTED] Sanchez-Rodriguez, Maria Felix
 [REDACTED] or Maria Felix Sanchez.
 [REDACTED] Sanders, Fejga (Fijga) (nee
 [REDACTED] Kemelgor).
 [REDACTED] Sang, Chow Kang or Sang Chow
 [REDACTED] Kang.
 [REDACTED] Sauer, Wilhelm or William Sauer
 [REDACTED] or William Otero.
 [REDACTED] Seid, Lum or Henry Lum Seid.
 [REDACTED] Selby, Harry William or Harry
 [REDACTED] Selvy.
 [REDACTED] Seo, Uneo or Joseph Uneo Seo.
 [REDACTED] Shavulsky, Nathan.
 [REDACTED] Shea, Bridget.
 [REDACTED] Shimada, Shigeo.
 [REDACTED] Silva-Torres, Sabino.
 [REDACTED] Silva, Trinidad Leal De.

[REDACTED] Simms-Lee, Henry Alan John.
 [REDACTED] Simonsen, John Gunnar or
 [REDACTED] Gunnar Johan Simonsen.
 [REDACTED] Smith, Suzanne Julie Puyoulet.
 [REDACTED] So, Pak Tsun.
 [REDACTED] Soto-Ruiz, Jose.
 [REDACTED] Spanos, Sotiros or Sotiros M.
 [REDACTED] Spanos.
 [REDACTED] Stein, Alma (nee Sudmal)
 [REDACTED] formerly Alma Sudmal Pontag.
 [REDACTED] Stoianovich, Michael L. or
 [REDACTED] Michael Lazary or Mial Lazo or Mike Louis.
 [REDACTED] Suarez, Horacio Antonio
 [REDACTED] Villazon Suarez.
 [REDACTED] Suchos, Plouheria.
 [REDACTED] Sze, Chao Yu.
 [REDACTED] Thomas, Christophena Al-
 [REDACTED] bertha.
 [REDACTED] Thomas, Ellis or Elice Thomas.
 [REDACTED] Torres, Servando.
 [REDACTED] Turco, Francesco or Frank
 [REDACTED] Turco.
 [REDACTED] Ullah, Turab Ali or Turab Ali.
 [REDACTED] Van Syckel, Lucille Lillian (nee
 [REDACTED] Richards) alias Grisch.
 [REDACTED] Wai, Chan or Wal Chan or
 [REDACTED] Hang Pal.
 [REDACTED] Walker, Verna Taylor or Verna
 [REDACTED] Taylor.
 [REDACTED] Watanabe, Hideo or Jerry
 [REDACTED] Watanabe.
 [REDACTED] Weisz, Wilhelm.
 [REDACTED] Whitehead, Charles Stanley.
 [REDACTED] Willem, Raquel (nee Rawuel
 [REDACTED] Mandado y Bertot or Raquel Saran Mandado
 [REDACTED] Bertot).
 [REDACTED] Williamson, Ferdinand Daniel
 [REDACTED] or Fred Williams.
 [REDACTED] Wilson, Asten or Harold
 [REDACTED] Wright.
 [REDACTED] Wilson, Noel Fitzgerald.
 [REDACTED] Yates, Caroline Albertha.
 [REDACTED] Yiakas, Dimos or Dimosthenis
 [REDACTED] Yiakas.
 [REDACTED] Young, Wong or Yung.
 [REDACTED] Yuk, Lum or John Lum.
 [REDACTED] Zauner, Kaspar.
 [REDACTED] Zauner, Margareta.
 [REDACTED] Ziegler, Hulda.
 [REDACTED] Ziotou, Anna.
 [REDACTED] Ziegler, Alfred.
 [REDACTED] Ahmed, Saleh.
 [REDACTED] Alfonso-Rodriguez, Bernardino
 [REDACTED] Perfecto or Perfecto A. Rodriguez.
 [REDACTED] Altamore, Giuseppe.
 [REDACTED] Alvanou, Helen or Ellen (nee
 [REDACTED] Boutis).
 [REDACTED] Anderson, Donald John.
 [REDACTED] Anderson, Mike or Goldburn
 [REDACTED] Gilroy Myett.
 [REDACTED] Aranda-Gonzalez, Jose.
 [REDACTED] Avalos-Jimenez, Alberto.
 [REDACTED] Ballard, Vera Agnes.
 [REDACTED] Barcelo, Francisco Diaz or
 [REDACTED] Francisco Barcalo Diaz.
 [REDACTED] Basoglu, Muzafer Sherif alias
 [REDACTED] Muzafer Sherif.
 [REDACTED] Benjamin, Simon.
 [REDACTED] Berrardini, Ubaldo.
 [REDACTED] Birthwright, Clinton Vinston.
 [REDACTED] Blair, Jessie (nee Stuart).
 [REDACTED] Bleier, Kain.
 [REDACTED] Bo, Cheong.
 [REDACTED] Bratsafolls, Anthony Nicholas.
 [REDACTED] Breda, Johannes.
 [REDACTED] Breit, Ester formerly Esteva
 [REDACTED] Tugetman.
 [REDACTED] Butwell, James Robert.
 [REDACTED] Calelides, Hercules alias Herak-
 [REDACTED] lis Kalalides.
 [REDACTED] Cardoso, Elena Haydee or
 [REDACTED] Elena Haydee Blanco de Cardoso.
 [REDACTED] Carillo Duran, Miguel.
 [REDACTED] Cascallar, Angel Vilas.
 [REDACTED] Cheng, Shau Hing or Shau Hing
 [REDACTED] Chung or Shau Hing How.
 [REDACTED] Chenko, Basil Michalt.
 [REDACTED] Chiodo, Egildo or Egildo Ilario
 [REDACTED] Chiodo.
 [REDACTED] Choy-Renteria, Olga Maria or
 [REDACTED] Olga Maria Choy.
 [REDACTED] Ciriello, Esther Martha.

XXXX Clark, Ascon George alias Christopher Williams.
 XXXXXXXX Clark, Cora Lavinia or Cora Lavinia Sanford or Cora Lavinia Farr.
 XXXXXXXX Contreras-Brambila, Jose.
 XXXXXXXX Cruz, Guadalupe Aguirre.
 XXXXXXXX Cruz, Felipa M.
 XXXXXXXX Curry, Elsie Maud.
 XXXXXXXX Czalkowsky, Wilhelm Johann alias Will Muller.
 XXXXXXXX Davoli, Luigi Giovanni Francesco.
 XXXXXXXX De Serra, Esther Flomena Loza y Perez or Esther Serra alias Maria Tapia.
 XXXXXXXX Diaz-Rosa, Eleazar Manuel.
 XXXXXXXX Dimitratos, Helen (nee Modona).
 XXXXXXXX Dishington, Norma or Norma Therese Marie Dishington.
 XXXXXXXX Dolgoruki, Igor Edgar Youry Olesha alias Edgar Sanders alias Dino Valencay Sagan Sanders.
 XXXXXXXX Dollah, Din Bin alias Ben Din Collah or Dan Dola.
 XXXXXXXX Driver, Aloo Shavaksha (nee Jhambala).
 XXXXXXXX Eason, Collette Maud (nee Gillis).
 XXXXXXXX Edwards, Ralph Leopold alias Charles Douglas.
 XXXXXXXX Ekloff, Helene.
 XXXXXXXX Ellsworth, Michael Hall.
 XXXXXXXX Eng, Irene Chi Che Wong.
 XXXXXXXX Erickson, Edith Sylvia.
 XXXXXXXX Farias, Eduardo Bousas.
 XXXXXXXX Fee, Ging alias Lal Hong.
 XXXXXXXX Feiger, Armin.
 XXXXXXXX Feiger, Freda.
 XXXXXXXX Fernandez, Domingo Augusto.
 XXXXXXXX Fernandez-Alvarez Jose or Jose Fernandez.
 XXXXXXXX Ferreira y Silva, Maximo alias Ferreira Silva alias Maximino Ferreira.
 XXXXXXXX Figueiredo, Joaquim.
 XXXXXXXX Finulliar, Trinidad Barlaan.
 XXXXXXXX Fisher, Joyce Lillian.
 XXXXXXXX Flores-Cortez, Bernardo.
 XXXXXXXX De Flores, Juana Gomez.
 XXXXXXXX Flores-Gomez, Rodolfo.
 XXXXXXXX Flores-Gomez, Bernardo.
 XXXXXXXX Fong, Eng Long alias Henry Sang.
 XXXXXXXX Francis, Emelie Yvonne.
 XXXXXXXX Francis, Fitzroy.
 XXXXXXXX Franco, Jose Mendez.
 XXXXXXXX Frischer, Ada.
 XXXXXXXX Galanis, George.
 XXXXXXXX Garcia, Jorge Lopez y or George Lopez.
 XXXXXXXX Geiger, Kurt.
 XXXXXXXX Geneen, Maurice.
 XXXXXXXX Giamonietis, Theodore or Theodoros Giamonietis.
 XXXXXXXX Goddard, Francis Frederick alias Pat O'Malley.
 XXXXXXXX Godlewski, Bertha or Bessie.
 XXXXXXXX Gonzales, Pedro Pablo alias Pedro Rodriguez.
 XXXXXXXX Gotthell, Zelman.
 XXXXXXXX Gotthell, Fanny.
 XXXXXXXX Gregorio, Francisco.
 XXXXXXXX Gross, Alexander.
 XXXXXXXX Guerrero, Olera, Pedro.
 XXXXXXXX Gutierrez-Hernandez, Ramon.
 XXXXXXXX Guzman, Salvador-Munoz.
 XXXXXXXX Hernandez-Garcia, Juana.
 XXXXXXXX Hewitt, Lulu Mae (nee Ferguson).
 XXXXXXXX Higa, Shimatsu.
 XXXXXXXX Himer, Nick or Miklos Himer.
 XXXXXXXX Hinds, Wilfred Lawson or Wilfred Loshington Edwards.
 XXXXXXXX Hsu, Hual Yun.
 XXXXXXXX Hsu, Fong, Chinn.
 XXXXXXXX Hung, Ho Tak.
 XXXXXXXX Hunt, Maisie.
 XXXXXXXX Hyland, Bridget Bridie.
 XXXXXXXX Jackson, Harriet Joy.
 XXXXXXXX Jackson, Naomi Constantino (nee Naomi Constantino Flores).
 XXXXXXXX Jacobsen, Borghild Tvede.
 XXXXXXXX Jensen, Vagn Aage.

XXXXXXXXX Jau, Ng Ngit alias Mrs. Jiu Nai Jau.
 XXXXXXXX Joe, May Ying.
 XXXXXXXX Joe, Yung Chu.
 XXXXXXXX Jon, Peter or Panayotis Ioannou or Peter Jones.
 XXXXXXXX Jung, Pay Yop or Loo Pun.
 XXXXXXXX Kadri, Zia or Ziauddin Mustafahasan Quadri.
 XXXXXXXX Kahn, Carmen Samenego.
 XXXXXXXX Karfola, Bangora.
 XXXXXXXX Kefalides, Nicolaos A. or Nicolaos Kefalides.
 XXXXXXXX Ken, Wong, Leu.
 XXXXXXXX King, Marcelle Espinozo.
 XXXXXXXX Kohler, Alfred Richard alias Frederick Gellen.
 XXXXXXXX Kohne, Richard Edward.
 XXXXXXXX Kohne, Gabrielle Henriette.
 XXXXXXXX Koike, Mantaro.
 XXXXXXXX Koike, Kumi.
 XXXXXXXX Kontizas, Artemis or Artemis Kontijas.
 XXXXXXXX Krasnoff, Rose.
 XXXXXXXX Sharfman, Leonard.
 XXXXXXXX Sharfman, Sol.
 XXXXXXXX Leblond, Marcel Alain.
 XXXXXXXX Ledee, Joseph Andre.
 XXXXXXXX Lee, Richard Dooban.
 XXXXXXXX Lefkovits, Jonas.
 XXXXXXXX Lefkovits, Judith (nee Kallsch).
 XXXXXXXX Liburd, Terrence Mansfield.
 XXXXXXXX Liem, Chang Mo or Chang Moo Chang Lien or Paul Chang Mo Liem.
 XXXXXXXX Ligato, Giuseppe Antonio or Joseph Ligato.
 XXXXXXXX Little, Robert Bell.
 XXXXXXXX Lopez-Martinez, Adrian.
 XXXXXXXX Louie, Harry Fong.
 XXXXXXXX Lozano, Serafin.
 XXXXXXXX Lozano, Elvira Calderon Grenas.
 XXXXXXXX Lucchino, Domenico.
 XXXXXXXX Luna, Catalina.
 XXXXXXXX Luna, Luz.
 XXXXXXXX Luna, Manuel.
 XXXXXXXX Luna, Julio.
 XXXXXXXX Madonis, Antonis Parashou alias Antonis P. Mantonis.
 XXXXXXXX Manstretta, Paolina Borra.
 XXXXXXXX Marshall, John Fitzherbert.
 XXXXXXXX Martinez, Ramon Antonio.
 XXXXXXXX McFarlane, Dudley Vincent.
 XXXXXXXX McNaughton, Mildred Grace.
 XXXXXXXX McPherson, Cyril George alias Edgar Broogs.
 XXXXXXXX Medina-Magdaleno, Luis.
 XXXXXXXX Mendez, Jesus or Jesus Mendez-Nava.
 XXXXXXXX Mendez, Maria Socorro.
 XXXXXXXX Mendez, Serapio.
 XXXXXXXX Mendez, Guadalupe Carrasco De.
 XXXXXXXX Mendoza-Pedrosa, Maria or Maria Vasquez-Pedrosa or Maria Fuentez-Vasquez.
 XXXXXXXX Merino, Sofia (nee Sofia Amadora Nevarro-Mon).
 XXXXXXXX Meyer, Constance Cornelia Josepha Maria Arts or Constance Cornelia Maria Tan Arts or Constance Arts Meyer.
 XXXXXXXX Mezen, James Anthony.
 XXXXXXXX Mirza, Rio Nusservan.
 XXXXXXXX Mon, Lau.
 XXXXXXXX Moo, James Loo.
 XXXXXXXX Moran, Joseph Patrick.
 XXXXXXXX Mossalides, Panayioties or Paul Mossalides.
 XXXXXXXX Moschitto, Anna Marie (nee Cipriano).
 XXXXXXXX Mustach, Mate.
 XXXXXXXX Nacarano, Gaspare Gregorio.
 XXXXXXXX Nunez-Diaz, Maria.
 XXXXXXXX Nunez-Urrutia, Jesus.
 XXXXXXXX Okada, Benzo Joe.
 XXXXXXXX Pacheco, Jesusita Ernestina (nee Dominguez).
 XXXXXXXX Park, Chu.
 XXXXXXXX Pao, Chao Rah.
 XXXXXXXX Chao, Ah Vong (nee Vong Chen).

XXXX Pao, Sung Zau alias Zau Pao Sung or Sung Ziang Pao or John Pao.
 XXXXXXXX Papazian, Haighu (nee Ogretmeroglu).
 XXXXXXXX Pell, Irene, formerly Irene Pelstrosoff Pell.
 XXXXXXXX Penn, Christian Emanuel.
 XXXXXXXX Perri, Flomena Maria Lucia (nee Mirabelli).
 XXXXXXXX Pfeffer, August.
 XXXXXXXX Pickering, Jens Wallace.
 XXXXXXXX Pickett, Evelyn Gladys.
 XXXXXXXX Pineda, Ibrahim Gaspur.
 XXXXXXXX Pitter, Walter Benjamin.
 XXXXXXXX Porter, Isaac N. alias Isaac Nathaniel Porter.
 XXXXXXXX Posada, Raul Rodriguez alias Raul Rodrigues Pasada.
 XXXXXXXX Prado-Lopez, Jose alias Jose L. Prado alias Jose Lopez-Prado.
 XXXXXXXX Pratt, Helen Theresa.
 XXXXXXXX Proper, Leendert Gerardus.
 XXXXXXXX Randall, Jack alias Johann Bernhard Rebel.
 XXXXXXXX Rano, Margret McInnes.
 XXXXXXXX Reid, Graces or Graciela Reid (nee Grace Marciano) alias Anna Josefina Reid.
 XXXXXXXX Rizick, Kalem Gibreen.
 XXXXXXXX Robinson, Ellen Alberta alias Ella A. Robinson.
 XXXXXXXX Rodriguez, Mildred Irene.
 XXXXXXXX Romero, Gonzalo or Gonzalo Romero Leira.
 XXXXXXXX Romero, Rodolfo Rolando.
 XXXXXXXX Romero-Goytortua, Xavier or Xavier Romero.
 XXXXXXXX Rosenbluth, Leah or Lena or Laah or Laja.
 XXXXXXXX Rovira, Pedro.
 XXXXXXXX Rowe, Cleveland alias Vincent Jones.
 XXXXXXXX Rowell, Alice alias Alice Rowell McCann.
 XXXXXXXX Rozovsky, Isajah or Isajar Rozauskas or Isajus Isjar or Isajan Rozauskas Rozovsky or Isajus Rosovsky-Rozauskas or Isajah Rozovski.
 XXXXXXXX Rubalcava, Pedro Serna.
 XXXXXXXX Ruiz-Torres, Jesus.
 XXXXXXXX Ruiz-Morales, Ynes.
 XXXXXXXX Ruiz-Morales, Andrea.
 XXXXXXXX Santillano-Cardoza, Pedro alias Pedro Armijo.
 XXXXXXXX Scala, Vincenzo di.
 XXXXXXXX Scott, Carmen Waul alias Carmen Waul Buchanan.
 XXXXXXXX Shong, Lee Ting.
 XXXXXXXX Simon, Lillian (nee Piltzmaker) or Cary Wang Simon.
 XXXXXXXX Simone, Michael.
 XXXXXXXX Sin-Tzu, Weng.
 XXXXXXXX Weng, Josephine alias Josephine Evelyn Tok Ying Hsi alias Josephine Tok Ying.
 XXXXXXXX Solis-Flores, Ricardo.
 XXXXXXXX Solomon, Saul.
 XXXXXXXX Spadone, Vito.
 XXXXXXXX Spina, Alfio.
 XXXXXXXX Spyrotos, Christoforos.
 XXXXXXXX Smith, Donald Bentley.
 XXXXXXXX Stanley, Leo.
 XXXXXXXX Stokes, Horace Murray.
 XXXXXXXX Suarez-Caballero, Victor Manuel.
 XXXXXXXX Sum, Pon Sing or Sing Sum Pon alias Gene Pon alias Pon Sing.
 XXXXXXXX Taam, Jennie.
 XXXXXXXX Taam, May Chan.
 XXXXXXXX Tel, Si Hung.
 XXXXXXXX Tjomstol, Steinar Salve alias Steinar Tjomstol.
 XXXXXXXX Tom, Kwok Tung or Tom Kwok Tung.
 XXXXXXXX Trott, Gwen Marie Allen.
 XXXXXXXX Vasilakis, Michael or Mihael Vasliakis or Mike Vasilakis.
 XXXXXXXX Vasquez, Rafael Soto.
 XXXXXXXX Vekris, Antonios Nikitas.
 XXXXXXXX Venturas, Panaghis John.
 XXXXXXXX Vigil, Jose.
 XXXXXXXX Vitiello, Alfonso.

- [REDACTED] Votting, Victor.
 [REDACTED] Vukusich, Stipan or Stepan Vukusich.
 [REDACTED] Wang, Ching Hsien.
 [REDACTED] Chin, Fan Ju or Ju Chin Fan Wang.
 [REDACTED] Weller, Susan Jenny or Zuzanna Swirska.
 [REDACTED] Wells, Anita or Anita Pitcherlie or Anita Remus or Anita Ames.
 [REDACTED] Wong, Wing Hee.
 [REDACTED] Wong, Tseng Sui Hsu.
 [REDACTED] Yau, Chan Choi or Chan Wing.
 [REDACTED] Yee, Tom Gong alias Hum Gim Wong alias James Wong Tom.
 [REDACTED] Zambrano, Jesus Ramon.
 [REDACTED] Zaton, Oscar.
 [REDACTED] Toticaguena, Juana Bengochea.
 [REDACTED] Kiritsis, Demetrios Spiros.
 [REDACTED] Aarsheim, Svein Ole.
 [REDACTED] Aceves-Garcia, Francisco or Frank Ramirez Aceves.
 [REDACTED] Agramonte, Raul Colarte or Raul Colarte.
 [REDACTED] Albano, Enrico.
 [REDACTED] Alfonso, Andres Olynpia Pena y or Andres O. Pena.
 [REDACTED] Aliano, Joseph.
 [REDACTED] Almasmary, Ahmed Kassim or Ahmed Gazin or Ahmed Kassim or Mohamed Messeri or Ahmed Kasson or Mohamed Masser.
 [REDACTED] Almelda, Raul Arencibia.
 [REDACTED] Alvo, Jennie nee Eugenia Perez or Jennie Perez.
 [REDACTED] Amada, Francisco or Frank.
 [REDACTED] Anastasslades, Athanassios.
 [REDACTED] Apoltelescu, Stefan.
 [REDACTED] Arditi, Albert Abraham.
 [REDACTED] Arditi, Dona Bella.
 [REDACTED] Arias, Bernard or Ben or Beeny Orias.
 [REDACTED] Asgarzadeh, Kamal.
 [REDACTED] Asgarzadeh, Safieh (nee Safieh Damerli Seyedi).
 [REDACTED] Attias, Henri or Henry Attias.
 [REDACTED] Avelar-Macias, Jose or Jose Maria Avelar-Macias.
 [REDACTED] Azioni, Giuseppe or Giuseppe Albertini.
 [REDACTED] Baez, Rodriguez, Leobardo.
 [REDACTED] Baird, Francis or Frank Blair or John William Blair.
 [REDACTED] Bakee, Said Bin or Syed Baker.
 [REDACTED] Bane, Joseph Vajnavowicz or Joseph Vejnevovitch or Bane or Banevovitch or Banevovitch.
 [REDACTED] Baracchini, Ennio.
 [REDACTED] Baresic, Mijo.
 [REDACTED] Baricevich, Jack or Giacomo or Jacob.
 [REDACTED] Baruch, Morris or Barouch or George Kyringis or Kiryakis.
 [REDACTED] Bassile, Moris or Maurice.
 [REDACTED] Behie, William Lewis.
 [REDACTED] Bellotti, Alessandro Angelo.
 [REDACTED] Benfanti, Vincenzo.
 [REDACTED] Benzel, Hazel Pearl (nee Rew).
 [REDACTED] Berchten-Breiter, Hans Carl.
 [REDACTED] Berchten-Breiter, Irene Dolores (nee Lewis).
 [REDACTED] Berger, Katalin.
 [REDACTED] Bianco, Emanuele Esposito.
 [REDACTED] Billi, Lino or Luiz Loyecchio or Luigi Lovecchio or Luigi Louvecchio.
 [REDACTED] Bingham, Alfred Augustus or Aeria Jackson.
 [REDACTED] Blache-Fraser, Elaine Stella.
 [REDACTED] Bless, Miguel Juan.
 [REDACTED] Boller, Peter Joseph.
 [REDACTED] Bove, Salvatore.
 [REDACTED] Bow, Ho or Ho Bo.
 [REDACTED] Brohman, Charles.
 [REDACTED] Bulens, Rosalie Josephine.
 [REDACTED] Burns, John Arthur or John Arthur Brown.
 [REDACTED] Butler, Stanley.
 [REDACTED] Cacioli, Rizleri or Richard.
 [REDACTED] Calatayud-Ramos, Primitivo or Roberto Ramos.
 [REDACTED] Camaloni, Pietro.
 [REDACTED] Carballo, Benito or Benito Carballo Entenza.
 [REDACTED] Cardenas-Garcia, Concepcion or Concha.
 [REDACTED] Cardenas, Salud.
 [REDACTED] Cardenas-Solorio, Jose.
 [REDACTED] Carlson, Hilmer.
 [REDACTED] Cascone, Ulisses.
 [REDACTED] Casimiro, Antonio.
 [REDACTED] Cassen, Aleksandra Olga (nee Stasiulyte).
 [REDACTED] Castelblanco, Dario.
 [REDACTED] Castillo, Santos Matthew.
 [REDACTED] Catanzaro, Damiano.
 [REDACTED] Catz, Frans James.
 [REDACTED] Caudillo, Cruz Maria or de Caudillo formerly Milan (nee Garcia).
 [REDACTED] Chal, Chang Kai.
 [REDACTED] Chan, Man Wei or Chan Nan Wai or Chan Kim.
 [REDACTED] Chang, Albert Chiang or Chiang Chang.
 [REDACTED] Chang, Lita Won or Lita Li Tang Wu.
 [REDACTED] Chang, Lin Chung-Ching or Chung Ching Lin Chang or Jean Chang.
 [REDACTED] Chang, Wan or Tom Jun Yue.
 [REDACTED] Chao, Gloria nee Gloria Ya Tsung Kung.
 [REDACTED] Chavez, Domingo.
 [REDACTED] Chavez, Eusebia Concepcion.
 [REDACTED] Chen, Chi Tsai.
 [REDACTED] Cheney, John Nelson.
 [REDACTED] Chin, Wee Kay or Sam Lee.
 [REDACTED] Chin, Mong Loong or Chan Yok.
 [REDACTED] Ching, Lee.
 [REDACTED] Chiu, Hin or Chiu Hin.
 [REDACTED] Choo, Anna Emielie Luise (nee Anna Emielie Luise Tuebben Hoffman).
 [REDACTED] Christopher, Dianna.
 [REDACTED] Cho, Chin or Cho Chin.
 [REDACTED] Choy, Hong Hing.
 [REDACTED] Chung, Tom Fun.
 [REDACTED] Cingiryan, Vasken or Changan.
 [REDACTED] Civelli, Vincent or Chivelly.
 [REDACTED] Claxton, Christine Albertha.
 [REDACTED] Clotis, Christos.
 [REDACTED] Cohen, Lulu or Lulu Salman Shamoun.
 [REDACTED] Callop, Mary.
 [REDACTED] Combojinopoulos, Alexandre or Alex Combojinot.
 [REDACTED] Costa, Natale or Nick Costa.
 [REDACTED] Costas, Anna Chris or Anna Giagou or Mrs. Christ Costas.
 [REDACTED] Courville, Blanche Maud nee Hills formerly Pugsley.
 [REDACTED] Dan, Lee Sing.
 [REDACTED] Danner, Geraldine.
 [REDACTED] Davis, Lillian Ann.
 [REDACTED] De Agullar, Colia Duron.
 [REDACTED] De Calves, Ondina San Martin.
 [REDACTED] De Delgado, Ana Ovidia Ruiz.
 [REDACTED] Dedes, Sophia (nee Dedogiou).
 [REDACTED] Dell, Edmondo.
 [REDACTED] De Luevano, Catalina Cortez.
 [REDACTED] De Monte, Lorenzo.
 [REDACTED] Demou, Michael Kyriakos.
 [REDACTED] De Munoz, Guadalupe Juarez or Guadalupe Juarez.
 [REDACTED] De Munoz, Sara Castillo.
 [REDACTED] De Oca, Pascual Eduardo Calderin Montes or Pascual Eduardo Calderin.
 [REDACTED] De Oliveira, Antonio.
 [REDACTED] De Ramirez, Andrea Castro.
 [REDACTED] De Ramirez, Estefana Rodriguez, or Maria Estefana Rodriguez De Ramirez or Ester Rodriguez De Ramirez or Estela Rodriguez De Ramirez or Ester Rodriguez-Belmares.
 [REDACTED] Ramirez-Mesa, Felipe.
 [REDACTED] Derkacz, Stanislaw or Stanley.
 [REDACTED] Derkacz, Zofia or Sophia.
 [REDACTED] De Torres, Antonia Marrero.
 [REDACTED] De Tovar, Cristina Orozco or Caritina Orozco de Tovar (nee Cristina Orozco-Flores).
 [REDACTED] De Vergara, Paula Nunez.
 [REDACTED] De Verna, Eugenia Gonzalez nee Eugenia Gonzales y Calvadilla.
 [REDACTED] De Vita, Blanca Margarita nee Castaneda.
 [REDACTED] Diaz, Juan Francisco Romelrio y.
 [REDACTED] Diaz-Hector, Candido.
 [REDACTED] Di Benardi, Anthony Vincent or Antonio Bernardo.
 [REDACTED] Di Marzo, Vincenzo or Vincent Di Marzo.
 [REDACTED] Din, Lee or Dim Lee.
 [REDACTED] Dornier, Anton John or Tony Dornier.
 [REDACTED] Doros, George.
 [REDACTED] Doros, Elizabeth Dissig.
 [REDACTED] Dos Santos, Antonio Anna.
 [REDACTED] Downs, John Ephriam.
 [REDACTED] Dwyer, Lilla Frances.
 [REDACTED] Eggers, Rose (nee McShane).
 [REDACTED] Elefteriades, Sofia.
 [REDACTED] Ellis, John Leslie.
 [REDACTED] Erlachtgerecht, Leon.
 [REDACTED] Errante, Bruno.
 [REDACTED] Fadiel, Fannie K.
 [REDACTED] Fels, August.
 [REDACTED] Firipis, Miltiadis or Milton Firipis.
 [REDACTED] Fischer, Max Richard.
 [REDACTED] Foley, John Frederick.
 [REDACTED] Fong, Mar Hing or Mah Hing Fong.
 [REDACTED] Fontanot, John.
 [REDACTED] Ford, Jonathan or John Ford.
 [REDACTED] Fraser, Constantia Augusta.
 [REDACTED] Fraser, Delphine.
 [REDACTED] Freund, Berta (nee Rosenfeld).
 [REDACTED] Fun, Wong.
 [REDACTED] Gabriel, Maurice or Maurice Gabriel Klabb or Maurice Charles Klabb.
 [REDACTED] Gaetzschmann, Otto Friederich.
 [REDACTED] Galindo-Garcia, Ruben.
 [REDACTED] Gang, Lee Hing.
 [REDACTED] Garciga, Felix Maria De La Caridad Cabrera.
 [REDACTED] Garrison, Alexander Heaven.
 [REDACTED] Gaubert, Martha Block or Matti Block.
 [REDACTED] Gaulle, Reginald Alexander or Gaul or Bobbie Gaul or Clyde Payne.
 [REDACTED] Geismar, Sophie (nee Sophie Lichtenstein).
 [REDACTED] George, Daisy Chaffoo or Daisy R. Chaffoo George.
 [REDACTED] Gesnador, Juan Villacis.
 [REDACTED] Get, Hor Fung.
 [REDACTED] Gianu, Periklis Savas or Pan-glottis Kolliosas.
 [REDACTED] Giordano, Carmelo.
 [REDACTED] Giurco, Mario.
 [REDACTED] Goldberg, Arnold or Arnold Gould.
 [REDACTED] Golonka, Stefan.
 [REDACTED] Gomez-Urquieta, Gregorio or Gregorio U. Gomez.
 [REDACTED] Gong, William or Gong Dick.
 [REDACTED] Gontan, Jesse.
 [REDACTED] Gonzalez, Joe S. or Jose Salvador Gonzalez or Joseph Salvador Gonzalez.
 [REDACTED] Gonzalez-Aguilar, Luis.
 [REDACTED] Gonzalez, Teresa (nee Castro).
 [REDACTED] Gracl, Giuseppe.
 [REDACTED] Gravel, Marie Simone (nee St. Pierre).
 [REDACTED] Gray, Alice Frances or Alice Frances Baksh.
 [REDACTED] Gregory, Clifford A.
 [REDACTED] Groene, Johannes Heinrich or John H. Groene.
 [REDACTED] Gross, Chaim Sandor.
 [REDACTED] Grzan, Sime.
 [REDACTED] Guajardo-Chavez, Juan.
 [REDACTED] Guajardo-Rodriguez, Baldo-mero.
 [REDACTED] Guajardo-Rodriguez, Isabel.
 [REDACTED] Haarburg, Catherine or Catherine Turrie Warnock.
 [REDACTED] Haldostian, Berj Havhanness.
 [REDACTED] Hallas, James John or Demetrios John Hallas or Dimitrios Hallas.
 [REDACTED] Hamarat, Metin Recep.
 [REDACTED] Hamilton, Harry Joseph.

- [REDACTED] Hatim, Mohammed.
 [REDACTED] Hecht, Gertrude Johanna Krons
 or Gertrude Johanna Krone or Charlotte
 Schmidt.
 [REDACTED] Helou, Carlos Samson.
 [REDACTED] Henry, Lilliane or Lilliane Les-
 perance.
 [REDACTED] Hernandez-Jimenez, Pedro or
 Pedro-Guillermo Hernandez.
 [REDACTED] Hernandez-Rodriguez, Oscar.
 [REDACTED] Hirte, Hermann Friederich or
 Herman Frederick Hirte.
 [REDACTED] Hofman, Gerrit Cells.
 [REDACTED] Hovanessian, Mary or Marieta or
 Martha or Sedrakian.
 [REDACTED] Huang, Wei Yip.
 [REDACTED] Huffaker, Vilma Gerda Gutta
 Anna or Vilma Gerda Gutta Anna Jacobsen.
 [REDACTED] Hylton, Norman Ellis.
 [REDACTED] Ingegneros, Salvatore.
 [REDACTED] Ives, Percy Alfred.
 [REDACTED] Jacobs, Rose or Rose Stotsky.
 [REDACTED] Jensen, Harold Emil.
 [REDACTED] Jensen, Niels Kristan.
 [REDACTED] Jimenez, Abelino or Avelino
 Jimenez-Rulz or Luis Minor.
 [REDACTED] Jimenez-Calveira, Jose Miguel
 or Jose Jimenez.
 [REDACTED] John, Klaus Gunther Fritz
 Helmut.
 [REDACTED] Jones, Neil Royes.
 [REDACTED] Jordan, Joyce Corrime.
 [REDACTED] Jorgensen, Rasmus Peter.
 [REDACTED] Jrimia, John or Hon Irimia.
 [REDACTED] Jukich, Rudy.
 [REDACTED] Kalimerakis, George Michael.
 [REDACTED] Kaminsky, Andreas or Andrew
 Delger.
 [REDACTED] Kampetis, Demetrios Anastasios
 or Kambitsis or James A. Kampetis or Kam-
 bitsis or Kamptis or Demetros Kamptis.
 [REDACTED] Karlson, John or Johannes or
 Johan Karlson.
 [REDACTED] Kaufman, Ida or Ida Greenberg.
 [REDACTED] Kaulins, Brigita.
 [REDACTED] Kaylas, Michael.
 [REDACTED] Kee, Chin Dew or Kee Dew Chin
 or Edward Chin.
 [REDACTED] Kelley, Stella Alice.
 [REDACTED] King, Wong.
 [REDACTED] Kirppu, Anna Wilhelmina.
 [REDACTED] Klein, Samuel or Tibor Schwarz.
 [REDACTED] Klinner, Jutta Klara.
 [REDACTED] Kornilakis, Antonios.
 [REDACTED] Kostas, Evangelia.
 [REDACTED] Kovacic, Frane or Frank.
 [REDACTED] Kristal, Celia or Cyna Krysztal
 or Celia Krysztal.
 [REDACTED] Kriticos, Nick or Nickolaos Kri-
 tikos.
 [REDACTED] Kuran, Ivan or John Kuran or
 John Gradick.
 [REDACTED] Kwan, Ho or Kwan Ho.
 [REDACTED] Laidlaw, Dorothy Muriel Dick-
 erson.
 [REDACTED] Lakshmansingh, Charles Gor-
 don.
 [REDACTED] Lancos, John or John Billan or
 Lancon.
 [REDACTED] Landry, Gladys Leotha.
 [REDACTED] Lauh, Ts-Sung Ernest.
 [REDACTED] Layton, William Valentine Os-
 born.
 [REDACTED] Lee, Dep or Lee Dep or Robert
 Edward Lee.
 [REDACTED] Lee, Hong Took or Took Lee or
 Lee Cho or Frankie Lee.
 [REDACTED] Lee, Wealin or Lung Wai Ng.
 [REDACTED] Lee, Wong Yuen or Yuen Wong
 or Wong Yuen.
 [REDACTED] Legaros, Demetrios Michael.
 [REDACTED] Lehto, John Vilhelm.
 [REDACTED] Leinwand, Shirley (nee Bar-
 ron).
 [REDACTED] Leiti, Waltraud or Waltrud
 Leiti Berger.
 [REDACTED] Leiti, Siegbert or Siegbert
 Leiti Berger.
 [REDACTED] Leiva, Hector Munoz.
 [REDACTED] Lekkas, Vassilios or Bill Lek-
 kas.
 [REDACTED] Leong, Ng or Bennie Wu.
- [REDACTED] Leong, Sai Yee or Leong Chow
 or Charlie Leong.
 [REDACTED] Letsch, John Peter.
 [REDACTED] Leung, Sue Jean Ng or Sue
 Jean Ng or Shee Ng.
 [REDACTED] Lehem, Matilde Saadi.
 [REDACTED] Lehem, Fortuna Florette.
 [REDACTED] Lilling, Etela or Esther Lilling
 or Etela Lilling.
 [REDACTED] Lin, Ling Kin or George Kin
 Lin.
 [REDACTED] Ling, Annabelle or Perseus An-
 nabelle Ling.
 [REDACTED] Ling, Lai Soon.
 [REDACTED] Linke, Paul Erwin.
 [REDACTED] Lianos, Leontios.
 [REDACTED] Loo, Fook.
 [REDACTED] Lopez, Antonio Garcia or David
 Espineira.
 [REDACTED] Lorier, Andries or Andrew
 Lewis.
 [REDACTED] Los Santos, Jose Tomas De.
 [REDACTED] Low, Yen or Low Yen or Lou
 Yit or Yit Lou.
 [REDACTED] Lozado, Leodegario B.
 [REDACTED] Lazaroff, Tsvetco.
 [REDACTED] Lazaroff, Helen.
 [REDACTED] Luchs, Harry Alfred.
 [REDACTED] Lum, Lee or John Lee or Howard
 Lee.
 [REDACTED] Lumley, Edward Nathony.
 [REDACTED] Luna-Castedo, Jose.
 [REDACTED] Lupu, Eulalia.
 [REDACTED] Lupu, Vasile or Fred Walters.
 [REDACTED] MacFarlan, Vida Gladys Anna.
 [REDACTED] Maffei, Giovanni Francesco.
 [REDACTED] Maidenbaum, Samuel or Samuel
 Magdenbaum or Josef Rutbowski.
 [REDACTED] Maki, Anna-Liisa (nee Makela).
 [REDACTED] Makrinos, Michael Markou.
 [REDACTED] Maldonado, Maria L. (nee Maria
 Luisa Pereyra).
 [REDACTED] Malz, Samuel.
 [REDACTED] Mandel, Hans or Hans Jean
 Mandel or Johann Mandel.
 [REDACTED] Mandel, Phyllis Barlow (nee
 Jackson).
 [REDACTED] Mandelbaum, Moses or Moses
 David Mandelbaum.
 [REDACTED] Manis, Michael Chirst or Mike
 Mennis or Michael Manis or Michel Mennis
 or Mike Manis or Maki Manis.
 [REDACTED] Manzoni, Mario Ramones.
 [REDACTED] Marsala, Giuseppe.
 [REDACTED] Martinez, Eugenio or Eugene.
 [REDACTED] Martinez, Josefa (nee Josefa
 Rafaela Cazanans Monserrat).
 [REDACTED] Martinez, Meleco.
 [REDACTED] Martis, John Ernesto or Johan
 Ernesto Martis.
 [REDACTED] Mas, Damian Garcias y or
 Damian Garcias.
 [REDACTED] Matsumoto, Hitoshi or Chojiro
 Sumi or Jack Chojiro Sumi.
 [REDACTED] Maxwell, Leonard Fritz or Ar-
 nold Maxwell.
 [REDACTED] Mazon, Celebi Robert.
 [REDACTED] McCourty, John.
 [REDACTED] McKim, Olive Kate.
 [REDACTED] McLellan, John or John Ronald
 McLellan.
 [REDACTED] McLoughlin, Isabella (nee Isa-
 bella Cronan).
 [REDACTED] Medovay, Moisha or Morris or
 Maurice.
 [REDACTED] Medrono, Junior, Luis Montes.
 [REDACTED] Mellon, Wilhelmina Lydia.
 [REDACTED] Mestril Renee (nee Casanova).
 [REDACTED] Metcalf, Henriette.
 [REDACTED] Miku, John or Frank Kartush.
 [REDACTED] Ming, Barbara Luke.
 [REDACTED] Modonas, Antonios.
 [REDACTED] Mombacher, Karl Ewald.
 [REDACTED] Mon, Frank or Mon Suey or
 Johnny Wah.
 [REDACTED] Mondlak, Sawa Yaroslav.
 [REDACTED] Monkarl, Hassen S. or Hassen
 El Sayed Menkar or Hason Monkal.
 [REDACTED] Montanaro, Gioacchino.
 [REDACTED] Montrand, Juana Cortez.
 [REDACTED] Mook, Lam Sang or Yee Lee.
 [REDACTED] Moons, Victor.
- [REDACTED] Morales-Avila, Gabriel.
 [REDACTED] Moretti, Dominick or Mario
 Moretti or Dominick Marchetti.
 [REDACTED] Moroch, Simeon.
 [REDACTED] Mortuza, Golam or Mohamed
 Ghulam Murtaza.
 [REDACTED] Mouquinho, Sofia (nee Sofia
 Jimenez Chavez).
 [REDACTED] Mueller, Carl Josef Peter.
 [REDACTED] Mul, Phaik-Sim L.
 [REDACTED] Muller, Heinrich Arthur or
 Henry Arthur Miller.
 [REDACTED] Mulley, Anne Jane.
 [REDACTED] Munoz, Eduardo Castaneda or
 Eduard Castaneda or Eduard Castaneda
 Munoz.
 [REDACTED] Nalman, Moshe or Mozek
 Najman.
 [REDACTED] Nass, Goldie.
 [REDACTED] Navarro, Raymundo or Ray-
 mundo Navarro Carrol.
 [REDACTED] Nevison, Herbert Peter.
 [REDACTED] Ng, You Lin or Yau Ng or You
 Ng.
 [REDACTED] Ngar, Chow See or Chow Pang
 or Pang Joe or Joe Pang.
 [REDACTED] Nicholson, Catherine (nee
 Byrne).
 [REDACTED] Nieto, Jose Galvan or Joseph
 Nieto Galvan or Jose Nieto Galvan.
 [REDACTED] Noutsopoulos, Spiros.
 [REDACTED] Novack, Jean or Zalata Nowik or
 Jennie Novack.
 [REDACTED] Nuzzozese, Hendrika Jacoba
 (nee Van Eyck).
 [REDACTED] Olsen, Einar Gran or Einar Ol-
 sen.
 [REDACTED] Olsen, Hans.
 [REDACTED] Orabona, Giuseppe.
 [REDACTED] Ordorica, Marcelino Vidaurraza-
 ga or Marcellino Vidaurrazaga.
 [REDACTED] Orlich, Nikola Vincent or Nick
 Orlich.
 [REDACTED] Osman, Hassan or Hasan Hajee
 Eoner or Omer Hassan Hagl or Agl Omer
 Hassen or Victor Barbere or Barbarie or Bar-
 bari or Abdi Ibrahim.
 [REDACTED] Otero, Jose Gomez or Jose Go-
 mez Otero Leon.
 [REDACTED] Padla, Ksenia.
 [REDACTED] Palacios-Valadez, Roberto.
 [REDACTED] Panagopoulos, John or John
 Nick Pappas.
 [REDACTED] Paoli, Roberto Giovanni or Rob-
 erto G. Paoli or Roberto Roberto Paoli or
 Giovanni Paoli.
 [REDACTED] Papa, Bertha.
 [REDACTED] Papazoglou, Dimitrios Emanuel
 or Papisoglou.
 [REDACTED] Parron, Maria De Los Nieves or
 Maria P. Pena.
 [REDACTED] Passerini, Luigi.
 [REDACTED] Pataca, Abilio or Joaquim Rod-
 rigues.
 [REDACTED] Pavich, Frank.
 [REDACTED] Pena-Romero, Eduardo or Ru-
 ben Alcares-Hervey.
 [REDACTED] Pena, Aurora Ortiz De or Au-
 rora Ortiz-Perez.
 [REDACTED] Pender, Bride Christina.
 [REDACTED] Pereda, Yolanda Mazar now Yo-
 landa Marty.
 [REDACTED] Pereira, Luis or Luis Masa Pe-
 reira.
 [REDACTED] Perez, Jose Dominguez or Jo-
 seph Dominguez.
 [REDACTED] Perez-Hernandez, Daise.
 [REDACTED] Perez, Narcisa Estrella De La
 Osa y.
 [REDACTED] Pesa, Vicko Ante.
 [REDACTED] Pezold, Frederick Emil.
 [REDACTED] Plan, Richard or Hsueh-Jul
 Pian.
 [REDACTED] Pian, Mabel or Mel-Po Lou
 Pian (nee Lou).
 [REDACTED] Picut Diaz; Guido Hilario or
 Guido Hilario Picot or John Avalos or John
 Gomez.
 [REDACTED] Piller, Karin or Kaarin Wirgo
 Piller.
 [REDACTED] Pina, Antonio Jose or Pinna or
 Pinno.

Polemis, Leonidas.
 Polemis, Afrodite (nee Dracos).
 Poon, Tung or Poon Tung.
 Profenna, Francesca or Frances
 Profenna or Francesca or M. Francesca Can-
 cro.
 Rodriguez, Elsa.
 Roggio, Santo.
 Roper, Ivan Leopold or Lee-
 man Searchwell.
 Roque, Jose Goncalves.
 Roros, Kostas.
 Rosini, Vice.
 Rothenberg, Izak or Jack.
 Roumeliotis, Nicholas.
 Rowlands, Timothy Bowen.
 Rumsey, May Eleanor.
 Ruse, Gloria Roberts.
 Ryan, Margaret Bertha (nee
 Hartlieb).
 Safyurtlu, Mahmut Iskender.
 Safyurtlu, Gulnar (nee Assa-
 dulah or Ecadullah).
 Sarkinen, Jenny Karja.
 Sauro, Federico or Federico
 Sauro Costagliola.
 Sawchuk, Anna.
 Schidlowski, Alice Tamm or
 Ursula Tamm Schidlowski.
 Schurmann, Milda (nee Egilt).
 Schwarz, Carl or Karol Szwarc
 or Karl Scharzt.
 Psiakis, Andrew Nicholas.
 Pugliese, Angela (nee Stucci).
 Quan, Lee Kee.
 Quoeq, Lui or Liu Quoeq or
 Liu Kwal or Liu Kal or Liu Kway or Lu
 Kal.
 Rabinowitz, Dina (nee Zaid-
 man).
 Ralsanen, Aino Alfrida (nee
 Vaukonen).
 Ramos, Manuel.
 Ramos-Perez, Francisco.
 Rana, Sudhir Narasinha.
 Rankines, Elkhanah Jacob.
 Rea, Raffaele or Ralph Rea.
 Refele, Hans Rainer.
 Reid, Desmond James.
 Reid, John Joseph or Timothy
 Lynch.
 Reyes, Ramon Joaquin.
 Rincon-Chavoya, George or
 Jorge Chavoya-Rincon.
 Ripley, William Charles.
 Rivieccio, Michele.
 Roberts, Constance Faith Alimo.
 Robertson, Henry Alexander.
 Robinson, Vernal.
 Rodriguez, Teresa (nee Perez
 Digon).
 Rodriguez-Rodriguez, Martin.
 Scott, Lydia Nicholas.
 Serna, Elvira Tarin or Elvira
 Tarin.
 Shabov, Joseph or Mohamed
 Ben Ali Shabov.
 Sherson, Beulah Dolly or Beu-
 lah Dolly Levine or Bulah Dolly Steinberg.
 Shults, Maria Magdalena.
 Simmons, William Leopold.
 Smith, Herta Jacobi.
 Smith, Otto or Otto Oertwig
 or Otto Ertwig.
 Smolinski, Bernice.
 Soon, Mark or Mark Lee or
 Mark Kee Watt.
 Sossoff, Basile.
 Spring, Adolph or Adolf Spring
 or Joe Spring.
 Stafford, Andre Cochelein.
 Stagner, Frank Harcourt.
 Stagner, Lawrence or Lawrence
 Robert Stagner.
 Stammer, Willy.
 Stamos, Anna.
 Stamos, Catherine Belle (nee
 Bemner).
 Stellatos, Ioannis.
 Stephenson, Margaret Gertrude
 or Marguerite Gertrude Stephens.
 Stern, Silviu Alexander.

Stewart, Harold Irving.
 Stillediotis, Evangelos Theodoros
 or Angelo Still.
 Stover, Maxine Mae.
 Stowe, Sam.
 Strauss, Anita.
 Strobbia, Comenick Jerome or
 Domenico Girolano Strobbia.
 Sulich, Giuseppe or Joseph
 Sulich.
 Sulskis, Gertrud Hildegard (nee
 Leutheuser).
 Sum, Lai or Sun.
 Sun, Chang or Wong Fook.
 Symonette, Melvin Paul or
 Lewill Winter.
 Szekely, Anthony.
 Szekely, Julia Balla.
 Tai, Lee Yung or Lee Yung or
 Lee Tai.
 Tang, Ah Chang.
 Taylor, Cyril or Frank Earle
 Williams.
 Thaller, Fay (nee Felge Ler-
 ner).
 Thomas, Beatriz or Beatrice (nee
 Camargo).
 Thompson, Eric Houston.
 Thompson, Mary or Mary Bowe.
 Thompson, Kenneth Leon.
 Tim, Chan Fook or Fook Tim
 Chan.
 Timis, John or John Tennas.
 Tjostolfsen, Nils T.
 Tomczak, Mieczslaw.
 Topel, Jacob Isaac or Jacob
 or Jacob Toppel.
 Torres, Enedina Alvarez.
 Torres, Geronimo.
 Torres-Carpio, Rogerio Alejan-
 dro or Rogerio Alejandro.
 Tortora, Louis.
 Tron, Gustavo Giovanni.
 Tsalapinas, Evangelos.
 Tsalapinas, Theodoros.
 Tso, Eugene or Hsi Chang Tso.
 Tubel, John.
 Tung, Anders Pedersen.
 Tuya, Maria Luz Martinez.
 Tyrnaeur, Lily.
 Tyrnauer, Abraham.
 Usher, Albert Winston or
 Michael Blake or Winston Churchill Usher.
 Utianski, or Elia Yapko or Elia
 Utkanski or Alec Utianski.
 Utianski, Mina or Mina Utkan-
 ski or Mina Muler.
 Valmas, Charalambos M. or
 Harry Valmas or Harry Michael Valmas or
 Haralambos Michalis.
 Vara-Brito, Alfonso.
 Vargas, Candido Perez.
 Vargas, Maria.
 Vasard, Richard Martin or
 Richard Martin Hamme.
 Vasquez-Gonzales, Candido.
 Vastakis, Spiridon Eleftherios
 or Spiros Eleftherios Vastakis or Spiros
 Vastakis.
 Ventimiglia, Giovanni.
 Vicuma-Salazar, Gregorio.
 Vidies, Theresa.
 Visco, Philomene Marie or
 Stasse or Cys.
 Vitoratos, Stefanos or Stephen
 Vitoratos.
 Vorrasso, Gluseppa Scannelli.
 Voz, Monique or Monique Con-
 stance Emma Antoinette Voz.
 Wai, Young Fook.
 Walzel, Klaus Dieter.
 Wang, Chao Chen.
 Wassberg, Thorsten Reinhold.
 Watt, Eileen (nee Currant).
 Westby, Evan Lewis.
 Wetzel, Renate.
 Wha, Ling Shao or Shao Wha
 Ling.
 Williams, Charlotte Rebecca or
 Lottie Williams.
 Wing, Eng or Wing Suey Eng.

Wing, Ho Chee or Robert Ho or
 Wing Ho.
 Wing, Jung or Ah Wah or John
 Wing.
 Wong, Hing or Tony Hing Wong
 or Wong Hing.
 Wong, Leong or Yep.
 Wong, Norman Seek Moon.
 Wood, Louie or Silverio La-
 desma.
 Yadgaroff, Isaac Ishak.
 Yeung, Qai Bock.
 You, Chong Mik or Don Chong.
 Young, David or Young Fook.
 Young, Yee.
 Yuen, Chin or George Chin.
 Zablocki, Joana (nee Abraham).
 Zadorozny, William or Basil
 Zadorozny.
 Zamarripa-Castilla, Indalecio.
 Zamarripa, Ascencion (Chona)
 Barrera de.
 Zavou, Costas Christodoulos
 or Costas C. Zavou or Castaes Zavou.
 Zeller, Kurt Robert.
 Zichichi, Natale.
 Zonoff, Andrew Neketo.
 Zuber, Harry Isaac.
 Farmanfarma, Ali Dad.
 Fook, Haw aka Victor Haw or
 Victor Haw Fook.
 Storper, Gertrude K.
 Wang, Niah-Tzu alias Wang
 Nian.
 Wang, Mabel U. alias U. Tai-
 yang.
 Pai, Ei Whan alias Edward
 Whan Pai.
 Yen, John Teng-Chien or Teng-
 Chien Yen or John T. C. Yen.
 Kulukundis, Eugenie (nee
 Diacakis).

With the following committee amend-
 ments:

Strike out the matter as it appears on
 page 8, line 23, and insert in lieu thereof
 "Geldis, Panagiotis or Pete Gel-
 dis."

Strike out the matter as it appears on
 page 10, line 1.

Strike out the matter as it appears on
 page 17, line 5, and insert in lieu thereof
 "Carrillo-Duran, Miguel."

Strike out the matter as it appears on
 page 20, line 5, and insert in lieu thereof
 "Guerrero-Olvera, Pedro."

Strike out the matter as it appears on
 page 28, line 21, and insert in lieu thereof
 "Apostolescu, Stefan."

Strike out the matter as it appears on
 page 31, lines 14 and 15.

Strike out the matter as it appears on
 page 32, line 14, and insert in lieu thereof
 "Collop, Mary."

Strike out the matter as it appears on
 page 33, line 2, and insert in lieu thereof
 "De Aguilar, Celia Duron."

Strike out the matter as it appears on
 page 33, line 7, and insert in lieu thereof
 "Deli, Edmondo."

Strike out the matter as it appears on
 page 46, lines 17 and 18.

Strike out the matter as it appears on
 page 49, line 17, and insert in lieu thereof
 "Stafford, Andree Cochelein."

The committee amendments were
 agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed
 to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the
 table.

LANHAM WAR HOUSING ACT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask
 unanimous consent that the Committee
 on Public Works be discharged from the
 further consideration of the bill (H. R.
 6130) to permit a first preference for

former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

There was no objection.

USE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL EQUIPMENT BY STATES DURING MAJOR DISASTERS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2199) to allow States during major disasters to use or distribute certain surplus equipment and supplies of the Federal Government.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have this bill explained. It has never been heard before our committee. I can find no hearing on it in the Senate. There is one word in there about which I raise a question, "donate." I do not know what authority the Federal Government has to donate any equipment to the States. I would be in favor of leasing or lending it, but I raise a question about the word "donate."

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

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

Mr. MCCORMACK. I think the word "donate" under the circumstances is appropriate. We donate to colleges and hospitals surplus goods that can be used by them. I suppose the word "donate" is used in the sense of a gift.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is my understanding that this has to do with road equipment. I do not know anything about it. We had no hearings on this, but I was told a moment ago that it had to do with road equipment. Then, of course, the question arose in my mind, what business does the Federal Government have donating road equipment.

Mr. MCCORMACK. This has to do with surplus material. It has nothing to do with anything that a Government agency might be able to use. This is material that has been declared to be surplus. The bill would apply not only to the States of New England but to Michigan or any other State. I believe it is the purpose of the bill to try to brush aside certain technicalities in order to get quickly the result that we all want. There is precedent for this in other organic laws with reference to giving surplus materials to colleges or hospitals. That bill came out of the Committee on Government Operations several years ago.

Mr. DONDERO. The way this bill has been explained to me, the purpose of it is simply to expedite the getting of material and equipment or surplus items which are needed in a disaster area rather than going through the State and having the State send it to any particular community. The purpose of this is to have it come directly from the Federal Government.

Mr. MCGREGOR. If I can inquire again. This bill provides that the materials shall go from the Federal Government to the States. The Federal Government donates or loans to the States. My distinguished chairman left the inference that the Federal Government was going to loan or donate directly to the local political subdivisions. Is that right?

Mr. DONDERO. It is simply a method of expediting the getting of materials to disaster areas. That is the way I understand the bill.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Might I say the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] represents the Worcester district which was terribly visited by a disaster, as well as the district of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]. I think a small part of the Speaker's district was unfortunately visited and also the district of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]. I believe also the district of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] was visited.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My district was not visited. But I did visit the areas of other Members and they certainly need help if any of our people ever did need help.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] introduced a similar or companion bill in the House. This bill has passed the Senate already, so quick action will get it to the White House. The bill is really the Saltonstall-Kennedy-Donohue bill.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am certain the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts understands I do not want to object to the consideration of this bill, but I do raise the question of how the Federal Government can donate or loan to a political subdivision any materials. It is my understanding under existing law that we loan it to the States and they are responsible and the State, in turn, lend it to the local communities.

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

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. DONOHUE. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] may I refer you to Public Law 875. There is provision in that law permitting the Federal Government not only to lend but also to give or to grant such materials to the States. Under existing law there is no provision which will be of help to individuals. We have been informed that throughout the country there is warehouse after warehouse filled with surplus material that is of no use to the Government. There are furnishings of all kinds such as dressers, dishes, and that sort of thing which could be used in refurbishing the homes of the disaster victims, and this bill would enable the Federal civil defense agency, through a State representative, to distribute that surplus material which is of no value or use to the Government to these individuals.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Do I understand that the State agency is going to distribute it to the local political subdivision or to the individuals?

Mr. DONOHUE. No, it goes through a State representative. It is requested,

let us say, by a municipality through the State representative, undoubtedly through the governor's office, and they in turn make the request to the Federal civil defense agency.

Mr. MCGREGOR. But it is not the Federal Government distributing surplus material, or what not, to any particular town; it must go through some State agency?

Mr. DONOHUE. That is right. Eventually it will come to a city or a town and they, through their representative, will see that it is given to the needy victims of disasters.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. That means, then, that Cleveland, which was very hard hit by a tornado, may apply to the State for some of this surplus property?

Mr. DONOHUE. That is exactly right.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes," approved September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109), as amended, is amended by striking out clause (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) by donating or lending equipment and supplies, determined under then existing law to be surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the Federal Government, to States for use or distribution by them for the purpose of the act, including the restoration of public facilities damaged or destroyed in such major disaster and essential rehabilitation of individuals in need as the result of such major disaster."

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, because it is a matter of emergency and vitally affects the immediate interests of my constituents, this morning I requested my distinguished colleague from Michigan, the chairman of the House Public Works Committee, to ask the members of his committee to approve the substitution of S. 2199 for my own bill, H. R. 5826, a bill to authorize the President to donate surplus Federal property to individuals in a major disaster area.

Following the major tornado disaster which occurred on June 9, 1953, in my home city of Worcester and surrounding central Massachusetts communities, I held repeated conferences with the officials of the RFC, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Farmers' Home Administration, and the Civil De-

fense Administration, which are the Government agencies, other than the Red Cross, that can render Federal aid in these disaster situations. I urged them to do everything they could in promptly bringing help to our people and communities who suffered so greatly from this terrible freak of nature, and they are doing everything they can within their limited power.

In talking with all these representatives, however, I was amazed to find that, while under existing legislation they can assist States and municipalities in the emergency restoration of public facilities, they considered themselves without authority to grant any direct aid to homeless victims of a "major disaster area." Their opinion was that present laws did not, at least by implication, permit them to do so. Few persons seem to realize that whatever Federal money may be sent into a disaster area, including grants from the President's disaster fund, such funds can now only be used for the emergency repair of local public works and the general welfare. In other words, although we can and do, here in this House, freely give money and supplies to unfortunate people all over the world, there appears to be no legislative authority by which any agency of this Government can directly and concretely aid American taxpayers who have lost virtually all they owned in these terrible tornado and other freak-of-nature disasters.

There are, in my central Massachusetts area alone, hundreds of American families who have lost their homes and all their furnishings with, unfortunately, little, if any, insurance recovery. They must still meet the mortgage interest payments on a demolished home, they have practically no financial resources now but the father's weekly pay, and their credit rating, under the circumstances, is extremely uncertain. They must start their lives all over again from nothing, and it seems to me that this Government should and can properly help them to begin anew just by donating articles they vitally need out of Federal surplus property that is now lying around uselessly in warehouses. By surplus property I mean any household furnishings such as tableware, chairs, tables, bureau dressers, cots, mattresses, and other available household items so essential to renewal of normal family living conditions.

The purpose of my bill was to remove any doubt in the minds of the Civil Defense officials that they or the President have the power to authorize the direct distribution by donation of Government surplus property to homeless major disaster victims who are in vital need of it.

Subsequently I requested Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY to introduce companion measures in the Senate, which they did, and that was passed by the Senate recently and is now here before us for substitution for my original bill. I greatly appreciate the wholehearted cooperation of both of our Massachusetts Senators in this matter.

The amended version of the Senate bill channels the surplus property through the States, and thus conforms to our past practices in this matter.

However, there is one change through which local governments are eliminated from the supervision of the distribution of the surplus property involved. This provision, if more time was available should, in my opinion, be most carefully scrutinized and evaluated. I very much fear the elimination of the local government participation will inevitably lead to unintended and hampering delay in prompt distribution of the needed supplies to homeless victims. They would certainly appear to be in a better position to accurately determine the needs of the disaster victims within their own area and could more accurately check to insure that no illegal divergence of the surplus property occurred. However, these matters can perhaps be taken care of in the future. The main thing is to get the surplus property to the tornado disaster victims in the shortest time possible.

Therefore, I urge all my colleagues here to unanimously accept and approve the essential principle embodied in this bill and which I originally offered. That principle is merely to extend to American taxpayers, victims of a major disaster, the same generosity this Government exhibits toward unfortunate people in foreign lands, and to which our own citizens have a preeminent claim.

I desire to again express my thanks to both Massachusetts Senators for their cooperation in this matter and also to my distinguished colleague and Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for permitting this most important measure to be considered today. We are also deeply indebted to our other distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority whip, as well as every other single member of the Massachusetts delegation who worked so hard with me to get this legislation approved.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that this bill has come to the House for what I am certain will be prompt and unanimous approval. While it will apply generally, I know that it will be of particular significance to that part of Massachusetts which was affected by the recent tornado.

Although the tornado itself first struck in Petersham, which is in the First District, fortunately, the damage there was not excessive compared to other areas in Massachusetts, and particularly in the neighboring Fourth District, represented by my colleague [Mr. DONOHUE]. The passage of this bill, which was introduced in the Senate by the two Senators from Massachusetts, and which is quite similar in purpose and effect to a bill introduced here by my colleague [Mr. DONOHUE], will be of considerable potential value in assisting in the necessary repair of the damage caused by the tornado. I know that it will be appreciated, not only by those directly affected but by all the people of Massachusetts who have consistently supported the traditional American responsibility for assistance whenever

disaster visited other parts of this country and the world. I want to commend the committee and the leadership who have made it possible for us to complete action on this important measure now without any delay. Obviously, the sooner this kind of relief can reach those who need it the more valuable it is.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to associate myself with my colleagues Massachusetts in urging prompt approval of this bill. Although my own district fortunately escaped the tornado of June 9, 1953, other sections of the State were visited by the disaster which struck so suddenly with such distressing loss to so many people. Hardest hit of all was the Fourth District represented by my colleague [Mr. DONOHUE], and I commend him for his prompt action in introducing the bill for which the Senate bill has been substituted. I also commend the committee for so expeditiously bringing this remedial legislation before the House and the Speaker and the leadership for their effective cooperation. When disaster strikes it comes with sudden swiftness and the correspondingly prompt and effective relief afforded by this legislation is richly deserved by Congressman DONOHUE, who has been so diligent and untiring in the interests of the stricken people in his district.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the House will give its immediate consent to Congressman DONOHUE's bill for which the Senate bill is substituted.

This bill will render much needed aid and assistance to the tornado victims of Worcester County where great loss of life, loss and devastation of property occurred. The situation is urgent and the relief provided by this bill will be of great benefit.

Most of the afflicted area struck by this terrible natural holocaust is located in Congressman DONOHUE's district and my own district has been affected to a considerable extent.

This great disaster points up the startling gaps in the Federal relief programs and we have learned to our sorrow that many of the programs set up to help disaster victims do not help to the extent we had intended and believed in this House.

These programs must be revised and perfected in line with pending legislation introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman DONOHUE, and myself, and I hope that the House will make a substantial and significant start in this important matter by unanimously passing this bill.

I commend my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman DONOHUE, for his untiring and most effective work in these matters, in which I have been privileged to join. I am thankful to the Speaker, the leadership, and the committee for their inspiring cooperation.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GIVES 1 PERCENT TO "HELP" TORNADO-WRECKED MASSACHUSETTS COMMUNITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the unprecedented tornado which struck Worcester, Mass., and surrounding communities on June 9, 1953, killed many and left thousands homeless.

Property damage is in excess of \$50 million.

This represents a total loss in many cases, because there was no insurance coverage for this type of destruction, which is as rare in Massachusetts as a volcanic eruption in Texas.

On June 11 the President declared the Worcester region to be a major disaster area. On June 14 the President approved the expenditure of \$500,000 out of the \$18 million available toward rehabilitation and emergency repair under Public Law 875, 81st Congress.

"Token" is the word to describe the help received so far from the Federal Government. As soon as news of the disaster was pushed from the front pages the responsibility for further aid was forgotten, even though it will be at least 6 months before the emergency is over.

There is much dissatisfaction up our way concerning the parsimonious assistance given by the Federal Government toward the relief of the disaster victims. Not since the floods of 1936 and the hurricane of 1938 has Massachusetts experienced such devastation.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts immediately appropriated \$5 million to reimburse cities and towns for tornado expenditures. The Red Cross raised its original allocation of \$100,000 to \$250,000. Large sums have been contributed separately by the people of the State to provide additional assistance. All these, taken together, still fall far short of the goal.

The Federal Civil Defense Administration has provided 280 home trailers—through the Housing and Home Finance Agency—to serve as temporary housing. The people of Worcester and vicinity are grateful for the assistance given via these and other measures, but so much more remains to be done.

If you could go to Worcester and see the people picking up the matchwood—all that remains of their homes—and trying to salvage a few useful things out of the wreckage that is almost complete, you, too, would be ashamed of the Federal Government's indifference to their plight.

The Boston Post, in an editorial on June 27, 1953, commented, in part, as follows:

If the job can be done with a minimum of Federal assistance, it will be done, even though the Federal Government has a moral obligation to help the stricken area. It seems rather plain that the tornado crisis in Massachusetts got a brush-off from the administration.

Last year Massachusetts paid almost \$2 billion into the Internal Revenue Bureau. Its total return in Federal grants of all kinds was \$107,631,000, a very modest sum compared to the handouts to some of the southern States. All that Massachusetts folks need to know is whether their tornado contributions are deductible. They can take it from there.

Small wonder that the editorial has a cynical tone.

In the light of the billions that are being appropriated for foreign aid, there should be room for a little more than 1 percent help for those of our own citizens who have lost all that they have worked for and saved through the years. We speak of putting the people of Europe on their feet again, but how about doing the same, at a trifling cost, for Americans who are the victims of a disaster that also kills, and ruins, right here in the United States?

The entire delegation from Massachusetts in the United States House of Representatives, under date of June 29, addressed a resolution to the President, requesting that he set aside sums out of the disaster-relief fund at his disposal, and in the substantial amount needed, for relief of the hard-hit Worcester area.

As there is no indication that this request will be approved, and in view of the great rehabilitation problem confronting our disaster area, I have introduced a similar bill to compensate for the deficiency.

TESTIMONY OF AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION BEFORE HOUSE VETERANS COMMITTEE

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make the announcement, that the American Medical Association is appearing before our Subcommittee on Hospitals of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, on Monday at 10 o'clock. They have been very active in trying to prevent the hospitalization of some non-service-connected veterans, and they have a right to be heard. The committee is hearing their case on Monday. I know the Members of the House are extremely interested in seeing that the rights of the veterans to hospitalization are not liquidated.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 noon.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1953—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CHIPERFIELD submitted a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 5710.

AID TO PEOPLE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that ever since his nomination a year ago, President Eisenhower has been keenly concerned with the sufferings of the people behind the Iron Curtain. I believe herein lies the solution of the great ills that beset the world—attention to these sufferings. I noted the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]—and I commend him for them—on aid to the people behind the Iron Curtain; their desire for freedom, their basic God-given rights. These are the things that we of the free world must be concerned with.

Today I introduced a resolution to provide for an authorization of \$500 million to be given to the President to be used in his very wide discretion to aid these people who are suffering, to get them to begin to go back on the path to security, to their God-given rights and freedom to which they as human beings are entitled.

I think this is the direction to the solution of all of our basic problems; once we can join hands with them we can then rid the world of the Communist conspiracy that is causing all these great evils.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think this is an excellent opportunity for us to capitalize and to exploit the feelings of the people behind the Iron Curtain, not only in our own national interest, but in the interest of the great, long-range result that we all have in mind, a future world peace.

There are persons behind the Iron Curtain who are willing to die for their liberty. I saw a picture of two young men with their arms upraised, apparently throwing a stone at an armored Soviet tank. That shows what the desire for

liberty means. There are countless millions of people behind the Iron Curtain who want to be free men and free women, who want a little freedom, who want some of the fruits of their efforts, who want to enjoy the sacredness of their family life, the same as all of us do, at least to some extent.

These are God-given rights.

When I saw those pictures and I read of what was happening, I knew that that was the outward manifestation of something that comes to us all through the natural law of God.

There is so much we can do; mere words are not enough; we have got to take action helping them with food and other ways. I am for it. We should cooperate in every way possible in trying to take advantage of the opportunity that exists because I think we have the greatest opportunity that has been presented during the past 5 years, since the termination of World War II. I am very happy to listen to the gentleman's remarks and to note the resolution he introduced.

I made the suggestion to a newspaperman when he asked me about it. I said: "We have got to take action." He said: "What kind of action, McCORMACK, would you take?" I said: "I would give the President two hundred million, three hundred million, or even five hundred million, as a blanket fund which he could use in the national interest of the United States."

I would have no hesitancy in giving to the President of the United States, no matter whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, a fund to use in the national interest of our country for things of that kind, because I know he will use it for the best interest of our country. This is a time for something more than words; this is the time for action to keep alive that spirit behind the Iron Curtain rather than bring about disillusionment and disappointment. This is one of the actions which I think would be very helpful. It certainly will put the Communist leaders on notice; it will give hope to the millions behind the Iron Curtain. Not only this, but there are also other things we can do and that we should do, but now is the time, the opportunity presents itself now, and we ought to take advantage of it.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I agree with the gentleman. I think it is a bipartisan matter of the greatest urgency, and I am glad to recall that the President has consistently been concerned with the plight of these people.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 16. An act to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of

the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4905. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1644. An act to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended, and the act of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1111), to remove the limitation upon the rank of the Director of Music, the leader of the United States Military Academy Band, and to remove the limitation upon the pay of the United States Naval Academy Band, and to authorize the appointment of the present leader of the United States Navy Band to the permanent grade of commander in the Navy.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

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

H. R. 1528. An act to authorize the exchange of lands of the Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument, Virginia, for non-Federal lands; and

H. R. 4905. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

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. DORN of New York and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY to extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BONIN and to include an editorial. Mr. DAGUE.

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

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GORDON and to include a telegram. Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS and to include an address made by the Governor of Tennessee at the International Kiwanis Convention, notwithstanding it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$196.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAKER and to include an article. Mr. JENKINS the remarks he made today in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. HARDEN in two instances, to include in one an article appearing in Time magazine, and in the other a preliminary report by the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

Mr. BOW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BONIN and Mr. ROONEY. Mr. WOLVERTON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL and to include a radio broadcast.

Mr. HALLECK and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin to revise and extend their remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE in two instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, July 13, 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:

834. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 12, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Cold Spring Inlet (Cape May Harbor), N. J., with a view to shore protection authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 206); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 12 illustrations.

835. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled, "A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1935 (The Bankhead-Jones Act), as amended, to strengthen the conduct of research of the Department of Agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

836. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of May 31, 1953, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

837. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certified copy of the acts of the 20th special session of the 17th Legislature of Puerto Rico, also containing acts of the first special session of the first legislature held under the new Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, pursuant to the provisions of section 23 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 327. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5877, a bill to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 761). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6200. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 762). Referred to the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 294. Joint resolution continuing the availability of appropriations for the Small Defense Plants Administration for the month of July 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 763). 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. 5664. A bill to amend the mineral leasing laws with respect to their application in the case of pipelines passing through the public domain; with amendment (Rept. No. 764). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 157. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; with amendment (Rept. No. 765). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 328. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4353, a bill to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 766). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 329. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5740, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to protect the public health and welfare by providing certain authority for factory inspection, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 767). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 129. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Chinese Communists are not entitled to and should not be recognized to represent China in the United Nations; without amendment (Rept. No. 768). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOPE: Committee of conference. H. R. 6054. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to provide for additional emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 769). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Committee of conference. H. R. 5710. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 770). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 6200. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 6201. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 6202. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 6203. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6204. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 6205. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 6206. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 6207. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 6208. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 6209. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 6210. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 6211. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 6212. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 6213. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. R. 6214. A bill authorizing the State of California to collect tolls for the use of certain highway crossings across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 6215. A bill to extend and improve the old-age and survivors insurance system, to provide permanent and total disability insurance and rehabilitation benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 6216. A bill relating to mining claims located on land with respect to which a permit or lease has been issued, or an application or offer for permit or lease has been made, under the mineral leasing laws, or known to be valuable for minerals subject to disposition under the mineral leasing laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 6217. A bill relating to mining claims located on land with respect to which a permit or lease has been issued, or an application or offer for permit or lease has been made, under the mineral leasing laws, or known to be valuable for minerals subject to disposition under the mineral leasing laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 6218. A bill to extend the period of restriction and of tax exemption of lands of certain members of the Five Civilized Tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE (by request):

H. R. 6219. A bill to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to regulate supply of crops and to thereby guard against famine and destitution in any part of the United States and its possessions and in other nations, to promote orderly marketing of crops, to insure against unduly depressive price levels, and to establish a board and corporations for such purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:

H. R. 6220. A bill relating to mining claims located on land with respect to which a permit or lease has been issued, or an application or offer for permit or lease has been made, under the mineral leasing laws, or known to be valuable for minerals subject to disposition under the mineral leasing laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 6221. A bill to assist in preventing defective construction of housing aided under Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 6222. A bill authorizing the modification of the existing project for navigation on the Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 6223. A bill to amend section 37 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended (32 U. S. C. 47), to relieve the States from pecuniary liability for property lost, damaged, or destroyed through unavoidable causes and to authorize the States to be relieved from accountability in any case except where it shall appear that the loss, damage, or destruction of the property was due to carelessness or negligence or could have been avoided by the exercise of reasonable care; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6224. A bill to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended (32 U. S. C. 194), to permit the States to organize military forces or cadres thereof, other than as parts of their National Guards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 6225. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" to provide for a statute of limitations with respect to civil actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (by request):

H. R. 6226. A bill to restore the jurisdiction of the district courts in certain civil actions brought against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 6227. A bill to promote the economic recovery of the Oglala Sioux Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Pine Ridge Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6228. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reser-

vation in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 6229. A bill to extend and improve the old-age and survivors insurance system, to provide permanent and total disability insurance and rehabilitation benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 6230. A bill to resume the redemption of currency in gold in order to restrain further deterioration of the dollar and to curb further inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H. R. 6231. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to disabled veterans who are 65 years of age or older and who are suffering from non-service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TABER:

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution continuing the availability of appropriations for the Small Defense Plants Administration for the month of July 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DODD:

H. J. Res. 295. Joint resolution designating June 26 of each year as National Baseball Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 296. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation of \$500 million and other sums to aid the suffering people of Communist-dominated nations and areas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to enact into law the principles of the Furcolo Federal scholarship plan; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to the Congress of the United States to enact legislation liberalizing certain provisions of the law relating to immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress in favor of the issuance of a commemorative stamp for Samuel Osgood; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the Massachusetts State Senate memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation liberalizing certain provisions of the law relating to immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress in favor of the issuance of a commemorative stamp for Samuel Osgood; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 6232. A bill for the relief of the Birmingham Iron Works, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 6233. A bill for the relief of Youssef Nemer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 6234. A bill for the relief of Michael Christopher Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 6235. A bill for the relief of Imre and Margareta Seykell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6236. A bill for the relief of Joseph Berke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6237. A bill for the relief of Dr. Beni Horvath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 6238. A bill for the relief of Russell Earnest and L. E. Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 6239. A bill for the relief of Spyran-gelos Vagelatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6240. A bill for the relief of Georgios Vagelatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 6241. A bill for the relief of Jose Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6242. A bill for the relief of the West Coast Meat Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 6243. A bill for the relief of Eloyse Gillian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6244. A bill for the relief of Hong Yun Pyo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 6245. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Pierino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 6246. A bill for the relief of Kyu Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 6247. A bill for the relief of Anthony Benito Estella, Natividad Estella, Virginia Araceli Estella and Antonio Juan Estella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 6248. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Hauser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 6249. A bill for the relief of Gusto Razo Martinez, Mrs. Carmine Cortez de Razo, and their minor children, Juan Razo Cortez, Cecilia Razo Cortez, and Maria Elena Razo Cortez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JULY 11, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, July 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.

Set our feet with steadfast purpose, day by day, upon the ascending trail of righteous duty and selfless service. As servants of the Nation, in times that try men's souls, may all uncleanness be burned from our hearts, error purged from our minds, and our will be lost in Thine. 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 Thy children may at last be bound by golden cords of understanding and fellowship around the feet of the one God. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on nominations under the heading "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar, under the heading "New Reports."

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of A. Jack Goodwin, of Alabama, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.