

## SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 10, 1950

*(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)*

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

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

God of the living and of the living dead, from the beauty of the lilies in temples of worship in the afterglow of Easter Day we come girding ourselves with its deathless message, as again we take up our daily tasks "feeling through all this earthly dress bright shoots of everlastingness." In our own risen lives, seeking those things which are above, enable us to challenge with the conquering truth of Easter all tyrants who denying it deal in falsehood and chains, as they exploit and degrade the holy temple of human personality. Knowing there is no way to dawn except by dark, or to Easter except by Calvary, may we face whatever the future holds calm and confident in the assurance that—

"There lives the beauty that man cannot kill,

Yea, that shall kill all ugliness at last;  
And Christ in love's white vesture  
moveth still among us.

May we hold that faith and hold it fast."

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MAYBANK, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Wednesday, April 5, 1950, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2246) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5943. An act to provide for the erection of a monument at the grave of Constantino Brumidi;

H. R. 7341. An act to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Colum-

bia to construct a bridge over the Anacostia River in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7846. An act to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed 5,000 copies of the hearings, held before said committee, on the resolutions entitled "Study of Monopoly Power";

H. Con. Res. 186. Concurrent resolution authorizing a statue of the late Brigham Young, of Utah, to be placed in Statuary Hall; and

H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of hearings relative to revenue revision held before the Committee on Ways and Means during the current session, including an index.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 44. An act for the relief of Arthur O. Fisher;

S. 46. An act for the relief of Primitivo Urcelay-Ruiz; and

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Theodore Constantin Trancu and his wife.

## LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

On request of Mr. HENDRICKSON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for an indefinite period.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANDERSON was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to sit each afternoon at 2 o'clock during the sessions of the Senate. For so long a time as we can obtain consent of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the meetings of the Committee on Finance will be held in the room of the Committee on the District of Columbia, on the Senate floor.

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

On request of Mr. McCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was granted leave to sit while the Senate is in session at any time during this week.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McKellar
Brewster	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Bridges	Hill	Magnuson
Butler	Holland	Malone
Eyrd	Humphrey	Martin
Cain	Hunt	Maybank
Capehart	Ives	Morse
Chapman	Jenner	Mundt
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Cordon	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Darby	Kem	Robertson
Donnell	Kerr	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Ecton	Langer	Stennis
Ferguson	Leahy	Taft
Flanders	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Lodge	Tobey
Fulbright	Long	Watkins
George	Lucas	Wherry
Gillette	McCarran	Williams
Green	McCarthy	Withers
Gurney	McClellan	
Hayden	McFarland	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. HOEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

During the call of the roll when Mr. ROBERTSON's name was called there were manifestations of applause in the gallery.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the visitors in the gallery that applause is out of order; any sort of demonstration is prohibited by the rules of the Senate. We are glad to have guests in the galleries, but order must be preserved; otherwise, the Senate cannot transact its business.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate, and without speeches.

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

## FEDERAL-STATE SYSTEM OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 547)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For President's message, see proceedings of the House of Representatives of April 6, 1950, on pp. 4952-4955.)

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

## ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES OF IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the carrying out of the provisions of articles 12 and 23 of the treaty of February 3, 1944, between the United States and Mexico, by authorizing the acquisition of certain properties of the Imperial Irrigation District of California, situated in the vicinity of Andrade, Calif., and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL PERSONNEL BOATS TO CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, reporting pursuant to law, that the city of San Diego, Calif., had requested the Navy Department to transfer two 24-foot plane personnel boats, for the use of the harbor department of that city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF PICKET BOATS TO CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Department of Police of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., had requested the Navy Department to transfer two 38-foot picket boats for harbor police protection from the water side of the harbor district of that city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law and the reasons for granting the status of permanent residence to each alien (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, together with a detailed statement of the

facts and pertinent provisions of law and the reason for ordering suspension of deportation of each alien (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Pantaleon Gutierrez-Zuniga and Jose Antonio Gomes, from reports relating to aliens whose deportation was suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on October 3, 1949, and January 16, 1950, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## AUDIT REPORT ON NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the National Capital Housing Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

## AUDIT REPORT ON PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Public Housing Administration, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1947 and 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

## AUDIT REPORT ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

## By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

## "Assembly Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to control of water pollution

"Whereas the Eightieth Congress of the United States enacted the Water Pollution Control Act which provides for the granting of loans to any State, municipality, or interstate agency for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge by such State or municipality of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into interstate waters or into a tributary of such waters; and

"Whereas Federal loans under the Water Pollution Control Act will be made only when approved by the appropriate State water-pollution agency; and

"Whereas the Water Pollution Control Act also provides for allocation of funds to States for expenditure by or under the direction of the State water-pollution agencies for conduct of research, prevention, and control of water pollution caused by industrial waste; and

"Whereas the legislature of this State created the State water pollution control board by enacting chapter 1549 of the statutes of 1949; and

"Whereas the State water pollution control board is charged with the administration of any State-wide program of financial assistance for, or research in, water-pollution control; and

"Whereas it was the intent of the Legislature of California that the State water

pollution control board be the State water-pollution agency within the meaning of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Federal Works Administrator is respectfully memorialized to recognize the State water pollution control board as the State water-pollution agency in connection with all matters relating to the Water Pollution Control Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized and urged to enact such amendments to the Water Pollution Control Act as may be necessary to authorize the States to designate the agency to act as the State water-pollution agency within the meaning of the Water Pollution Control Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Federal Works Administrator."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

## "Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relating to memorializing Congress to exempt motion picture and all types of theatrical entertainment from the Federal admissions tax

"Whereas for the purpose of meeting wartime emergency necessity, the Congress of the United States enacted an excise tax of 1 cent for each 5 cents, or major fraction thereof, of the amount paid for admissions to any place, including motion-picture theaters and other places where theatrical entertainment is presented; and

"Whereas the said wartime emergency no longer exists; and

"Whereas it should be a principle of Federal taxation that the burden thereof be fairly and equitably distributed; and

"Whereas the said admissions tax is unfair and inequitable in its operation, in that it imposes an onerous and oppressive burden upon children and upon persons of low income, who are thereby denied access at reasonable cost to the wholesome recreation afforded by motion pictures and theatrical entertainment; and

"Whereas, due in large measure to said tax, the production of motion pictures in this State is at its lowest level in many years and attendance in motion-picture theaters has noticeably decreased; and

"Whereas this State accounts for 90 percent of the production of motion pictures in the United States, and the aforesaid low level of production of the same is certain to have serious detrimental effect upon the economy of this State and upon the welfare and well-being of its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States immediately to enact legislation exempting motion pictures and all types of theatrical entertainment from the operation of the aforesaid Federal admissions tax; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman and each member of the committee on taxation in each House in Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

## "Assembly Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to modify the Federal luxury tax

"Whereas there exists a Federal law taxing luxuries; and

"Whereas many of the items designated as luxuries and taxed as such are in fact utter necessities in modern life; and

"Whereas the Federal luxury taxes were imposed during a period of great national emergency, partly for the purpose of discouraging unnecessary spending and to aid in conservation of the limited wartime supply of certain consumer goods; and

"Whereas scarcities of consumer goods no longer exist; and

"Whereas a luxury tax on legitimate business in times of peace is inequitable to a large portion of the population, such as waiters, musicians, actors, and other persons of special talents who are unemployed as a result of the 20-percent luxury tax on theatrical entertainment, night clubs, and cafes, which is forcing many such establishments to close their doors or to abandon the music and entertainment portions of their normal service; and

"Whereas a tax upon the use of public communication and transportation facilities is a tax not on a luxury but on a business and social necessity and works such a hardship upon small business in particular that it is in fact ruinous to many; and

"Whereas these so-called luxury taxes also extend to many articles, such as baby oils, necessary to the care of infants, thus throwing a disproportionate burden upon young families which have not yet had time to achieve the higher brackets of income and therefore suffer under a tax which takes from those least able to pay; and

"Whereas the tax of necessities as luxuries also works a hardship and inequity upon women in requiring them to pay a 20-percent luxury tax upon such necessities as low-cost luggage, cosmetics, handbags, and similar articles as necessary to their business and social life and any other article of clothing; and

"Whereas this hardship and inequity could be relieved by a proper reclassification and modification of the items subject to tax as luxuries to the end that only those articles which are in fact luxuries or of luxury quality would be taxed; Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly),* That the Legislature of California hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to relieve articles necessary to ordinary business and livelihood from the imposition of luxury taxes in order to reduce the hardships upon those of low income, upon women, and upon small business; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman and each member of the Committee on Taxation in each House of Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

## "Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Senate joint resolution relative to the distribution to unemployed seasonal agricultural workers of surplus food in storage in the State of California owned by the Federal Government to be made available to them through State and county agencies

"Whereas there is unemployment and consequent hardship among numbers of unem-

ployed seasonal workers in the central valleys of the State of California and this problem will increase for the next several weeks or until seasonal work is again available for them; and

"Whereas many of these unemployed agricultural workers whether residents for past 3 years in this State or not such residents, are seriously in immediate need of food and other assistance; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has quantities of surplus food in storage in the State of California at this time consisting of beans, butter, potatoes, honey, dried prunes, peaches, apricots, raisins, and other foodstuffs in addition to the powdered milk and powdered eggs now being distributed through the State department of education, which can be and should be made immediately, devoid of unnecessary red tape, available to such persons to avoid distress and deprivation for many such workers and their families including many small children; and

"Whereas the only surplus food now being distributed, is through the department of education, consisting chiefly of powdered milk and powdered eggs and some potatoes, and is definitely inadequate and insufficient as a diet and such deficiency unless immediately remedied will produce illness of possibly epidemic proportions and which will be prevented if the Federal Government will turn loose the surplus food in its possession as requested by this resolution; and

"Whereas the proposal of getting surplus food into the hands of California State and county agencies for immediate distribution to these people that distress and even in many cases starvation may be prevented, is desperately urgent: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly),* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Secretary of Agriculture and the President and the Congress of the United States take immediate action to make such surplus food available to such unemployed and hungry people; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate immediately transmit copies of this resolution by wire to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the President of the United States and that each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress be notified by wire of this action of the California Legislature and the urgency thereof."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolutions in favor of an immediate survey of the hydroelectric potentialities of New England States

"Whereas resolutions providing for a study of the development of the rivers and waterways in New England are now pending in the present session of the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas there are widespread variances in the conclusions of the potentiality of hydroelectric power in the studies now available; and

"Whereas the exploration and development of new hydroelectric power in New England is of vital importance to New England citizens and industry; Therefore be it

*"Resolved,* That the General Court of Massachusetts earnestly urges the Congress of the United States to pass and respectfully requests the President of the United States to approve the bill now before it calling for an extensive study of the development of New England water or any similar legislation; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be submitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress

and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, March 23, 1950.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,  
"Clerk."

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 29, 1950.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,  
"Clerk."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Finance:

## "Resolution 209

"Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly proposing that the Congress of the United States be memorialized respecting the earmarking of funds collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to each State to be used in the administration of the unemployment insurance law

"Whereas under existing law, the several States of the Union bear the responsibility for the administration of the unemployment insurance and employment service programs; and

"Whereas the Federal Government levies a pay-roll tax of three-tenths of 1 percent on employers of eight or more persons to pay the administrative cost of such programs by the States; and

"Whereas each State has no control over the amount it receives for the administration of such program and must accept whatever amount is allowed to it by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas since the inception of unemployment insurance and employment service program, the Federal Government has collected from the employers of this State for the administration of this program \$150,000,000 more than has been returned to the State for this purpose, and the amounts so returned to the State of New York have been consistently and grossly inadequate; and

"Whereas it was never intended that the Federal Government should divert the proceeds of this tax for its own general purposes, which it has done to the extent of \$1,000,000,000; and

"Whereas the continued inadequacy of operating moneys and personnel makes the detection of improper and fraudulent benefits claims exceedingly difficult and impedes efforts to cope with tax evasions; and

"Whereas the failure to make adequate moneys available for efficient administration, to the extent that it weakens control over disbursements from the unemployment insurance fund, jeopardizes the effectiveness and stability of the entire program and brings it into disrepute: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved (if the senate concur),* That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, respectfully memorialized to enact legislation which will—

"1. Earmark the taxes collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to assure adequate funds for administration by each State of the unemployment insurance and employment service program;

"2. Transfer any excess over the amounts allocated by the Federal administrative agencies to the States for use in the unemployment insurance and employment service program with full responsibility resting on each State for the proper use thereof free from Federal control;

"3. Make reasonable provisions assuring all States equitable participation in such allotment; and be it further

*"Resolved (if the senate concur),* That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the

House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate of the United States, and each member of the Congress duly elected from the State of New York.

"By order of the assembly:

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,

"Clerk.

"In senate March 20, 1950, concurred in without amendment.

"By order of the senate:

"WILLIAM S. KING,

"Secretary."

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Kentucky Hospital Association, of Louisville, Ky., signed by J. Ray Ingram, executive secretary, remonstrating against a reduction of appropriations for hospital construction; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Washington, D. C., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 2408, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of William J. Smithers, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of a soldiers' bonus bill; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of George Smith, of Richmond, Va., relating to the old-age social security system; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Nineteenth District Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California, signed by Sam J. Sacco, district commander, praying for the enactment of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolution adopted by the Massachusetts State Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, Boston, Mass., relating to the partitioning of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Captain Stephen T. Schoonmaker Post 1429, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Teaneck, N. J., protesting against a world government or world federation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Captain Stephen T. Schoonmaker Post 1429, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, Teaneck, N. J., protesting against the ratification of the genocide convention; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of petition from the members of the Eighty-fifth Street Baptist Church, of Birmingham, Ala., signed by F. M. Walker, church clerk, praying that no successor to Myron C. Taylor be appointed as representative to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Salvatore Locatelli, of Boston, Mass., relating to compensation for a plan for a bomb-proof shelter prepared by him; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A communication from Emile J. Morin, president of the Consolidated Sportsmen's Club of Maine, of South Portland, Maine, transmitting a proclamation of the Governor of Maine, favoring the enactment of legislation designating the third Sunday in September of each year as "Children's Day in Sports" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the rehabilitation committee of the North Carolina Department, the American Legion, at Asheville,

N. C., relating to a period in training to build up physical tolerance for veterans with arrested disease, etc.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the Woman's Auxiliary to the Marion Academy of Medicine, and the New York Fraternal Congress, of New York, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Walter A. Ross, of Davenport, Iowa, relating to the repeal of the Talt-Hartley law, etc.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the Piqua Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution of Piqua, Ohio, and the Catholic Daughters of America, Court of Our Lady, No. 647, of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of James A. Imrie, of Los Angeles, and sundry other employees of offices of collectors of internal revenue, all of the State of California, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 137, to grant permanent civil-service status to certain temporary and war-service employees of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, of San Pedro, Calif., signed by Rev. D. W. Bradley, chairman, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 2311, to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the North-East Ogden Improvement Association, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing a Fair Employment Practices Commission; ordered to lie on the table.

Resolutions adopted by Local No. 5, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America (CIO), and the CIO Council, both of Akron, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 2311, to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by Latwu Lodge 588, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 2311, to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter and two telegrams in the nature of memorials from the Interracial Association of the University of Michigan, the Jewish Forum, of Detroit, Mich., and the management and employees of the Brown-Saltman Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Ferguson bill (S. 2311) to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by 100 men and women assembled at a cultural festival of the IWO, at Youngstown, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Mundt bill, to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from B'Nai B'rith Women, Kings County (N. Y.) Chapter No. 456, relating to the liberalization of the Displaced Persons Act; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution relating to the consolidation of all torpedo activities in order to restore to Newport, R. I., its normal economic life in the centralizing of all manufacture, overhaul and ranging of torpedoes at the naval ordnance plant, Newport, R. I.

"Whereas the naval ordnance plant, United States Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I., is comprised of the land, buildings, and equipment located on Goat Island, Rose Island, Gould Island, and Torpedo Station Annex, Coddington Cove, and all in the Narragansett Bay area; and within this plant are all of the machinery, machine tools, devices, facilities, and services to manufacture, modify, overhaul, repair, and conduct research and proof ranging of all types of modern automobile torpedoes; that is, electrical (except batteries), chemical, and steam; and, adequate storage facilities for all required raw materials necessary to maximum production requirements, and additional modern buildings specially designed and constructed to process, overhaul, and repair of torpedoes, and their storage, on a modern assembly line operation; and

"Whereas the said plant occupies approximately 13 acres of land and estimated to have a value of about \$40,000,000 including land, building and equipment; and

"Whereas in this ordnance plant, the production of torpedoes was discontinued about 5 years ago and transferred to naval ordnance plant, Forest Park, Ill., as a result of a one-vote majority in the United States Senate in deciding this momentous change in naval policy; and, major overhaul operations, on Gould Island, were discontinued about 3½ years ago; until at the present time due to the curtailment of funds and work, and the later transfer of manufacturing and overhaul operations on torpedoes to other ordnance stations, the peak force of 13,500 will have been reduced to about 450 as of July 1, 1950, leaving only some research work at the Newport Naval Torpedo Station; and

"Whereas the production and overhaul facilities of this completely equipped, self-contained plant complete from pattern making and foundry castings of all torpedo parts to the final testing, proof ranging, and storage for issue in ready-for-combat condition, of every known type of modern torpedo, have now been held in grease for possible potential use for these past several years; and

"Whereas this plant has been inspected by the Industrial Board of Survey, operating under the cognizance of Chief of Naval Operations, and this agency should be in possession of factual information relative to the feasibility of consolidating and centralizing all manufacture, overhaul, and ranging of torpedoes, at the naval ordnance plant, Newport, R. I., during these peacetime operations in order to effect maximum economies and efficiency in the expenditure of public funds; and

"Whereas such a consolidation of all torpedo activities presently conducted at naval ordnance plant, Alexandria, and at the naval ordnance plant, Forest Park, Ill., at the naval ordnance plant, Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I., if effected, in addition to the national economies which may be realized, also would restore to Newport, R. I., the normal economic life previously enjoyed by its citizenry prior to the abrupt removal of this major industrial activity of this city, which from the year 1872 has been developed and expanded with local skills, and would restore to the youth of this city the prospect of development and employment of their labor after completion of school studies in a local environment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Louis Johnson, is hereby requested to determine from the results of industrial surveys made of the naval ordnance plants engaged in the manufacture, overhaul, and research of torpedoes, and after personal consideration, the feasibility of consolidating and centralizing all present activities relating to the manufacturing, overhauling, modifying, repairing, testing, and proof ranging of torpedoes at the naval ordnance plant, Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I.; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, is hereby requested to inform the Governor of the State of Rhode Island, of his decision in this matter; and further, that copies of this resolution be sent to the Representatives of the State of Rhode Island in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress for their information and opportunity of assistance in attaining the objective herein sought, namely, the reactivation of manufacturing and overhaul activities at the Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I., or the immediate use of the facilities of this ordnance plant for the production of ordnance materials other than torpedoes for which such facilities may be adapted."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their good offices to amend H. R. 6533, the Dingell bill, so-called, or a similar measure to provide that some of the money be made available by the aforesaid bill to improve and study salt-water fish, and to secure prompt passage of the Dingell bill

"Whereas the Dingell bill, so-called, is now pending in the United States Congress, and has a laudable purpose, namely, providing money for the purpose of making a survey of fresh-water fish and their habits, and for the purpose of improvement of ponds and streams; and

"Whereas the citizens of the State of Rhode Island are interested in the study, propagation, and increase of salt-water game fish in the Rhode Island territorial waters; and

"Whereas the members of the Rhode Island General Assembly feel that the above-mentioned Dingell bill, or a similar bill, should be amended to add to the provisions of this bill, language permitting some of the funds provided for in this bill to be used for the purpose of making a study of and improving the propagation of salt-water game fish and to increase the number of salt-water game fish; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the members of the Rhode Island Legislature, respectfully request our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to amend the Dingell bill to provide that some of the money provided therein be used for the purpose of making a study of and improving the propagation of salt-water game fish for the purpose of increasing the number of salt-water game fish, and to request our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to pass the Dingell bill, or other bill of similar purport; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

#### ECONOMY IN OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT—PETITION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD, with the signatures attached, a petition signed by sundry members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the State of Utah, relating to economy in the operation of the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, as follows:

#### PETITION IN SUPPORT OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT

Whereas I am convinced of the absolute necessity for economy in the operation of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the members of the Hoover Commission have made concrete recommendations after a thorough, complete, and factual survey of the functions and departments in the Federal Government;

I, therefore, urge the Members of Congress to immediately enact the legislation embodying the recommendations of the Hoover report.

I further pledge that, in signing this petition I will write a letter to my Senators and Congressmen, expressing my support of the Hoover Commission recommendations.

D. P. Derrick, Robert C. Johnson, Murray G. Stowe, Lu D. Strock, Loren Burr, Donald H. Simms, Gordon Barnes, Allen B. Rudy, E. B. Duffin, Hal Walker, J. M. Howes, W. G. Matheson, D. H. Lowder, Phillip C. Hogensen, Wilford W. Goodwill, C. W. Reed, Edward Hitchcock, Leo A. Hansen, Ben B. Khazazen, Marion C. Armstrong, Hyde T. Clayton, S. R. Redding, Don J. Hansen, Roland Dance, John F. Nowes, Milo P. Smith, Stratford L. Wendell, George T. Kingdon, W. H. Nofsinger, Walter L. Latshaw, Robert D. Welt, L. B. Robbins, Clem K. Yoko, L. C. Poate, William Baines, William Aspden, Earl B. Osborne, Lee Bindrup, Ray S. Robinson, L. Howard Marcus, Ed M. Bog-gess, Sterling M. Jensen, Lester H. Johnson, Donna D. Clare, O. P. Scule, Grace F. Spalding, Ray H. Christensen, N. G. Morgan, F. Robert Bayle, Patton N. Leaver, Lewis R. Rich, Hal W. Gunn, Ralph W. Carter, C. C. Harmon, Louis C. Kjar, Earl M. Wallace, R. B. Jex, V. A. Rideout, B. L. Paston, V. Ross Ekins, Earl D. Tanner, Tom Fyans, Dean Williams, Norman Clayton, John W. Lowe, Ken Williams, Shirl B. Taylor, Richard V. Peay, Robert B. Bullen, Preston Adams, W. H. Bruderer, Rod P. Dixon, E. Don Kirkham, Thomas R. Muir, Preston D. Linford, D. Eugene Moench, Glen H. Walker, Thomas E. O'Connor, Woodrow J. Taylor, D. C. Anderson, W. F. Burrell, C. W. Davis, Curzon Hailles, Joe Schee, C. H. Day, L. C. Kearns, Francis W. Kirkham, Grant M. Prsbrey, E. C. Harper, J. L. Ayer, Leon Frehner, Arthur L. Crawford, Wilbur L. Jarvis, Jean Neal, Vesta P. Crawford, Sylvester Broadbent, Brent Gottfredson, Paul B. Pusey, Katharine M. Love, Grant W. Midgley, M. C. Wissman, J. Norman Jorgensen, George B. Earl, Fred E. Curtis, Clay Young, Edward F. Richards, Carl Sandberg, Elmer E. Jonssen, Merrill K. Davis, Carol McKeon, John B. Hover, W. Donald Oakes, Edward A. Tugan, L. Lon Decker, J. N. Holland, H. Manison, W. W. Romney, Edward F. Folland, Kenneth D. Proctor, George Marquardt, Robert C. Crandall, Bryce J. Fairbanks, James J. Soderberg, Sid H. Eliason,

Don F. Brodshaw, Patton N. Leaver, Ray S. Robinson, R. B. Decker, W. B. Franklin, Norton Parker, Elsmar G. Kern, Lyman E. Duncan, Robert K. Potter, Janet Stine, David E. Fullmer, Jeddie H. Roderick, Reid W. Brenton, Lester F. Hewlett, Russell B. Jex, Willis H. Cowles, Shine B. Taylor, J. Thomas Fyans, all of Salt Lake City, Utah; Preston D. Linford, Kent Foutz, both of Ogden, Utah; Walter P. Eggett, Marvin Teuscher, Mrs. Marvin Teuscher, Mildred Brown, Mrs. Stanford Dahl, Mrs. David Teague, Mrs. Roy Okey, David Teague, Roy Okey, Mrs. Phillip W. Green, Phillip W. Green, Walter B. Devey, C. H. Hansen, J. Ralph Binnall, Harold W. Anderson, Merrill Preston, J. O. Whiting, Mr. and Mrs. Elmo Hunter, Mr. and Mrs. Athol Ross, all of American Fork, Utah.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H. R. 4433. A bill to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over certain land in Shirley, Mass.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1433).

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

H. R. 4732. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the Two Rock Union School District, a political subdivision of the State of California, in Sonoma County, Calif., and to furnish said school district water free of charge; with amendments (Rept. No. 1435).

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

H. R. 3783. A bill authorizing the transfer of part of Camp Joseph T. Robinson to the State of Arkansas; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1436).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution to correct the formula used in computing the income taxes of life insurance companies for 1947, 1948, and 1949; with amendments (Rept. No. 1434).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 587. A bill for the relief of Sister Stefania Cuprys; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1437);

S. 615. A bill for the relief of James Greenwood; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1438);

S. 977. A bill for the relief of Jacques Yedid, Henrietta Yedid, Richard Emanuel Yedid, and Ethel Danielle Yedid; with amendments (Rept. No. 1439);

S. 1051. A bill for the relief of John Splinggaard, his wife, and two children; with amendments (Rept. No. 1440);

S. 1572. A bill for the relief of Steven Etienne Laszlo; his wife, Mary Laszlo, and his son, Ervin Laszlo; with amendments (Rept. No. 1441);

S. 2013. A bill for the relief of Victor Alezandrovitch Martinuk; without amendment (Rept. No. 1442);

S. 2040. A bill for the relief of Adele De Pauli; with amendments (Rept. No. 1443);

S. 2053. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James A. Vaughn and daughter Mary Ann Vaughn; with amendments (Rept. No. 1444);

S. 2175. A bill for the relief of Eivind Hognestad; without amendment (Rept. No. 1445);

S. 2176. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bel Tse Chao and his wife, May Chao; without amendment (Rept. No. 1446);

S. 2232. A bill for the relief of Peter Heyden; without amendment (Rept. No. 1447);

S. 2243. A bill for the relief of Tevfik Kamil Kutay; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1448);  
S. 2257. A bill for the relief of Hyman Winterman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1449);

S. 2258. A bill for the relief of Dr. Aposotolos A. Kartsonis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1450);

S. 2511. A bill for the relief of Dr. John R. Portaria; without amendment (Rept. No. 1451);

S. 2556. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Billy J. Knight and Dorothea Knight; without amendment (Rept. No. 1452);

S. 2629. A bill for the relief of Marianne Bruchner; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1453);

S. 2646. A bill for the relief of the Articaire Refrigeration Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1454);

S. 2990. A bill for the relief of Amy Louisa Shier; without amendment (Rept. No. 1455);

S. 3163. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Honora Redman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1456);

H. R. 633. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Victor V. Greg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1457);

H. R. 715. A bill for the relief of Manuel Uribe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1458);

H. R. 1481. A bill for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni; without amendment (Rept. No. 1459);

H. R. 1600. A bill for the relief of Gustav Schilbred; without amendment (Rept. No. 1460);

H. R. 1699. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Kraus; without amendment (Rept. No. 1461);

H. R. 1861. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1462);

H. R. 1871. A bill for the relief of Hilde Flint; without amendment (Rept. No. 1463);

H. R. 3306. A bill for the relief of Antonio Rojas Velez; without amendment (Rept. No. 1464);

H. R. 3309. A bill for the relief of the estate of Ovidio Vazquez; without amendment (Rept. No. 1465);

H. R. 3315. A bill for the relief of Alejo Padilla; without amendment (Rept. No. 1466);

H. R. 3319. A bill for the relief of Juana Pagan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1467);

H. R. 4380. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay; without amendment (Rept. No. 1468);

H. R. 4857. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katsuko Nakahara Huntley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1469);

H. R. 5276. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia (Iole) M. Stefani Lencioni; without amendment (Rept. No. 1470);

H. R. 5580. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1471);

H. R. 5753. A bill for the relief of Jean Clark; without amendment (Rept. No. 1472); and

H. R. 6051. A bill for the relief of Alcide Raymond; with amendments (Rept. No. 1473).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 272. A bill to facilitate the admission of certain foreign workers desiring to perform agricultural work in the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 1474); and

S. 2107. A bill for the relief of Georges Gregory Alpiar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1475).

By Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1637. A bill for the relief of Marie Henriette de Bruyn; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1476); and

S. 2309. A bill for the relief of Oscar (Oszkar) Nemenyi, Marianna Nemenyi (wife), and Thomas John Nemenyi (son); without amendment (Rept. No. 1477).

By Mr. DONNELL, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 2719. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 1478); and

H. R. 4164. A bill for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Pansy Pippin and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 1479).

#### EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Health, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, is agreed that further study of the health problems of the Nation and of legislative proposals relating thereto is needed. Therefore at the request of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent that the time for filing a report in accordance with Senate Resolution 184 be extended indefinitely.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 3374. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3375. A bill for the relief of Harold Frederick D. Wolfgramm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WATKINS also introduced Senate bill 3376, to provide for the organization of interstate water and power users' associations for the purpose of entering into contracts for the repayment of the costs of water and power projects on interstate streams and for the ownership, operation, and maintenance of such projects, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 3377. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3378. A bill for the relief of Armando Santini; and

S. 3379. A bill for the relief of Dr. John M. Maniatis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE (by request):

S. 3380. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1939, to redefine the term "contraband article" with respect to narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 3381. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the naval ammunition depot at Iona Island, N. Y., to the Palisades Interstate Park Commission for use as a public park; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 3382. A bill to continue further for an additional temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 3383. A bill to promote interstate commerce in coal, to provide for the conservation of the coal resources of the Nation, to assure an adequate supply of coal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 3384. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building in Terryville, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3385. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of certain historic property and architectural values north of Washington Square in New York City, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 3386. A bill to aid small business, to assist in promoting maximum employment and production, and to encourage the free flow of capital into small-business enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3387. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code provisions relating to tax rates applicable to corporation net incomes and net operating loss carry-over; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3388. A bill to amend the existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, to provide additional punishment for violations of such laws, and to permit the United States, as well as private persons, to commence treble-damage actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 3389. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Anson Pease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT—AMENDMENT REPORTED

Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an additional amendment to the bill (S. 3105) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5226) to amend paragraph 207 of the Tariff Act of 1930, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

#### EXTENSION OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM—AMENDMENT

Mr. GEORGE (for Mr. PEPPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. PEPPER to the bill (H. R. 6000) to extend and improve the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System, to amend the public assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SCIOEPPEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5472, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5472, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. O'CONNOR (for himself and Mr. TYDINGS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to House bill 5472, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and myself I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the amendment prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the explanation presented by the Senator from Oklahoma will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The explanation of the amendment presented by Mr. KERR is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT BY SENATOR KERR  
MARKHAM'S FERRY PROJECT

The Markham's Ferry project was authorized in accordance with House Document No. 107. It is one of three reservoirs on the Grand River which was then contemplated to operate as a unit. Since the authorization, the Grand River Dam Authority of Oklahoma has constructed the Pensacola Reservoir and is now operating it as a hydroelectric plant. The reservoir contains a flood pool on top of the power reservoir which is operated in accordance with the directives of the Corps of Engineers. The Corps of Engineers are now constructing the Fort Gibson project below the Pensacola Dam and below the proposed Markham's Ferry Reservoir, which is the middle of the three reservoirs.

A proposal has recently been made by Gov. Roy Turner of Oklahoma that the Grand River Dam Authority be allowed to construct the Markham's Ferry Reservoir, financing it by the sale of revenue bonds. He has recommended that a \$7,000,000 participation by the Federal Government, through the Corps of Engineers, for flood control in that reservoir would accomplish the same purpose as if the Government constructed the project at an estimated cost of \$32,000,000. I quote a paragraph from Governor Turner's memorandum on this subject:

"It is my sincere belief that it would be to the best interests of all parties concerned and certainly a great advantage to the State of Oklahoma to have the Markham's Ferry project constructed and operated by the Grand River Dam Authority, as was originally intended by the act of the Oklahoma Legislature in 1935, as subsequently amended. I would appreciate it very much if you would give your assistance to the authority and to the State of Oklahoma in this regard."

In compliance with the request of Governor Turner, Senator KERR and Senator THOMAS introduced an amendment to the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bill (H. R. 5472) which reads as follows: "That the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes approved by the act of June 28, 1938, for the Arkansas River Basin, as modified by the act of August 18, 1941, is hereby further modified to provide for the construction of the Markham's Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the State of Oklahoma (through its Grand River Dam Authority) in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document

No. 107 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and House Document No. 758 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, such project to have the same number of acre-feet of flood storage and the same pool elevation as so recommended by the Chief of Engineers and to be operated for flood control and navigation in accordance with section 7 of Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the further sum of \$7,000,000 to be paid to the Grand River Dam Authority as the total contribution of the United States for flood-control storage in such project."

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 5943. An act to provide for the erection of a monument at the grave of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H. R. 7341. An act to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Anacostia River in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7346. An act to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 186) authorizing a statue of the late Brigham Young, of Utah, to be placed in Statuary Hall, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,  
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.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,  
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward A. Towse, of Hawaii, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii, vice Albert M. Cristy, deceased;

John D. Hill, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Alabama;

John H. Manning, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of North Carolina; and

Robert Grant, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois.

PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS—LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AND AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCLELLAN

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the President to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, dated March 7, 1950, and an address delivered by him to the Congress on March 24, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL POLICY—ADDRESSES BY SENATOR AIKEN AND DR. JOHN D. BLACK

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Food Allotment Program," and an address entitled "Dairy Products and the Agricultural Surplus," delivered, respectively, by Senator AIKEN and Dr. John D. Black at the Northeast Dairy Conference, held in Washington, D. C., on March 30 and 31, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1950

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum compiled by the staff of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, providing for reorganization of the Department of the Treasury, which appears in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES, AND STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO PLAN

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding President Truman's Reorganization Plan No. 1, from the New York Times of April 9, 1950, together with a statement in opposition to the plan, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE PLEA OF PUERTO RICO—STATEMENT BY LUIS A. FERRE

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "The Plea of Puerto Rico," by Luis A. Ferre, vice president of the Ponce Cement Corp. and Porto Rico Iron Works, Inc., which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE—ARTICLE FROM THE JACKSON COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY WEEKLY BULLETIN

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Keep on Calling It What It Is, Doc—It's Socialized Medicine," published in the Jackson County Medical Society Weekly Bulletin, Kansas City, Mo., of March 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NO EXCUSES FOR THE KERR BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Excuses for the Kerr Bill," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATURAL GAS BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Natural Gas Bill," published in the New York Times of Sunday, April 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRICING NATURAL GAS—LETTER TO NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. SCHOEPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter under the heading "Pricing natural gas—Kerr bill to aid consumer by fostering competition," written by Roland F. Beers, head of the Department of Fuel Resources, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Troy, N. Y., addressed to the editor of the New York Times and published in that newspaper on April 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAY TO CHEAP GAS

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Way to Cheap Gas," published in the

Chicago Daily News of April 7, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

**DEFICIT SPENDING—EDITORIAL FROM THE NORTHAMPTON (VA.) TIMES**

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Could Stronger States Solve Problem?" from the Northampton Times, of Cape Charles, Va., the issue of March 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

**SOCIAL SECURITY FOR HIRED FARM WORKERS**

[Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of questions and answers under the heading "Social security for hired farm workers," which appears in the Appendix.]

**THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—ARTICLE BY HELEN DELICH**

[Mr. O'CONNOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the American merchant marine, written by Helen Delich, and published in the Baltimore Sun of April 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

**ACCEPTANCE OF NEW MUNDT BILL SHOWS PUBLIC UNDERSTANDS REDS—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA WORLD-HERALD**

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Acceptance of New Mundt Bill Shows Public Understands Reds," published in the Omaha World-Herald of recent date, which appears in the Appendix.]

**LEON BLUM**

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a news story special to the New York Times under the date line of Paris, March 30, concerning the death of Leon Blum, former Premier of France, and also an editorial from the New York Times of March 31, an editorial from the Washington Star of April 2, and an editorial from the Washington Post of April 1, 1950, all relating to the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

**DR. CHARLES R. DREW**

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of April 6, 1950, in tribute to the late Dr. Charles R. Drew, and an obituary notice of his death from the New York Times of April 2, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

**THE ROAD TO NOWHERE—ARTICLE FROM THE MAGAZINE AMERICA**

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Road to Nowhere," published in the March 8, 1950, issue of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

**FLOOD OF AMERICAN SECRETS TO RUSSIA—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW HAMPSHIRE MORNING UNION**

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Jordan's Testimony Is Vindicated," relating to secret information being furnished Russia, published in the New Hampshire Morning Union of March 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

**COST OF THE CHRYSLER STRIKE**

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Billion Is Cost of Chrysler's Strike to Date," published in the Washington Post of April 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

**SOCIALISM AS A THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE**

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Socialism Held Threat to United States by Whittemore," published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

**OUR OLDER WORKERS—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON DAILY GLOBE**

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Older Workers," published in the Boston Daily Globe of April 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

**UNBIASED INVESTIGATION NECESSARY**

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Unbiased Investigation Necessary," published in the Exeter News-Letter of Exeter, N. H., of March 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

**SMALL-BUSINESS LOANS—DISCUSSION BETWEEN SENATOR LUCAS AND GEORGE J. BURGER**

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a discussion between Senator LUCAS and George J. Burger on small-business loans, which appears in the Appendix.]

**MEDICAL CARE FOR NEEDY PERSONS—STATEMENT BY DR. GEORGE F. LULL**

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding medical care for needy persons by Dr. George F. Lull, secretary and general manager of the American Medical Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

**STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA**

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Government by Pressure," published in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner on March 22, 1950, dealing with the general subject of statehood for Alaska.

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

**GOVERNMENT BY PRESSURE**

A fund of \$25,000 from the Territorial treasury has been made available by the Territorial Board of Administration to finance the fight of Governor Gruening and his cohorts on the statehood committee for Alaska statehood. This is part of the sum or more than \$5,000,000 in appropriations by the 1949 legislature which the board was forced to "freeze" last June to prevent a complete break-down of Alaska finances.

Other funds "frozen" at the same time—and remaining frozen as far as any public announcement is concerned—included appropriations for pensions, school and hospital construction, funds for a number of administrative boards and commissions, and reimbursement to school boards of interest due on money borrowed by the Territory in the 1947-49 biennium.

Meanwhile the straitened Territorial treasury was forced to seek further relief in a loan of more than \$500,000 from Alaska banks. Advance payment of approximately \$500,000 in fish trap taxes for 1950 was accepted from the salmon industry, bringing to \$1,000,000 the added amount of cash that was secured to keep the Alaska government functioning in the face of extreme financial peril.

Under these circumstances, the release of \$25,000 to the statehood committee at this time makes fully as much sense as most of the other fiscal gyrations of the Gruening administration.

The committee, described by at least one Democratic member of the Territorial senate as the "worst seen for any committee or board" when the names were placed before a joint session of the legislature for approval, reportedly plans to charter airplanes to take witnesses to Washington, D. C., to testify before the Senate committee before which the statehood bill is pending.

The Territory now has a delegate to Congress who is a champion of statehood and the author of the pending bill; the Secretary of the Interior is in favor of statehood; the President of the United States is in favor of statehood. There can be little information on that side of the question desired or required by the Senate committee, which cannot be secured from these sources.

In addition, the Governor is currently on another of his trips, at taxpayers' expense, to the Nation's Capital.

The projected sending of plane loads of added witnesses to appear before the committee, providing free trips to Gruening's closest followers out of the sadly depleted public purse, thus becomes simply another instance of an attempt at government by pressure. It appears to be the only kind of government understood by the ruling clique in Juneau these days.

Release of the \$25,000 fund for expenditure in this fashion by the statehood committee was announced following passage of resolutions by a Ketchikan union and the Anchorage Republican Club. Then and only then did the Governor disclose to the public that the money had actually been "unfrozen" 6 days before by the board of administration.

This properly brought from Territorial Senator Gunnard Engbreth an expression of wonderment at "how many other official acts are being kept under cover in Juneau" by the present administration. It is a question which other citizens of the Territory would do well to wonder about also.

The handling of this entire transaction displays the same arrogant disregard of the public concern and the public interest which has become an all too familiar pattern in the Territory under the present regime.

**STATEHOOD AND GRAND JURIES**

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the March 31 issue of the Alaska Weekly entitled "Statehood and Grand Juries."

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

**STATEHOOD AND GRAND JURIES**

The statehood problem is occupying the center of the stage as the hearings before the Senate committee have been set. Most of the noise is coming from the statehood proponent camp and it will be interesting to note whether or not this group will develop any more sound ground in support of statehood than the flag-waving, defense argument.

Without entering into the merits or demerits of "statehood now" we have as yet been unable to get it through our thick heads as to how Alaskan statehood would affect the defense of the North in one way or the other. The answer to that question it seems to us lies in the fact that last week the House Armed Services Committee gave approval to a \$66,320,045 military construction program for Alaska and that there seems to be a general attitude on the part of Congressmen of

both parties to move forward with other essential requirements for both the military and the civilian development of the Territory.

In the meantime the Gruening administration, which has made much ado about interesting capital and encouraging capital already in the field, has started a wholesale grand jury investigation obviously designed to harass business with the flimsy charge of monopoly where, in the very nature of things, no monopoly could exist.

Hundreds of subpoenas have been issued throughout Alaska and the States demanding the books and correspondence of various concerns. Business executives, their accountants and attorneys will be called upon to spend weeks of valuable time and thousands of dollars in an effort to prove that they are not monopolistic or have not conspired with some monopolistic operator.

Transportation companies, liquor dealers, cannerymen, herring packers \* \* \* just about everyone with a business in the Territory bigger than a shoeshine stand, has been ordered to appear before the Anchorage grand jury—strangely enough at just about the time the statehood hearings will be on in Washington, D. C.

Of course Captain Lathrop, having poured out capital with a lavish hand to develop a coal mine which has been a godsend to the rail belt and furnished one of its best year-round pay rolls, is undoubtedly a monopolist since there is no other privately operated commercial coal mine serving the same area. He really should be penalized and financially crippled so that he cannot contribute further to Alaskan development.

One thing that should loom large in the mind of even the most rabid capital brawler is that there is no more certain way to frighten capital away from the Territory, or State, than to berate, harass, and hamper capital already in it. Ask almost any businessman why he opposes statehood and you will find that he brushes most other objections aside and answers, "Gruening."

#### AUDIT OF ALASKAN TERRITORIAL FUNDS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Senator Butrovich Recalls Democratic Audit Scandal," written by Jack Daum, and published in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner on March 30, 1950, dealing with the general subject of statehood for Alaska.

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

SENATOR BUTROVICH RECALLS DEMOCRATIC AUDIT SCANDAL—REPUBLICAN CHARGES \$27,000 IN OFFICIAL FUNDS UNACCOUNTED  
(By Jack Daum)

JUNEAU, March 30.—The complete story of the 1949 Territorial audit which uncovered shortages of more than \$49,000 and resulted in the conviction of the Territorial treasurer on charges of embezzlement was related at the Territorial Republican "unity caucus" today by Senator John Butrovich, of Fairbanks.

Senator Butrovich was a member with James Nolan, of Wrangell, of a two-man committee appointed to secure an audit of Territorial records. His account of the audit went back to the first Territorial audit in 1923 and concluded with the imprisonment of Oscar Olson, former Territorial treasurer.

#### TWENTY-SEVEN THOUSAND DOLLARS STILL MISSING

He also told the gathering of more than 80 Republican delegates that a \$27,000 shortage in liquor stamps remains unaccounted for, and he pledged himself to the task of

bringing the facts to light and revealing the source of the shortage.

"Auditing is a normal function of government," Butrovich explained, "and the auditing committee is required by law to report to each legislature within 10 days after the legislature convenes."

This function was carried out, he said, every 2 years from 1923 to 1941, after which time there was no report made until February 1945.

He charged that the 1945 audit was never presented to the legislature, and that to the best of his knowledge nobody in the legislature saw the report.

#### AUDIT DEMANDED

"In 1947," he continued, "a number of legislators demanded that funds be allotted for a complete Territorial audit by an auditing firm. We were told there were no funds, but the legislature appropriated \$20,000 for the purpose."

"When we returned to the next legislature, expecting the money to be available for the audit, we found that the funds had been frozen, and again there was no money for an auditing investigation."

"But," he noted, "there was more than \$23,000 unfrozen and spent for the Alaska development board."

#### DIFFICULTIES

Butrovich told the difficulties in obtaining an auditing committee and of the further difficulties in deciding on an auditing firm. But, he said, the firm of Arthur Anderson and company of Seattle was given the nod, and the audit got under way.

When the auditing committee received the report from the Anderson firm, Butrovich said that the findings clearly indicated that the treasurer should be removed from office immediately.

"At the time of the audit report, however," he said, "Governor Gruening was in Washington, so we took the findings to the acting governor."

#### BOOKKEEPING ERROR

"After handing him the report and pointing out the discrepancies, we asked him his opinion. His answer was:

"Looks like a bookkeeping error to me."

Butrovich went on to explain that the remaining shortage of \$27,000 "will be brought to light if it's the last thing I do."

#### BARNES SPEAKS

Doris M. Barnes, of Wrangell, GOP candidate for reelection to the house of representatives, spoke after Butrovich, and told the delegates that "every trip Senator Butrovich made from Fairbanks to Juneau in connection with the audit was made at his own expense."

A record was made of Senator Butrovich's accounting, and the GOP committee said it will be given Territory-wide airing.

#### SECRETARY FINLETTER—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Washington Post published on Saturday a very fine editorial concerning an excellent appointment made by President Truman. I refer to the appointment of Mr. Thomas K. Finletter as Secretary of the Air Force. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to introduce this editorial into the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

#### SECRETARY FINLETTER

It is hard to think of a man better qualified to be Secretary of the Air Force than Thomas

K. Finletter. Mr. Finletter is perhaps best known for the air policy study made in 1947 that bore his name. But he also is a distinguished attorney in private life who has had wide experience in government. He was, for example, an assistant to the Secretary of State for 3 years; he was a consultant at the San Francisco conference; and more recently he served as head of the ECA mission in London. He has had a superb opportunity to develop a long-range philosophy about the execution of national policy and where the military instrument fits into that policy.

The fact that the Finletter commission recommended a minimum of 70 groups for the Air Force is now being cited as an indication that Secretary Finletter may revive the air-power fight on Capitol Hill. We think this inference would place the new Secretary under a severe handicap. In the first place, the Finletter report was made more or less in a vacuum, on the basis of what the Air Force needed quite irrespective of other considerations. Mr. Finletter is too wise a man not to recognize the complementary importance of a sound economy, the needs of other services, the dove-tailing of military and foreign policy, and the fact that new considerations have arisen since the report was made.

Secondly, the number of air groups in itself means nothing. Group is a relative term, and the composition of groups is constantly changing. It is the size of the groups and what is in them—and how these groups relate to intelligence estimates and to diplomatic endeavors—that is important. Mr. Finletter should be in a position to offer a more precise definition of the issues in what is largely a semantic squabble. We hope that as he does this he will regard the Air Force not as a special entity in itself, but as merely an important element in national policy.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, if morning business is closed, I wish to call up a conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was about to ask whether morning business is concluded. If it is, the Chair has an announcement of his own which he would like to make at this point.

Some time ago the Senate authorized the Chair to appoint a Special Committee on Small Business. The Chair has delayed making that appointment in part because he understood the President was to send to Congress a message on small business, and the Chair thought it might be appropriate to await that message. However, the message has not come, and the Chair does not feel disposed to wait any longer to appoint the committee.

In connection with the formation of the committee, the Chair was confronted by one or two difficulties growing out of the fact that heretofore there have been two Special Committees on Small Business, one in the Seventy-ninth Congress and one in the Eightieth Congress, the committee in the Seventy-ninth Congress being presided over by the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the committee in the Eightieth Congress being presided over by the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

In the creation of the new committee, the Chair had to consider whether there

was any priority of right on account of the two special committees which previously existed. The Chair did not feel obligated to reappoint all the members of the old committees, because since they went out of existence, new Members of the Senate have come in, some of whom are not overburdened with committee work.

Another question which arose was that if the Chair appointed any of the members of the old committees to the new committee, and left any of the members of the old committees off the new committee, implications might arise as to the reason why some were reappointed and others were not reappointed.

Taking the entire situation into consideration, the Chair felt, and feels, that it is advisable to appoint an entirely new committee, without any possible reflection upon any of the members of the old committees, all of whom did good work—and that is especially true of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the same is true of the other members of the old committees. All of them did constructive work; the Chair thinks the two committees, or the same committee with different chairmen, infused into small business in the United States confidence that Congress was attempting to legislate or to outline a program which would be beneficial to them, in comparison with the other business groups of the country.

Under the circumstances, the Chair has felt that it was appropriate to create an entirely new committee, made up of members who have not heretofore served on the Small Business Committee. Such a committee would afford an opportunity for some very able new Members of the Senate, who have come to the Senate since the old committees went out of existence, to apply themselves to this problem.

The Chair has done his best to appoint a committee which will be fairly representative of the Senate and of the country. Therefore the Chair is prepared to announce the appointees, which the Secretary will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL].

#### REHABILITATION OF NAVAJO AND HOPI TRIBES OF INDIANS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 2734, to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservation, and for other purposes, and I ask

unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 2 and 3, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment; insert the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment; and on page 8, line 11, of the Senate engrossed bill strike out "(1)"; and on page 8, line 22, of the Senate engrossed bill, beginning with the comma, strike out through the word "Indians" in line 25; and the House agree to the same.

ERNEST W. McFARLAND,  
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,  
ZALES N. ECTON,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

TOBY MORRIS,  
JOHN R. MURDOCK,  
COMPTON I. WHITE,  
WILLIAM LEMKE,  
WESLEY A. D'EWART,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

#### HOUSING ACT OF 1950—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the conference report.

(For conference report, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6, 1950, page 4902.)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina what the conferees have agreed upon.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I shall read a brief statement in regard to everything which was agreed upon.

Mr. President, because the Housing Act of 1950 has been discussed so thoroughly during the recent debate on the bill, and because there are other privileged matters pending before the Senate, I, at this time, simply want to call to the Senate's attention a few of the more important provisions of the conference report.

We have extended and improved the whole FHA housing program.

The bill agreed upon puts great emphasis on low-cost housing by extending liberal terms to houses which will sell from \$5,000 to \$7,000. It also encourages the construction of larger size houses with three and four bedrooms by permitting higher mortgage ceilings on them. The encouragement to this type of housing is found in the section 8, title I program and the section 203 (b) (2) (D) program.

The bill provides for the continuation of multifamily rental housing on a sounder basis than did the 608 program, and is designed to encourage the construction of 4½-room family units rather than the efficiency and 1-bedroom type of which we already have an oversupply.

We accepted the March 1 deadline for 608 applications as provided by the House, but have reduced the authorization from \$600,000,000 to \$500,000,000.

We provided, Mr. President, for a FHA insured cooperative loan program under section 213. If 65 percent of the members of the cooperative are veterans, a 95-percent insured loan may be obtained. This was a compromise between the Senate-passed 100-percent loan, where 75 percent are veterans, and the House provision of 95-percent maximum loan, where 100 percent of the cooperators are veterans.

When we passed the GI loan program some time ago, we intended to make it possible for veterans to get 100-percent loans at 4 percent interest. During the last 2 years, such loans were virtually unobtainable. By retaining the Senate-passed \$150,000,000 direct loans to veterans in those areas where such GI loans are not available, by eliminating the combination loans, and by increasing the guaranties on veterans' loans, we are confident the lending institutions will cooperate in making "501" loans to our GI's.

While we accepted the later date of the House on the termination of the combination FHA-GI loans, we provided that the Veterans' Administrator could terminate it any time before December 31. I feel confident that the Administrator will waste no time in getting the 501 program operating full steam ahead and in putting an end, long before December 31, to this burdensome and unnecessarily expensive combination loan program.

Mr. President, the conferees spent the major portion of their time discussing the Government's so-called secondary mortgage market program operated by the Federal National Mortgage Association. Time does not permit me to say more than that every member of the conference was deeply disturbed by the present magnitude of the program, and the abuse and the distortion of its original purpose. We have provided in a temporary way for a much more restrictive operation of the program, eliminated the power to make commitments to purchase, and have strongly recommended a more active sale of the mortgage holdings by the Federal National Mortgage Association. Instead of an additional \$750,000,000 which the House authorized without restriction, we agreed to an additional au-

thorization of \$250,000,000 with restrictions. When the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency returns from the recess, we plan to study the possibility of more permanent and effective legislation on this subject.

We have provided for the disposition of all temporary and permanent war housing. The Senate provision providing for the transfer of some 43,000 units of permanent housing to local housing authorities, if they request it and show a need for it for low-rent use, was retained.

Finally, but most importantly, in my opinion, is the housing loan program provided for educational institutions. The Senate provision for 40-year loans, not at 2½ percent interest, as originally provided for in the Senate bill, but at one-fourth of 1 percent above the going Federal rate for longer-term Government securities, was agreed to by the House, provided the institution is unable to obtain a loan otherwise on reasonably comparable terms. This will result in an estimated average saving to college students of approximately \$170 a school year. Thus, we have provided in this bill for the first peacetime program of Federal aid to higher education.

I urge that the Senate accept the conference report.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Did the Senator from South Carolina say that the conferees have agreed upon a deadline of March 31 or March 1, for section 608 loans?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senate provided for a February 1 deadline; the House provided for a March 1 deadline. The House provided for a total of \$600,000,000, and the Senate provided for a total of \$400,000,000. In the conference, we agreed on the March 1 deadline, with a total of \$500,000,000 for the section 608 program. The conferees on the part of the Senate held out as long as they could for the February 1 deadline and for the total of \$400,000,000, but finally we agreed to the March 1 deadline.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it was very difficult for me to hear what the Senator just said. Will he please repeat it?

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly. The Senate conferees finally gave in to the House conferees, receded from the February 1 deadline in the field which the Senate had provided, and accepted the March 1 deadline which the House had provided.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wonder about the words "in the field." Do they make any difference?

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, they are not in the law. The deadline is stated specifically in the conference report.

Mr. WHERRY. But the Senator from South Carolina just stated that the deadline is to be March 1 in the field. Do the words "in the field" make any difference in that connection?

Mr. MAYBANK. No. The Senate version of the bill provided for a deadline of February 1 in the field. But the conference report deadline does not relate to in the field at all; it is merely a March 1 deadline.

Mr. WHERRY. I still would like to have an answer to my question. Does it make any difference whether the application is in the field or whether it is in Washington?

Mr. MAYBANK. No.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that in addition to giving one more month of time in which pending applications for FHA loans may be considered the House version of the bill carries \$100,000,000 more than was provided in the Senate version of the bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. The House version of the bill carried \$200,000,000 more, but the conference report carries \$100,000,000 more.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And it carries provision for a 90-percent loan; is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Instead of the 85-percent loan as provided in the Senate version of the bills. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement in regard to this matter, which I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### A SUMMARY OF S. 2246

S. 2246, as agreed to by the Senate and House conferees and as approved by the House, expands and supplements existing Federal housing legislation to make current programs more useful and to provide additional types of aid for particular housing problems. The provisions of the bill would serve the following broad purposes:

1. It would continue Federal assistance to private housing production on a basis that would stimulate more housing at lower costs and lower rents and of more adequate size for family use. It would also broaden the provisions for FHA insurance of loans for cooperative housing. The 1949 record housing production was deficient in two major respects: Much of the housing was still too costly for many families and most of it was too small for families with children. Moderate-priced sale housing consisted largely of minimum two-bedroom units, and rental housing was both too costly and small, with efficiency and one-bedroom units making up a large part of the production. The continuing high birth rate makes it clear that more family type units will be necessary to meet the needs of the market. The Public Health Service reports that "many families formed during the war and postwar years are contributing to the high birth rate by the addition of a second and even a third child."

Under the bill as agreed to, an FHA-insured two-bedroom house valued at \$7,000 could be bought with a \$350 down payment with 30 years to pay, compared to \$700 with 25 years to pay previously. A four-bedroom house valued at \$9,000 could be bought with a down payment of \$450 with 30 years to pay, compared to a \$1,100 down payment and 25 years to pay under previous law. In the rental field any projects insured that are estimated to cost more than \$8,000 per unit would have to have an average of at least two bedrooms per unit in order to secure the best mortgage insurance terms, and the more liberal insurance terms for rental projects

would be limited to the first \$7,000 per unit cost.

2. The bill would establish an orderly and feasible policy for the further use and disposal of federally owned war housing and veterans' emergency housing in local communities and at educational institutions. Temporary housing under existing law has been operated under a blanket threat of removal by the end of the year. This bill would properly relate its disposition to local situations and needs.

3. The bill would make home loans to veterans more widely effective and available by broadening the base for such GI guaranties and by enabling the Government to make such loans if they cannot be obtained from private sources. Many veterans have been discriminated against because they live in areas where private home loans under the GI bill are not available. This would assure them of equitable opportunity to use this benefit and would also facilitate farm housing guaranties.

4. Colleges and universities have been under tremendous pressure to meet the heavy demand for postwar education. Housing has been a prime bottleneck in their operations. Many students have been denied a chance to continue their education because there was no place for them to live. Institutions have been unable to increase their faculties because they were unable to house additional teachers. The bill undertakes to relieve this problem through Federal loans for such housing where private financing is not obtainable and thus to insure educational opportunities to more people.

A more detailed explanation of the provisions of the bill follows:

#### AIDS TO PRIVATE HOUSING

Title I of the bill carries the main provisions extending and revising Federal aids to privately built and financed housing. This title amends the National Housing Act with respect to the mortgage insurance programs of the Federal Housing Administration and extends the secondary mortgage market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association, in the RFC. The provisions in brief are:

1. Home repair and modernization loans (title I, National Housing Act): The bill extends FHA insurance for this purpose (under title I, National Housing Act) to July 1, 1955, and authorizes up to \$1,250,000,000 in outstanding insured loans, approximately the same level at which program has been operating. Authority for this type of insurance had expired March 1, 1950.

2. Low-cost homes in outlying areas (a new sec. 8, title I, National Housing Act): This broadens FHA insurance of small homes in outlying and suburban areas to meet the growing demand for such housing where normal FHA property requirements are not feasible or necessary. The provision succeeds the more limited previous insurance in this field based on a \$4,500 maximum loan.

The new section provides: FHA insurance of 95 percent of value for loans up to \$4,750 for owner-occupants, but with increases permitted up to \$5,600 in high-cost areas (for builders the loan limits are \$4,250 to \$5,000 with 85 percent insurance of value). Maximum interest is 5 percent, with 1 percent maximum insurance premium, terms up to 30 years, compared to 20 years previously.

Important new feature is that such houses would now be individually inspected and insured by FHA, the same as other FHA insured homes, and such mortgages could now be purchased by the FNMA. This is designed to add greater security and marketability to such mortgages and thereby make funds for such purposes more generally available.

The bill authorizes FHA, with the approval of the President to insure up to \$250,000,000 in such loans at any one time.

3. FHA-insured owner-built and sale housing (title II, sec. 203, National Housing Act): This is the regular FHA program for one- to four-family dwellings which accounts for a large proportion of current home building. The bill provides relatively more liberal terms for lower-cost and larger family housing since most of the moderate-cost housing the past year has been small-size, two-bedroom units. The bill authorizes an additional \$2,250,000,000 in outstanding insured loans under this title for sale, rental and cooperative housing.

The types of FHA insurance provided under section 203 are:

(a) For new homes valued at not more than \$7,000—or up to \$8,000 in high-cost areas—if for owner occupancy, the terms are: 95 percent insurance at 4½ percent interest, up to 30-year term (for operative builders insurance is limited to 85 percent of value). Previously on a \$7,000 value, for example, a buyer had to pay at least \$700 down with 25 years for the balance; under the new bill, his down payment would be \$350 with 30 years for the remainder.

(b) For new homes with three and four bedrooms the 95-percent insurance, 30-year terms, would be available for homes valued at \$8,000 and \$9,000, respectively—and up to \$9,000 and \$10,000 in high-cost areas. Thus, under the bill, a four-bedroom house in a high-cost area valued at \$10,000 would require a \$500 down payment, with the balance payable in 30 years. Previously such a house insured by FHA would have required \$1,300 down payment with 25 years to pay the balance.

(c) For new homes valued at more than the above limits, but not more than \$11,000, the bill authorizes the FHA to insure 95 percent of the first \$7,000 and 70 percent of the next \$4,000, or a maximum of \$9,450 on an \$11,000 house. Previously FHA could insure 90 percent of the first \$7,000 and 80 percent of the next \$4,000. Thus the bill provides more incentive for lower costs, since the down payment on a \$7,000 house would be \$350 less than before, but on an \$11,000 house would be \$50 more.

(d) Houses valued above \$11,000, but not more than \$20,000 continue to be eligible for FHA insurance on a flat 80-percent ratio, as before.

4. FHA-insured rental housing (title II, sec. 207, National Housing Act): The bill provides a broader type of permanent FHA insurance for rental housing to replace the emergency type insurance under title VI, section 608, which expired March 1, 1950. The new bill also makes it illegal to discriminate against children in any rental housing insured under its provisions. Under the previous emergency rental insurance, FHA could insure up to 90 percent (\$8,100) on an average value of \$9,000 per unit, with no requirements as to size of unit. The new bill, as in its single-family (sec. 203) provisions, provides more liberal terms for lower-cost and larger rental units, since a large part of rental housing the past year has been at higher rentals and for small units unsuited for most family living. The new bill provides as follows:

(a) FHA insurance of 90 percent up to \$7,000 per unit of FHA's estimate of cost, and 60 percent on the next \$3,000. The insured loan could thus range from \$6,300 on the first \$7,000 to a maximum of \$8,100 on a \$10,000 unit cost.

(b) In order to obtain maximum mortgage loans any such insured rental project with an estimated unit cost of more than \$8,000 must have an average size of not less than 4½ rooms per unit (two bedroom average), so that any efficiency or one-bedroom units must be fully offset by three- or four-bedroom apartments.

Since rentals approved by FHA are determined by cost the bill thus tends to restrict such insured projects to lower rents or larger

units than most of those provided the past year.

(c) The bill authorizes an additional \$500,000,000 under the previous emergency rental insurance provisions (title VI, sec. 608) for FHA to process and insure applications for such rental insurance filed on or before March 1, 1950. This is to take care of a large number of applications for which previously authorized funds were not sufficient.

5. FHA-insured cooperative housing (sec. 213, title II, National Housing Act): This broadens and replaces previous authority for FHA to insure loans for cooperative housing projects, particularly for veterans.

Previously FHA could insure up to 90 percent of cost on a cooperative loan, and 95 percent if 65 percent of the members were World War II veterans. The bill would permit the 90 percent ratio to be proportionately increased per veteran member, up to 95 percent, even though veterans constitute less than 65 percent of membership. Thus, a veteran in any cooperative will benefit from 95 percent insurance and reduce his down payment requirement. The bill permits insurance up to \$8,100 per unit (\$8,550 for veterans) based on a \$9,000 cost limit, or if the need for larger family units necessitates higher cost, \$1,800 per room (\$1,900 for veterans) based on a \$2,000 maximum room cost.

If the cooperative is formed simply to build and develop the project, with the homes then to be bought by the members, the individual mortgage, if otherwise qualified, may then be insured on the 4 percent, 40-year basis provided for lower-cost cooperatives. Heretofore, such mortgages have had to be treated as regular individual insured loans, limited to 25 or 30 years at 4½ percent.

These provisions are designed to stimulate more private lending for cooperative housing and to enable more families, especially veterans, to undertake such projects in order to serve more middle-income families than has thus far been possible.

6. Secondary mortgage market (title III, National Housing Act): The bill increases the authorization for the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase Government insured and guaranteed mortgages to make more home financing available.

The bill authorizes an additional \$250,000,000 for such purchases, bringing the total authorization to \$2,750,000,000.

The bill makes FHA-insured loans for low-cost houses in outlying and suburban areas (sec. 8, title I, previously described) eligible for purchase on the same basis as other FHA-insured mortgages.

The bill makes GI loans on farm houses eligible for purchase on the same basis (that is, 100 percent) as other GI home loans.

The bill permits the FNMA to charge not more than 1 percent of the outstanding loan as a fee.

The bill provides that FNMA may contract to purchase mortgages only after they have been guaranteed or insured, thus eliminating future advance commitments.

Disposal of war and veterans housing: Title II of the new bill defines and revises previous laws and policies relating to the disposal of federally owned housing originally provided for war workers or for emergency use of veterans in the postwar period. This relates to about 365,000 units still in Federal ownership, of which nearly two-thirds are temporary structures, and under present law, subject to removal at the end of 1950 unless specifically exempted. The bill recognizes that continued use and removal of temporary housing depends primarily on local housing conditions, and that sale of permanent housing has been impeded because of the resulting possible displacement of present occupants.

The bill carries certain provisions to take care of special problems and extensions, but

generally sets up the following means of meeting the situation:

Temporary housing may be transferred to local communities and to educational institutions and nonprofit organizations now operating such housing (they have already acquired a large amount of similar housing under previous authorities), provided they apply by December 31, 1950, and pay the cost of any land involved. The local community will then determine its continued use and handle its eventual removal or disposal.

Temporary housing not so transferred will be required by the Federal Government to be vacated no later than July 1, 1952, and removed as soon as possible thereafter.

The bill authorizes the transfer of some of the permanent housing—about 44,000 units in 149 projects previously requested by localities, plus others applied for by the locality within 60 days and found suitable for such use—to the local communities for use as low-rent public housing under the United States Housing Act. Net income from this housing would be paid to the Federal Government. The bill also authorizes transfer to the Public Housing Administration, for use as low-rent housing for agricultural workers and for disposal, the farm-labor camps now administered under the Department of Agriculture.

Most of the permanent war housing is to be sold, with the occupants, either individually or in cooperative groups, having first opportunity to purchase, and with veteran occupants having first preference. Housing not so purchased would then be sold to others, with nonoccupant veterans or veteran groups having first preference.

#### CHANGES IN HOME LOANS TO VETERANS

In order to make home loans to veterans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act more generally available and effective, the bill makes the following changes:

1. Such loans under the new bill may be guaranteed up to 60 percent, but not more than \$7,500, instead of 50 percent and \$4,000 as before. The maximum term is also extended from 25 to 30 years. This will extend the range of 4 percent GI home finance to veterans.

2. The Veterans' Administrator is directed to prescribe minimum requirements for new construction guaranteed by GI home loans.

3. A provision is added to the GI bill to assist in making the GI guaranty more workable in the case of a farm home.

4. The Veterans' Administrator is authorized to make direct loans up to \$150,000,000 to veterans for homes, in an amount of not more than \$10,000 per loan, if the veteran is unable to obtain private financing at not more than 4 percent interest.

5. In view of the broadened scope of GI loans, the bill terminates authority for combination GI-FHA loans now in use, effective December 31, 1950, or sooner if the Veterans' Administrator finds it is desirable.

#### LOANS TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

In order to enable colleges and universities to serve more students and better meet the educational demand that has developed since the war, the bill authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make up to \$300,000,000 in loans to such educational institutions to provide housing for faculty and students. The loans may be for 40 years and shall bear interest at not less than the going Federal rate, plus one-fourth of 1 percent.

#### REGULATION OF HOUSING FEES

The bill directs the FHA and the Veterans' Administration to prescribe limits on charges and fees imposed upon builders and purchasers with respect to housing assisted under the FHA or VA program and makes housing on which excessive fees and charges are made ineligible for FHA mortgage insurance and VA loan guaranties.

DELIVERED PRICE SYSTEMS AND  
FREIGHT-ABSORPTION PRACTICES—  
CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1008) to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices.

(For conference report, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1950, p. 4452.)

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. When the Senate took a recess last Thursday, the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, was the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It still is. The Chair should have announced at the beginning that that was the unfinished business.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, Mr. President, I make a point of order against the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is privileged, since it relates to a conference report, and when it is disposed of the Senate will automatically return to the consideration of the bill referred to by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. In order to displace the bill, H. R. 5472, however, a majority vote of the Senate is required, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion by the Senator from Nevada does not displace the unfinished business. The conference report being privileged, if the Senate votes to take it up—which must be, under the motion, by a majority vote—it would be, of course, considered until it is disposed of. Then automatically the bill referred to by the Senator will again come before the Senate. If the Senate refuses by a majority vote to take up the conference report, the Senate will still have the bill under consideration to which the Senator refers.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is chairman of the Public Works Committee, has been attempting for some time to obtain consideration of H. R. 5472.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must announce that the motion of the Senator from Nevada to proceed to consider the conference report is not debatable. The question is on the motion.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Byrd	Chavez
Brewster	Cain	Connally
Bridges	Capehart	Cordon
Butler	Chapman	Darby

Donnell	Jenner	Magnuson
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Malone
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Martin
Ecton	Kefauver	Maybank
Ferguson	Kem	Morse
Flanders	Kerr	Mundt
Frear	Kilgore	Neely
Fulbright	Knowland	O'Connor
George	Langer	O'Mahoney
Gillette	Leahy	Robertson
Green	Lehman	Saltonstall
Gurney	Lodge	Schoeppel
Hayden	Long	Sparkman
Hendrickson	Lucas	Stennis
Hickenlooper	McCarran	Taft
Hill	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Holland	McClellan	Watkins
Humphrey	McFarland	Wherry
Hunt	McKellar	Williams
Ives	McMahon	Withers

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to proceed to consider the conference report on Senate bill 1008.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LONG. The motion is not debatable, but, if the conference report is brought up, it will be open to debate at that time, will it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. HOEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr.

ELLENDER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate, and his pair has been announced previously by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is also absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 36, as follows:

## YEAS—35

Brewster	Gurney	McFarland
Bridges	Hendrickson	Mundt
Butler	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Byrd	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Darby	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kem	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Kerr	Taft
Ecton	Knowland	Wherry
Ferguson	Lodge	Williams
Flanders	McCarran	Withers
George	McCarthy	

## NAYS—36

Aiken	Hill	McKellar
Cain	Holland	McMahon
Chapman	Humphrey	Magnuson
Chavez	Ives	Malone
Connally	Kefauver	Martin
Cordon	Kilgore	Maybank
Douglas	Langer	Morse
Frear	Leahy	Neely
Fulbright	Lehman	Sparkman
Gillette	Long	Stennis
Green	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McClellan	Watkins

## NOT VOTING—25

Anderson	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Benton	Millikin	Thye
Bricker	Murray	Tobey
Downey	Myers	Tydings
Eastland	Pepper	Vandenberg
Ellender	Russell	Wiley
Graham	Smith, Maine	Young
Hoey	Smith, N. J.	
Johnson, Tex.	Taylor	

So Mr. McCARRAN's motion was rejected.

## PROCEDURE ON YEA-AND-NAY VOTES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to a precedent which is growing, and to which all Senators, I believe, should give serious consideration. As I understand, Senators on both sides of the aisle, before their names are called on a vote

upon a measure, frequently walk up to the desk and vote. That precedent is growing more and more each day. It happened in connection with the vote just had. I believe we ought to observe the rule, and that a Senator should answer "Yea" or "Nay" when his name is called, and not take advantage of the rule by walking up to the desk and voting with the clerk before his name is called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair believes it would be advisable, for the information of the Senate, to have the clerk read the rule with respect to yea-and-nay votes.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Rule XII. Voting, etc.: 1. When the yeas and nays are ordered, the names of Senators shall be called alphabetically; and each Senator shall, without debate, declare his assent or dissent to the question, unless excused by the Senate; and no Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the Presiding Officer, but may for sufficient reasons, with unanimous consent, change or withdraw his vote. No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor shall the Presiding Officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Obviously, under the rule, no Senator has the right to vote except when his name is called alphabetically. The Chair hopes Senators will observe the rule. The practice referred to by the Senator from Illinois has become a habit, although, fortunately, not universally so. However, any effort by a Senator to vote in advance of his name being called is a violation of the rule. If the attention of the Chair were called to a violation, the Chair would so hold. The attention of the Chair usually is not called to it, and therefore he has no information regarding it. This announcement does not mean, however, that after a roll call is completed a Senator may not be recognized to vote or change his vote prior to announcement of the final result.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to address a query to the distinguished majority leader, as to what his pleasure is relative to calling up the conference report on the basing-point legislation after the pending measure has been disposed of.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to advise the Senator from Nebraska that on tomorrow the Democratic policy committee will meet, and following the meeting of the policy committee I shall be better able to answer the Senator's query. It is my understanding that it will take this afternoon and tomorrow to conclude debate upon the pending bill. I have no disposition to delay any of these matters. As the Senator from Nebraska knows, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has been attempting to call up the so-called river and harbor and flood-control bill for a long time. There are other very important measures which the Senate must consider. Therefore, I should like very much to have the policy committee help me tomorrow to make a determination as to what shall be taken up following disposition of the unfinished business. However, whatever the Senate may take up, I assure the Senator from Nebraska it will be an im-

portant measure. It will be either the conference report on the basing-point bill, or FEPC, or ECA, or the Agricultural Commodity Credit Corporation bill. All of them are important, and I believe all Senators ought to be present when the Senate votes upon any of them.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the majority leader for his answer. The basing-point conference report is a privileged matter, and, in that respect, I believe it falls into a category different from that of any of the other measures the distinguished majority leader has mentioned. Of course, I do not expect to be admitted to the Democratic policy committee meeting, and, therefore, I shall have no chance to determine what the next measure to be taken up will be, but I submit, in all kindliness, that it seems to me that after the unfinished business has been disposed of, the privileged matter, the conference report, should have the right-of-way, and we should consider it and either adopt it or reject it. The bill has been pending in the Senate since last year, and it should be disposed of as soon as possible.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the suggestion made by the able minority leader. Obviously, in due course, we shall take up the conference report on the basing-point bill. So far as the Senator's visiting a meeting of the Democratic policy committee is concerned, I issue to him an invitation to come to our meetings any time he may wish to do so. I do not say that we will follow the wisdom, advice, or counsel which he may choose to give us, but he will always be welcome to attend a session of the policy committee.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator from Illinois realizes that several Senators are violently opposed to the conference report on the basing-point bill because they feel that its adoption would emasculate many features of the anti-trust law. We anticipate lengthy debate on the report when it comes before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand there will be some debate on the conference report on the basing-point bill. That is another reason why I am eager to have it come up for consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. I have all the respect in the world for the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. However, I am sure he will agree that we should take first things first, and consideration of the conference report on the basing-point bill has priority. Of course, when it comes up for consideration it will be debated, and I believe it should be fully debated. However, consideration of the report is long past due, and it should be brought before the Senate without further delay.

Mr. LUCAS. It is a privileged matter, and it may be called up at any time.

#### CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES AND NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, in the absence of the senior Senator from

Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the chairman of the committee, I report favorably certain routine nominations in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. They have been in the committee for the required 7 days, and no objections have been filed. Included in the nominations are those of W. Stuart Symington, to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and Frank Pace, Jr., to be Secretary of the Army. I am told that it is important that these nominations be confirmed today, and I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nominations be considered and confirmed, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified forthwith.

#### FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the river-and-harbor bill was before the Senate at the last session of Congress, all the committee amendments were agreed to, and the bill went over on objection. At this session the committee reported five additional amendments, three of which have been agreed to. So there are now to be considered two amendments, and the clerk will state the first of the two.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 53, after line 15, it is proposed to add the following:

The sum of \$1,500,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended by the Federal Power Commission for carrying out any examinations and surveys provided for in this act or any other acts of Congress, to be prosecuted by the Federal Power Commission.

#### A NEW PLAN FOR INTERSTATE OPERATION OF WATER AND POWER PROJECTS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am going to discuss a matter which is relevant and material to the bill which is now before the Senate. I hope the Senators who are interested in flood projects, power projects, and reclamation projects will remain in the Chamber to hear what I have to say on this very important matter.

Mr. President, the easy-to-build western reclamation and flood-control projects have already been constructed, or are well on their way.

From here on the reclamation and flood-control program calls for the construction for the most part of giant multiple-purpose projects on the large interstate streams of the arid West. Reclamation and flood control should be inseparable in future planning.

Incidental to the dams on the main streams of these river systems are smaller projects, largely for irrigation which with the help of power revenues from the large power plants, constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation or the Army engineers, will become feasible.

Water being what it is in the arid West—the very lifeblood of its economy—the basic policy of all reclamation and flood-control programs should be to put to the fullest possible beneficial use every drop of water available for consumptive use. Irrigation, municipal, mining, industrial, and miscellaneous demands must be satisfied if there is to be any future expansion in the West.

An abundant supply of low-cost electric energy can be a great aid to growth, but without an adequate supply of water for consumptive use, it is valueless. There can be no progress without life-giving water. That fact cannot be over-emphasized.

Recognition of this elementary truth has given rise to planning future projects by westerners in such a way that the consumptive use of water is given the first consideration. Everything else is secondary.

Development of river systems should be planned as a whole and for all purposes. If the basin-wide development is feasible from the standpoint of economics, that is, if the project taken as a whole is self-liquidating, then it should be constructed. Growing out of this generalization is this problem: Will the full development of all the possibilities of a river system make feasible individual units for consumptive use such as irrigation, municipal, and industrial purposes for example, which, standing by themselves, would be of doubtful feasibility.

To be specific, there are numerous small irrigation and industrial water projects planned on the main streams and on the tributaries of the Columbia and Colorado and other western rivers. These small consumptive use projects will not be self-liquidating standing alone; consequently, they need the financial aid available from the tremendous power revenues that will be obtained from the other units of the basin development.

It is the development of these small and somewhat localized projects which will encourage the development of new homes, farms, and industries.

The power units must have a market for their output. There must be people to create that market, but without water for consumptive uses, there cannot be homes, farms, and industry to sustain people. It follows then that power projects built either by the Bureau of Reclamation or the Army Engineers, are inextricably tied in with irrigation, municipal and industrial water projects. One group cannot be successful without the other. It should be clear, therefore, that there is no other logical way to put to a beneficial use the remaining waters of the West, which, as I have already said, are principally in interstate streams, without a basin-wide development including both power plants and consumptive water use units. These go hand in hand.

Another problem that is coming to the front in the minds of westerners interested in reclamation is the growing tendency to get away from the basic policies established in the first Reclamation Act adopted in 1902. This policy required the landowners and water users

to repay the costs of construction of a project on an amortized basis and when that was done, the operation, maintenance, and the equitable ownership came to those who made the repayment of the costs.

In the hurry-up days of the depression when projects had to be started without contracts for the repayment of the costs in order to furnish employment there developed the so-called 9 (E) contract for the rental of water to the landowners and other water users. Under this policy nothing was said about the repayment of the costs and there was no provision for the transfer of the operation and maintenance and equitable ownership over to the water users when the total income from rentals would equal the cost of construction. The central valley program in California is an example of this kind of a situation.

The United States has already constructed, through the Bureau of Reclamation, a number of power projects which are directly connected with irrigation. Grand Coulee and the Shasta Dam in the central California project are examples. In addition, the Bureau of Reclamation constructed Hoover Dam on the Colorado. This is a flood-control and power project primarily, although it does store water for future use in irrigation. However, there is no direct diversion from the reservoir for irrigation.

The power features of the projects I have just named are operated and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation. So far as I know there is no intent ever to turn these projects over to the people in the areas who, by their patronage, will have paid for the cost of the construction. I think it may be safely said that the Bureau of Reclamation plans for the permanent operation of these projects by the Bureau or some other Federal agency.

I may interpolate and say that on the Columbia, the Bonneville Administration is the Federal agency which is now operating these projects which are already constructed.

A comprehensive development of the Columbia River alone and its possibilities would probably make the United States the greatest utility owner and operator in the world, with the exception of Russia, if the policy followed on the Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee, and Bonneville projects is adopted for the rest of the Columbia development, and all the other river systems of the West.

It is claimed on the Columbia and Colorado Rivers, and I believe the claims can be firmly justified, that the entire reimbursable costs of the full developments can be entirely repaid by the water and power users if the entire developments are considered as single units (in the case of the Colorado, two units, upper and lower divisions by compact agreement) and the proceeds from them as basin-wide units are applied to the repayment of costs. In these projects, of course, power would be the greatest contributor.

It should be pointed out that whether the income is from power or water or both, the people of the Columbia and Colorado Basins are the ones who will pay the entire reimbursable costs of construction. That they will make a profit

in using the water and the power does not alter the fact that they in the end will repay the entire cost of the comprehensive developments. Incidentally, they will also pay heavy income taxes on whatever profits they make out of those operations. In the long run the increased Federal taxes collected from the areas will amount to more than the total cost of the projects.

I am calling attention to large projects already under the control of the Bureau of Reclamation, of the Department of Interior, and apparently permanently so, to indicate what will likely happen in the future. So far as I know, there is nothing being suggested that when these projects are paid for, the people of the river systems will ever own and operate them.

Developments on other river basins such as the Columbia are now being planned which would add immense additions to the power units under the control of the United States. There are at least nine large power projects on the upper Colorado River alone. To these should be added the vast program of dams and power plants on the Missouri Valley River system. All of these projects come under the control of the United States, and they undoubtedly will in the future, unless some other methods are found or policies adopted for the operation, maintenance and equitable ownership of these projects. The continued operation of these developments by the United States would go a long way toward nationalization of the power industry in the western part of the United States and eventually in the whole country.

Whether to continue that policy or to find another way to take care of this much desired development, that is, the development of all these streams, is one of the problems now facing Congress. If the policy of the original Reclamation Act of 1902 should be followed on interstate stream projects, the people of all of these river areas would own the projects when costs of construction were repaid. They not only would have the equitable ownership, but they would also operate them, under amendments to the original act, and that operation would begin as each unit in the basin-wide developments was completed.

Many projects have already been constructed under the original Reclamation Act. Under the repayment contracts, these projects, soon after they were constructed and tested, were turned over to the water users to operate and maintain. Some of them have power units; although at this stage of reclamation history the power units were incidental rather than the main part of the projects.

There are many of these projects including incidental power plants now in successful operation—projects where the Bureau of Reclamation moved out as soon as the projects were finished. The only connection the Bureau has with these projects is to check occasionally to see that the management is protecting the physical features of the dams, reservoirs, power plants, and other facilities. The Government's interest is that of a creditor who is entitled to see that the security is protected. When the reimbursable costs are paid, the Government

has no further interest except to hold the legal title under the reclamation law. The equitable title is in the water users.

In the first reclamation projects, in the early days, the Government contracted directly with the individual land-owners and water users. As the program grew, this proved to be very cumbersome. To remedy this situation, irrigation districts and water users associations were organized to represent groups of land-owners and other water users in their dealings with the United States. Repayment contracts were signed either by the district or the association in behalf of the individual water users. The use of these entities has been extensive in the West. Their organization and their methods of operation are well known to western water users.

Now that the remaining water development of the West is largely on interstate streams, a new problem is presented. It is argued that there must be one entity to operate an integrated program for the entire river system, or a division of it where a division has been made by compact between States—as, for example, the separation of the Colorado River into the upper and lower divisions.

A Federal valley authority modeled on TVA is held to be the ideal way for the further development of the interstate streams of the West. In the West there is strong resistance to these proposals. I do not intend at this time to argue the merits or demerits of valley authorities. In passing, I might point out that the problems of the use of western rivers, where there are so many private rights to the use of water under the doctrine of appropriation by beneficial use, are in no way comparable to the problems on interstate river systems where irrigation is not practiced and where there are no State and private rights under the western doctrine of appropriation by beneficial use.

Mr. President, I agree with those who contend that there should be one entity to integrate and coordinate projects on interstate streams. It should be a strong organization, one clothed with ample authority to act in harmony with interstate water compacts, approved by Congress and with interstate water commissions authorized by those compacts to regulate the flow and use of such streams.

I go one step further than the proponents of the one-entity operation and management of rivers are willing to go, namely, that there should also be one interstate organization, locally controlled, which would have the authority to own in trust, for the numerous water and power users on the main stems of such river systems or divisions of river systems, at least all the major projects or units of projects and their facilities which are constructed under a basin-wide development.

I believe firmly that the resources of these great river systems belong to the people who have pioneered these areas and who are willing to continue the pioneering process in establishing and maintaining homes, industries, and still higher standards of civilization.

I am also convinced that it will take a basin-wide development, with all the revenues produced by the various projects or units of projects which are constructed, to repay the reimbursable costs of such development. They are so huge that they are entirely out of reach of private enterprise financing.

I envision the time when those reimbursable costs of construction are repaid. The repayment cannot be made, however, until the projects are completed and until there has elapsed sufficient time in which to put to a beneficial use the waters so developed and made available, whether it be in irrigation, municipal or industrial water projects, or in electric generation plants whether for a reclamation project or a flood-control project constructed by the Army engineers.

When the time does come that the costs have been repaid—or earlier, if possible—I think the States on these interstate streams and the United States should enter into a compact which will determine what disposition should be made of the net power revenues which would come out of the operation of these various basin-wide programs.

May I summarize my conclusions:

First. The program of developing interstate streams should include all uses of water, both for consumptive and for power generating purposes; and if the over-all, basin-wide project is found to be feasible, then the Federal Government should finance its construction, even though individual units or projects for the consumptive use of water standing alone might not be self-liquidating.

Second. That the basic policy of the Reclamation Act of 1902, as amended, should be reaffirmed and made a part of all reclamation and flood-control projects now in operation or under construction or being planned for construction on interstate streams in the 17 arid States of the West. Repayment contracts covering the reimbursable costs of construction should be entered into with an entity representing the water users under federally constructed projects on these interstate streams; and when repayment of the reimbursable costs has been made, the equitable title to the projects shall be in the entity representing these water and power users, to be held in trust for the people in the areas of said interstate river systems.

Third. That there should be a strong interstate water and power users' association which can operate and maintain, for the benefit of the citizens of the area, basin-wide projects on interstate streams. That said association, either directly or through its stockholder members, should take over and maintain and operate each major unit of the basin-wide development as soon as it is completed; and that when reimbursable costs have been repaid on each unit, the equitable title to each unit, and finally the entire development, should vest in and be held in trust by the interstate association for the benefit of the citizens of that area, including the water users, members of the association.

Reclamation and flood-control development on the interstate water

courses of the West is now at the crossroads, so far as future policy is concerned. At the present there are no entities which can sign a repayment contract and can agree to operate and maintain the various reservoirs, dams, and power plants on these interstate streams. For instance, in the upper Colorado River Basin, where a compact has been entered into between the States, dividing their share of the waters of that stream among them, there are at present no legal entities authorized to sign repayment contract for the construction of the large reservoir and power plants on the main stem of that river.

Let me say here that the program, the investigations, and the planning now have reached the authorization stage. Bills which now are pending would authorize the construction of those large reservoirs on the upper Colorado River. I repeat that at the present time there are no agencies with authority to sign repayment contracts. We must face this problem at some time in the near future, and I think now is the time when we should consider it.

Furthermore, no policy has thus far been declared by Congress as to the future disposition of power and power revenues, both on the interstate projects and on many of the State projects where, along with irrigation, there is power development incidental to the principal purpose of the project. Most or at least some of those repayment contracts provide that if the power development is made by the association or by the water user at its own cost, then it will have full control and ownership of the power development. On the other hand, if the money used to finance the project comes from the United States, then the future disposition of those projects will be left to Congress. That means that no policy as to that matter has been settled at this time. It has not been determined whether or not the water users and others signing for the construction of the projects will have the right to the use of the power and power revenues to pay construction costs of the over-all, basin-wide developments. In fact, the future policy of the United States as to how interstate projects should be handled has not been worked out as yet.

On the Columbia River and on the Missouri there are also vast programs in both the planning and the construction stages. Incidentally, I was told only the other day that some 104 reservoirs are planned on the Missouri River, alone. Many of them now are under construction, but still we have not adopted a policy as to how they shall be operating in the future. Some of them have been authorized; all together, there are probably \$1,500,000,000 in projects which will soon be knocking at the doors of Congress for authorization. Many of them are now knocking at the door for appropriations.

It seems to me now is the time for the Congress to adopt a concrete, definite policy that will settle, once and for all, the questions which I have raised with reference to the projects on interstate streams.

There are various proposals before the Congress. We are asked to approve basin accounts which name the Federal Government, through one of its agencies, as the keeper of that account and the agency to actually control the disposal of power and to collect the revenues.

Several bills seeking to authorize a TVA or valley authority type of Federal authority not only to own and operate the basin-wide developments, but also to construct them, have been introduced, and are now before committees of the Congress.

Most of the proposals which have been made overlook the fact that the people of the 17 Western States will have to pay for the construction costs of these giant projects, and should have the final say as to their ownership and operation unless the Congress adopts a policy of Federal ownership. Proposals made to date seem to go in the direction of permanent Federal control and operation of these multiple-purpose projects.

I have been studying this problem for many years, Mr. President, during a period when I have been representing water users in their relations with the Bureau of Reclamation or with other agencies of the Government. I have some rather definite ideas on the questions involved, and I have attempted to set them forth rather specifically in my remarks here today.

I have drafted a bill which I offered earlier in today's session, for reference to the appropriate committee—which I sincerely believe will meet the situation in the West on interstate rivers, and will furnish the type and kind of an organization that ought to be authorized to provide for a unified, integrated control of the operations of at least the various major projects or units of projects on interstate streams.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I have introduced be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3376) to provide for the organization of interstate water and power users' associations for the purpose of entering into contracts for the repayment of the costs of water and power projects on interstate streams and for the ownership, operation, and maintenance of such projects, and for other purposes, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That this act may be cited as the Interstate Water and Power Project Act of 1950.

#### FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) The development of multiple-purpose reclamation and flood-control projects on interstate streams is necessary to attain the maximum beneficial use of the waters of such streams.

(2) The majority of such essential projects would embrace irrigation of lands and other consumptive uses of water and the generation and sale of electric energy in two or more States.

(3) The development of such projects is impeded by the fact that instrumentalities of the several States are without authority to contract with the United States for the construction and repayment of the costs and to provide for the operation and maintenance of projects which are interstate in character.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act that—

(1) The development of projects for the irrigation of lands and other consumptive uses of water and the generation and sale of electric energy in two or more States can be facilitated by the establishment, as hereinafter authorized of corporate entities to be known as interstate water and power users' associations empowered to enter into contracts with the Federal Government for the construction of such projects and for repayment of the costs thereof, and to operate and maintain and to hold in trust for its shareholders the equitable ownership of the completed projects or units thereof.

(2) When reimbursable costs of the construction of any such project, or unit thereof covered by a separate repayment contract, have been repaid to the United States, the equitable title to such project or unit and the rights to the permanent and exclusive use of the water diverted and made available, to the exclusive use of the electric energy produced and generated, and to the exclusive use of the proceeds from the sale thereof subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 13, shall be vested in perpetuity in the interstate water and power users' association which shall have become entitled, by contract with the United States, to the rights and benefits conferred by this act and by such contract, and shall be perpetually held by such association in trust for the use and benefit of its shareholders.

(3) Where putting waters of interstate streams to maximum beneficial use for irrigation purposes and other consumptive uses requires the construction of projects, the costs of which are beyond the ability of water users under such projects to repay from proceeds derived from the use of such water, revenues received by an interstate water and power users' association from the sale of electric energy produced by such projects, shall be applied to the repayment of such costs to the extent necessary to insure that all such waters available and which can be feasibly used for irrigation purposes and other consumptive uses may be put to the fullest possible beneficial use.

(4) The use for navigation in connection with the operation and maintenance of reclamation projects, flood-control projects, or power-development projects constructed under the provisions of this act, or waters arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

#### INTERSTATE WATER AND POWER USERS' ASSOCIATIONS

SEC. 3. For the purpose of establishing an organization with adequate powers to contract with the Federal Government for the construction of water and power projects utilizing the water of interstate streams for irrigation and other consumptive uses of water, and the development, production, distribution, and sale of power within two or more States, and with adequate powers to maintain and operate such projects (or units thereof covered by separate repayment contracts) upon their completion, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is directed, upon receipt of articles of incorporation filed in behalf of incorporators by the Governors of a majority of the States on the river system (or division of river system which has by interstate compact been made a division of such river system) to charter a body corporate which shall be known as an interstate water and power users' association and shall have the powers and authority set forth in this act, together with such other powers not inconsistent

therewith as may be necessary to enable the association to carry out its functions and as may be set forth in its articles of incorporation. Such articles of incorporation may thereafter be amended in any manner not inconsistent with the provisions of this act by the filing with the Secretary of the Interior the proposed amendment by the association.

#### BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 4. The management of an interstate water and power users' association shall be vested in a board of directors consisting of not less than 5 and not more than 21 members, to be elected by the shareholders. Such members shall serve for terms of 3 years, except that (1) of the members first elected, not less than one-third shall serve for terms of 1 year, not less than one-third shall serve for terms of 2 years, and the remainder shall serve for terms of 3 years, and (2) a member elected to fill a vacancy caused by death or resignation shall serve only for the unexpired portion of the term for which his predecessor shall have been elected. During any period when any obligation of the association is owing to the United States there shall be an additional member who shall be a representative of the United States and who shall be appointed by the President. Directors shall receive compensation at rates to be fixed by the association, except that in the event the director appointed by the President is an officer or employee of the United States he shall not be entitled to compensation in addition to his compensation as a Government officer or employee. No person shall be eligible to serve as a director unless he is a citizen of the United States. All members of the board except the Federal representative shall be residents of the area to be served by the project. The shareholders from each State within such area shall elect at least one member of the board.

#### OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

SEC. 5. (a) The board of directors of an interstate water and power users' association is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949 to appoint and fix the compensation of such committees, officers, and employees as it deems necessary to carry out the functions of the association. No person shall be appointed as general manager, secretary, or treasurer of an association, or as a member of an executive committee thereof, except upon the affirmative vote of three-fourths of the membership of the board of directors.

(b) The provisions of the act entitled "An Act to Provide Compensation for Employees of the United States Suffering Injuries While in the Performance of Their Duties, and for Other Purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, shall apply to persons employed under the provisions of this section; and the remedies afforded by such act shall be exclusive and in lieu of any other remedy.

#### PRINCIPAL OFFICE

SEC. 6. An interstate water and power users' association shall maintain its principal office within the area to be served by the project which it is organized to develop and in which it is to perform its functions.

#### CAPITAL STOCK

SEC. 7. The capital stock of an interstate water and power users' association shall be in such number of shares as may be specified in the articles of incorporation, shall be issued to a conservancy district, water users' association, or other organization or entity authorized under State law to subscribe for, acquire, and hold such stock, and shall be issued to the respective holders in proportion to the water rights which they hold or represent. Such stock shall be assessable for the purposes specified in section 8.

## SOURCES OF REVENUE

SEC. 8. (a) Revenues for the accomplishment of the purposes of an interstate water and power users' association shall be raised—

(1) From assessments against the shares of stock of the association, or calls against subscriptions for such stock, insofar as may be necessary to meet:

(A) Costs of construction, improvement, enlargement, betterment, repairs, operation, and maintenance of the power plants and irrigation and other works of the associations, or of those managed, controlled, operated, or maintained by it.

(B) Payments due the United States under any contract or contracts between the United States and the association, or payments under any contract between the United States and other parties which are assumed or guaranteed by the association.

(C) Deficiencies caused by the failure of some of the shareholders of the associations to pay assessments upon their shares of stock.

(D) Any and all lawful obligations of the associations.

(2) From income arising from the carriage, sale, rental, or delivery of water for irrigation or other purposes or from the sale, rental, lease, or otherwise furnishing of electric or other power, or power privileges, or from other lawful operations of the association.

(b) Assessments authorized under subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be equitably but need not be equally assessed.

Such equitable but unequal assessments may be made in any situation where expenditures are made or are necessary for purposes that are of benefit to a part only of the shareholder; or where existing or future contracts with the United States, or the laws or regulations of the United States, now or hereafter, require or permit unequal assessments; or where unequal assessments are required or permitted by the terms or conditions of any contract between the association and any shareholder.

## GENERAL CORPORATE POWERS OF ASSOCIATIONS

SEC. 9. Subject to the provisions of this act, an interstate water and power users' association—

(1) shall have perpetual succession in its corporate name;

(2) may sue and be sued in its corporate name;

(3) may adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(4) may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws;

(5) shall have power to acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or donation, such real and personal property and any interest therein, and to dispose of any such property or interest therein, as the board of directors deems necessary or appropriate in carrying out the purposes of the association;

(6) shall have power to enter into such contracts and agreements, and to do such acts and things as the board of directors deems necessary to carry out the purposes of the association: *Provided*, That contracts involving in excess of \$100,000 must also be approved by a vote of three-fourths of all shareholders of the association.

## DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF PROJECTS

SEC. 10. (a) An interstate water users' association shall have power to contract with the Government of the United States or any agency thereof for the construction, preservation, operation, and maintenance of tunnels, reservoirs, regulating basins, diversion canals and works, dams, power plants, transmission lines, and all other works incident thereto, and used in connection therewith.

(b) Section 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma

and the following: "and shall include an interstate water and power users' association organized under the Interstate Reclamation Project Act of 1950."

(c) The reimbursable costs of multiple-purpose projects shall be equitably allocated among the various activities thereof in such manner as may be necessary to encourage the widest possible use of water for irrigation purposes and other consumptive uses and to avoid the imposition upon water users of a share of the joint costs which is excessive in relation to the benefits derived therefrom. The allocation of such costs shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior in the case of projects constructed or to be constructed by the Department of the Interior, but he shall consult with the Secretary of the Army with respect to allocations to flood control and navigation and with the Federal Power Commission with respect to allocations to power. Such allocations shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Army in the case of projects constructed or to be constructed by the Department of the Army, but he shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior in the case of allocations to irrigation and the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and with the Federal Power Commission and the Secretary of the Interior with respect to allocations to power.

(d) The provisions of section 9 (except subsections (c) and (e)) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 shall, to the extent not inconsistent with this act, be applicable with respect to any project undertaken pursuant to this act, that for the purpose of any repayment contract under such section there shall be included in the general repayment obligation of the interstate water and power users' association, in addition to the part of the construction costs allocated to irrigation, the part of such costs which are allocated to power and municipal water supply.

## DISPOSITION OF WATER

SEC. 11. Water diverted from an interstate stream by an interstate water users' association shall be allotted to the shareholders of such association in accordance with their respective water rights as determined by the laws of the States having jurisdiction thereof or by compacts between any two or more of such States. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to interfere with the right or power of any State to regulate within its own boundaries use and control of water.

## DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC POWER

SEC. 12. (a) An interstate water and power users' association shall have authority to enter into contracts for the lease of power privileges or for the sale of electric power generated by it. In any such lease or sale preference shall be given to municipalities and other public corporations or agencies, and to cooperatives and other nonprofit organization financed in whole or in part by loans made pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended.

(b) An interstate water and power users' association shall also have authority, in order to provide for emergencies, break-down relief, increased stability, and economy in operations, to enter into contracts or arrangements upon suitable terms with public- and private-power systems for the purchase or mutual exchange of electric power.

(c) No contract relating to electric power or power privileges shall be entered into under this section unless, in the judgment of the board of directors it will not impair the efficiency of the project for irrigation purposes and other consumptive uses of water.

(d) In disposing of electric power under this section an interstate water and power users' association shall not enter into contracts for deliveries of firm power outside of States which comprise or portions of which comprise, the area or river system which such

association is organized to develop, and contracts for delivery of firm power in such States shall provide that, whenever the association finds that a purchaser is by reason of the purchase of power under such contract supplying power to an adjacent marketing territory outside such States on a firm basis and thereby precluding the marketing in that territory of firm power capable of being developed at plants of another interstate water and power users' association in such territory, the amount of firm power supplied to that purchaser shall be reduced to the amount required by it within the States referred to in this subsection, after taking into account the amount of power reasonably available to that purchaser from its own power plants within such States. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to preclude interconnections with power-marketing areas outside such States, for the purpose of delivery of surplus energy on an off-peak, emergency or temporary basis, or for the exchange of power and energy, including the exchange of power or energy for water or storage of water.

## REVENUES FROM DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC POWER

SEC. 13. (a) There shall be charged against the power and miscellaneous revenues, including revenues on account of benefits to downstream power plants which result from upstream improvements, derived from or incidental to the operation of any power plant or plants including transmission lines and other facilities incident to the marketing of power from such plants by an interstate water and power users' association, all operation, maintenance, and construction costs of such power plants, transmission lines, and other facilities that are allocated to power purposes, and interest as provided in subsection (c). There shall also be charged against such revenues all reimbursable costs which are properly allocable to purposes other than power, but which are assigned for repayment from power revenues, in connection with projects within the jurisdiction of such association, whether or not such projects include power features: *Provided*, That assignment of such costs in excess of amounts which are so assignable under the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto) shall be made only upon specific authorization by act of Congress.

(b) At the close of each fiscal year the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to the Congress a report reflecting with respect to each interstate water and power users' association, the Federal expenditures allocated to power and the Federal expenditures allocated to irrigation and other water-supply purposes, and the progress of repayment thereon.

(c) The revenues referred to in subsection (a) and the costs therein authorized to be charged against such revenues, together with estimated future costs and revenues, shall be taken into account in fixing rates for the sale of power by an interstate water and power users' association: *Provided*, That estimated future costs and revenues of projects or divisions thereof upon which construction has not been initiated shall be so taken into account only if funds for the preparation of designs and specifications or for the initiation of construction have been made available to Federal agencies charged with responsibility thereof pursuant to law, or if estimates of requirements of funds for those purposes have been submitted to the Congress by the President. Such power rates shall be fixed by the association, from time to time after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Army as the case may be and the Federal Power Commission, at levels which in the aggregate will be at least sufficient to cover (1) the operation, maintenance, and all other costs of generating, transmitting,

and disposing of such power and energy, including among such costs depreciation on the depreciable properties included in the construction costs allocated to such generation, transmission, and disposition, plus amortization, over a reasonable period of years, of the nondepreciable properties included in the construction costs so allocated, and included interest on the unpaid balances of the Federal expenditures allocated to power, at rates not less than those specified in existing applicable laws or, where no rates are so specified, at such rates as may be determined from time to time by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate, having regard to the probable term of the power expenditures and the rates payable on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States; and (2) any additional amounts which may be required to return the reimbursable costs properly allocable to purposes other than power, but assigned for return from power revenues. In keeping its accounts and in setting rates for the sale of power an interstate water and power users' association shall take into consideration, for all properties under its jurisdiction the application of interest on the unpaid balances of the Federal expenditure allocated to power to the return of costs properly allocable to purposes other than power, but assigned for return from power revenues, to the same extent that application of interest on power expenditure to the return of such costs may be taken into consideration under the Federal reclamation law.

(d) Until such time as all obligations of an association to the United States have been discharged all power revenues of such association over and above those required to satisfy the requirements of this section shall be (1) held as a reserve for depreciation and used for the purposes of replacement of facilities as rapidly as replacement becomes necessary, (2) held as a reserve for future payments on the repayment obligation, or (3) used for making accelerated payments on such obligation.

(e) The distribution of all power revenues of an association after satisfying the requirements of this section and after all the obligations of an association to the United States have been discharged shall be in accordance with such provisions as shall be contained in a compact for the division and allocation of such excess power revenues which shall have been duly entered into by the States in the area of said interstate river system and approved by Congress.

#### STATE COMPACTS

SEC. 14. (a) Any two or more States are hereby authorized to negotiate and enter into compacts (1) to further and supplement on behalf of the State the purposes of this act, and (2) to carry out on behalf of the States appropriate projects and activities in relation thereto, and (3) to provide for the division and beneficial use of the waters of interstate streams according to the equitable rights of said States. No such compact shall become effective or binding upon the parties thereto unless and until it shall have been ratified by the Congress.

(b) An interstate water and power users' association shall cooperate with and furnish information and assistance to the States for the purpose of negotiating, entering into, and carrying out compacts under this section. Compacts heretofore or hereafter entered into between any two or more States relating to waters of interstate streams shall be binding upon such associations and each such association and its stockholders shall be subject, in the operation and maintenance of projects or units of projects, to the terms of such compacts and to the determinations under such compacts of any interstate commission established there-

under for the management, protection, and division of such waters.

#### INTRASTATE PROJECTS

SEC. 15. Notwithstanding any other provision of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), upon the request of a water users' association or other organization created under State law, which is or hereafter becomes a party to a contract heretofore or hereafter entered into for repayment to the United States of construction charges on any project or unit thereof constructed pursuant to such laws, there shall be included in such contract provisions to the effect that—

(1) the power features of such project or unit thereof shall be operated by the contracting association or organization and for such purposes the provisions of section 12 and 13 of this act shall apply to the association or organization to the same extent as though it were an interstate water and power users' association established under section 3 of the act;

(2) the general repayment obligation under such contract shall be extended to include, in addition to the part of the construction costs allocated to irrigation, the part thereof which is allocable to power and municipal water supply; and

(3) when such repayment obligation shall have been discharged the equitable title to such project or unit and the rights to the permanent and exclusive use of the water diverted and made available, to the exclusive use of the electric energy produced and generated, and to the exclusive use of proceeds from the sale thereof, shall be vested in perpetuity in such association or other organization and shall be held by it in trust for the use and benefit of its shareholders.

#### EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION

SEC. 16. A State or interstate water and power users' association, and its property, including its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, and income, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

#### SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 17. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

#### PRESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND ACT

SEC. 18. The right to repeal, alter, or amend this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. WATKINS. I desire to discuss briefly a few of the main provisions of this bill, which I think will point up what I am attempting to do by the measure.

In the second section of the bill, I have attempted to set forth findings and policies which rather comprehensively outline the scope of the measure and what is intended to be accomplished. These findings and statement of policy are:

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) The development of multiple-purpose reclamation and flood-control projects on interstate streams is necessary to attain the maximum beneficial use of the waters of such streams.

(2) The majority of such essential projects would embrace irrigation of lands and other consumptive uses of water and the generation and sale of electric energy in two or more States.

(3) The development of such projects is impeded by the fact that instrumentalities

of the several States are without authority to contract with the United States for the construction and repayment of the costs and to provide for the operation and maintenance of projects which are interstate in character. (b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act that—

(1) The development of projects for the irrigation of lands and other consumptive uses of water and the generation and sale of electric energy in two or more States can be facilitated by the establishment, as hereinafter authorized, of corporate entities to be known as interstate water and power users' associations empowered to enter into contracts with the Federal Government for the construction of such projects and for repayment of the costs thereof, and to operate and maintain and to hold in trust for its shareholders the equitable ownership of the completed projects or units thereof.

(2) When reimbursable costs of the construction of any such project, or unit thereof covered by a separate repayment contract, have been repaid to the United States, the equitable title to such project or unit and the rights to the permanent and exclusive use of the water diverted and made available, to the exclusive use of the electric energy produced and generated, and to the exclusive use of the proceeds from the sale thereof subject to the provisions of subsection (e) of section 13, shall be vested in perpetuity in the interstate water and power users' association which shall have become entitled, by contract with the United States, to the rights and benefits conferred by this act and by such contract, and shall be perpetually held by such association in trust for the use and benefit of its shareholders.

(3) Where putting waters of interstate streams to maximum beneficial use for irrigation purposes and other consumptive uses requires the construction of projects, the costs of which are beyond the ability of water users under such projects to repay from proceeds derived from the use of such water, revenues received by an interstate water and power users' association from the sale of electric energy produced by such projects, shall be applied to the repayment of such costs to the extent necessary to insure that all such waters available and which can be feasibly used for irrigation purposes and other consumptive uses may be put to the fullest possible beneficial use.

(4) The use for navigation, in connection with the operation and maintenance of reclamation projects, flood-control projects, or power-development projects constructed under the provisions of this act, of waters rising in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian, of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

In view of what I have said in the preliminary remarks, I think it is not necessary for me to make any extended comment on the policy statement except to state that subdivision 4 of section 2 is taken from the Flood Control Act of 1944. This section gives priority to consumptive uses of water over navigation in streams rising in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian. I may interpolate at this point to say that those States comprise for the most part the 17 States in the arid West which come under the Reclamation Act. I wanted to have this policy mentioned again in legislation referring to interstate streams.

INTERSTATE WATER AND POWER USERS'  
ASSOCIATIONS

Section 3 permits the Secretary of the Interior, upon application by a majority of the governors of States within an interstate river system or division of a river system which has, by interstate compact, been made a division of such river system, to charter a body corporate which shall be known as an interstate water and power users' association. The section also provides for an amendment of the original articles by filing with the Secretary amendments which shall be consistent with the provisions of this act.

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

Section 4 provides for a board of directors consisting of not less than 5 and not more than 21 members, to be elected by the shareholders. It provides for a term of office which is staggered and also for filling of vacancies. It also contains a provision that the United States shall have a director in the association so long as the association is indebted to the United States. Members shall be residents of the States in the area to be served by the association and each State shall have a right to elect at least one member of the board.

Section 5 pertains to the duties of officers and employees. Because of the nature of the association, which is a group of States acting together, each with independent rights in these streams, and which must rely for its popular support on almost unanimous consent of its shareholders, there must be three-fourths vote of the members of the board of directors in selecting its general officers.

Section 6 provides for the principal office of the association to be within the area which is to be served by the project.

Section 7 is one of great importance. It provides that the capital stock of the association shall be in such number of shares as may be specified in the articles of incorporation and shall be issued to a conservancy district, water users' association, or other organization or entity authorized under State law to subscribe for such stock and shall be issued to the respective holders in proportion to the water rights they hold in the interstate streams which will be made available for use by reclamation or flood-control projects.

This section specifies two types of entities which may become subscribers and provides that any other entity authorized by State law may likewise be a holder of stock.

I have deliberately suggested the idea of a conservancy district or water users association as stockholders for the reason that these two organizations seem to be fairly well understood in many of the Western States where they are now used on intrastate streams representing water users in dealings with the United States through the Bureau of Reclamation.

To better understand what I am trying to get at let me illustrate:

In the Provo River project in Utah the reclamation project operates in an area where water rights had been established many years ago. It was a very difficult job to superimpose a new water system involving new rights in this old area.

The organization to stand between the Government and the water users was a mutual water users association organized under the laws of the State of Utah. Stockholders in the association are metropolitan water districts, irrigation districts—both of which, by the way, are public corporations—private irrigation companies, private individuals, and even the State of Utah. This water users association represents all of these different entities in their dealings with the United States.

The various entities have subscription contracts with the parent association for stock which cover their interest in the Provo River project. The association in return has entered into a contract for the construction of the Provo River project by the Bureau of Reclamation, and for the repayment of those costs to the United States by the association. The association issues calls upon its stockholders for payments on their subscription contracts. It levies assessment for other purposes, it collects all of the money which will be due the United States for the construction of the project. Each of the subscribing stockholders, whether it be a metropolitan water district or an irrigation company, operates its own independent distribution system, without any control being exercised over it by the parent water users' association.

The arrangement may appear to be involved, but it has proved to be very simple in operation, as well as very efficient and economical. It is entirely divorced from politics.

Conservancy district statutes which permit cities and towns, counties, metropolitan water districts, irrigation districts, States, private irrigation companies and even private individuals to form public corporations or entities known as conservancy districts are a comparatively new development, but have proved to be very efficient in bringing together all the various interests who seek benefits from water and power projects and by reason of that fact should be required to help pay the reimbursable costs of construction. Colorado and Utah have such conservancy district laws and I am informed New Mexico has had the same statute for a number of years. Conservancy districts are now operating successfully in Utah and Colorado on intrastate projects. It may be that any State on an interstate river desiring to participate in water and power projects of an interstate character under the proposed act would rather use the conservancy district to bring all of its water users together in one group, and have the district subscribe for stock in the interstate water and power users' association. If each State on an interstate stream adopted either the mutual water users association or the conservancy district plan for representation, the member States would need to have only one stockholder each as a shareholder in the interstate water and power users' association.

Under this proposed act, articles of incorporation can be very elastic. States, through their representative associations or districts, or both, can agree on taking in only reservoirs, power plants, and so forth, on the main stems of the rivers

involved, or they can expand the association's jurisdiction to cover smaller projects and even those which are built outside the area through transmountain diversions. This proposed measure is much like the laws of most States which permit the incorporation of various types of corporations. Only broad general provisions are enacted under which a wide range of incorporation agreements are made possible.

It should also be mentioned at this point that the repayment contract between the proposed interstate water and power users association and the United States will also be an instrument which shall designate projects to be constructed. Under this agreement a wide range of projects may be included, and most important of all, provisions may be contained in these repayment agreements which will fully protect the United States as a creditor.

The Bureau of Reclamation has a reputation over the years of gradually tightening up on its repayment contracts to the point where the United States is fully protected in securing repayment if the project is feasible at all. I know from personal experience that this is true, because I have helped negotiate a number of repayment contracts between water users' associations and the United States.

Necessarily, the provisions of this measure have to be broad in scope so that almost any conceivable kind of project may be brought within the general program on an interstate river system. Repayment contracts to meet conditions peculiar to each river are possible under the broad powers given interstate associations.

SOURCE OF REVENUE

Section 8 provides the means by which the association can obtain its revenue. It is broad in scope, and I think is more or less self-explanatory.

By reason of the special purposes of organizations proposed, this measure necessarily contains provision which specifically apply to these types of organizations. I invite attention to subsection 2, which provides "Assessments authorized under subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be equitably but need not be equally assessed." This has specific application to this type of organization for the reason that some units of the over-all development will be of benefit only to a particular group of water users. Subscription contracts between the parent interstate association and the State representative shareholder or shareholders will provide for the repayment by the actual water users of the special costs incurred for the special benefit of that group. It will be necessary, therefore, for the parent association to levy the kind of assessment which will fit this kind of project to be paid only by the shareholder who receives the special benefits.

Section 9 covers the general corporate powers of the association, and I think is more or less self-explanatory. However, I invite attention to subdivision 6 of that section which again points up the fact that in an organization involving a number of States, there must be almost a

unanimity of agreement on large expenditures. This section provides that the contracts in excess of \$100,000 must be approved by three-fourths of all the shareholders of the association. This provision and others on the details, of course, are set up in order to attract attention to the problems involved. Naturally, I expect there will be much discussion of these provisions, and I anticipate many changes before the act is finally written, if it should be finally adopted by the Congress.

In other words, there must be something to raise these questions and problems so that they can be discussed and studied by committees considering legislation of this kind.

#### DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF PROJECTS

Section 10 is an important section, since it gives the interstate association power to contract with the United States in the building of interstate projects and incidental works. It also amends section 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to include interstate power and water users associations as one of the entities which may sign contracts with the United States under the 1939 act.

Subdivision C of section 10 should be self-explanatory, but additional explanation may be necessary. Since these projects are to be financed by Federal funds, I deem it necessary that the allocation of costs to irrigation, power, and other features of the projects should be made by the United States through the Secretary of the Interior if the project is to be constructed by the Reclamation Bureau, or by the Secretary of the Army if it is to be constructed by the Army engineers. Both of these secretaries should also consult the Federal Power Commission when it comes to allocation of the costs to power.

Subsection (d) of this section also amends the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 in such a way as to bring repayment of the costs allocated to power within the repayment contract.

#### DISPOSITION OF WATER

Section 11 provides that the water in interstate streams shall be allotted in accordance with the respective shareholders' rights as determined by the laws of the States having jurisdiction thereof or by interstate compacts between any two or more States.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. The contracts for repayment for reclamation work provide for a stated number of years, without interest, do they not?

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Under the plan proposed by the distinguished Senator from Utah, when the money is entirely repaid to the Federal Government, where does the ownership of the project rest?

Mr. WATKINS. According to the measure as I have drawn it, the equitable title would be in the water users who have repaid the costs, but I have added a provision to the effect that the equitable ownership of the right to the use of the

power and to the proceeds of the sale of power would be in the association of water and power users who have paid for it, with this qualification, that in the event the project is entirely paid for and in the meantime there has been no compact entered into between the States and the United States for the division of power and power proceeds, there shall be a compact entered into to divide those proceeds after the project has been paid for.

Mr. MALONE. I take it from the Senator's statement that he means the State or States in which the project is located.

Mr. WATKINS. I mean the States on the interstate stream which join the association and which agree to repay the costs of construction of both the power plants, reservoirs, and canals, or whatever is included.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The States in which the irrigated area is located would be the only States which would enter into the compact, would they not?

Mr. WATKINS. Only those that require irrigation on interstate streams would be included in the act. In the Missouri River system I think all the States, with the possible exception of one, require irrigation to make crop growth profitable. Minnesota does not; but even in a situation of that kind, the rights of Minnesota in and to a stream can be taken care of by the articles of incorporation, so that whatever rights there may be to the use of power or water can be protected.

Mr. MALONE. Perhaps no State would enter into such a compact, so far as a single irrigation district is concerned, that did not have land included within its borders to be paid for by its particular district.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Nevada will not raise his voice a little bit.

Mr. MALONE. I will ask the Official Reporter to read my question.

The Official Reporter (J. Chester Wilfong) read as follows:

Mr. MALONE. Perhaps no State would enter into such a compact, so far as a single irrigation district is concerned, that did not have land included within its borders to be paid for by its particular district.

Mr. WATKINS. Of course, if the State is not interested in irrigation, it cannot be required to repay any of the irrigation costs.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. A State might be interested in irrigation, but not from that particular project. I am trying to keep it down to one project and ascertain where the ownership would rest.

Mr. WATKINS. It would rest in the interstate association established by the States interested and which become a party to the articles of incorporation filed with the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to inquire whether it would mean the people of a State which has an area within its boundaries which would be irrigated by this project.

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask, with that definition in mind, where the ownership of the project would rest after the debt was fully repaid to the Government.

Mr. WATKINS. Equitable title would be in the interstate association.

Mr. MALONE. It would be in the conservation district, or whatever it would be called, in proportion to the areas owned by the people, would it not? In other words, the people of a particular area would own the part which was located in their State?

Mr. WATKINS. I see what the Senator is referring to.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, the people who had used the water for irrigation purposes, and who had repaid the money, would own it, would they not?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; the people of any State. In other words, if it were a Colorado irrigation project, and there was an interstate association on the upper Colorado River, the full use and ownership of that irrigation project would be in the people of Colorado.

Mr. MALONE. The people who were using the water?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. My second question is this: Does the Senator agree with the comparatively recent program which has been put forth by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, under which they are to act as a sort of public utility, and continue to collect money for the use of water for a long period of years, or indefinitely, as a matter of fact, without ownership passing to the water users?

Mr. WATKINS. I do not agree with a policy which puts the United States in the position of renting water, or renting or selling electricity. I believe the United States Government should be confined to the original role provided for it under the Reclamation Act, namely, to make investigations, do the planning, and build the project after it has obtained contracts from water users. The development to which the Senator has reference came up in later years. Under that development, the United States is put in the position of renting water to water users, without any agreement being entered into which provides that when the water users have repaid the cost of the project they will own it. We are now moving in the direction of putting the United States into the utility business on a permanent basis.

Mr. MALONE. Am I to understand the Senator from Utah does not agree with that policy?

Mr. WATKINS. I do not agree with that policy. The proposal I have in mind is aimed at meeting that kind of situation.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield further.

Mr. MALONE. It may be that the Bureau of Reclamation is taking this method of getting into a permanent business, along the line of the Indian Bureau, by continuing to supervise and to add employees, without transferring any property.

Mr. WATKINS. Perhaps that is correct. However, I am not accusing them of deliberately moving in that direction. I am merely pointing out what is actually happening, without ascribing any motives to anyone. I am trying to provide a remedy for the condition. Instead of having at the top an all-inclusive bureau, staffed by outside people appointed by the President, and called either a reclamation bureau or a valley authority, sent into a State in the West without the consent of the people of that State—

Mr. MALONE. Or sent anywhere else.

Mr. WATKINS. Or anywhere else, for that matter. Instead of having that kind of arrangement, my proposal provides that a local community—an irrigation water-users' association or water district—in the State of Utah, or any other State, shall help select the officers of an interstate association who will run the projects and the people themselves will own it, because they will have to pay for it.

Mr. MALONE. Or the people in Kansas, or the people in Oklahoma?

Mr. WATKINS. It would apply to any State in the arid West. I am talking particularly about the arid West. However, I feel the same type of proposal would fit any area in the United States. In other words, I believe that in the Tennessee Valley, for instance, instead of having members of the board of directors appointed from Idaho, Ohio, or Wisconsin, the people of Tennessee and the other States involved should select their own directors. They should own and operate the project and they should repay the cost, including interest to the United States Treasury. They could do that if it were turned over to them through an interstate power association. In that way local control would be provided.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield further.

Mr. MALONE. I shall come in a moment to the power phase, which would include the Tennessee Valley Authority. As chairman of a subcommittee I held hearings on the Tennessee Valley Authority in order to find out exactly what the condition was, and I think I did find out. However, further on the matter of water control and utilization, did not the State of Arkansas apply to come under the Bureau of Reclamation, and are not the western half of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas already under the Bureau of Reclamation, so far as investigations are concerned?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; they are not only under the Bureau of Reclamation for purposes of investigation, but approved projects are being built in those States at the present time, both by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. MALONE. Do I correctly understand that applications have been made by other States, further east, to come under the reclamation law?

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct. The State of Arkansas, through its Senators, has sought to have enacted by Congress legislation authorizing it to come within the benefits of the reclamation law, which had been enacted sometime earlier.

Mr. MALONE. Personally, the junior Senator from Nevada can see no objection to bringing other States under that particular bureau in a proper way if similar development is needed.

Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. First, does the Senator from Utah intend to introduce a bill, which could be referred to a committee, and upon which hearings could be held?

Mr. WATKINS. I have already introduced a bill; I am discussing the bill which I introduced earlier today. I intend to discuss it in connection with an amendment which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs intends to offer to the Flood Control Act, with respect to the basin account. I think the measure I have prepared may meet that situation much better than the basin account amendment. In other words, it has all the virtues, all the assets, of the basin account amendment, without any of its liabilities.

Mr. MALONE. I intend to come to the basin account in a moment, but in another connection.

Does the Senator from Utah agree with the junior Senator from Nevada that all the laws relating to water supply in the arid and semi-arid areas, with regard to State ownership and control of unappropriated water, should not remain intact?

Mr. WATKINS. I do, and I have included in my bill a section that was adopted in the 1944 Flood Control Act, known as the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment, which sets up a priority for consumptive uses of all waters west of the ninety-eighth meridian, even ahead of the waters used for navigation.

Mr. MALONE. Of course, it is well known to all Senators from the western arid and semi-arid section of the country that the limit of a State's water supply is the limit of the State's development. Therefore the condition is entirely different in the arid and semi-arid areas where the idea is to get the water out of the streams and on to the land, from the situation in the humid areas, where the idea is to get the water off the land and back into the streams.

I believe the Senator is entirely clear and certainly sound in that the land-owners within the several States if it is an interstate project, and within one State if it is an intrastate project, should form their districts, underwrite the cost, represent the Government in connection with the long-established Bureau of Reclamation policy, and when they have entirely repaid the cost, the ownership should be transferred to the people within the district. That has been done before.

Mr. WATKINS. Under all the early contracts between the Bureau of Reclamation and the water users, operation of the projects was turned over to the water users, usually within a year. From that time on the water users operated the projects, and it has been held by the courts, as I recall, that under that arrangement, even though the United States keeps a legal title to the land on which a reservoir is constructed, or on which canals are constructed, the water users have the equitable title, and have the right to the exclusive use of the water, and all the facilities for diverting the water and storing it and using it beneficially.

Mr. MALONE. When the debt is entirely repaid, the ownership passes permanently, does it not?

Mr. WATKINS. It is an equitable ownership. Until Congress acts, the legal title does not pass. We have to distinguish the legal title from the equitable title.

Mr. MALONE. Under the bill now being introduced and explained by the Senator from Utah, the title would pass permanently, would it not?

Mr. WATKINS. Not the legal title; only the equitable title. Perhaps that may not be clear to the Senator from Nevada, but it is an expression used in the law. The equitable title means that while the legal title may remain in one owner, the exclusive right to the use of the particular object under consideration may be in someone else, although he never had the legal title; but the right is just as positive and just as capable of being defended as if he had the full legal title.

Mr. MALONE. Is there any objection to the legal title passing?

Mr. WATKINS. I have an idea that on interstate streams there might be involved questions of constitutional law which would make it perhaps difficult for the United States to transfer the legal title.

Mr. MALONE. But legal title could pass in the case of an intrastate project, could it not?

Mr. WATKINS. I think it could, in an intrastate project.

Mr. MALONE. Should it not pass?

Mr. WATKINS. I think I would agree that it should pass, but I have not provided for that in the bill I have introduced, because it would only put another obstacle in the way of its passage. The United States has thought, for some reason or other, that it should keep the legal title, although the right to the full use of a project and all its facilities is in the water users in perpetuity, while the United States has seen fit to keep the legal title.

Mr. MALONE. In any event, the bill will go to a committee, where hearings may be held on it?

Mr. WATKINS. I hope so.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to pass to the power features now, and that would bring in the TVA and the basin account. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if a precedent has not been set in connection with the Boulder Dam project act, now called Hoover Dam, and other projects, that in the case of a com-

mercial project the revenues from the power that is developed goes to the Government to pay for the project.

Mr. WATKINS. I have provided in my bill that identically the same standard for fixing the rate under the present reclamation practice shall apply to the water users association which may be set up under the act. In other words, there shall be taken into consideration the repayment costs, the amortization payments which must be made each year, whether they run for 20 years, 60 years, 75 years, or 100 years. There also has to be figured in the cost of operation and maintenance of the project, the setting aside of something for depreciation, and then there must be figured in what we call the interest component in determining the rates charged for the power. That interest component is the same as if the interest had to be paid to the United States on whatever basis now determined under the present practice. As the Senator from Nevada will find as I proceed with my prepared text, I have adopted identically the language contained in the proposed amendment to the flood-control bill reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate. The Senator from Nevada will recall the bill which was before the committee. I have adopted the language of that amendment except, that instead of having the Federal Government operating the basin account, we substitute for it the Interstate Water Users Association composed of the various groups within the States on an interstate stream.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The item of interest which would be charged on any advanced or developed power is comparable at least to the rate the Government pays for money, is it not?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. It even means that the Secretary of the Interior would have to determine the amount of interest to be collected. I see what the Senator is getting at. Under present reclamation laws, the interest component is used. The law contains a provision that the interest component shall be used to determine what the rate shall be. The rate of interest must be figured. That money is used to help pay for the irrigation end of these projects and the costs of the projects themselves. All my bill does is to say that the same thing shall be done under it, and that the interstate association shall become the trustee of all of the power moneys which are collected for the purpose of building this all-comprehensive river development, to the end that every drop of water available for consumptive use may be put to consumptive use. The consumptive use is the big thing in the arid West. Power comes along with it. There must be power-project contributions in order to build many of these irrigation projects, because it is necessary to have power to pump irrigation water as well as contribute revenue. The water cannot be obtained by means of gravity.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada understands perfectly about the repayment of the cost of the

power development with interest. The Hoover Dam, formerly the Boulder Dam, pays 3 percent interest. It was formerly 4 percent, which is more than the Government pays for the money. Purchasers of the power are perfectly willing to pay it. But after the project, the Hoover Dam, is entirely repaid on the basis of a 50-year amortization period, of which about 37 years are left, I believe, does the Senator's bill propose that the revenues from that project then would go to develop the other areas of the basin outside of the States wherein the project is located?

Mr. WATKINS. The bill applies to the new projects which are coming along and are yet to be constructed. I have not attempted to upset outstanding contracts on projects on interstate streams. Section 15 of the bill provides in effect that the provisions with respect to power shall apply on intrastate streams, that is to a project wholly within a State, the same as it does to an interstate project. But the Hoover Dam, which the Senator mentioned, is on an interstate stream, a contract has already been set up with respect to it, and the bill would not affect it.

However, when the contract runs out, as it will in time, there is a possibility under this bill that then the water users of the lower Colorado, who have been set off from the upper basin by the compact entered into in 1922, could form an interstate association on the lower Colorado, possibly take over the Hoover Dam, and repay the costs on whatever terms the United States wants to let them have it. The benefits then would go to the people of the lower Colorado, including California, Nevada, a small part of Utah, and a small part of New Mexico. Arizona, California, and Nevada would obtain the principal benefit. It may be said that there is going to be some private benefit. It would go to the entire region in reduced rates so that everybody in the region would get some benefits from this kind of project.

The bill also provides that the so-called public-power-priority provisions now provided for shall be applied to public institutions. These interstate associations would be required to sell the power to those organizations in the order of their priority. That would give priority to municipalities, public corporations, REA cooperatives, all in order of their priority, and finally whatever was left could be sold to private utilities or else disposed of or used by the association as it saw fit, if it could not find any buyers.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, that is a very important point. The distinguished Senator from Utah of course understands that when the Boulder Dam Project Act was passed in 1928, it contained a provision that there should be paid to the States of Arizona and Nevada certain amounts of money, in lieu of taxes presumably, that is to say, 37½ percent of all the money the project made, in addition to the payments due the Government each year amortized over the 50-year period, the power to be sold at a competitive price on the market, instead of as low as it could possibly be sold for return of the bare cost of the project to the Government. The

cost basis was provided based on the cost of petroleum fuel. Later the two States of Arizona and Nevada accepted \$300,000 each year, still presumably in lieu of taxes, on the theory that the price of oil might be reduced to the point where no revenue would be available. But no payments are made to any State except where the project is located, just as in the case of an intrastate power project which would be totally within one State. When it is located in two States on what basis would the junior Senator from Utah set up a redivision of the revenues with five States from a project located totally within two States?

Mr. WATKINS. Inasmuch as the water in the first place had to be divided by a compact between the States, I should say that, after the power has helped pay off the development of the entire river system, then the States interested and the United States, sitting down together, should formulate and enter into another compact for the division of power and power proceeds.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I might say that the Senator has raised an entirely new question. I presume that Utah and the upper basin would profit by the revenue from projects on the Green River and the Little Colorado and other streams in the upper basin. Would the Senator say that California, Arizona, and Nevada, although having nothing to do with the area where the projects are located, would still enter into the division of the revenues?

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator does not mean anything south of Lee's Ferry. The Senator does not mean that the lower division would enter into it as well.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator's State is in the lower division.

Mr. WATKINS. Just a corner of Utah is. The bill provides that when a river has been divided into divisions by compacts, such compacts are to be respected, and only that particular division would share in the projects in that division, and not in the others.

Mr. MALONE. Why would it not include all the seven State in the basin if we desert the premise that only the States and areas repaying the cost or in which the project is located should be the owners following repayment to the Government?

Mr. WATKINS. For the simple reason that they agreed, by a treaty or compact which has been ratified by the States and by the United States, to divide it into two divisions.

Mr. MALONE. But the two divisions had nothing to do with power.

Mr. WATKINS. I rather think they did have something to do with power.

Mr. MALONE. It never was mentioned, and the Colorado River compact could not by the widest stretch of the imagination be construed to refer to any power development.

Mr. WATKINS. One of the things that come out of the water which is divided is power. Hydroelectric power cannot be had without water.

Mr. MALONE. Fish come out of the water, too.

Mr. WATKINS. If the fish are caught in California, they belong in California. If the fish are caught in Utah they belong in Utah.

Mr. MALONE. And if caught in Nevada they belong in Nevada. Along with power developed in Nevada after the cost has been repaid with interest.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. We in Utah are going to claim the fish we catch in Utah.

Mr. MALONE. I thought the people of Utah would claim what it caught or developed in Utah.

Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to clear up one thing. I, as the Senator from Utah does, disagree with the basin account system simply because revenues are taken from power in one State and transferred to another State. Am I correct in saying that the Senator in his bill would do the same thing, only he would use another method?

Mr. WATKINS. I simply say that as a matter of public policy all the water that can be used in feasible projects for consumptive purposes in the West where water is so important should be used. That policy should be favored, and we should take the power revenues from the entire river system and help build consumptive use projects over and above what the water users themselves can economically and feasibly pay back. The power is one of the resources of the river system that should help develop the river system. That is my program. That is what I have tried to provide in the bill. I understand that the Bureau of Reclamation agrees largely with that kind of procedure. In other words, if the entire river system projects as a whole are feasible, and one unit within it needs some help, because the water users, the irrigators, for instance, cannot afford to pay the entire cost, then that unit will receive help from the income of the entire river system. That is what I intend to do by this bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Utah will recall, I am sure—I think he was attending the meeting that day—a meeting Secretary Krug attended, who was not the first Secretary who advocated this principle; and I am sure the Senator will recall that under direct questioning by the junior Senator from Nevada, Secretary Krug said that the Government of the United States should own and control the Hoover Dam and the power revenues coming from it, and that the Government of the United States could spend them in New York or any place, if it wished to do so. The only difference between that policy and the policy of the junior Senator from Utah, so far as I am able to determine, is that the junior Senator from Utah would simply spend the revenues in Utah and New Mexico which were developed in Arizona and Nevada.

Mr. WATKINS. I would spend them in the States within their part of the

river system. The income from a river should be spent in the States within that river system or where it has been separated by compacts in two or more divisions in the divisions where they are earned.

Mr. MALONE. If you take the revenues away from the area—the States where the dam is located and the power actually produced—there would be no limit to the distance after the precedent set.

I would respectfully call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that he would have the revenues coming from a project located within two States used for the benefit of other States. If the Senator will further yield, let me inquire: Why not take a further step? In the case of the revenues from an irrigation project within the basin there, instead of using those revenues for the benefit of the people within the project in which the actual irrigation occurs, why not spread the revenues over the entire basin and let the people within the project continue to pay the costs on a public-utility basis.

Mr. WATKINS. For the simple reason that irrigation cannot stand that kind of cost; it is impossible.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, I understand that the Senator from Utah would have that done if it were possible.

Mr. WATKINS. Certainly; if it were necessary for some of the richer and larger irrigation projects to help the weaker ones, so that the entire system could be put to beneficial use, I would say "Yes." But it is not necessary to do so. They will have enough money from power to construct the entire project and to have money left over.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. That is a very interesting theory, to me, namely, that if certain irrigation projects—for instance, the Imperial Valley project, in California—have repaid the costs of construction, we should have the people within the project continue to make those payments, if they can afford to do so—and I think those in the project I have mentioned could—and the money should be used to construct projects in New Mexico and Utah, simply because they are also in the basin.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of fact, another principle enters into the situation there. Water which is developed on the farms is put to beneficial use on the farms—

Mr. MALONE. Not according to the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. WATKINS. Well, according to the law which prevails, which the Bureau of Reclamation has had to recognize time and again. The States granted to those who put the water to beneficial use the permanent right to the use of the water; and if they do not use the water, they can lose that right.

However, inasmuch as the Senator from Nevada has been a State engineer of the State of Nevada, he knows the law with respect to the beneficial use of water.

Mr. MALONE. But they would not lose it to the United States Government.

Mr. WATKINS. No; they will not lose it to the United States. For instance, if Nevada is a part of the compact, the water will go to the State of Nevada; and any citizen can, under the laws of the State of Nevada, obtain a right to that water, if he will put it to beneficial use.

Mr. MALONE. But never in Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. No. However, the Senator has not listened to all of my speech. If he would, he would understand this point.

Mr. MALONE. I have listened to enough of it to know that the Senator proposes, in regard to power, a principle entirely different from that in regard to water and entirely different from any suggestion heretofore made by any Senator and different from any suggestion ever made, except by Mr. Krug when he proposed to take Hoover Dam revenues to develop projects in other areas in the United States.

Mr. WATKINS. That is a different situation; it cannot be made to work the same in the case of water, which is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. MALONE. I submit that if we were to act according to the recommendation of the Bureau of Reclamation, and if we were to pass the sort of law it proposes, we could do so; namely, we could collect tribute from the irrigation and power projects for a thousand years and could spend the money anywhere.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator knows this bill is not the type of legislation which will put the Bureau of Reclamation in control of the water development in the West. What I advocate is just the reverse; it will place the control in the hands of the people who repay the reimbursable costs of the projects.

Mr. MALONE. That is what I want to do with the power projects located in the respective States.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what will be done under the bill I have introduced.

Mr. MALONE. No; what the Senator has just explained to me is that five States, instead of two—or instead of three in the case of Hoover Dam; in that case I refer to the three that are interested in repaying the entire cost of the Hoover Dam—will receive the benefits, although only two or three States will pay the costs. The Hoover Dam is located in two States, Arizona and Nevada. In other words, the Senator wishes to include two other States which have repaid none of the money whatever.

Mr. WATKINS. No; because that is in the lower Colorado. The upper Colorado States will take care of themselves.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator has just said that the five lower-basin States will be included, in respect to receiving the receipts from the Hoover Dam instead of the two wherein the project is located—or the three States repaying the cost of the project.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator misunderstands. Hoover Dam, being in the lower basin, would be a part of the assets of the lower basin.

Mr. MALONE. If that theory should prevail then would not the irrigation project be a part of the same thing?

Mr. WATKINS. If the people down there wish to do that, I see no reason why it could not be done. However, I say now that many irrigation projects cannot get by without some help. The Senator well knows that the irrigation projects have had to be subsidized to the extent of having the projects built and having repayment advanced for as long a period as 40 years or longer. Otherwise they could not get by; it is not feasible.

However, my bill relates to an entirely different situation. Power, of course, is developed by a stream of falling water, and it is one of the attributes of the water which the people should own who own the water. However, it is necessary to have some kind of policy by which all the water in the West can be put to beneficial, consumptive use; that must be done in order to permit people to live there, for people cannot live there without water. No matter how much power may be developed, the power is of no use unless the people who live in that area have water to use in their homes and on their farms. Without such water, power would be useless. It is my theory—the Senator from Nevada may not agree with me—that all the power which comes from the upper basin or from the entire basin—

Mr. MALONE. That is seven States.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not agree, because the Colorado has already been divided by compact into the upper and lower divisions.

Mr. MALONE. Nothing whatever about power is said in them.

Mr. WATKINS. If not, perhaps there would have to be a compact on the division on power.

In other words, the interstate association I propose must be the trustee of the entire revenues from the river system or a division of a river system, to be used to help put to beneficial, consumptive use all the water which it is possible to put to that use. When that is done, and when we have repaid the costs to the United States, then the States and the United States can sit down together and can enter into a compact, and then can determine what will be done with the power revenues, from that point on.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada sees no more reason why Utah or New Mexico should participate in the revenues from a dam located in Arizona and Nevada than that Arkansas should participate in those revenues. No compact ever included anything which touched upon that point.

If the Senator will further yield, let me say that all States have some kind of assets. Some of them cannot raise corn, although Iowa or perhaps part of Utah can raise corn; but some of those smaller States have minerals, and some have dam sites. If, however, every time the Government finds something in one of those States, the Government appropriates it for the use of other States or enters into some kind of collaboration or agreement in regard to dividing it with other States then it seems to the junior Senator from Nevada that they have a

long way to go in order to become self-supporting.

I believe that I thoroughly understand now what the junior Senator from Utah is trying to do.

However, I am opposed to having the revenues from a power project in Idaho used on a project in the Northwest Columbia Basin, as I am opposed to the revenues from Hoover Dam being divided with any State or area not participating in the repayment of the cost of the project to the Government with interest.

Mr. WATKINS. If it is on the main stem of the Snake River and is one of the new projects, I think it should go into the same pool, to help build all the irrigation projects in that territory.

Mr. MALONE. But I must say to the Senator that I thoroughly disagree with any theory by which the power revenues from a project in one or two or even three States, as in this case, would be used in another State. When the States have repaid every cent the Government invested in Hoover Dam, with interest beginning at 4 percent, and later at 3 percent, I disagree with any theory that the revenues from that dam should be used in another State, even though that State has not paid for the project. A bank which would operate on such a theory would be a most peculiar kind of bank.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, if the Senator will read the bill, he will find that a division of power revenues after the projects have been paid for would be subject to future agreement between the States and the United States.

Mr. MALONE. I hope we have a good chance at the bill when it comes before the committee.

Mr. WATKINS. I certainly hope so; and I shall be glad to have the committee consider the bill at any time. We have not had an alternative to the TVA plan for river operation.

In the case of the TVA, the money spent by TVA comes from appropriations and from the revenues of the TVA. Under such a system, the directors are appointed by the United States Government. In such case, it might be that three entire strangers would come into the area I have been discussing, to govern or operate the projects. However, under the other system the citizens of that area and the REA and the other groups of that area would constitute the stockholders, along with the State representatives; and they, in turn, would take their stock in the association; and by that means, the officers to control the organization would be selected. That is the nearest it is possible to get to local control and ownership of interstate streams and power developments.

I submit to the Senator from Nevada that if he will consider for a moment the situation on the upper Colorado, he will realize that it so happens that under the compact the State of Wyoming has been given approximately 14 percent of the water of the upper Colorado for consumptive use. The State of Wyoming has no very good power sites. However, in the State of Utah we have nine power sites, at which immense quantities of power could be developed. I do not think it would be proper for the State

of Utah, simply because it happens to have the power sites, to say that it is going to have all that power. According to the bill I am introducing, I say—and I think my State is willing to agree to it—that the State of Wyoming would be entitled to take enough of the power revenue coming from that project, including some in Utah—some may be in Colorado, but most of it will be in Utah—to help pay for putting the water on the farms in Wyoming to beneficial use. The lands there cannot pay the entire cost; it would be prohibitive for them to do so. But they will pay all that they can economically pay; if a finding of feasibility is made—as one is now being made—those farmers will agree to pay every dollar they can economically pay. The rest must come from the power revenues. I say to the Senator that there must be cooperation among the States. I want the Senator to keep that thought in mind. Contrary to what happened in the lower basin, the five States of the upper basin have agreed to a division of the water, and that agreement has been approved. I have confidence that when the time comes to agree as to a division of the power, they will do that, likewise.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator has just explained that the revenue from the power developments on the Green River—I assume the Senator refers to those projects—will help pay for the irrigation developments in another upper-basin State, and that the irrigation water users there will pay for what they can. In other words, there is a connection between the power developed in Utah and the irrigation in Wyoming.

Mr. WATKINS. But none of the power plants are in Wyoming. They are in Utah.

Mr. MALONE. But they are not in Colorado. No objection is being interposed by the people who are helping pay the cost, regardless of the Hoover Dam being in Nevada. But what the Senator is trying to do is to divide the revenue from Hoover Dam, while the State of Utah has never contributed anything to the repayment—and the Government will be entirely repaid including interest.

Mr. WATKINS. Under my bill there could be an association in the lower Colorado to represent that group of water users.

Mr. MALONE. I understand; but that is exactly what the Senator is proposing, to divide the revenues from Hoover Dam with a State which has contributed nothing. I am clear on that point, am I not?

Mr. WATKINS. If the Senator is clear on it, I am not, if that is the Senator's conception.

Mr. MALONE. Let us go over it again.

Mr. WATKINS. There is no use re-arguing it.

Mr. MALONE. Let us make this point clear.

Mr. WATKINS. Go ahead.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Utah is proposing that, when Boulder Dam, which is now Hoover Dam, is repaid, the revenues obtained from the

operation of the dam shall go to build reservoirs some place in the lower basin outside the States wherein the dam is located.

Mr. WATKINS. The lower basin includes the States of Arizona and California. But that is not covered in this bill, because it is one of the projects already under contract.

Mr. MALONE. It is setting a precedent. Let us pass on to the TVA. I happened to be chairman of a committee appointed to investigate that project; \$800,000,000 was spent, and none of it was paid back but \$30,000,000. That is as of about 2 years ago. I am not talking as of this date. No interest was paid on the power money. About \$450,000,000 of the \$800,000,000 was assigned to power, with no interest charged and with no definite period of amortization. If they were willing to set a definite amortization period and a rate of interest at 3 percent, or even 2½ percent, whatever the money costs the Government of the United States, and if the money were to be repaid to the Federal Government and deposited in the United States Treasury, from which it could be withdrawn each year in such amount as may be needed to operate the plant, just as in the case of the Hoover Dam, very little objection in my opinion would ever be raised against TVA. The objection is raised because they took about \$800,000,000, with \$450,000,000 of it allocated to power, paid no interest, and had no amortization. To this day, it has not been paid back.

The Senator would set a precedent to that effect. His act would provide the basis to take over the Hoover Dam project when the amortization period is over, and the project paid for with interest.

Mr. WATKINS. So far as the precedent to which the Senator refers is concerned, I do not think it actually exists. There is no us arguing further.

Mr. MALONE. Would the principle extend to the houses in the basin, too; should we divide up the houses and other property? How far does this principle go?

Mr. WATKINS. I think it is apparent on its face that my bill does not cover the houses. It does not attempt to do anything of that kind whatever. I think if the Senator will analyze it, he will find it a perfectly reasonable bill.

Section 11 provides that the water in interstate streams shall be allotted in accordance with the respective shareholders' rights, as determined by the laws of the State having jurisdiction thereof, or by compact between any two or more such States. Nothing contained therein shall be construed to interfere with the right and powers of any State to regulate within its boundaries the use and control of water. The general theory of this act is that it may be used by States which have already entered into interstate compacts for the allocation of water rights in interstate streams. These compacts, as is well known, must be ratified by the Congress of the United States.

An interstate association is required to recognize State water laws and the rights guaranteed by compacts. It is not in-

tended that it shall in any way interfere or even direct the distribution of that water. What the State does with it will not be the business of the parent interstate association except that it is required to help with the power revenues in the construction of State projects within the interstate river system to the end that all waters available for consumptive use are put to beneficial use.

#### DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC POWER

Sections 12 and 13 are two of the most important sections in the entire act. These sections establish the association as the trustee for all power and power revenues which are to be held in trust for the development of the entire river system, to the end that all waters available for consumptive use will be put to a beneficial use. In doing this, the association will be required to take from power revenues as well as from assessments from the actual water users, funds for the repayment of the reimbursable costs to the United States.

The so-called priorities granted purchasers of electric power developed under Federal reclamation projects are retained in subsection (d) of this act. The act provides "in any such lease or sale, preference shall be given to the municipality and other public corporation and agency and to cooperatives and other non-profit organizations financed in whole or in part by loans made pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended." These are the so-called public power features of the reclamation laws.

Other sections are probably self-explanatory with the possible exception of subsection (e). This subsection is intended to protect one river system against competition from another river system. It is possible, for instance, that a river system like the Columbia may produce cheaper power than could the Colorado. The Columbia might need an outside market for its power and consequently would attempt to distribute power in the Upper Colorado River Basin. Power revenues are necessary to bring about the fullest development of irrigation and other consumptive uses. Therefore, the Upper Colorado River Basin area might find its power market endangered to the point where the several projects therein might not be feasible. The restrictions here, however, are limited to firm power.

Section 13 should be studied carefully. Its principal objective is to provide a method for carrying out the trusteeship of the association. Power rates would be fixed, revenues received and paid out in order to accomplish the purposes of the interstate association and the general provisions of the reclamation law. It lays down the rules which the Federal Government requires an interstate water and power association to obey in fixing power rates in federally financed projects. I may say in general that these rules are identical with the provisions of a recent amendment proposed by the Interior Committee of the Senate to the River and Harbors Act of 1950.

These provisions were originally set up to cover a basin account on the Columbia River. About all that has been done to the committee amendment is to

replace the Federal agency with the interstate association, which would operate the basin account.

I do not intend to go into a long discussion of this particular section. It is involved, it is true, but no more involved than present reclamation law which requires the Federal Government to use certain yardsticks for fixing rates on Federal power projects. It includes, as a study will disclose, the well-known interest component.

In subsection (d), however, a new provision has been added which requires an interstate association to take certain steps with respect to power revenues. This subsection makes it impossible for an association to use excess power revenues for declaration of dividends to its stockholders. It has three alternatives for the disposal of all excess power revenues, these are: First, reserve for depreciation to be used for replacement of facilities as rapidly as replacement becomes necessary; second, a reserve for future payments on its obligations to the United States; third, it may accelerate payments on its obligations to the United States out of these surplus revenues. It may use any one or more of these alternatives, but is not authorized to use the power revenues, which are to be held in trust, for any other use than mentioned in this act.

Subsection (e) of section 13 is intended to take care of the situation which will arise when all of the reimbursable costs of the basin-wide river system projects have been repaid to the United States. I may interpolate here to say that, for the purpose of this bill, the division of a river system into two or more divisions by compacts is considered the same as an interriver system. It is assumed that the river compacts between the various States will follow the pattern adopted by the upper Colorado River States. This compact makes specific allocations of the waters of the upper Colorado, but it provides that a division of power revenues are not included within the compact but shall be the subject of an agreement in the future.

Subsection (e) further provides that these excess revenues from power shall be distributed in accordance with the provisions of a compact which shall have been duly entered into by the States in the area of the interstate river system and approved by Congress. This would mean that at any time the States may agree among themselves and with the United States for the disposition of excess power revenues received after the reimbursable costs of the projects have been repaid. Or they may put off that day until the projects have been repaid and then enter into such a compact but the associations shall not have the power at any time to dispose of these excess revenues except by compact as specified in the subsection.

This provision may not be of immediate interest for the reason that development of these river systems will require at least 100 years or longer. No matter whether the time is long or short, however, there should be a provision in which the problem is recognized. That

is why this subsection (c) has been made a part of the act.

Section 14 relates to State compacts.

Subsection (a) merely authorizes compacts between two or more States and provides that they shall not become effective until they have been ratified by the Congress.

Subsection (b) is of great importance. First, it provides that interstate water and power users' associations shall cooperate with and furnish information and assistance to the States for the purposes of negotiating, entering into, and carrying out compacts under this section. Next, it provides "compacts heretofore or hereafter entered into between any two or more States relating to waters of interstate streams shall be binding upon any association and each such association and its shareholders shall be subject, in the operation and maintenance of projects or units of projects, to the terms of such compacts and to the determinations under such compacts of any interstate commission established thereunder for the management, protection, and division of such waters."

This provision is sweeping in its effect. It means that the association shall in a large measure be the instrumentality through which the compacts are carried out.

For instance, on the upper Colorado a number of hold-over storage reservoirs have been planned. These reservoirs would supply the water required to fulfill the commitments of the upper-basin States to the lower-basin States of the Colorado River under the compact of 1922. Power plants will be operated in connection with these dams. The revenues obtained from operation will pay the cost of construction, operation, and maintenance of these reservoirs and will also provide addition revenue to aid in the repayment of construction costs of the irrigation features of the over-all development where such irrigation developments are too costly to be repaid entirely by the water users.

This act is sufficiently broad to permit the incorporators to provide in the articles of incorporation any agreements which may be required to effectuate all existing or future interstate river compacts. The articles of incorporation, together with the repayment contracts between the United States and the interstate association, can be prepared to meet any situation that may arise during the development of any interstate river system.

Section 15 makes, so far as possible, the policies and provisions of the rest of the act applicable to intrastate projects.

I have in mind the situation which prevails in the Central Valley project of California. Nearly all, if not all, the waters of the stream rise in the State of California and all the reclamation projects are built there. Yet there are two or three different types of operation. The Army engineers constructed some of the projects, which include power projects and flood-control projects. I assume that those which have been completed are at this time operated by the Bureau of Reclamation. No repayment contracts have been entered into be-

tween any of the water users and the United States. There are what we know in reclamation parlance as 9-E contracts under which the United States rents the water to landowners. There is nothing said in the contracts regarding the water users' finally having to repay the cost of construction and receiving the title or the right to own and operate the projects.

Section 15 would make possible in that area the organization by the people of the area—all the public corporations as well as the private water users' corporations getting together, very much the same as it is done in Utah and Colorado—to sign a contract with the United States for the operation of all dams, whether built by Army engineers or by the Bureau of Reclamation, to maintain them, operate them, and, eventually, to own the equitable title to them as soon as the reimbursable costs are repaid. That would take the United States out of the utility business in California, or in any other State in which there is a similar situation.

Mr. President, I realize that the proposal which I have made will probably stir up some discussion among water users of the West. I am not speaking merely out of the dark on this subject. I have been associated with water users' associations for approximately 14 years before coming to the Congress.

All I am proposing is to expand an intrastate water users' association idea to cover an interstate situation and to authorize the incorporation, through filing with the Secretary of the Interior of the necessary articles, of an organization to take the place, on an interstate stream, which a State association now occupies with reference to waters wholly within a State. I have adopted the policy of bringing the Bureau of Reclamation back to its basic policy, which it is supposed to be following, namely, that when the reimbursable costs are repaid, those who repaid them are entitled to the equitable ownership and operation of the projects. As a matter of fact, they should have the operation of them long before the costs are repaid. That is the customary thing to do. Power is one of the products coming out of the self-same water which belongs to the States, and there is no reason why they should not be trustees of the income to see that there is sufficient revenue to support an over-all project development. That is what I am attempting to accomplish. I think it is fair. I invite discussion of this proposal.

If there are no questions, I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to call up committee amendment A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 53, after line 15, it is proposed to add the following:

The sum of \$1,500,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended by the Federal Power Commission for carrying out any examinations and surveys provided for in this act or any other acts of Congress, to be prosecuted by the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McFarland
Anderson	Hendrickson	McKellar
Brewster	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Bridges	Hill	Magnuson
Butler	Holland	Malone
Byrd	Humphrey	Martin
Cain	Hunt	Maybank
Capehart	Ives	Morse
Chapman	Jenner	Mundt
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Cordon	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Darby	Kem	Robertson
Donnell	Kerr	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kilgore	Schoeppl
Dworschak	Knowland	Sparkman
Ecton	Langer	Stennis
Ferguson	Leahy	Taft
Flanders	Lehman	Taylor
Frear	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	Long	Tobey
George	Lucas	Watkins
Gillette	McCarran	Wherry
Green	McCarthy	Williams
Gurney	McClellan	Withers

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, two or three days ago I sent to the desk amendment A, which I wish to offer now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk read amendment A just a few minutes ago for the information of the Senate.

The question is on agreeing to amendment A, offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has the Senator from New Mexico spoken on amendment A? I intend to make some remarks.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from California.

#### AMERICAN POLICY IN KOREA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on April 7 the text of the note handed to the Korean ambassador by Secretary of State Dean Acheson on April 3 was published in the American Press. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the text of the note handed by the Secretary of State to the Korean Ambassador.

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

#### TEXT OF UNITED STATES NOTE TO KOREA

The Secretary of State wishes to take this opportunity to express to His Excellency the Ambassador of the Republic of Korea, prior to the latter's return to Seoul, the deep concern of this Government over the mounting inflation in Korea. The Secretary of State wishes His Excellency to convey to the President of the Republic of Korea the view of this Government that the communication of March 4, 1950, from the Korean Prime Minister to the chief of the Economic Cooperation Mission in Korea, in which the view was expressed that there is no serious problem of inflation in Korea, but rather a threat of deflation, indicates a lack of comprehension on the part of the Korean Government of the

seriousness of the problem and an unwillingness to take the drastic measures required to curb the growing inflation.

It is the judgment of this Government that the financial situation in Korea has already reached critical proportions, and that unless this progressive inflation is curbed in the near too distant future, it cannot but seriously impair Korea's ability to acquire effectively the economic assistance provided by the Economic Cooperation Administration.

#### BUDGET LIMITS IGNORED

Government expenditures have been vastly expanded by bank overdrafts without reference to limits set by an approved budget. Tax collections have not been increased, aid goods have been under-priced, and governmental subsidies have been expanded. The dangerous practice of voluntary contributions has been used as an inefficient substitute for a sound taxation system. These uneconomic practices have in turn served to expand the currency in circulation, unbalance the Korean national budget, and cause a sharp rise in wholesale and retail prices, thereby strengthening the growing forces of inflation.

The Secretary of State must inform His Excellency that unless the Korean Government is able to take satisfactory and effective measures to counter these inflationary forces, it will be necessary to reexamine, and perhaps to make adjustments in, the Economic Cooperation Administration's assistance program in Korea.

The Secretary of State wishes to inform His Excellency in this connection that the American Ambassador in Seoul is being recalled for consultation within the next few days regarding the critical problems arising out of the growing inflation in Korea.

#### ELECTION MOVE NOTED

Of equal concern to this Government are the reported intentions of the Korean Government, as proposed by the President of the Republic of Korea in a message to the National Assembly on March 31, to postpone the general elections from the coming May until some time in November, to draw to His Excellency's attention the fact that United States aid, both military and economic, to the Republic of Korea has been predicted upon the existence and growth of democratic institutions within the republic. Free, popular elections, in accordance with the constitution and other basic laws of the republic, are the foundation of those democratic institutions.

The holding of the elections as scheduled and provided for by the basic laws of the republic appears to this Government as equally urgent with the taking of necessary measures for the countering of the inflationary forces already discussed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with the general objectives of encouraging the strengthening of free institutions, building the Nation's economy, and maintaining a solvent government, there should be no difference of opinion here or in Korea. As one of the few constitutional republics in that area of the world Korea has a great responsibility to demonstrate that freedom and constitutional government are not incompatible with the situation in Asia despite the views of some far eastern experts, official or unofficial.

The timing of the release of the note to the Korean Ambassador is unfortunate, coming as it did on the heels of the April 3 publication of the memorandum prepared by Owen Lattimore pursuant to the State Department request of August 18, 1949 in which, with

reference to Korea, the memorandum states:

4. South Korea is more of a liability than an asset to the interest and policy of the United States. It is doubtful how long the present regime in South Korea can be kept alive, and the mere effort to keep it alive is a bad advertisement, which continually draws attention to a band of little and inferior Chiang Kai-sheks who are the scorn of the Communists and have lost the respect of democratic and would-be democratic groups and movements throughout Asia.

His memorandum ends up with the following paragraph:

6. The United States should disembarass itself as quickly as possible of its entanglements in South Korea.

In my remarks on the floor of the Senate relative to Owen Lattimore and American policy in the Far East, to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 5, 1950, beginning at page 4804, the following colloquy on page 4830, between the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] took place:

Mr. ANDERSON. I was interested in the question with reference to Korea, Japan, and China, so far as the attitude toward the United Nations is concerned. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that he did not believe that we were following Lattimore's line with reference to Korea, Japan, and the United Nations?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, I said in my speech—and I do not know whether the Senator was present during that time—

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I was. Having made that statement, I ask the Senator whether he would regard Lattimore as the architect of our far-eastern policy?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say that Mr. Lattimore has had a considerable influence on our policy on the continent of Asia, with particular reference to China. I do not believe—and I say I think it is very fortunate—that to date the Department has followed his advice insofar as the Republic of Korea is concerned, insofar as Japan is concerned, or insofar as American recognition of the Communist regime or their entrance into the United Nations, is concerned.

Up to this moment I believe that the release of the Korean note was a mere coincidence having no relation to the Lattimore recommendations, however, in view of the fact that the note has been released the Congress and the American public are entitled to have some additional background information.

The United States is partly responsible for the serious economic condition Korea finds herself in at the present time due to the fact that we consented to the unnatural division of the country at the thirty-eighth parallel. This has made more difficult the economy of the country due to the fact that much of the hydroelectric power and a considerable amount of other resources are north of that line.

As members of the United Nations we bear a responsibility for the creation of the Republic of Korea. The United Nations Commission supervised the election and the press of the world was present. It is generally agreed that the government elected represented the will of the people in the area of Korea free from Communist domination.

The Government of Korea has been constantly faced with the overt acts of aggression across the thirty-eighth parallel by Communist irregulars from north of the line. At the time I was in Korea last November there had already been 360 violations of the thirty-eighth parallel by Communist groups from North Korea ranging in size from a squad to a battalion. Many additional violations of the border have taken place since last November, the latest being a few days ago. President Syngman Rhee recently pointed out that there had been substantial casualties on the part of the forces of the Republic of Korea, and there have been considerably greater casualties on the part of the invading forces. Needless to say in that part of the world the "cold" war is quite "warm."

There are a number of responsible people in the Republic of Korea who believe that once the Chinese Communists have liquidated the remaining resistance by the forces of the Republic of China to their regime that they will then move both Communist troops and equipment back into Manchuria and make them available to the North Korean Communists for an invasion against the Republic of Korea. For that reason these Koreans have taken a realistic view of the situation and have urged that the Republic of Korea move against the illegal Communist regime of North Korea and unify their country before all of Asiatic communism can unite to destroy the last vestiges of freedom in Asia.

This Government along with more moderate Koreans have constantly urged that no such action be taken because it might appear in the eyes of the world to be an act of aggression even though the North Korean regime has no standing except in the eyes of the Soviet Union and her satellites. It is difficult to be asked to stand and wait when every responsible Korean knows that should communism overwhelm the Republic of Korea wholesale liquidations would take place.

Due to the fact that we bear responsibility for permitting the country to be divided, that we as a member of the United Nations participated in the formation of the Republic of Korea by a free election, and that we have vigorously urged that no police action be taken against the Communist regime north of the thirty-eighth parallel, the government of the republic has been faced with the problem of maintaining a military establishment far larger than the size of the country or its economy can properly support. Our own military expenditures approximate about 34 percent of our budget. The expenditures of the Republic of Korea for its external and internal security forces approximate between 22 and 30 percent of their budget which equals or exceeds the expenditures for defense of most of the North Atlantic Pact nations who have the added advantage of being a part of a pact wherein we recognize that an aggression against one is an aggression against all the signators. Korea to date has no such assurance.

In addition to this fact, in his speech before the National Press Club of Jan-

uary 12, 1950, as reported in the Washington Star on January 13, Secretary of State Dean Acheson made clear that Korea was outside of our defense perimeter. He does it in the following language:

First of all, let's deal with the question of military security. I deal with it first because it is important, and because, having stated our policy in that regard, we must clearly understand that the military menace is not the most immediate.

What is the situation in regard to the military security of the Pacific area, and what is our policy in regard to it?

In the first place the defeat and the disarmament of Japan has placed upon the United States the necessity of assuming the military defense of Japan so long as that is required, both in interest of our security and in the interests of the security of the entire Pacific area, and in all honor, in the interest of Japanese security. We have American, and there are Australian troops in Japan. I am not in a position to speak for the Australians, but I can assure you that there is no intention of any sort of abandoning or weakening the defense of Japan, and that whatever arrangements are to be made either through permanent settlement or otherwise—that defense must and shall be maintained.

This defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus. We hold important defense positions in the Ryukyus Islands, and those we will continue to hold. In the interest of the population of the Ryukyus Islands, we will, at an appropriate time, offer to hold these islands under trusteeship of the United Nations. But they are essential parts of the defensive perimeter of the Pacific, and they must and will be held.

The defensive perimeter runs from the Ryukyus to the Philippine Islands. Our relations, our defensive relations with the Philippines, are contained in agreements between us. Those agreements are being loyally carried out. Both peoples have learned by bitter experience the vital connections between our mutual-defense requirements. We are in no doubt about that and it is hardly necessary for me to say an attack on the Philippines could not and would not be tolerated by the United States. But I hasten to add that no one perceives the imminence of any such attack.

So far as the military security of other areas in the Pacific is concerned, it must be clear that no person can guarantee these areas against military attack. But it must also be clear that such a guaranty is hardly sensible or necessary within the realm of practical relationship.

Now, Mr. President, what do you think your reaction would be if you were a citizen of the Republic of Korea or a responsible government official there, your country had been divided in an unnatural sort of a way with the consent of the United States; your Republic had been created by free elections held under the auspices of the United Nations, strong representations had been made not to take police action against the illegal Communist regime in the north that was constantly endangering the security of the Republic and necessitating the maintenance of a much larger army and police force than the size of the country and its economy would normally warrant, the Secretary of State on January 12 of this year serves public notice that your country is outside the defense responsibilities of the United States; and then the people of Korea and the people

of the United States are informed on April 7 that they must stop operating on an unbalanced budget, and immediately must put their economic house in order? This, of course, would mean that a substantial reduction would have to be made in both the Army and the national police force.

As in the case of most public questions, there are two sides to this one also. First, we are urging the Republic of Korea to do what we say, not to do what we do. For 14 out of the last 16 years, this Government has operated on an unbalanced budget. It is true that part of this was due to the "hot" war in which we were engaged for part of that time. The Koreans are engaged in at least a "warm" war, which is neither all "hot" nor all "cold."

Nor would I raise this issue if, as a matter of national policy, we are going to take the same attitude to the same extent with all the ECA and North Atlantic Pact countries. If anything, we should be more considerate of Korea because she does not have, to date, the guaranties which are possessed by the North Atlantic Pact countries. I want it to be clearly understood that I fully support the recommendations of the State Department that the elections be held in May, as originally contemplated. I think Korea can do much to bolster a belief in constitutional government and to offset the undermining of her system of government which has been going on in this country by certain of the Communist press and among those who consciously or unconsciously follow or parallel the Communist Party line. I fully support the urgent recommendations of the State Department that Korea make every effort to put her economic house in order by the enactment of a sound tax structure and the elimination of nonessential expenses. This is good advice for any government to follow, including our own.

However, Mr. President, the American people are entitled to have more of the facts relative to our foreign policy than it has been our policy many times in the past to give them. I am convinced that it will be difficult to develop public support for a foreign policy unless the people are taken more into the confidence of their Government in Washington. Under our constitutional system, that job cannot be left to the Executive alone. The Congress, in general, and the Senate, in particular, have a responsibility, under the Constitution, which they cannot and should not abdicate to anyone.

#### EXTENSION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS' RETIREMENT BENEFITS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2559) to authorize the extension of officers' retirement benefits to certain persons who while serving as enlisted men in the Army of the United States during World War II were given battlefield promotions to officer grade and were incapacitated for active service as a result of enemy action, which was, on page 2, line 9, strike

out all after "States," down to and including "injury" in line 20, and insert "shall be considered to have been serving on active duty as a commissioned officer when so injured, for the purpose of determining entitlement to physical disability retirement benefits in effect at the time he was relieved from active duty: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 411 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.) shall apply to persons qualified for retirement benefits under this act: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall preclude persons entitled to retirement benefits under the provisions of this act from computing their retirement pay in accordance with the disability retirement laws in effect prior to the effective date of the Career Compensation Act of 1949."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask the Senator from Texas the nature of the bill and the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The House passed Senate bill 2559 on April 3, with an amendment which was made necessary because of the passage of the Career Employees Compensation Act. The amendment affects only two enlisted men who were promoted on the battlefield to be officers. The Defense Department and the Bureau of the Budget approved the amendment, and the Senate subcommittee unanimously agrees in regard to the House amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that the Senator from Texas has taken up this amendment with me, inasmuch as for the time being I am sitting in the seat of the minority leader. I am a member of that committee. I recall the bill. I believe the House amendment is entirely justified, inasmuch as the new promotion bill has become law since this measure was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MALONE, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut as soon as the Chair has put the question on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment A. The amendment is subject to debate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 53, after line 15, it is proposed to add the following:

The sum of \$1,500,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended by the Federal Power Commission for carrying out any examinations and surveys provided for in this act or any other acts of Congress, to be prosecuted by the Federal Power Commission.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMAHON, Mr. FERGUSON, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Connecticut whether he wishes to discuss an amendment; or if he wishes to discuss another matter, let me ask him how long he wishes to proceed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief comment on the remarks just concluded by the Senator from California. It will not take me more than a minute and a half to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have stated over and over again that I think the Committee on Public Works and the Senate have been most tolerant in regard to this measure. I wish, I could be more tolerant and more patient. I thought the Senator from California was going to discuss the amendment then pending to the rivers and harbors bill, or I would not have yielded to him.

I should love to yield to my friend the Senator from Connecticut; but I think the business now before the Senate should be disposed of promptly. Therefore, I ask that amendment D be called up.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, merely to permit me to send to the desk two reports from the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to proceed with the rivers and harbors bill. I do not think it will take us more than a few minutes to conclude action on this bill, and then I can yield. I have been waiting 6 months to get this bill before the Senate. The bill was reported 7 months ago.

Therefore, I ask that amendment D be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands with a view to the establishment of harbors for light draft vessels for refuge and other purposes.  
MESSAGE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE  
TO THE KOREAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Cali-

fornia [Mr. KNOWLAND] addressed the Senate on the subject of the message of the Secretary of State to the Korean Government. I shall not discuss the references the Senator from California has made to Mr. Owen Lattimore, because I am a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee which is hearing the charges and conducting that investigation. Although I do not place upon myself a prohibition against discussing anything which may take place in this investigation in the future, I still say it is my present intention to maintain silence on the subject until the investigation is completed and a report is submitted to the Senate.

However, I wish to say that I think it was indeed unfortunate that the Senator from California at least left the implication that the Secretary of State might have been influenced in his latest message by the views of Dr. Lattimore. I should like to call attention to the fact that under date of January 19, 1950, there was a ye-and-nay vote in the House of Representatives on the subject of Korean aid; and on that ye-and-nay vote the position of the minority party in regard to Korea apparently was identical with the position of Dr. Owen Lattimore on that subject, because at that time the proposal for aid to Korea was defeated by a vote of 193 to 191, 170 Democrats were in favor of granting further aid to Korea and keeping it alive; 61 Democrats voted "nay." Among the Republicans, 21 voted "yea," and 130 voted "nay." So at least on that date, January 19, 1950, the sentence of death on Korea was pronounced by the great majority of the minority party.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I shall yield in a moment. Later on, that vote was repudiated, and the House voted to grant that aid.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I simply say to the Senator from Connecticut that, in the first place, one of the first to be critical of the action taken by the House of Representatives was the junior Senator from California, because I have supported the administration in regard to the aid-to-Korea program; I think it is part of the global problem the world is facing. But, in all fairness to the Members of the House of both parties who may have voted against the Korean aid bill, I may say I think they did so because they felt it was rather futile to support a bill designed to aid Korea when the administration had permitted all China to go behind the iron curtain. I think that was one of the motivating forces which caused many Democrats in the House and many Republicans to vote against the aid to Korea bill. I am glad, just as glad as is the Senator from Connecticut, that the House reversed its position. But certainly we are not going to be able to stop communism in Asia by our action in the small Republic of Korea, if we are unconcerned about the great nation of China, with her 450,000,000 people going behind the iron curtain.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, in deference to the great anxiety of my good friend from New Mexico, to get ahead with his bill, I shall not carry on the debate. I do not know what motivated the gentlemen in the House who voted against giving aid to Korea; it is not known to me. I only say that when we consider the vote that took place on January 19 it is inappropriate to ascribe the views of Dr. Lattimore to the administration or to the Secretary of State.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I will yield in a moment. It was the Secretary of State who made Herculean efforts to get the House to reverse its position, and who was successful in the endeavor; therefore, he should not now have his motives questioned in seeking to strengthen that government by implying that his motives are influenced by the views of Dr. Lattimore.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure if the Senator had listened carefully to my remarks, or had read them in the RECORD, he would have found I was not critical of the Secretary of State for having followed Mr. Lattimore's position in reference to Korea; to the contrary, both today and on the floor Wednesday night, I commended the State Department for not following the views of Mr. Lattimore in Korea, in the United Nations, and in regard to recognition of China. I pointed out in my remarks today that I thought it unfortunate that a coincidence occurred, that immediately, almost simultaneously with the release of the Lattimore recommendations, this note should have been handed to the Korean Government. I still say I think it is most unfortunate for the reasons I have outlined. I tried to make it perfectly clear that in my judgment it was merely a coincidence, and I did not charge that the Department was following the advice. But I pointed out some of the problems with which the Republic of Korea has to contend under the desperate situation with a gun pointing at its stomach.

Mr. McMAHON. In concluding, I merely want to say to the Senator that I do not wish to read into his speech anything that is not in it; on the other hand, I say to the Senator I commend the Secretary of State for having done what he did. It was the right thing to do, regardless of what anyone else had said about the proposition. I presume he was not aware of the fact that there might be people who would say, "this view seems to concur with the view expressed by Lattimore." Nor could he say, "I cannot give forth any views that may coincide with Lattimore's, because people may be suspicious of them." We would be deprived thereby of the correct judgment of a responsible official who is charged with doing the right thing, as his conscience guides him.

That brings to my mind an editorial which I should like to place in the RECORD a little later today. It was printed in the New York Times recently. It pointed out the evil flowing from a kind

of association of the actions of Government officials with the views of other persons who happened for some reason or other, to be unthoughtful at the moment. I understand the Senator from California is not making that charge.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thoroughly agree with what the Senator has said, and it should not stop any person, in the executive branch of the Government, in good conscience, from making such recommendations as he believes are in the best interests of this country. But I think the able Senator from Connecticut will agree with me that it also should not foreclose any Member of the Senate, whether he be on the Senator's side of the aisle or on this side of the aisle, who wants to raise constructively certain questions in regard to the policy adopted. We should not be foreclosed from bringing to the attention of the American people information in a constructive and I think helpful sort of way as to just what some of the ramifications of the policy may be.

Mr. McMAHON. I could not agree more heartily than I do with the Senator. I shall take my seat, saying that I welcome the Senator's speech upon the subject. I thought it appropriate that the RECORD should contain a reference to the position the Senator's party had taken in the House, since the position which was taken by Dr. Lattimore was also described in the Senator's speech.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE RELATING TO REVENUE REVISION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 192, which was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of each part of the hearings relative to revenue revision held before said committee during the current session, including an index.*

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution. The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING BEFORE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ENTITLED "STUDY OF MONOPOLY POWER"

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 125, which was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings, held before said committee, on the resolution entitled "Study of Monopoly Power."*

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this is a courtesy due the House, because the resolution is for the benefit of their com-

mittee. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the courtesy? Does the Senator mean it relates to their own committee, and that we have nothing to do with it?

Mr. HAYDEN. We have nothing to do with it, except that the amount of money involved is such that it requires the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Are we also investing funds in the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. WHERRY. How about the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senate must concur, because of the amount.

Mr. WHERRY. But there is no money paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, is there?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. WHERRY. It is, therefore, merely a courtesy to the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona to concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I call for the question on amendment D, which has been stated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question about the amendment. It has to do with the coast of the Hawaiian Islands, calling for surveys, has it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. It is designed to help the fishermen in Hawaii make a survey as to whether or not they can get around.

Mr. WHERRY. When the survey is made the matter will be referred to the proper agency, I assume.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It will be referred to the proper agency, with recommendations as to whether any project would be feasible in the future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There are on the table about 14 amendments by individual Senators, having to do with the authorization of surveys. The amendments have been offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New

Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

They propose to authorize examinations and surveys to determine whether improvements may be needed and justified in the respective localities. No construction work is provided for. The question is, Can these survey amendments be acted upon en bloc?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They would all have to be offered by unanimous consent, and, by unanimous consent, they could be voted on en bloc.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments containing the survey authorizations be voted upon en bloc. They have all been sent to the desk. They are on the table, and, with the exception of one, I think they have been printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to make a comment with respect to the request. There is lying on the table an amendment affecting the Columbia Basin, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I was about to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether he would have any objection to reserving the presentation of the individual amendments with respect to surveys, which I understand have not been acted upon by the Public Works Committee, until the amendment to which I refer has been presented.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming, I think if he will let me ask unanimous consent to have the survey amendments acted upon by the Senate, it will save time, and we can proceed with the amendment the Senator wishes to discuss.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator how much is involved in those amendments?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no particular amount of money involved, except the regular amount which the Corps of Engineers would expend in making a particular survey.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico that all the amendments referred to which are lying on the table, having been printed, may be considered as having been offered by the various Senators whose names he has mentioned, and be acted on en bloc?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I refer to the survey amendments only.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, did the distinguished Senator send to the desk the list of Senators proposing the amendments?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sending it to the desk now, together with the amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. If they are the amendments which are on the copy of the sheet which the Senator handed me without identifying them particularly, I have no objection.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They are the same ones.

Mr. WHERRY. According to the list, the first amendment is by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] in connection with Mataponi River, Va.; the next one, by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], in regard to Satilla River; the next, by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], in connection with the Severn River; the next, by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], in connection with New Creek; the next, by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], in connection with Combahee River; the next, by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], in connection with the Milwaukee River; the next, by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], in connection with Apes Hole Creek; the next, by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], in connection with the Nine Mile Drain; the next, by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], in connection with Chincoteague Bay; the next, by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], in connection with Israel River, N. H.; the next, by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], in connection with streams in St. Johns, Flagler, and Putnam Counties, Fla.; the next by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], in regard to Middle Creek, N. C.; the next, by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], in connection with Seabeck Harbor, Wash.; and the last, by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], in regard to Walnut Creek.

Is that a complete list of amendments which the Senator desires to offer en bloc?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. None of them, as I understand, has to do with any authorization for construction, but is simply with reference to surveys to be made, which surveys will be reported to the proper agencies, and then the question of whether there is to be any authorization allowed will be determined.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They provide only for preliminary examinations and surveys to determine whether improvements are needed and justified in the particular localities. They do not provide for any construction work whatsoever.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request—I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question. When these amendments are voted upon, do I correctly understand that the committee amendments will then have been completed and that the bill will then be open to individual amendments?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if there is any order in which they will be taken up, or only as individual Senators obtain the floor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know. I presume it will be according to the recognition of Senators.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and going back to the bill which was taken up 2 or 3 days ago, there were five amendments not offered in the committee which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico offered, three of which were approved at that time and two of which have been approved today.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Were they all committee amendments up to that time?

Mr. CHAVEZ. As a matter of fact, every committee amendment reported to the Senate last October was acted on and approved by the Senate. The five amendments submitted after we started discussion of the bill at this session of the Congress were approved by the committee after it had made its regular report.

Mr. WHERRY. Were the amendments which are now being offered en bloc considered by the committee?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendments were considered by the committee and were approved.

Mr. WHERRY. So that the committee has full knowledge of them?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The committee has full knowledge of them. They have been discussed.

Mr. WHERRY. Are they in the same status as the other five amendments which have been referred to?

Mr. CHAVEZ. They are.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that all the amendments referred to by the Senator from New Mexico may be considered as having been offered and that they may be acted upon en bloc?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the status of the committee amendments to House bill 5472? As I understand, the committee increased the House authorization by approximately \$108,000,000, in title I, on rivers and harbors, and by \$338,000,000 on flood control, or a total increase of \$446,000,000. Is my understanding correct that those amendments were adopted by the Senate last October, on call of the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the call of the calendar on the 17th of last October all committee amendments were adopted, and all the committee amendments which have been reported by the committee have also been adopted, so that all committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I find this news somewhat disappointing, because I had intended to raise objections to a number of authorizations which I did not believe were justified by public need.

So, Mr. President, I should like to proceed, if I may, and discuss them one by one. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider its action of last October in connection with the amendment submitted by the committee on page 3,

lines 11 and 12, with reference to the so-called Shrewsbury River project.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Illinois propounded a parliamentary inquiry. When he finished the parliamentary inquiry, as I understand, he used his recognition to make a request. My point of order is this: Is not the floor open for further recognition of Senators by the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognized the Senator from Illinois to make a parliamentary inquiry. Upon the Chair's answering his inquiry, the Senator did not automatically retain the floor. He did submit a unanimous-consent request that the Senate reconsider the vote by which certain amendments were adopted last October.

Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] that the individual amendments referred to by him be voted upon en bloc? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, they will be regarded as having been adopted.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 47, after line 4, insert the following:

"Mattaponi River, Va."

On page 47 after line 8, insert the following:

"Satilla River, Ga.; St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla.; Suwannee River, Ga. and Fla.; for flood control, navigation, and other beneficial uses."

On page 16, after line 22, insert the following:

"Severn River, with particular reference to Ringgold Cove, Ann Arundel County, Md."

On page 16, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

"New Creek, Staten Island, N. Y."

On page 31, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

"Combahee River, Broad River, Black River, and their tributaries, all in the State of South Carolina."

On page 48, after line 20, insert the following:

"Milwaukee River and tributaries, Wis."

On page 16, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

"Apes Hole Creek, Somerset County, Md."

On page 48, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

"Nine Mile Drain and Carlow Ditch, Macomb County, Mich."

On page 17, after line 5, insert the following:

"Chincoteague Bay, with a view to establishing a harbor of refuge at Chincoteague, Accomack County, Va."

On page 46, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

"Israel River, at and in the vicinity of Lancaster, N. H., in the interest of flood control and related purposes."

On page 47, after line 8, insert the following:

"Streams in St. Johns, Flagler, and Putnam Counties, Fla., for flood control and major drainage improvements."

On page 17, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"Middle Creek, N. C."

On page 18, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"Seabeck Harbor, Hood Canal, Wash."

On page 49, after line 2, to insert:  
"Walnut Creek Drainage Area, Contra Costa County, Calif."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will bear with me, I wish to ask that a committee amendment from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be now taken up. The request of the Senator from Illinois for unanimous consent to reconsider the previous action of the Senate may, I suggest, be well postponed until after the consideration of this Interior and Insular Affairs Committee amendment.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois is still pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is either pending or it may be renewed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If it is still pending, I most respectfully object, because I understand he has reference to all the amendments adopted last October. To that I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand that the Senator from Illinois asked unanimous consent with reference to more than one amendment. He did not make the request as to all amendments. He referred to the Shrewsbury River project.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to suspend, pending discussion of the Columbia River project.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois withdraws his request for the moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I call up an amendment for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which is numbered "3-8-50-A."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to have the amendment stated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not think that will be necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was, on page 45, after line 14, to insert the following new sections 205 and 206:

SEC. 205. (a) The following projects are authorized to be constructed, substantially in accordance with the physical plan presented in the report of the Commissioner of Reclamation dated May 2, 1949, by the Department of the Interior under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, who, in prosecuting his activities under this section, and in operating and maintaining such projects, shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto):

Mountain Home project, Payette unit, Idaho: *Provided*, That no funds shall be expended on other than the following features:

Upper Scriver Creek power plant;  
Lower Scriver Creek power plant;  
Smiths Ferry Dam;  
Smiths Ferry-Scriver Creek Tunnel;  
Scriver Creek Dam and Reservoir;

until the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, has submitted to the Congress a supplemental report and finding of feasibility under the provisions

of the Federal reclamation laws, taking into consideration the participation of this project in the Columbia Basin account.

Cambridge Bench project, Idaho.

Council project, Idaho.

Hells Canyon project, Idaho: *Provided*, That the operation of Hells Canyon Dam and Reservoir for the generation of power shall be without prejudice to future depletion of stream flows arising from upstream diversions for beneficial consumptive uses in an amount which the Secretary of the Interior determines to be reasonable, having regard for the upstream beneficial consumptive use of water for the new and supplemental land developments indicated in chapter IV of the Substantiating Materials, Hells Canyon project report, approved by the Acting Secretary of the Interior, June 9, 1948.

Bitterroot Valley project (including Woodside unit), Montana.

Canby project, Oregon.

Crooked River project, Oregon.

Vale project, Oregon—Bully Creek extension.

The Dalles project, Oregon—West unit.

Grand Coulee Dam, Wash.—Modifications for flood control.

Upper Star Valley project, Wyoming.

and the following projects, previously authorized under the Water Conservation and Utilization Act, 54 Stat. 1119):

Mann Creek, Idaho.

Missoula Valley project, Montana—North Side unit.

(b) The sum of \$200,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the partial accomplishment of the projects authorized in this section.

SEC. 206. (a) In order to provide a method of accounting for the return of costs assigned for return from power revenues, in a manner which reflects the interrelationship of certain projects in the Pacific Northwest, the Secretary of the Interior shall establish a Columbia Basin account. The account shall be credited with all power and miscellaneous revenues, including revenues on account of benefits to downstream power plants which result from upstream Federal improvements, derived from or incidental to the operation of Federal power plants now existing, or authorized heretofore or in this act, within the Pacific Northwest, including all transmission lines and other facilities incident to the marketing of power from such plants. The account shall be charged with all operation, maintenance, and construction costs of such power plants, transmission lines, and other facilities that are allocated to power purposes, and with interest as provided in subsection (c). The account shall also be charged with all reimbursable costs properly allocable to purposes other than power, but which are assigned for return from power revenues, in connection with all projects now existing, or authorized heretofore or in this act, within the Pacific Northwest, whether or not such projects include power features: *Provided*, That assignment of such costs of existing or heretofore authorized projects in excess of amounts which are so assignable under the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) shall be made only upon specific authorization by act of Congress. Revenues and costs in connection with projects hereafter authorized to be constructed in the Pacific Northwest shall be included in the Columbia Basin account only upon specific authorization by act of Congress. For the purposes of this section, the Pacific Northwest shall be defined as the area, within the United States, comprising the Columbia River Basin, the basins of other streams entering the Pacific Ocean between the Canadian boundary and the California-Oregon boundary, and the closed drainage areas of Oregon.

(b) As of the close of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1951, the Sec-

retary of the Interior shall report to the Congress on the status of the Columbia Basin Account, and on the revenues from and costs of constructing and operating Federal facilities in the Pacific Northwest for the supply of water for irrigation, municipal water supply, or other reimbursable purposes. The Secretary's report shall be prepared in such a manner as accurately to reflect the Federal investment allocated to power and the Federal investment allocated to irrigation and other water supply purposes, and the progress of return and repayment thereon.

(c) The revenues and costs credited and charged to the Columbia Basin Account, together with estimated future costs and revenues, authorized to be so credited and charged shall be taken into account in fixing rates for the sale of power and energy from Federal plants and facilities in the Pacific Northwest: *Provided*, That estimated future costs and revenues of projects or divisions thereof upon which construction has not been initiated shall be so taken into account only if funds for the preparation of designs and specifications or for the initiation of construction have been made available pursuant to law, or if estimates of requirements of funds for those purposes have been submitted to the Congress by the President. Such rates shall be fixed from time to time by the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Federal Power Commission, at levels which in the aggregate will be at least sufficient to cover (1) the operation, maintenance, and all other costs of generating, transmitting, and disposing of such power and energy, including among such costs depreciation on the depreciable properties included in the construction costs allocated to such generation, transmission, and disposition, plus amortization, over a reasonable period of years, of the nondepreciable properties included in the construction costs so allocated, and including interest on the unpaid balances of the Federal investment allocated to power, at rates not less than those specified in existing applicable laws or, where no rates are so specified, at such rates as may be determined from time to time by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate, having regard to the probable term of the power investment and the rates payable on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States; and (2) any additional amounts which may be required to return the reimbursable costs properly allocable to purposes other than power, but assigned for return from power revenues. In maintaining the Columbia Basin Account and in setting rates for the sale of power and energy, the Secretary of the Interior shall take into consideration, for all properties covered by the Columbia Basin Account, the application of interest on the unpaid balances of the Federal investment allocated to power to the return of costs properly allocable to purposes other than power, but assigned for return from power revenues, to the same extent that application of interest on power investment to the return of such costs may be taken into consideration under the Federal reclamation laws.

(d) Allocations of construction costs for projects authorized in this act to be constructed in the Pacific Northwest, and for other projects included in the Columbia Basin Account as to which allocations have not heretofore been made, shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior in the case of the projects constructed or to be constructed by the Department of the Interior, after consultation with the Secretary of the Army as to allocations to flood control and navigation and with the Federal Power Commission as to allocations to power. Such allocations shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Army in the case of projects constructed or to be constructed by the Department of the Army, after consultation with the Secretary of the

Interior in the case of allocations to irrigation and the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and with the Federal Power Commission and the Secretary of the Interior with respect to allocation to power.

(e) In marketing power and energy from Federal Power plants, the revenues from which are credited to the Columbia Basin Account pursuant to this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall not enter into contracts for deliveries of firm power outside the area comprising the States of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington and those portions of the Pacific Northwest not within said States, and contracts for delivery of firm power in this area shall provide that, whenever the Secretary finds that a purchaser is by reason of the purchase of power under such contract supplying power to an adjacent marketing territory on a firm basis and thereby precluding the marketing in that territory of firm power capable of being developed at Federal plants in such territory, the amount of firm power supplied to that purchaser shall be reduced to the amount required by it within the area described in this subsection, after taking into account the amount of power reasonably available to that purchaser from its own power plants within that area. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preclude interconnections with power marketing areas adjacent to the above-described area, for the purpose of delivery of surplus energy on an off-peak, emergency, or temporary basis, or for the exchange of power and energy, including the exchange of power or energy for water or storage of water.

(f) The Secretary of the Interior shall contract for appropriate repayment to the United States, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws, for all irrigation services provided by or obtained from all projects in the Pacific Northwest constructed pursuant to the laws affecting the prosecution of works for the improvement of navigation and the control of floods.

(g) Except as specifically provided in this section, nothing herein shall be construed as repealing, modifying, or affecting in any way the Federal reclamation laws, the laws affecting the prosecution of works for the improvement of navigation and the control of floods, the act of August 20, 1937 (50 Stat. 731), as amended, the act of June 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 270), the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), or the act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 22). Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to projects of the Bureau of Indian Affairs or to supersede existing provisions of law relating to the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife.

Renumber succeeding sections and any references thereto accordingly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this amendment deals with the authorization of some 13 projects in the Columbia River Basin. Of these projects, 1 is exclusively a power project, 10 are exclusively reclamation projects, 1 is partly power and partly irrigation, and 1 involves a modification of the Grand Coulee project in order that that dam may be used for flood-control purposes. The authorization of these particular projects was under consideration during the last session of Congress by the Committee on Public Works. Considerable testimony was taken, but one of the members of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] suggested to the Committee on Public Works that since these projects were primarily reclamation projects and were to be authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, it might be well for the Committee on Interior and Insular

Affairs to consider them. It was so agreed upon the floor of the Senate. At the beginning of the present session the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs immediately began hearing upon the projects, and they are now before the Senate with the approval of the Committee.

I want to say, Mr. President, that in cooperation the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have—

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. While it is true that the Committee on Public Works suggested that, inasmuch as the projects being discussed were irrigation projects and should be considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, neither the Committee on Public Works nor any of its members agreed that whatever the committee did with reference to irrigation and reclamation should be contained in a flood-control and rivers and harbors bill. Am I correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the Senator from New Mexico is partially correct, at least. I think the RECORD will show that the Senator from New Mexico, speaking on behalf of the Committee on Public Works, expressed the understanding that these particular amendments were to be studied by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Because that is where they belonged. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Because they belonged there, we wanted the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to consider them. However, it was not understood by the Committee on Public Works, or any member of that committee, that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs could discuss a reclamation or irrigation project and recommend an amendment to a flood-control bill covering it. Of course, any Senator may submit an amendment; but I wish it to be understood that so far as the committee was concerned the committee knew what it was doing and knew that the subjects of reclamation and irrigation belonged to the committee which is so honorably headed by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct in his statement so far as it goes. However, in order that the RECORD may be perfectly clear and so that the Senate may pass on the understanding, I desire to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 7, at page structured in the Pacific Northwest, and for I thought was the understanding of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I had obtained the floor by asking the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to yield. I then said:

Earlier today the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], chairman of the Committee on Public Works, submitted a report on House bill 5472. As that bill was considered by the Committee on Public Works, it contained a provision dealing with the authorization of certain reclamation projects

in the Columbia River Basin. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had no opportunity to pass upon those recommended reclamation authorizations. The chairman of the Committee on Public Works was kind enough to call in members of the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with respect to the drafting of the bill in its relation to reclamation projects. One of the members of the Committee on Public Works, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], raised the question, in the proceedings yesterday in the Committee on Public Works, with respect to these reclamation projects.

I have had a conference with the senior Senator from New Mexico, and I desire the record to show that I understand the understanding between the Public Works Committee and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to be that although the bill as reported does not contain any provision at all with respect to these reclamation authorizations, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is recognized as having the right to offer, as necessary, as part of the report and as a committee amendment, provisions dealing with that authorization. The reason for that, of course, is that the development of the Columbia River Basin is a joint operation by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The report by the Committee on Public Works is, as I understand, not to be considered as excluding the consideration of reclamation authorizations.

I am announcing to members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that this matter will be laid before the committee at its regular session on Monday next, when the committee, if it so desires, may take action with respect to the reclamation authorization.

I ask the Senator from New Mexico whether I have correctly stated the understanding.

Whereupon the RECORD shows:

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The Senator from Wyoming has correctly stated the understanding.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So I am here today, acting on behalf of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to present the amendment, which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, after hearing, has duly approved. We are asking that the action of the committee on this amendment be the action of the Senate.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think the Senator from Wyoming and I are so very far apart. The record which he has read is correct. The Senator from Wyoming did ask about having hearings in his committee on matters which had to do with irrigation projects only, it is true, and we agreed to that, because his committee has jurisdiction of such matters. We also knew that the committee makes investigations and surveys and holds hearings, and has the right to bring in amendments before this body. But the point I am trying to make is that there was no agreement whatsoever by the Committee on Public Works that because we agreed to some work being done by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, we were to sit back and acquiesce in any amendments which that committee might suggest.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course I do not mean to imply that the Committee on

Interior and Insular Affairs can bind the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The record as read by the Senator from Wyoming is to the effect that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was to study irrigation districts within the Columbia River Basin. Is it not true that in the amendment which has just been read to the Senate there are irrigation projects outside Columbia River Basin?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; there are none outside of the Columbia River Basin. The projects are all within the basin.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad the Senator from Wyoming made that point clear, because the projects included in the amendment are all within the Columbia River Basin, and were discussed by the Committee on Public Works last fall.

I think the RECORD should be further elucidated. The Senator from Wyoming was kind enough to read the RECORD. He did not finish the portion of the reply of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, in which he said—reading from the same page of the RECORD:

Mr. President, the Committee on Public Works of the Senate wanted to include the items of the Reclamation Service, but it happened that one member of the committee also belonged to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and he had some doubt whether the latter committee would be willing; so, if they do not mind, it is all right with us.

Mr. President, so that the Senate may understand the matter, I merely desire to say that we have some difficulty separating rivers and harbors projects from irrigation projects, and we are in a peculiar position in the West. We have to have the indulgence of both committees in the consideration of our projects, because they cannot be separated.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Washington will agree, however, that so far as the Committee on Public Works was concerned, and so far as the recommendations and reports it made to this body, which have been approved, were concerned, none of the irrigation or reclamation items involved in the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming were included. They were not reported, were they?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct, but they are all items which are included in the Columbia Basin comprehensive plan of the Engineers and of the Bureau; they were discussed before the Committee on Public Works, and were sent to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs only because of the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not also true that the contemplated plan was not approved by the Committee on Public Works at that time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was not approved, but it has been thoroughly dis-

cussed by the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We are in a peculiar position, because we have to ask the indulgence of both committees, since we cannot separate, in the comprehensive plan for development, power, and irrigation, and rivers and harbors and irrigation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think the understanding which the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reached upon the floor of the Senate certainly was not binding upon the members of the respective committees.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Supplementing the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I should like to say that the occasion upon which the comprehensive plan agreed to between the Reclamation Service and the Corps of Engineers affecting the Columbia Basin came before the Committee on Public Works, was not in connection with the hearing on this omnibus bill, but, instead, was in connection with a hearing on a proposed Columbia Valley project, a quite different matter, still pending, and upon which hearings are still being held.

I should like to say further that while much the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is saying is completely correct, I would not want to leave it at all unchallenged that the report of the committee lies within the purview of the statement made by the distinguished Senator on the priority date of the measure read by him into the RECORD. It was the clear understanding of at least one member of the Committee on Public Works, the junior Senator from Florida, that the only matter to be heard was the question of whether or not certain reclamation projects should be approved, and a certain financial authorization made, so that they could go ahead during the next 3 years. There was never any discussion before the Committee on Public Works of such items as the basin account, the matter of charging parts of reclamation costs to power manufactured by dams erected by the engineers, whether the reclamation projects were nearby and closely related to, or had any geographic relation whatsoever to the dam. Nor was there involved any such proposal as that now contained in the committee amendment to restrict the sale of power produced there to the area of the Columbia Basin.

I find many other provisions entirely foreign to the bare matters stated so capably by the Senator from Wyoming on the occasion of the prior debate, namely, the consideration as to whether certain reclamation projects within the comprehensive plan should be reported for approval and for partial authorization at the same time that the omnibus flood control and rivers and harbors bill was adopted.

I am hoping, Mr. President, that the Senator will confine his request, com-

ing from the committee, to a much more limited field than that covered at present by the amendment, because otherwise it would seem to me to reach to the very heart of the service of the Committee on Public Works and of the Corps of Engineers and could not be permitted to go unchallenged by the Committee on Public Works.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is now discussing the merits of the amendment. I was actually somewhat at a loss to understand what all this technical discussion was about. Now I see. But, Mr. President, neither the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs nor, so far as I know, any of the members, ever had the slightest idea that we were to receive from the Committee on Public Works anything more than courteous attention when we made our report. We have made our report, and I think we are about to receive the courteous attention upon the merits of the recommendation which was made.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but in view of the statement made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I think the record should be cleared up. The amendment we have here was proposed to the committee as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill. There was all sorts of testimony taken on this proposal as an amendment. The Columbia Valley Administration proposal is entirely another proposal, although it has some relation to it. They are along two parallel lines. The junior Senator from Washington and I submitted this as a joint amendment. All it is predicated upon is a committee amendment to the rivers and harbors bill. There are pages of testimony on it in the hearings.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Can the Senator tell what action the committee took?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee took no action. It was discussed on the request of one member of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now, if I may resume, I will say I am afraid that some of my colleagues have gotten the idea that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was trying to take advantage of the Committee on Public Works. Nothing could be farther from the desire of the chairman of that committee. But it is quite evident, Mr. President, that there is going to be a debate with respect to the establishment of a "Columbia Basin account." It is quite evident that there is going to be a debate now on this amendment as to whether or not there shall be unified action in the development of the water resources of the Columbia Basin. I believe that unity of action in the development of these water resources is of the highest public importance. There has been cooperation between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in the field. These two agencies of Government, seeking to cooperate in the interest of the public and in the reduction of expense to the public in the elimination of overlapping operations by the two agencies, reached

an understanding that these particular reclamation and power projects should be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, and that certain other projects should be constructed by the Army engineers.

The amendment which the committee has reported favorably to the Senate was based upon a proposal that was made to the committee by the Secretary of the Interior, with the support of the Bureau of the Budget. It represents the considered opinion of the executive arm of the Government that when the development by the Army engineers is in progress in the Columbia Basin, there shall also be in progress the development which in this cooperative understanding and preliminary work between the two agencies was assigned to the Bureau of Reclamation for construction.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is the chairman adduce testimony to justify the proposed legislation in section 206? Did the Senator's committee take evidence on that section?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, the committee held protracted sessions on it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask a second question simply to clear away confusion from my mind. Did the Committee on Public Works, which reported the bill, take evidence on section 206?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not a member of that committee. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has just stated that the Committee on Public Works did take testimony on it.

Mr. WHERRY. That is all I want to know. Was the testimony which was offered to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs also submitted to the Committee on Public Works?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, not all of it. During the last session of Congress the Committee on Public Works received some testimony with respect to these projects of the Bureau of Reclamation. How complete that testimony was I do not know. But I do know, as I stated last October, that the able chairman of the Committee on Public Works was good enough to permit members of the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to attend the meetings and sit with the staff of the Public Works Committee. As I said a moment ago, Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation were working together in the field, and up to this moment practically, the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have also been working in harmony. But I want it to be clearly understood that I never had the slightest notion that the Committee on Public Works or any of its members were committed or could be committed by any action of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to know where the evidence is. Does the evidence adduced by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs appear anywhere in the record so we can see it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The record of the hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has not been received from the Government Printing Office.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the evidence submitted to the Committee on Public Works all the evidence that was before the Senator's own committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; it was not.

Mr. WHERRY. Where can we secure the additional evidence?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As soon as it comes from the Government Printing Office it will be available. But the committee has filed a report—

Mr. WHERRY. I have the report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A very ample report on the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. But the evidence is not available at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The hearings have not been printed up to this time.

Mr. President, I was about to say with respect to this matter, that these projects which are recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are estimated to cost \$412,700,000. The authorization for an appropriation, however, as presented is for less than half of that, namely, \$200,000,000. Of the total estimated cost of \$412,700,000, it is estimated that the reimbursable share will be \$384,228,000. Of this amount \$9,628,000 will come by way of agricultural payments of the settlers upon the land. The nonreimbursable portion of the total cost is only \$28,482,000.

There will be about 116,000 acres of land benefited by the water supply, of which 90,390 acres are now receiving water from the irrigation projects, but not receiving enough. In other words, this project will provide for supplemental water. Approximately 25,386 acres of new land will be brought in under this project.

Mr. President, as I have said, the amendment covers proposals which were submitted to the Senate in a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, accompanied by a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The letter from the Secretary of the Interior was addressed to the Vice President; and then both letters were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Late in March, just after the report had been made, the chairman of the committee addressed to the Secretary of the Army a letter with respect to the project. I offer at this point a copy of that letter, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Is there objection?

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND  
INSULAR AFFAIRS,  
March 29, 1950.

HON. GORDON GRAY,  
Secretary of the Army,  
Department of Defense,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has recently concluded hearings on a proposed amendment to H. R. 5472 to authorize the construction of certain projects by the Bureau of Recla-

mation and the establishment of a "Basin account."

These authorizations are consistent with the recommendation of the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in his letter of February 1, 1950, with which he also transmitted his views on your recently completed review report on the Columbia River and the companion report of the Department of the Interior.

The proposed legislation, particularly as it pertains to the "Basin account," is in line with the principles contained in the agreement signed on April 11, 1949, by the Secretary of the Army and the Corps of Engineers on the one hand and the Secretary of the Interior and the Commission of Reclamation on the other.

It is likely that the omnibus river and harbor and flood-control bill will come up for discussion on the floor of the Senate at once. Discussion of this aspect may logically be brought up. I understand that you have already communicated your views to the Senate Public Works Committee on those parts of Director Frank Pace's letter of February 1, which refer to the Corps of Engineers' proposals. It occurs to me that it also would be well for you and General Pick to make a formal statement on the amendment, cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, for public recognition.

The action taken by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was predicated upon the assumption that your Department concurred in the position taken by the President and expressed in Director Pace's letter of February 1, 1950, which translated some of the principles contained in your agreement of April 11, 1949, into a draft of legislation. A statement by you confirming your position would be most helpful.

Accordingly, I shall appreciate receipt of a letter from you as promptly as possible on the subject.

Sincerely yours,  
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,  
Chairman.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a reply to that letter was received from the Secretary of the Army, Hon. Gordon Gray, under date of April 5, 1950. I ask unanimous consent that his letter may be read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,  
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1950.  
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In your letter of March 29, 1950, you requested that the Chief of Engineers and I make statements on the proposed amendment to H. R. 5472 relating to the Columbia River Basin, particularly with respect to the "Basin account."

The agreement of April 11, 1949, between the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army included an item (No. 6) to the effect that financial assistance from all power revenue-producing projects in the Pacific Northwest should be pooled and extended to aid irrigation under principles consistent with those embodied in reclamation law, and it contemplated the establishment of a "Basin account." The Chief of Engineers and I continue to be in full accord with this item of the agreement of April 11, 1949.

This Department supports also the proposed amendment transmitted with the letter of February 1, 1950, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the Secretary of the Interior insofar as it may affect the projects and duties of the Corps of Engineers, and I have no objections to the parts thereof which pertain to the Department of the Interior and only indirectly to the Department

of the Army. Specifically in response to your letter, I concur in the proposal to include the revenues and costs of power projects of the Corps of Engineers in the "Basin account."

This report has been reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget, and I am advised that there is no objection to its submission.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON GRAY,  
Secretary of the Army.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have had that letter read in order that it may be perfectly clear that the Department of the Army, to which is assigned the Corps of Engineers, has—through its Secretary—given its approval to the proposal which here is made in the amendment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. President, I also have a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman, dated April 4, dealing with the same general subject; and I ask that that letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,  
Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs  
Committee, United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Your letter of March 29 asks for my views on the desirability of enactment of the amendment to H. R. 5472, to authorize certain projects for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation in the Columbia Basin and to authorize the establishment of a "Columbia Basin account."

This Department is in full accord with these purposes of the proposed amendment, and particularly the establishment of a "Columbia Basin account."

Establishment of a "Basin account" is felt by the Administration to be most necessary to provide for proper accounting, uniform rate-making, and a method of obtaining financial assistance for irrigation projects. As you know, the establishment of a "Columbia Basin account" was recommended in the agreement which was signed on April 11, 1949, by the Secretaries of the Army and the Interior, and the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Chief of Engineers.

It is noted, however, that by changing the word "may" to "shall" in what is now line 4, page 7 of the proposed amendment, the committee has changed the amendment as recommended by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in his letter of February 1, 1950, by making it mandatory for the Secretary of the Interior, in setting power rates, to take into account the interest component to the extent permitted by reclamation law. Under the original language recommended by the Bureau of the Budget such use of the interest component would have been discretionary. The choice of "may" was deliberately made and was thought to be preferable in view of reference by the President of the whole subject of the sources of reclamation subsidy to the Water Resources Policy Commission for study and recommendation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of the foregoing views to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,  
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say a few further words in explanation of the amendment. It is fully covered, of course, in the report sub-

mitted by the chairman in behalf of the committee. All the details regarding this proposal are there presented.

Let me briefly state that the revenues from the Hells Canyon project—which, by the understanding of the Corps of Engineers and of the Department of the Army with the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior is to be solely a power project—are, under the amendment, to be credited to the proposed "Basin account" and will be used to reimburse the Government for the construction costs of the 12 projects, in addition to the Hells Canyon project, authorized by this amendment. In addition, there will be reimbursement in excess of more than \$9,000,000 from payments made by the settlers.

It is evident from what has been said here today that there will be some discussion in respect to the proposal contained in this amendment to establish a "Columbia Basin account."

Briefly, Mr. President, the purpose is to have credited to the "Columbia Basin account" certain revenues, particularly the power revenues. I read from the amendment:

The account shall be credited with all power and miscellaneous revenues, including revenues on account of benefits to downstream power plants which result from upstream Federal improvements, derived from or incidental to the operation of Federal power plans now existing, or authorized heretofore or in this act, within the Pacific Northwest, including all transmission lines and other facilities incident to the marketing of power from such plants. The account shall be charged with all operation, maintenance, and construction costs of such power plants, transmission lines, and other facilities that are allocated to power purposes, and with interest as provided in subsection (c).

I shall not bother to read the remainder of the provision. It has already been presented for publication in the amendment, as I submitted it at the very beginning.

I wish to make clear, however, that it is generally understood that the development of irrigation and reclamation in the West can no longer be carried on without revenues in addition to those which are derived from the settlers upon the soil themselves. The cost of these multiple-purpose projects—which produce power and provide for flood control and for navigation—is altogether too great to be saddled upon the settlers upon the reclaimed land. So for some time in the past it has been the practice of Congress to authorize these multiple-purpose projects, having in mind the purpose of having the power revenues finance the construction costs. The Columbia Basin project existing in the Northwest under present arrangements will not be paid out, as I recall, for approximately 150 years. Under the proposal for the "Basin account," it, like other projects, will be paid out in approximately 50 years.

Mr. President, I have before me a table which shows the cost of various projects which have been planned in this area. The Corps of Engineers' projects which have been constructed or which are under construction and which have been authorized—beginning with Bonneville and ending with the Chief Joseph Dam,

including McNary Dam—amount to approximately \$680,000,000. Projects proposed to be authorized in this bill—Albeni Falls, Lookout Point (Waldo), Dexter, Hills Creek, Cougar, Green Peter, White Bridge, Libby, Priest Rapids, John Day, and The Dalles—will total approximately \$1,100,000,000. Projects on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation, constructed, under construction, or authorized, amount to a total of \$315,000,000 as follows: Grand Coulee, \$210,000,000; Hungry Horse, \$90,000,000; Palisades, \$10,000,000; Anderson Ranch, \$5,000,000.

Projects proposed to be authorized under House bill 5472: Hells Canyon, \$311,000,000; Mountain Home, \$33,000,000, making a total of \$344,000,000.

The grand total of these various power projects is as follows:

For the Corps of Engineers, \$1,330,000,000; for the Bureau of Reclamation, \$540,000,000; transmission systems are estimated at \$830,000,000—or a total of \$2,700,000,000.

So, Mr. President, it is evident that one of the great needs for the development of the tremendous water supply in the Pacific Northwest is the establishment of a "Columbia Basin account" to which may be credited the earnings from power, and from which the Congress, if it decides in the future to authorize additional projects, may take the sums of money necessary for the construction of the projects.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my understanding that the proposed "Columbia Basin account" is to be one in which all interest and amortization payments, instead of going to the General Treasury, are to be impounded, for additional development of the Columbia Basin projects. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment authorizes the establishment of the account and the crediting to the account of these revenues; but this amendment does not make any specific provision for the utilization of the funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me ask this question: If the provisions of this amendment were to go into effect and were not to be altered by future legislation enacted by the Congress, would the amendment mean that all future amortization payments derived from the power revenues would go, not to the General Treasury, but to this "Basin account" and, therefore, would be used for additional capital investments in this area; or would they go to the General Treasury?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; let me say to the Senator that the "Basin account" is merely an accounting device. It does not dispose of the money. That is a matter to be determined in the future by the Congress of the United States. In our report describing the "Basin account," the first paragraph contains the following:

The accounting procedure, will show balances which may be considered in connection with analysis of financial feasibility of projects, rate making, and project pay-out. It is not a revolving fund or a fund of any type. All revenues will continue to go into

the Treasury as at present, and all funds will continue to be appropriated by the Congress as at present.

By the amendment which is being presented here, the committee is recommending, as I stated at the outset, 10 projects which are wholly reclamation; one of which is partly reclamation, one of which is completely power, together with another project, at a total cost of \$412,700,000, and an authorized appropriation is made of only \$200,000,000.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand, then, that the alleged advantage of the "Basin account" is that it would permit maintenance of a uniform power rate through the Northwest, with some power being sold below cost and other power being sold above cost, so that each project would not have to stand upon its own feet, but the system of developments as a whole would be the unit?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that is one of the most important features of the "Basin account."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Can the Senator give assurance that there is no proposal here to make this serve as the starting point for unlimited development of the Northwest?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all. Every project which is not included in this bill, or made possible, will have to stand on its own feet, will have to be recommended by the Executive, will have to be approved by the Congress; so that in the creation of this account we merely establish the accounting system and create the device whereby, as the Senator has so well stated, it will be possible to administer the power sales throughout this great area as a uniform system.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator stated that this amendment, if adopted, will be different from provisions for the disposal of power under TVA or MVA?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The power would be disposed of under existing law by the Secretary of the Interior. This is like the Bonneville project which is now in operation.

Mr. LANGER. If the amendment is adopted, will it affect that project in any manner?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would not affect the Bonneville marketing; no.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming whether the amendment would not altogether change the aspect of the flood-control bill as presented by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico—that is, in the matter of repayment, and in the whole matter of construction of projects in the Northwest.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not understand that it would. It would have the effect of providing that certain power revenues shall be used to reimburse the

cost of these 13 projects. That is a device which has been used before, and of course, with respect to the reclamation projects, here we have reimbursement, not only from power, but from reclamation.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether it would not set a precedent heretofore unknown in the development of the Southwest or the Northwest, in that it would take revenues from a project in an entirely different State and apply them to a project in a State within which it is authorized?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right about that, of course. The purpose is to recognize the physical fact of nature that the stream is a unit, and the measure proceeds upon the theory that in the development of the water power, the beneficial uses of the water in that stream also shall be developed as a unit. It is very different, of course, from the projects with which reclamation started in 1902, when each particular project had its own particular water supply and its own revenue. We now have a uniform system.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator—

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder whether the Senator will yield, at that point, so I may again make the Record clear on this point.

Mr. MALONE. That is what I am trying to do—to clarify it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator wants to amplify one of my answers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to have him do that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When I asked the Senator about it, he said it was something new. It is not at all something new. The Congress of the United States, for instance, in connection with the Missouri River Basin, in the Flood Control Act of 1944, although it did not set up a basin account as such, did, by section (c), provide for allocations, costs to be distributed between power and reclamation projects. The same Congress—I forget the exact date—in approving the Rio Grande Basin development, provided for allocation of costs as between projects. It is nothing new. It is merely the sensible way in which to approach a geographical situation such as we have in the Pacific Northwest. The Missouri Valley project has already been approved. It is a comprehensive plan. There is also the Rio Grande project. Similar provision I am sure would be advanced in connection with the so-called Arkansas Basin and other river-basin proposals. The law I have referred to is Public Law 535.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like first to make a statement.

It bears on the point about which the Senator asked. Assuming as we do a 50-year period of repayment, with the production of commercial power from each power unit, sales of power are estimated to bring in a total gross revenue of \$12,000,000,000 during that period from Army power projects and from Bureau of Reclamation power projects. It is estimated that after the operation, maintenance, and replacement costs are fully met, there will remain net revenues sufficient to repay the capital costs allocated to power, of \$3,560,000,000, plus assistance to irrigation enterprises, of \$600,000,000. In addition to repaying these costs, the net power revenues will provide the additional sum of \$2,100,000,000. The total aid to present and future possible irrigation projects is therefore \$2,700,000,000. This would accrue from the power operations in the manner I recited earlier in the day.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I submit, Mr. President, that there is a considerable difference between a development in a humid area, where the idea is to get the water off the land and back into the stream, to get rid of it, and a development in an irrigation area, such as the Southwest or the Northwest. A precedent is being set which might very well be carried on to the Colorado River or to any other place where the Congress of the United States sets up a system, whether it be a basin account or a Columbia River authority. All the money derived within the basin would be thrown into one particular account. A great hardship might be created in a basin in a single State, and the State apparently would have no chance whatever of a voice in making an interstate compact prior to the passage of such a law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. MALONE. I should like to finish this one point, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

Mr. MALONE. The precedent would apply to the Southwest, where, while the debate on the Senate floor is proceeding, mines are operating. If the revenues from certain projects within certain States can be taken to develop projects in other States, I submit to the senior Senator from Wyoming, it is only one step then to doing what Secretary Krug, prior to his resignation, suggested before our committee, speaking as a member of the distinguished Senator's committee, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. When Secretary Krug, under direct questioning, said that when these projects were completely paid off, with interest during construction, then, while the money would belong to the Government, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior could take the money to build a project in New York or any other place.

Now, if the Senator will yield further—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator it is necessary for me to make this comment upon what he has said,

that the statement which he quotes from Secretary Krug is not at all binding upon the Congress, and it is not implicit, as I see it, in this amendment.

We have come to the time in the development of the West when I am convinced there are many areas capable of being reclaimed which will be utterly lost to reclamation if they are to be dependent upon power revenues from plants close by. We have come to the point where, if we desire to develop reclamation projects which are distant from a power project in a basin, we must, it seems to me, follow the basin-account method by creating a system of unitary development of the basin.

Mr. MALONE. Regardless of the effect on any State in the basin?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think the committee to which the Senator from Nevada and I belong would hesitate for a long time before authorizing any project that would be disadvantageous to any particular State. I think there are more advantages to be gained by all the States from this method than could possibly be achieved by clinging to the old method which would make it impossible to reclaim many large areas of reclaimable land.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say that, having established the fact that we are changing the policy in large areas of the Northwest, which may be a precedent anywhere in the United States, perhaps extended outside the basin, as Secretary Krug suggested when he was Secretary of the Interior, a part of the administration, and supposedly speaking for the administration—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He was not speaking for the Congress.

Mr. MALONE. Would it not be a reasonable request—and I will say I voted against this amendment in my own committee, for reasons which I have tried to make clear—would it not be a reasonable request on the part of the committee which deals solely with flood control, and which was courteous enough to extend an invitation to another committee to participate in the discussions, that we lay such an amendment aside until such time as the committee, of which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is chairman, has an opportunity to hear evidence? I have never heard any evidence presented. I am a member of both committees, and I have made no decision in the matter. We are trying to pass upon something which might change the entire situation.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Nevada has any fear that this amendment might injure any State, I should like to point out to him that the Governors of every State involved in the Columbia River Basin, regardless of party, wholeheartedly endorsed this proposal. I am one who has been very active in the matter. Yet, the proposal does not contain a single irrigation project in the State of Washington, which State produces most of the power. We

think the over-all development of the basin is good for every State. Nearly everyone has agreed to it. The President of the United States sent a strong message regarding it. The Bureau of the Budget made a very lengthy and strong report. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which the Senator is a member, discussed it. It was brought up as a necessity because of the over-all development and because the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers agreed on the report. No State is against it; every State I know of is for it, with one possible exception, and that has to do with a disagreement only as to the method of approach.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to say, in closing, that I think I have made my point clear that this is neither the time nor the place to do what is being attempted. Everyone has agreed except the members of the committee of the Senate of the United States which is supposed to pass upon that particular matter, namely, the flood-control committee. It has certainly made no decision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, what the Senator has said is, of course, a very proper argument for consideration by the Senate. I want to say, Mr. President, that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs received innumerable communications from all the States in the Columbia River Basin, urging not only the approval of these reclamation projects, but also urging the approval of the basin accounts. I am very confident that in submitting this amendment for inclusion in the bill, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is acting in harmony with the desires of the public officials and of the people of that great area. I know there are Senators from the Northwest who desire to discuss this measure. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was not unanimous, by any means, and I know that one of the distinguished and able Senators from the Northwest intends to make extended comment upon the Columbia Basin. But, speaking for the committee as a whole, I know I am acting in accordance with the wishes of public officials when I urge upon the Senate due consideration of the arguments which will be made by our distinguished colleague from the Northwest.

Mr. CHAVEZ rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With that, Mr. President, I am about to yield the floor. Does the Senator from New Mexico want to ask a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, would he permit me to make this observation? I think I can speak for the Committee on Public Works as a whole. It is sympathetic to what is attempted to be accomplished.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But if it is good, should we try to accomplish it in this way? Here is a new project which has been presented in the form of an amendment to the flood-control bill which will take practically 40 percent of the total

amount of money authorized, in the neighborhood of—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The authorization amounts to approximately \$412,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only that, but is it good business to change the policy of the "Basin account"? I might agree with the Senator, but to bring it about under this kind of a situation raises the question of whether it should be done. We are authorizing approximately \$412,000,000, as the Senator says, and we are changing the policy completely without having any hearings before the committee which has the bill under consideration. Does the Senator from Wyoming think it should be done in this way?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. While I understand the point of view of the Senator from New Mexico, I submit that in the light of circumstances as they exist, in the light of the agreement of cooperative effort which was carried out by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, in the light of letters which I have filed this afternoon from the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior, and in the light of the enlarged need for the development of water power in the great Northwest area, I feel, Mr. President, that the matter properly comes before the Senate, and I believe the amendment should be approved by the Senate.

Mr. President, I was about to yield the floor, but I want to ask unanimous consent that there may be printed as part of my remarks the following portions of the committee report:

Part IV, beginning on page 5, entitled "Projects Recommended for Authorization"; part V, entitled "Basin Account"; and part VII, entitled "Brief Project Descriptions."

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

#### IV. PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR AUTHORIZATION

##### General

Of the 13 projects included in this amendment, 10 are exclusively irrigation developments, 1 combines power production with irrigation, 1 is primarily for the production of power, and 1 involves the modification of outlet works in Grand Coulee Dam to permit its operation in the interests of flood control.

The project combining power and irrigation is the Fayette division of the Mountain Home project, Idaho. Its authorization is recommended subject to the provision that no funds be expended for construction of the irrigation facilities until the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, has submitted to the Congress a supplemental report and finding of feasibility. The authorization for construction of the other 12 projects is made without such limitation.

Construction of the 10 irrigation projects recommended for authorization without limitation will provide security where insecurity now exists in basic water supplies, will stabilize agricultural production and broaden the opportunities of established farmers, will further livestock enterprises, and will not stimulate the production of crops in surplus supply. The power developments will help meet the large additional power supply required in the economy of the region. With modification of the outlets in Grand Coulee Dam, storage behind it will be usable, in conjunction with additional storage planned

in other reservoirs, for the control of floods so urgently needed in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., and along other reaches of the lower Columbia River.

These irrigation projects embrace a total of 115,776 acres. Seventy-eight percent (90,390 acres) of the total is now irrigated but is in urgent need of supplemental water. Typical water shortages range from 30 to 70 percent of a full supply. The water to be provided (1 to 2.5 acre-feet per acre) will eliminate these shortages.

Of the 25,386 acres of new land, less than half (11,770 acres) is in projects made up entirely of new land. The greater part of the new land (13,616 acres) is in projects which are primarily supplemental water developments. The reservoirs supplying these irrigated areas will flood about 10,000 acres, of which 86 percent is dry grazing land. The remainder (14 percent) is arable land, only part of which is irrigated.

The recommended Hells Canyon power project and the power features of the Mountain Home project which are authorized without limitation are integral parts of co-ordinated plans developed by the Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, and Corps of Engineers to meet the growing and pressing power needs of the Pacific Northwest. The cost of developing the 1,020,000 kilowatts of installed capacity in the two developments will not necessitate any increase in power rates now in prospect. One of the developments, the Hells Canyon project, has a large storage reservoir of 4,400,000 acre-feet capacity which will be operated as a part of the main control plan to reduce flood stages in the lower Columbia River area. In addition to flood-control benefits, this project also will create navigation benefits. The 19,500 acres of land to be flooded by reservoirs serving these power developments are predominantly (91 percent) dry-grazing and waste lands.

The aggregate construction cost of the 13 projects, excluding the irrigation features of the Mountain Home project, is approximately \$412,710,000. Of this total, the amount tentatively allocated to nonreimbursable purposes is \$28,482,000, and to reimbursable purposes, \$384,228,000. Certain allocations to recreation not in accord with the President's policy are included in the nonreimbursable total above and the nonreimbursable costs of the individual projects discussed below. These will be modified in the final allocations of costs to bring them into harmony with that policy, at no significant detriment to the favorable benefit-cost ratios of these projects, inasmuch as the amount of such allocations constitute only 2 percent of the total cost of the projects. Much the greater part of the reimbursable cost is represented by the \$358,471,000 allocation to power. The irrigation allocation is \$25,757,000.

Return of the power investment, together with interest at 3 percent on the unpaid balance, will be made from revenues obtained through power rates established in a manner discussed subsequently. The irrigation investment will be returned from two sources. The aggregate amount which water users can reasonably be expected to repay is \$9,628,000. The balance of \$15,918,000 will be assigned for return from power revenues and returned through operation of the "Columbia Basin account", discussed below.

The deferred irrigation features of the Mountain Home project, which are not included in the preceding data and discussion, will provide for the irrigation of 192,000 acres of desert land. Associated with these irrigation features, there also will be an additional power installation of 60,000 kilowatts. The construction cost of these features is estimated at \$203,821,000.

Brief descriptions of each of these projects are included later as section VII of this report.

#### V. BASIN ACCOUNT

The committee held extensive hearings on the "Basin account" and related provisions, and has examined its relation to existing and proposed projects. In its essence, the "Basin account" is an accounting procedure. The accounting procedure will show balances which may be considered in connection with analysis of financial feasibility of projects, rate making, and project payout. It is not a revolving fund or a fund of any type. All revenues will continue to go into the Treasury as at present, and all funds will continue to be appropriated by the Congress as at present. Congressional control of funds will remain as it is at present.

Under the "Basin account" and related annual report, records will be kept for all power and irrigation projects on a region-wide basis. All power costs and all reimbursements to be received from power revenues are kept on a consolidated basis.

The "Basin account" will permit the maintenance of a uniform power rate throughout the Northwest at a lower level than would otherwise be possible. Under the "Basin account" the rate would approximate the average rate for all of the power projects in the basin, whether the generation facilities are constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation or by the Corps of Engineers. The committee recognizes that it would be possible, but undesirable, to have a uniform power rate without the "Basin account" only if that rate were set substantially at the level of the rate which would be applicable to the highest cost power project. Three choices are open to the committee. One is to have a heterogeneous collection of power rates, one rate for each project, even though the power would be marketed through one transmission system resulting in confusion and competition among Federal projects. The second choice is to establish a uniform rate at the level consistent with the highest-cost power project, an undesirable and unequitable procedure. The third alternative, which is recommended by the committee, is to establish uniform rates, as indicated, through the "Basin account."

The "Basin account" will continue and extend the long-established principle of assistance to irrigation developments from power revenues. It has the further advantage, by the pooling of costs and revenues, of permitting the evaluation of proposed irrigation projects upon their merit, and not upon the physical accident of whether or not a particular irrigation project may be related to a particular power project by geographic coincidence.

The amendment proposed by the committee is consistent with the draft proposed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with regard to the application of the interest component for the return of irrigation costs which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay, in that this existing feature of the Federal reclamation laws will be applied in the Pacific Northwest so long as it is contained in the law.

Evidence submitted during the hearings indicated that power rates in the Pacific Northwest will have to be raised somewhat in any event above those now prevailing for the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams. This is because of the fact that higher power-cost projects, a number of which are already authorized and under construction, are to be brought into the system, but their rates will be equated with the existing projects through the use of basin account.

The committee concludes, with some concern, that if the interest component on the power features does not continue to be available for financial assistance to irrigation projects, or if some alternative means of providing financial assistance to such projects is not provided, a still further raise in power rates for the entire Northwest will be neces-

sary. This is particularly true inasmuch as, in setting power rates, the Department of the Interior has pursued the policy enunciated by the Congress in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887), which provides that the Secretary of the Interior "shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles. \* \* \*." While the rates charged and to be charged in the Northwest will be sufficient to repay the costs allocated to power, plus interest over and above those costs, it has properly been the aim of the Department of the Interior, under these congressional instructions, to keep those rates as low as possible. Thus, there will be little, if any, net power revenues available over and above that which will be necessary to repay power costs plus interest. Hence, if the reclamation law were to be changed so that the interest component could no longer be utilized to assist irrigation, or unless some other form of financial assistance is provided, this second raise in power rates would become necessary.

The committee observes that the agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army dated April 11, 1949, provides that financial assistance to irrigation projects should come from power revenues and that such support should be furnished from all power revenue-producing projects in the Federal system in the Pacific Northwest. By terms of the same agreement, the Corps of Engineers further agreed that the Secretary of the Interior should be responsible for establishing and administering any basin account necessary to effect the pooling of financial assistance from power and for recommending to the Congress projects to be covered into the "Basin account."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised, and by further letter dated February 13, 1950, has confirmed, that it is the President's position, as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, that the Federal investment in all Federal power facilities, and the revenues therefrom, regardless of whether they are under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, or the Bonneville Power Administration, should be pooled by means of the "Basin account." The committee concurs in this recommendation, recognizing that the power system, regardless of who may build or operate any portion of it, consists of one system of dams, which will be interconnected by one system of transmission lines and coordinated to provide one uniform power rate.

The Congress will retain, under the amendment proposed by the committee, full authority to decide what further projects can or cannot receive financial assistance from the "Basin account," as participation in the "Basin account" can be accomplished only if the Congress specifically provides, by legislation, that any particular project shall receive such assistance.

Existing projects which have power features and the projects recommended in the amendment will come under the "Basin account" immediately, but additional projects would require a special act of Congress for that purpose.

The committee considered the possibility of limiting the application of the interest component for assistance in repaying costs beyond the ability of the water users to repay to Bureau of Reclamation power projects only. As previously indicated, this was not consistent with the recommendation of the President or the Secretary of the Interior. The committee found that such assistance would be sufficient only if the irrigation features of the Mountain Home project were not included and that, beyond these presently proposed projects, such limitation

would jeopardize the development of future projects, since it might require a general raise in the power rates in the entire Northwest in order to provide the necessary financial assistance to irrigation. This would not be desirable. Consideration was given to the fact that, if the rate of interest which is to be applied on the Federal power investment were to be lowered even so much as one-half of 1 percent, the interest component from Bureau of Reclamation power projects would not be sufficient to provide the necessary financial assistance to existing and presently proposed projects.

While several of these higher-cost projects are already under construction, their effect upon the power rates will not be left for some time. For this reason, the committee examined carefully into the need for establishment of the "Columbia Basin account" at this time. It considered and rejected the possibility of authorizing the 13 projects all as one project, and leaving for later consideration the question of the "Basin account." While the 13 projects, as a group, would have financial feasibility, this proposal offered no solution to similar problems encountered in eight other existing, single-purpose irrigation projects which require financial assistance from power revenues. Nor did it offer a means of providing pay-out within a reasonable period of time for the Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington. Nor did it provide a solution for an authorized project which, while it does have a small power facility directly related to it, does not have sufficient self-generated revenues to make it financially feasible. Nor does it provide a basis for contracting for the sale of power at uniform rates from power plants which are currently under construction and for which contracts are now being negotiated. Nor did this proposal provide for the incorporation into the program of future projects. The committee concludes, therefore, that the "Basin account" should be established at the present time.

Testimony was submitted to the effect that there is precedent for basin-wide accounting as proposed for the Pacific Northwest. The reclamation project in the Central Valley of California was authorized by the Congress as a financial unit and is thus operated. This present Congress has passed a law relating to the American River which brings the first of several Army projects into the Central Valley project (the Folsom Dam). The President has recommended the extension of this congressionally approved practice to cover the entire Central Valley for all multiple-purpose projects. Further, in adopting the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act, the Congress provided for the use of power revenues from Hoover Dam for the investigation and construction of other disassociated projects in the Colorado Basin.

Evidence presented to the committee comparing repayments by project beneficiaries in the West as compared with other areas further justifies the basin-account approach and indicates the equitable manner in which it would allow the people of the area to take credit for excess revenues which their projects put into the Treasury, and would permit them then to use those excess revenues as a credit against the costs of projects which they still propose to build. The account approach is equitable to the Nation as well in that it provides for adequate return of project costs to the Treasury, and, through development of the resources of the Northwest creates new markets for eastern goods, and new taxable wealth which, through income and other Federal taxes, helps support the Nation.

The reports on Columbia Basin account will provide the Congress with a continuing, annual record of the total reimbursable Federal investment in these water-resource projects in the Northwest, together with an annual record of the progress of the Northwest in returning that investment to the Treasury.

All power projects in all parts of the Northwest will contribute to the extent necessary, if at all, toward repayment of the costs of irrigation projects in the Northwest. Since the power plants and the existing and potential irrigation projects are distributed geographically throughout the Northwest, all parts of the Northwest will contribute to and receive credits from the "Basin account."

Since the entire development of these resources is dependent upon water, and since all parts of the basin contribute to those flows, especially the upstream areas, all parts of the Northwest should appropriately participate in the benefits from putting those waters to useful purposes.

Of special importance to the committee is the fact that the "Basin account" will not affect or alter the relationships between existing Federal, State, and local agencies.

#### *Effect on power operations and rate policies*

There are certain of the Pacific Northwest Federal power generating facilities which are now operated as separate units, and which may of necessity continue for a time to be so operated after enactment of this proposal. While this proposal does not require that the power from such units be marketed at the same low uniform rate applicable to the principal system, it is the intention of this proposed legislation to facilitate the interconnection of these units into an integrated region-wide power development wherever and to the extent that this is economically desirable both from the standpoint of good business management and of development of the resources of the region. Certainly so far as the larger Federal plants are concerned, which together will represent the bulk of the power generated in the area, there are very substantial economies to be derived from operation of these plants as a unified system rather than as separate and isolated units. In such integrated system such as proposed for this area the physical operation of the system as a unit is a necessity.

Operation of this Federal power system on a physically integrated basis means maximum production at lowest cost, maximum economy of water and energy, maximum revenues, and greater stability of power supply at lower cost for the public and private distributors whom it serves.

The physical integration of the whole system permits the application of a uniform power rate to the entire region, thus diffusing the benefits of low-cost power to the maximum number of people. All communities have equal opportunity to share in those benefits with no discrimination between those near to or distant from the generating plants. Such a practice is consistent with the principle that upstream areas should benefit equally with downstream areas. This policy tends to speed decentralization of industry and assure location at the best sites from the point of view of markets, raw materials, labor supply, transportation facilities, etc., regardless of location of generating plants. Historically, rate structures in the electric industry have moved from territorial differentials toward uniformity throughout the territory served.

Pooling of system obligations and revenues as contemplated in this amendment will permit rates to be established at a level which will pay off, within the period required by law, all costs of the power system, as well as irrigation costs beyond the repayment ability of the water users, in a manner which avoids arbitrary maintenance of high rates.

#### VII. BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

During the hearing the committee had available supplemental project reports which described the projects in detail, including engineering and economic justification, discussion of the physical plan of development, repayments by the water and power users, and other pertinent matters. Those docu-

ments were supplemental to the report of the Secretary of the Interior and since they were referred to on many occasions during the hearings, and further, since the proposed amendment relates to those particular documents, the committee has requested that they be printed as volume II of the Interior Department Report of the Columbia River Basin which is to be published as House Document No. 473.

The committee finds, upon examination, that the water resource projects which are recommended for authorization are fully justified.

The committee noted that in his letter of February 1, 1950, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget recommended the authorization of two-thirds of the power features of the Mountain Home project, but recommended that the irrigation features and the other one-third of the power features which are inextricably associated therewith be not authorized at this time. Objection to the authorization of the irrigation features of the Mountain Home project was without prejudice to its reconsideration after the report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission has been received. That report will deal with a number of major policies, including the maximum length of time for repayment of irrigation costs, the levels of subsidiary justifiable for irrigation projects, the source of such subsidies, and related considerations.

During its hearings, the committee requested the Bureau of Reclamation to present facts concerning the recommended program. So that it might compare the irrigation and related power features of the Mountain Home project, which represent a major portion of the total irrigation proposal originally contemplated, the committee requested as well, similar information in each case for the Mountain Home project. It is the view of the committee at this time that it would be inadvisable to separate these two related phases of this project. The committee recognizes that the cost per acre is relatively high, but by the same token the committee notes that the water users on this 192,000-acre project, which is for development of new lands, could also make relatively higher repayments per acre than would be possible from other projects with similar land use. After careful deliberation the committee concludes that the irrigation and related power features of the Mountain Home project should be authorized at this time on a deferred basis.

The amendment proposed by the committee would retain for the President and the Secretary of the Interior full opportunity to review and approve, or disapprove, development of the irrigation and related Garden Valley Reservoir power features of the Mountain Home project. This has been done by providing that no funds shall be expended on any features of the project except those which have already been approved by the President, until the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, has submitted to the Congress a supplemental report and finding of feasibility under the provisions of the reclamation laws to cover the irrigation and related power features. Such report can be reviewed by the President and the Secretary of the Interior in the light of the recommendations of his Water Resources Policy Commission.

Mr. LONG and Mr. CAIN addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall take only a few moments. I have an amendment at the desk relating to a proposed tidewater channel for the port of New Orleans. I know that the usual way to bring up such a project for consideration

is to have the Bureau of the Budget report on it, and for the report of the Bureau of the Budget, together with the report of the Corps of Engineers of the Army, to be sent to the Committee on Public Works, at which time the proposed project is to be studied by the committee, and we should have recommendations of the committee on such a project.

It is my impression that the committee plans to stand together in its opposition to any amendments which do not come within that category. I have no desire to have this project voted down merely because it has not been studied. However, I regret to say that, while the Army engineers reported the matter to the Bureau of the Budget May 15, 1948, almost 2 years later the Bureau of the Budget is still sitting on the matter, and refuses to say either "Yes" or "No" with reference to the project. As a result, the development of the port of New Orleans is being held up. Obviously, if the city of New Orleans is to have a tidewater terminal, which would have to be superior to the present access to that port, industries situated in the area and people who are developing the port of New Orleans, which is greatly congested, would wish to build their new docks and new facilities on the tidewater channel. However, we find that at this date the project is still being held up by the Bureau of the Budget.

I have discussed the matter with members of the committee, and they feel that the project should not be considered by the committee without a report from the Bureau of the Budget. If that is the present position of the committee, I can see no alternative except to press for a decision, one way or another, on the floor of the Senate. However, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if the matter can be considered in the next flood control bill when such a bill is considered by his committee. If it can be done in that way, I should prefer not to offer my amendment at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I answer the Senator from Louisiana by saying that, notwithstanding the fact that the chairman of the committee and the committee itself feel sympathetic, not only to the project offered by the Senator from Louisiana, but to many other projects, and possibly also to the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming, we feel that we have a duty to perform. We have had 17 days of hearings on the pending bill. We examined more than 150 witnesses. The printed hearings comprise 1,122 pages. The items which we have in the bill passed the test of examination, there are reports by the Army engineers and reports from the Bureau of the Budget. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that the Budget Bureau does cause delay. Probably if the Bureau of the Budget had reported to us on the items in which the Senator from Washington was interested, we could have given consideration to them. They expect a committee to take their word for it, after the committee has done its work.

I promise the Senator from Louisiana that just so soon as he has his bill ready

the committee will give it consideration, in due time. We shall be glad to hear witnesses, and we shall be glad to hear from the Bureau of the Budget and from the Army engineers. However, after we have worked so hard on this particular bill, we shall oppose—and I believe the committee will stick together in its opposition—any amendments on which the committee has held no hearings, has had no report from the Bureau of the Budget, or which we think is detrimental to the bill itself as it now stands.

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana fully realizes that a project of this magnitude should go through the usual process of study by the Army engineers. That has been done in this case. A favorable recommendation by the Army engineers has been submitted. I feel also that a recommendation should be made by the Bureau of the Budget. However, we find that in many cases the Committee on Public Works, after a thorough study has been made by it, has authorized a project even in spite of an adverse recommendation on the project by the Bureau of the Budget. In this particular situation, with regard to the proposed tidewater channel for the Port of New Orleans, we find that the Bureau of the Budget has been indefinitely sitting on the project, and by doing so it prevents consideration of the project. I would be satisfied if the Senator could assure me that at the time the committee takes up the general flood control and navigation bill, this project will be considered by the committee, even if the Bureau of the Budget continues to refuse to act on it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I pay my respects to a recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, but I am one of those Senators who believe that Congress legislates, not the Bureau of the Budget. As chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I assure the Senator that the project will be considered whether the Bureau of the Budget recommends it or not.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, with that assurance, I shall not press the amendment. I merely wanted the assurance, which the distinguished chairman of the committee has given me, that the Bureau of the Budget could not, in effect, veto a worthy project by simply refusing to act upon a recommendation of the Army engineers.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on that point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. When, in the normal course of legislation, will the next flood-control bill be considered?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New Mexico is unable to give an answer to the Senator from Utah. However, flood-control bills come up every once in a while.

Mr. WATKINS. About every 2 years?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That has been the record. The last one came up in 1948, in the Eightieth Congress, which was only 2 years ago. The one before that was 4 years ago. There was one in 1944, one in 1946, and another one in 1948.

#### INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION CONVENTION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive J, Eighty-first Congress, second session, the texts, as certified by the French Government, of the telegraph regulations—Paris Revision, 1949—annexed to the international telecommunication convention—Atlantic City, 1947—and the final protocol to those regulations, which were signed in the French language at Paris on August 5, 1949.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the convention; that the protocol, together with the President's message of transmittal, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed, and the President's message, together with the convention, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message will be printed in the Record. The Chair hears no objection.

The President's message is as follows:

#### To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the texts, as certified by the French Government, of the telegraph regulations (Paris Revision, 1949) annexed to the international telecommunication convention (Atlantic City, 1947), and the final protocol to those regulations, which were signed in the French language at Paris on August 5, 1949, such ratification to be made subject, however, to certain reservations and declarations as set forth and explained in the report which the Secretary of State has addressed to me in regard to this matter.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the telegraph regulations and final protocol, together with the volumes referred to in that report.

In the event that the Senate advises and consents to ratification of the telegraph regulations and final protocol, it is urged that this be done with the understanding that such ratification will be subject to the reservations and declarations as set forth in the report by the Secretary of State.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 10, 1950.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) volume (certified) containing French texts of telegraph regulations (Paris Revision, 1949), final protocol, and related resolutions and opinions; (3) volume containing the texts in English.)

#### IMPORTS FROM LOW-PAID LABOR COUNTRIES

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may insert some material in the Record?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MALONE. There recently appeared evidence that the ECA was promoting further imports into the United States of America from the low-living-standard and slave-labor countries, and I wish to quote briefly from a statement which I made early in 1949, when the Senate was debating the extension of the ECA. I then referred to an article written by Mr. Hoffman, and which appeared in the April 1949 issue of the American magazine, from which I read in part as follows:

Another way Europeans can increase their sales to us is by letting us see exactly what they do offer. Perhaps a fair train touring the country with displays of European merchandise and taking orders from wholesalers and department stores would help.

Mr. President, at that time I commented on that quotation, and said:

Mr. President, I have no doubt that it would help greatly to promote sales of European goods produced by cheap labor—to have a fair train financed by ECA funds touring the country—and I am very glad to know that Mr. Hoffman is undertaking to bring that about.

Subsequently, Mr. Hoffman denied that he had any idea of financing such an enterprise. But I now call the attention of the Senate to the issue of the Journal of Commerce of New York of today, Monday, April 10, in which an article appears from which I read:

**ECA SETS UP UNIT TO PUSH IMPORTS—HOFFMAN MINIMIZES EFFECT OF SUCH GOODS ON UNITED STATES ECONOMY**

The article reads in part:

Establishment of an international trade promotion division to help Marshall-plan nations earn more dollars by exporting more to the United States, was announced over the week end by the Economic Cooperation Administration.

In announcing the new unit, the aid agency declared Europeans must take far more vigorous steps to sell the United States market. This country, ECA continued, must refrain from blocking those efforts by means of tariff, customs procedure and similar barriers.

"This country" means the United States of America. Further along in the article it is said:

As a major activity in the foreign liaison field, ECA will send abroad a number of trade promotion experts to work closely with regular commercial attachés now in the field, but who will have the sole function of assisting in stimulating European exports to the United States. It will also maintain close contact with the Washington embassies and legations on all questions relating to imports, and advise various United States organizations on their relations with the United Kingdom's dollar export board and other similar bodies.

The article further says:

In the trade promotion field, the new division will concern itself with the elimination of trade barriers and with the development of plans to bring together the European seller and the American buyer.

The new ECA unit will also be concerned with international trade fairs—

I call attention particularly to the words "international trade fairs"—special exhibits of foreign merchandise, foreign trade zones, department store merchandising of imported goods, import credit facilities, and general consultation.

Mr. President, I want to draw the Senate's attention further to a statement which I also made early in 1949, during the course of the ECA debate on the extension of that organization. I quoted first from Mr. Cripps, as set forth in a London dispatch of April 6:

Sir Stafford Cripps told the House of Commons today that Britain's ability to earn enough dollars to exist was dependent on an enlightened policy of importation by the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Meaning the United States of America, Mr. President. My comment on that statement, at that moment, Mr. President, was as follows:

This statement of Sir Stafford Cripps leads directly to the consideration by this body of the second step of the three-part free trade program—the 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—

The Trade Agreements Act was not before the Senate, as Members of the Senate will remember, until September, at which time it was debated at some length. I continue to read from my statement made at that time:

The 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—under which the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade principle upon the theory that the more they divide our markets with the countries of the world, the less their trade-balance deficits will be—then, Mr. President, the next rivet is to be driven into the coffin of jobless men—the International Trade Organization.

The International Trade Organization, Mr. President, is right at this moment being considered in one of the committees of the Senate. I draw the attention again of Members of the Senate to the fact that Mr. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State, said last year at the time the matter of the extension of the ECA for another year was being debated, in March 1949, that the three parts of this free trade set-up are each necessary and dependent upon the other. What were those three parts, Mr. President? This is what Mr. Thorp said they were. First, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which turned over to the executive—State Department—the constitutional responsibility of the United States Congress of regulating the national economy through the regulation of imports; the Congress gave them the authority to lower tariffs and import fees 75 percent after perfunctory hearings—practically free trade.

Second, that the ECA, formerly known as the Marshall plan, would make up the trade deficits of Europe each year in cash and go on until such time as the markets of this Nation could be divided, so that it would theoretically wipe out those deficits.

Third, the setting up of the International Trade Organization, which I have already explained, which simply means an organization of 58 nations, 57 foreign nations and the United States, the United States having one vote the same as Siam has; and to that organization we would assign all our rights to fix the tariffs and import fees for its member nations.

And last, but not least, Mr. President, to fix the quotas of production of its member nations.

Mr. President, I submit that would result in the beginning of the end of the standard of living of the United States of America as we know it. In other words, that would result in the complete removal of the floor under wages and investments and sacrifice the workingmen and investors of this Nation on the altar of one economic world.

This program, coupled with the relatively recent statement of the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, that we must search for more products to import into the United States from Europe.

That, Mr. President, marks the abandonment of the workingmen and investors of the United States of America.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President—

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be pleased to yield if I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Ferguson	McKellar
Cain	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Malone
Chavez	Holland	Morse
Connally	Kerr	Mundt
Cordon	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Darby	Langer	Schoeppel
Donnell	Lehman	Stennis
Douglas	McClellan	Watkins

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). A quorum is not present.

The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. BUTLER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. WHERRY answered to their names, when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FEAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEM, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. O'CONNOR, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WITHERS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CRITICISM OF TIME MAGAZINE— PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, and as a citizen who lives in the Pacific Northwest, looks forward to an opportunity in the next several days to address himself to the pending business, but for some few minutes during the remainder of this afternoon he will not speak to the pending business.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes to speak seriously about a humorous subject, humorously about a serious subject, and then just seriously about a matter which is important to each of us and to the Nation as well. He thinks that the question, Who is our critic? to which he will address himself will provoke curiosity and surprise in other Senators and provide citizen readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with information which has not previously been brought to their attention.

When I was spending a lazy and happy evening at home some several weeks ago, my young son, Buzzy, aged 12, looked up from something he was reading and said: "Dad, what does expendable mean?" In response I told Buzzy that it was my understanding that the word "expendable" had been used in World War I to cover material and equipment only. It meant that the military forces recognized that in order to win a campaign or battle it would be necessary to lose and consume and destroy both material and equipment. So far as I knew, the word "expendable" was not employed to cover personnel until World War II. Probably the word benefited from a popular usage after William Allen White, Jr., wrote his splendid story about torpedo boats and their crews, *They Were Expendable*. I asked Buzzy to bring me his copy of Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, which was last published in 1945, so that together we might explore the meaning

of the word. Webster's dictionary said that expendable meant "capable of being expended; normally used up or consumed in service; hence, left in the path of the enemy and sacrificed, according to plan, in order to gain time, especially in a delaying action. Item of equipment, armament, or the like, unit or member of personnel, treated as expendable."

Buzzy seemed to understand Webster's definition of expendable, but I noticed that he frowned as he went back to his reading on the other side of the room. A few minutes later he came back to say, "Dad, I can't jibe Mr. Webster's definition with the way in which Time magazine uses the word about you in the issue that came today." He passed it over, and after a hasty look I just about jumped out of my chair. On page 18 of the issue of March 20, 1950, I found my picture and that of seven of my colleagues. There was a thumbnail sketch of each of us, none of which was designed to be either objectively accurate or complimentary, because the heading at the top of the page was "The Senate's most expendable."

I saw what Buzzy meant. How could Time use a complimentary word, "expendable," in a completely derogatory way? Aside from being indignant and even hurt in a purely human fashion, I became extremely curious in a great hurry. Here was a criticism it was necessary for me to understand and trace to its source, because a little guy who is pretty fond of his dad wanted to know why Time magazine thought his father should be liquidated from the United States Senate. I told him I did not know, but that I would make it my business to find out. I am now ready to report to my son, who is entitled to know the facts, and I intend to make this report openly and in my own name.

One night last week I attended the annual Press Club dinner. It was a splendid evening, made so, in part, by the talents of Morgan Beatty who acted as toastmaster. He mentioned in passing that the Congress represented the last true stronghold of free and competitive enterprise because its Members had to fight and to compete for both excellence and survival. He complimented his guests by referring to them as being responsible men, each responsible to himself as an individual and responsible likewise to the district or State which he represented.

We were privileged that night to hear from two great Americans, both Democrats, the Vice President of the United States, Mr. BARKLEY, and the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN. They were the only speakers, and no person present had reason to think there should have been more. Between Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. RAYBURN they have spent 74 years in the Congress of the United States. This permitted them to emphasize the greatness and the promise of the American way of life as few men could. They had fun with each other and with the audience, but each, in closing, spoke seriously of his hopes for our tomorrows.

Mr. BARKLEY gave his interpretation of the virtues of America. In conclud-

ing his brief observations, he pointed out that America was vigorous, dynamic, and vital because men were not only permitted but encouraged to criticize each other. The Vice President reminded us all that constructive criticism, offered by responsible and qualified critics, is good for everybody. Out of such criticism, he said, come growth, progress, and development. Along with everyone else, I applauded and approved of what the Vice President said.

Constructive criticism, Mr. President, even though it be barbed and pointed, is an admirable thing. Prejudiced criticism which is offered by anonymous or nameless persons is an evil thing and ought to be crushed with brutal and ruthless means whenever that is possible.

Ten of the happiest and most worthwhile years of my own life have been spent in public service. Out of that experience I have learned many things. From these years I have gained many friends and many enemies, and I love and enjoy them both, though for different reasons. One lesson I have learned, and one lesson by which I am guided, is to listen to anybody who has a right to speak on any subject. This lesson has taught me to do business freely and gladly with any man I can trust, be he either a friend or an enemy. This lesson has taught me to avoid any relationship of any kind with any man whose skin is white but whose heart and soul are those of a coward. This kind of a lesson has enabled me pretty generally to live at peace and in contentment with myself, and with others.

I am offering these observations this afternoon not alone for my son Buzzy, but in the name of every other person in American public life everywhere, and because a number of my associates in the Senate have taken a contrary view from that of Time magazine in writing to constituents of mine throughout the State of Washington. My appreciation for these unsolicited letters is very keen and deep seated. If it were not for Buzzy and for my colleagues I would not bother to attempt to ridicule, condemn, and destroy a portion of the reputation which Time magazine has for being fair, objective, impartial, and accurate.

Time magazine is a powerful and influential American news medium. Its total paid-up circulation as of December 31, 1949, was 1,545,000. Time magazine is circulated and read in every one of our American States and Territories. Time magazine is sent across the seas in order to bring the United States home to those who serve its many purposes throughout the world and to provide citizens of foreign lands with a picture of what America really is. It is no small undertaking to attempt to convince others that Time magazine possesses a reputation which it does not deserve. Maybe David felt like this when he took off on Goliath.

After my first conversation with Buzzy I promptly took the first obvious step. I wrote a personal letter to Mr. Henry R. Luce, who is described in the masthead of Time magazine as being the editor in

chief. The date of this letter was March 16, 1950, and I wish to read it now:

MARCH 16, 1950.

Mr. HENRY R. LUCE,  
Editor in Chief, *Time Magazine*,  
Chicago, Ill.

MY DEAR MR. LUCE: Because I thoroughly respect and enjoy my work I am not unduly disturbed by the attached comment about me which appeared in your issue of March 20. As an individual I consider the observations to be both inaccurate and unfair, but as a Senator I will not question the right of your staff writer to speak as he likes.

I want to think, however, that you will permit me to become acquainted with the author of the comment. Perhaps he or she will be the one who authored a comparable reference several weeks ago. Members of your staff call me from time to time about public questions and I try to respond with fairness and frankness. All of them ought to treat me in the same way. Though I have no intention of complaining openly about anything which is written, common courtesy and decency dictate that I ought to know who my critics are. This would enable me to argue for my positions and would maintain a healthy and reasonable relationship between your splendid magazine and my office.

I will do business gladly with anyone who criticizes me openly, but I doubt that you would want me to do business with nameless persons who snipe from the rear, and I wouldn't do it anyway.

With kind personal regards, I am,  
Very sincerely,

HARRY P. CAIN.

Mr. President, Mr. Luce has not as yet answered this letter. I doubt if he will. I wonder why he does not. It seems curious to me that Mr. Luce does not acknowledge a reasonable letter from a Member of the United States Senate. I wonder why he ignores a reasonable request for information.

Small wonder that I am speaking not only for myself, as the junior Senator from Washington, but for the inalienable right to courtesy and decent treatment which belongs to every Member of this great body, regardless of the side of the aisle on which he sits. I am beginning to wonder who Mr. Henry R. Luce is. As I wonder, I am reminded that Whittaker Chambers was until recently a staff member for *Time Magazine*. As I wonder, I am thinking about the recent trial of Alger Hiss, who was convicted of perjury partly on the strength of the testimony offered by Whittaker Chambers, a long-time member of the Communist Party, and of the part that Mrs. Hiss played in that trial. No perjury charges have yet been made against her, but her testimony was identical in many instances with that offered in his defense by Alger Hiss. Mrs. Alger Hiss has been Henry Luce's personal editorial assistant. She was formerly his office manager. She was part and parcel of *Time Magazine*. I am thinking of all these curious and devious relationships when I wonder why Henry Luce sees fit to disregard a request made by a responsible Member of the greatest body, to my mind, on this globe, the United States Senate.

Under date of March 24, 1950, I received a letter from T. S. Matthews, editor of *Time Magazine*. This letter is

short and interesting. It reads as follows:

TIME, THE WEEKLY NEWSMAGAZINE,  
March 24, 1950.  
The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN,  
*The United States Senate*,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Your letter of March 16 to Mr. Luce has come to me, rather than to him, since I am now editor of *Time*. As such, I am much more immediately responsible than he is for whatever appears in *Time*.

Like almost everything we publish, the article you refer to was the joint work of many hands; in this case, our Washington bureau and our New York editorial staff. They are not nameless persons. Their names are listed in the magazine's masthead, on page 17 of the current issue.

Yours sincerely,

T. S. MATTHEWS,  
Editor.

The letter made little sense to me. Mr. Matthews tells me that he wrote because he is the editor of *Time Magazine*. Why he should be more responsible for the policy conduct of that magazine than is the editor in chief, Mr. Henry Luce, I do not know. I had thought that the editor in chief was the proper person from whom to request information.

Mr. Matthews tells us all that almost all of the comments which appear in *Time* are the joint work of many hands. He suggests that it took his Washington bureau and New York editorial offices to compose page 18 of the *Time* issue of March 20. If this be true I must conclude that the personnel of *Time Magazine* is overpaid and overstaffed.

Mr. Matthews tells me that his Washington bureau and New York editorial staff does not consist of nameless persons because they are listed in the magazine's masthead. I am willing to admit that they are listed, but from that listing there is no way of knowing who is assigned to what capacity, or who is charged with doing what to whom. I doubt if many of my colleagues have ever thought to look at the masthead. Because, in the interest of accuracy, it ought to be carried as a part of my remarks I ask unanimous consent that it be printed, from top to bottom, at this point.

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

TIME, THE WEEKLY NEWS MAGAZINE  
Editor in chief: Henry R. Luce.  
President: Roy E. Larsen.  
Editorial director: John Shaw Billings.  
Editor: T. S. Matthews.  
Managing editor: Roy Alexander.  
Assistant managing editor: Dana Tasker.  
Senior editors: Robert W. Boyd, Jr., Otto Fuerbringer, Thomas Griffith, Hillis Mills, Duncan Norton-Taylor, Content Peckham, Joseph Purtell, John Tibby, Max Wags.  
Associate editors: Edward O. Carr, Max Gissen, Frederick Gruin, Henry Anatole Grunwald, Louis Kronenberger, Jonathan Norton Leonard, Paul O'Neil, Margaret Quimby, Walter Stockly, John Walker, Samuel G. Welles.  
Contributing editors: Douglas Auchincloss, Harriet Bachman, A. T. Baker, Louis Banks, Marvin Barrett, Bruce Barton, Jr., Marshall Berger, Lester Bernstein, Earl Burton, Gilbert Cant, William T. Carnahan, Edwin Copps, Henry Bradford Darrach, Jr., Nigel Dennis,

Allan B. Ecker, Peter Ehlers, Alexander Eliot, Osborn Elliott, Dennis S. Feldman, John Scott Fones, Barker T. Hartshorn, Roger S. Hewlett, Robert Manning, Dwight Martin, Peter Mathews, John T. McCullough, William F. McHale, Robert McLaughlin, Ruth Mehrtens, William Miller, Marylois Purdy, Francis Ronalds, Jr., Carl Solberg, Chandler B. Thomas.

Editorial researchers: Marianna Albert, Helga Boedtker, Dorothea Bourne, Charlotte Brandis, Ruth Brine, Elizabeth Budelman, Marjorie Burns, Peggy Bushong, Nancy McD, Chase, Theresa Ann Cohen, Terry Colman, Estelle Dembeck, Anne B. Denny, Terry Drucker, Blanche Finn, Rosemary L. Frank, Mary Elizabeth Fremd, Judith Friedberg, Manon Gaulin, Marion Jean Gibson, Muriel Hall, Paula Hoffman, Marcia Houston, Mary Elizabeth Johnston, Isabella Kohn, Vera Kovarsky, E. Eleanore Larsen, Essie Lee, Anne Lopatin, Helen Newlin, Amelia North, Carolyn L. Pfeiffer, Elizabeth Poe, Dorothy Slavin Potts, Jacqueline Schiltz, Jane Darby Scholl, Ruth Silva, Mary L. Snow, Jane E. Sontheimer, Frances Stevenson, Jean Sulzberger, Yi Ying Sung, Eleanor Tatum, Lucy Thomas, Margaret Louise Thompson, Martha L. Turner, Mary Vanaman, Ada Van Gelder, Helen K. Zimmerman.

United States and Canadian News Service: Robert T. Elson (chief of correspondents), Donald Bermingham, Willard C. Rappleye, Jr., Jean Snow.

Bureaus—Washington: James Shepley, Edward F. Jones, John Beal, George B. Bookman, Windsor P. Booth, Sanford Lee Cooper, Jerry Hannifin, Frank McNaughton, Alyce Moran, Richard Oulahan, Jr., Robert Sherrod, Anatole Visson, Chicago; Hugh Moffett, Ben Williamson, James R. Conant, Margo Parish, Lewis Spence, Gordon Pushie; Los Angeles: Fritz Goodwin, Florence McNeil, James Murray, Edwin Rees; Detroit: Fred Collins; Atlanta: William Howland; Boston: Jeff Wylie; Dallas: William Johnson; Denver: Barron B. Beshor; San Francisco: Martin O'Neill, Serrell Hillman; New York: James Bell; Seattle: James L. McConaughy, Jr.; Ottawa: John M. Mecklin, Grace Brynolson; Montreal: Stuart Keate.

Foreign news service: Manfred Gottfried (chief of correspondents), Eleanor Welch, Donald Burke.

Bureaus—London: Eric Gibbs, Thomas A. Dozier, Honor Balfour, Cranston Jones, Clara Applegate, Cynthia Thompson. Paris: Andre Laguerre, John Boyle, John Stanton, Fred Klein, Frank White. Berlin: Enno Hobbing, Will Lang, David Richardson. Rome: George E. Jones, John Luter, William Rospigliosi. Athens: Mary Barber. Bombay, Robert Lubar. Hong Kong: Robert Doyle, Wilson Fielder. Tokyo: Carl Mydans, Frank Gibney, Shelley Mydans. Buenos Aires: Robert Neville. Rio de Janeiro: William White, Connie Burwell White. Mexico City: Robert Spiers Benjamin. Central America: William H. Forbis.

Publisher: James A. Linen.  
Advertising director: H. H. S. Phillips, Jr.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in respectful language I asked Mr. Luce if he would provide me with the name of the author of the thumbnail sketch about me and seven other Senators as those sketches appeared in the issue of March 20. This request, which was unanswered, was forwarded to Mr. Matthews and he thought it proper to ignore the request. In my letter to Mr. Luce I said that I wanted to be given an opportunity to argue the merits of my Senate positions with the author. Was this, I ask the Senate, an unreasonable request or desire? I think that each of my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, will consider it

to have been reasonable and would expect it to have been satisfied had my colleagues, rather than I, had occasion to write to the editor in chief of Time magazine.

I wonder if Mr. Matthews, the editor of Time magazine, thought it would be difficult for me to uncover the author who would obviously remain unnamed and anonymous until I found out who he was. I think it likely that few, if any, of my colleagues are actually aware of the name of the person who is primarily charged with writing about the Senate of the United States for Time magazine, and I am absolutely certain that I am the only Member of this body who is reasonably familiar with the author's background and attainments. In the last week or two some 10 or 12 of my colleagues have asked me if I knew the name of the author, and I merely grinned in reply and suggested that in due course I would talk about the name and what it stands for.

Mr. President, I have never met Mr. Matthews, the editor of Time magazine. His letter to me constituted the only contact I have had with that individual. I will not state that he is a dummy, as his letter implies, but I will point out that he failed to recognize a legitimate request for an answer to the two questions I submitted to Mr. Luce in my letter of March 16. I wanted to be advised of the name of the author of the thumbnail sketches, and I inquired if that author might have been the one who made an uncomplimentary reference to the junior Senator from Washington which appeared in the Time issue of October 24, 1949. In writing to me Mr. Matthews wasted both his time and mine, because his letter, in response to my request, was completely unintelligible. In due time I may have sound reason to conclude that Mr. Matthews, the editor of Time magazine, is a dunce, but for the moment I am willing to let his letter to me speak for itself.

Under a column titled "The Congress" in the Time issue of October 24 there appeared, in part, the following references to me and to the Senate:

**CONGRESS TRUDGED TOWARD ADJOURNMENT**

Up for debate was the liberalized displaced-persons bill, which leaders in both parties were pledged to support. In a final delaying tactic, McCARRAN had departed for Europe for further investigation of the DP situation. But McCARRAN's allies carried on. For nearly 6 hours, Washington's garrulous lightweight, HARRY P. CAIN, held the floor with a low-grade filibuster. It was a shabby show. But at a time when Senators were itching to shut up and go home, the talk-down worked. At the week's end, by a vote of 36 to 30, the Senate sent the bill back to the Judiciary Committee. Nineteen Republicans joined 17 Democrats (mostly from the South) to put off the bill until next year.

Mr. President, this magazine never overlooks an opportunity really to give southerners the business, and I, as one whose blood originally was that of the South, will speak for all southerners, as well as for the Senators living above the Mason and Dixon's line, as they sit on this side of the aisle in the United States Senate.

When I first saw this column I did not like it, because I thought the refer-

ences were unfair. It had been my considered view that no harm would come to anybody if the bill were returned to the Committee on the Judiciary to await the return from Europe of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who had gone abroad by unanimous consent of the Senate. It was a fact then and remains a fact today that we are not bringing displaced persons to this country as rapidly as their admission was authorized by the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. I rather took for granted that most Americans who believed in fair play would support the action which returned the bill to the committee. Sixty-six Senators voted on my motion to recommit the bill, and 36 of these gentlemen voted in favor of the motion. No one forced 66 Senators to vote either in favor of or in opposition to the motion. These Senators stayed on the job because they thought it was their duty to do so. They listened to the debate, which some spineless timebrat—I think it is about time, Mr. President, that we on the floor of this body start making up names, and that is the best one I can think of at the moment, a "spineless Timebrat"—"T-i-m-e-b-r-a-t."

I repeat, Senators listened to the debate which some spineless "Timebrat" characterized as being a filibuster, and each Senator voted as he thought proper.

It is important to no one but myself, Mr. President, but I canceled a very attractive invitation to study housing policies, programs, and operations in Europe in order that I might remain on the floor of this Senate and do what I thought was good for the people of this country.

I said nothing to anybody about the article in the October 24 issue of Time magazine. I hardly thought about it twice. I never thought about it again until some "Timebrat" called the junior Senator from Washington an expendable, and employed in doing so a phrase which had appeared in the October 24 issue. That is why I wondered recently if the two articles were written by the same individual, and then it was that I determined to find out if this was so.

Getting no help from Mr. Luce or Mr. Matthews, as I sought to do in a courteous and proper way, I turned to my own resources. Any man coming from the West is inclined to do that. If he cannot get help from someone else, he is going to help himself if it is humanly possible.

I had no trouble in uncovering the author. He turned out to be a fellow who is, as every man ought to be, rather proud of his handiwork. He said to a member of my staff that he was completely responsible for writing about the eight Senators whom he called expendable and that he did so as a result of his mature and considered thought. He said that he thought HARRY CAIN was a nice and pleasant sort of guy in a personal way and that he, the author, would be pleased to discuss his opinions with the junior Senator from Washington should the latter find it convenient to pay the author a visit in his home some day.

Well, Mr. President, to go on with the story, this rather unusual invitation started to stimulate my sense of humor. I decided to accept the invitation but not in the way which had been intended by the author. I wrote him a nice and cheerful letter. I thought about the words of that letter. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a part of my remarks at this point and I shall then read a portion of the letter for my own enjoyment and because it will provide some information for my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

MARCH 25, 1950.

Mr. FRANK McNAUGHTON,

*Time Magazine, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR FRANK: Though I did not personally enjoy I did read with thoughtful interest your recent evaluation comment about me and other Senators in Time. It seems to me that you wrote out of a shallow prejudice which is not supported by any facts but I have neither time nor inclination to quarrel with your right to say what you like.

I want to think that you will come along for a visit with me sometime next week. I have in mind drawing your authorship to the attention of the Senate and I want to be completely certain of my facts. My intention is to advise my colleagues of what you have been and of who you really are in order that they may judge for themselves your capacity, judgment, and background as an anonymous critic. My personal and casual relationship with you has always been pleasant enough and I shall want to be concretely fair in presenting your record and attainments for others to read and think about. My chief concern is to see that you get proper credit as a real person and this can best be done with some help from you.

With kind personal regards, I am,  
Most cordially,

HARRY P. CAIN.

Mr. CAIN. The portion of the letter I shall read is as follows:

I have in mind drawing your authorship to the attention of the Senate and I want to be completely certain of my facts. My intention is to advise my colleagues of what you have been and of who you really are in order that they may judge for themselves your capacity, judgment, and background as an anonymous critic. My personal and casual relationship with you has always been pleasant enough and I shall want to be concretely fair in presenting your record and attainments for other to read and think about. My chief concern is to see that you get proper credit as a real person and this can best be done with some help from you.

With kind personal regards, I am.

This letter was written on March 25 and 3 days later I received a friendly letter in reply. Senators will enjoy that portion in which the author provides all of us with some illuminating information about himself and his background. That is what he said in part:

I intend to come by and see you sometime this week at the earliest opportunity. However, since you want to be able to advise the Senate who and what I am, here are some facts which you could easily ascertain by asking any one of hundreds of newspapermen I have known in the city of Washington over the past 15 years.

I think that sentence about hundreds of newspapermen and the fact that he has been living here for 15 years is a

sentence he will in the future not put in a letter to somebody else who seeks information about who he is.

I was born and raised on a Missouri farm—

He wants to get down to bedrock right off the bat—

I am 43. I attended the University of Missouri as a journalism student. My record there speaks for itself. As a boy, at the age of 16, I ran a butcher shop. For 3 years before going to the university I ran a general store and worked in a bank. My record there speaks for itself. I worked as a ranch hand in Wyoming and a carpenter in Colorado. After I left the university, I was employed successively on newspapers at Muskogee, Okla., Casper, Wyo., Nebraska City, Nebr., and Monroe, La., as a reporter and deskman; thereafter I was with the United Press for 9 years in New Orleans, Oklahoma City, and Washington.

In my career, as far as I can remember, I have joined only one organization, which may be of interest to you—

Listen to this, Senators. It is a complimentary reference, but it is an extremely meaningless and restricted field of enterprise for a big-leaguer to be a part of—

that was the Parent-Teachers' Association in Takoma Park, Md., of which I had the honor of serving as president.

My career is an open book; and if you can't get the additional information you want from my colleagues, I'll be glad to supply you with whatever I can.

My personal relationship with you—

We are having quite a lot of fun in writing to each other pleasantly so far, but that will soon be terminated—

has always been pleasant and I know it will continue to be so. I never let my personal inclinations intrude themselves in the slightest into my writings, and I shall not do so in the future.

After puzzling over the lack of real information which this letter possessed I hurried off a note to the author which said this:

Your letter of yesterday, which came but a few minutes ago, has pleased and tickled me. The information it contained was obviously quite good but not nearly as broad as that which I need. I have asked Burgess to secure from you the answers to 15 direct and easy questions. Some of the hundreds of newspaper men you mentioned as knowing you here in Washington haven't the foggiest idea what the correct answers actually are. I really want to know who you are and with your continuing help I certainly shall.

Now, Mr. President, while we are waiting for the author to visit with me in my office I want to make a few observations about Time magazine in general, because they are of terrific importance to Congress.

My first observation is to recognize the relationship which presently exists between the Economic Cooperation Administration and Time magazine, for this relationship is important and we ought to think about it. As every Senator knows and as every American ought to know the ECA was authorized by Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, chapter 169, second session, to make, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator, guaranties of investments in enterprises producing or distributing information media. The law authorized \$10,000,000 for this purpose and provided

a termination date not later than 14 years from the date of enactment of the act. Time magazine has taken advantage of this guaranty provision as no other American magazine has.

We had better make up our collective minds that Time magazine is deserving of what amounts to a subsidy, because without it they obviously would not sell a single solitary subscription in Germany, for example. Time magazine had better be deserving of a continuing help by Congress, or we ought to have manhood enough to stand up and take away from them what they have been unreasonably benefiting from so far. As of December 31, 1949, Time magazine has had its subscription investment guaranteed in west Germany, the Netherlands, Austria, and Norway—in what amount do Senators think? In the sum of three hundred and forty-three thousand eight hundred American dollars. No other American periodical comes within \$100,000 of this figure. What is presently important, because all of us as Members of the Senate will be required to vote on it, is that they have obligations pending now before Mr. Paul Hoffman, the ECA Administrator, or his proper agent, in the sum of \$248,500 for the future.

Mr. President, I have not been in opposition to the informational media guaranty section of Public Law 472. I voted for that law. I hope to be able to vote for it again. I thought there was sufficient reason to provide a guaranty of currency convertibility so that Europeans might become better informed of what is being attempted by America to restore sanity and peace to the face of the earth. I am for any reasonable procedure which will provide Europe with a truly objective and unbiased picture of America. With reference to Time magazine, I am now convinced that it is abusing—we hope it will stop doing so—and has abused the confidence placed in it by the ECA and by the Congress, of which we are all Members. I believe I can establish this simple statement of simple fact.

The 1949 ECA report on Recovery Progress and United States Aid devotes its chapter I to the subject of guaranties. In part this chapter points out:

The Congress, recognizing that a flow of private capital from the United States to the participating countries of Europe would help the dollar position of these countries and accelerate economic recovery by adding to their productive capacity, undertook in the Economic Cooperation Act to encourage new American investments by authorizing the ECA to guarantee convertibility of the proceeds of such investments. Section 111B3 of the act authorizes the guaranty of the convertibility of certain investments, including enterprises producing and distributing informational media. \* \* \* Applications for informational media guaranty are considered in the light of the legislative intent to help spread a true understanding of American institutions and of democracy in Europe. The legislative history of the ECA reveals that the Congress had in mind both giving to readers in Europe reliable news and informed comment on world affairs and keeping them informed about the American way of life. The types of information in the various media which are believed best designed to achieve the legislative objective include: Accurate and objective reports and

discussions which will inform the people of Europe of current news developments, thinking, and comment in the United States on subjects of world concern—the ERP itself, American foreign and domestic policy, economics, politics, and the like; and information of a general nature which will present to Europeans a faithful and well-rounded picture of American life.

The question here, Mr. President, is very clear. If Time magazine is giving to Europeans a faithful and well-rounded picture of American life, if its observations are accurately and objectively written, then Time magazine in my opinion ought to continue to benefit from a convertibility guaranty which is obviously not made available to many a deserving American private business.

Let us get it through our heads, that we are—perhaps some of us because of fear—providing a subsidy for a news medium which on occasions has been diabolically malicious and unreasonable, when we turn down one application after another from a legitimate, hard-working American business concern.

If on the other hand it can be established that Time magazine reporting is neither accurate, well-rounded, nor objective then this magazine, or any other magazine which acts in like fashion, ought to have its outstanding contract or agreement with ECA cancelled promptly and completely. I will provide the Senate with some information from which each individual Senator can draw his own conclusions concerning whether Time magazine is further deserving of any assistance from the Congress and from the ECA.

In its issue of April 3, Time magazine, because time does march on rapidly, devotes page 20 to a listing of those Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, whom it refers to as being the Senate's most valuable 10. I agree with Time magazine that some of these 10 individuals are among the more distinguished men who live today. I like and enjoy working with all of them. If they take Time's evaluation seriously I am very willing to be enthusiastic for their sakes. I would, however, urge them not to get too excited about their sudden elevation to the pinnacle of Time's list of successful men as I would urge the expendables not to be unduly worried about their evaluation by Time which was in reverse.

For the reason that the example is a conspicuous one and because I am trying to determine what Time magazine is trying to do not only to me but to this country, I shall refer to only two who are included in Time's Senate list of the best 10.

I hold the majority leader the Senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] in high regard as a pretty good friend. I consider him to be a man of capacity and force. He is presently engaged in a tough struggle for re-election and whatever help I can give in that campaign will go to his Republican opponent, Mr. Everett Dirksen. Good as I think the senior Senator from Illinois is, I think that Everett Dirksen is better. If Time magazine is trying to re-elect the Senator from Illinois, the junior Senator from Washington will try to defeat him.

But one thing I will not do, Mr. President, is to say one thing to the face of the Senator from Illinois and another thing to his back. In a quaint sort of way Time magazine tells the people to believe two things about him. I think Time magazine is wrong in both its pointed evaluations.

The second evaluation was made in the issue of April 3, when Time magazine put the senior Senator from Illinois—and I have no criticism of that—among the first 10 Senators, as Time magazine sees them. I wish to read this evaluation to refresh the memory of Senators; it is a good one:

SCOTT LUCAS, Democrat from Illinois, 58, majority leader. At first irascible, impatient, and ineffective, he has learned how to work with his colleagues, to accept the slowness of Senate processes, and to keep his ulcers from acting up.

Bear in mind parenthetically, Mr. President, that it is by such descriptions that Europe is getting to know us in America. [Laughter.]

I read further:

In White House conferences, he gives President Truman an honest count, even when it is painful. He fought gallantly for the civil-rights program, beat off crippling amendments aimed at ECA, even went to a Republican caucus to plead for a liberalized DP bill. Not brilliant, he is a slogging, dogged fighter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one moment, in reference to the matter he has been discussing? I wish to refer to the last phrase the Senator has read.

Mr. CAIN. I say to my devoted friend, the senior Senator from New Mexico, that under these circumstances, when I wish to preserve continuity in my remarks on a subject about which I never expect to speak again, I beg the indulgence of Senators to permit me to proceed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. CAIN. This evaluation, Mr. President, is said by Time magazine to make the senior Senator from Illinois one of the 10 most prominent Members of this body. It apparently wants its 90,000 subscribers in the State of Illinois to think that this is so.

Parenthetically, Mr. President, I think this observation ought to be inserted here. The State of Illinois is second only to New York State in its number of Time magazine subscribers. If we take the 9 States from which come the Senate's most valuable 10, as listed by Time magazine, we find a total of 467,000 Time magazine subscribers. In doing the same elementary arithmetic with the seven States from which come the Senate's most expendable, as listed by Time magazine, the subscribers to Time magazine total 121,000. Although Time magazine appears to be a rather tricky sniper, it is a cautious and careful sniper, and selects its targets accordingly.

It seems to me that Time magazine credits everybody in Illinois with having a very short memory. If this be so, which I doubt, because I know there are intelligent Americans living in Illinois, I wish to refresh their memory by calling

attention to page 14 of the Time magazine issue of January 10, 1949.

Time magazine then said, as its condensed opinion:

Illinois' handsome—

I certainly agree with that statement—athletic Senator SCOTT WILKE LUCAS is living proof of the virtues of party regularity. In his 14 years as Congressman and Senator he has sponsored little major legislation, made few headlines, shown no notable talent for leadership.

The senior Senator from Illinois, to my mind, Mr. President, as I have said, like most people, is neither a great man nor a small man. I have no reason to think him not to be a good and a reasonable man. But the point, Mr. President, which is completely aside from the senior Senator from Illinois either in or out of the Senate of the United States, is that Time magazine does not know what he is because it writes of him, in the short space of little more than a year, as being two different kinds of a man. Both comments were written by the same individual.

Now we are getting somewhere, Mr. President. I am sorry it takes so much time; but strive as I could, I could not make it any briefer. Neither comment about the Senator from Illinois to my mind was worth the paper it was written on. As an afterthought, I am reminded of something else which Time magazine said about the majority leader—who is perfectly innocent, as regards the discussion just now—on March 28, 1949. This sketch is more inexcusable than those I have just referred to. It is worth noting. Here it is:

But Harry Truman had gone fishing in Florida, and his Senate majority leader, SCOTT LUCAS, had put on an inept show, bellicose when tact was required, weak and confused when strength was called for.

Mr. President, I really wonder what Europe thinks about us as American individuals and about the Senate of the United States when Europeans, by means of our subsidy—we are the ones who are responsible for this—read such trash and such trivial junk as appeared in Time magazine about a very distinguished American, the majority leader.

I consider the Senator from Illinois to be a rather consistent and sometimes outstanding disciple of administration policies and programs. Occasionally the New Deal goes too far to suit him, but not very often. Several years ago the Senator from Illinois voted for the Taft-Hartley bill, but then turned around and voted to sustain the President's veto. This conduct permitted the senior Senator from Illinois to jump in either of two directions almost simultaneously. I do not think he voted both ways on the labor question because he sought to be all things to all people at the same time. My impression was that he voted his own conviction when he supported the law, but he voted to sustain the President's veto as a conscientious member of the administration's ball team; and I can understand his action in that respect. The people of Illinois will determine whether they thought the Senator from Illinois was right or wrong in that in-

stance. I simply call the record to their attention in urging them to disregard the political whimsy about a good American which Time magazine has offered for their consideration.

It is always good, Mr. President, to see success come to anyone who is new in any business. Time magazine with its 90,000 subscribers in the State of Illinois has complimented the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who now occupies the chair, in a most flattering way. Time magazine claims him to be one of the 10 best Members of this body. I have absolutely no quarrel with its views of him or of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] or of anyone else. This is what Time magazine said about the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on page 20 of the April 3 issue:

PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat from Illinois, 58, the ablest, best-balanced liberal Democrat in the Senate and its most impressive freshman in years. He is a humanitarian who does not believe government should do all things for all men, a maverick liberal who also insists on prudent spending. "To be a liberal one does not have to be a wastrel." An ex-professor, and a veteran of Chicago's rough and tumble city council, he has the economist-sociologist mind, a notable capacity for collecting, sifting, and appraising facts.

Back in January of 1949—and I am only referring to the record—Time magazine made a brief but a far different reference to the junior Senator from Illinois. If Time magazine is going to be politically mixed up in the State of Illinois, the junior Senator from Washington is not going to stay out of Illinois, because he has a friend there by the name of Everett Dirksen, whom he holds in high regard.

On that occasion this was said:

Illinois' able PAUL DOUGLAS, 56—

Time magazine evidently jumps 2 years in 1 year. It called the junior Senator from Illinois 58 years old in its issue of April 3, 1950. At some time I should like to get the record straight in that respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Would the Senator from Washington like to have that point cleared up? The birthday of the present Presiding Officer is on March 26, so that in January 1949 the junior Senator from Illinois was 56 years old. The issue of Time magazine to which reference has been made appeared, the Chair believes, on the 26th of March, at which time the present Presiding Officer was 58 years of age. So although only 15 months had elapsed, nevertheless it followed that there was a difference of two chronological years in the age of the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CAIN. That is a very excellent explanation of the matter, from which all of us will accurately benefit.

As I was saying, Mr. President, on that occasion this was said in Time magazine:

Illinois' able PAUL DOUGLAS, 56, was a one-time leftish college professor and a wounded, decorated marine veteran.

Mr. President, I see good things about both of those classifications, for those who were able to be marines, on the one

hand, and for those who believe, as I disbelieve, in a more liberal economic philosophy, let us say.

At the moment the junior Senator from Illinois, in the view of Time magazine, is a well-balanced, liberal Democrat. Mr. President, how different that is from what Time magazine said about the junior Senator from Illinois a year ago. At that time the same writer in Time magazine inferred that the junior Senator from Illinois had been or was a leftist. Mr. President, I consider the junior Senator from Illinois to be a very able man, although I do not share many of his views. I once read a book of his, *The Coming of a New Party*, which was dedicated to Norman Thomas; and I found myself in sturdy disagreement with many of the views which were expressed. I do not believe, Mr. President, in a planned economy, although perhaps Time magazine does. It may have thought that the book to which I have referred was cause for elevating PAUL DOUGLAS to the top of Time's list of notables. I would not know.

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

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator heard my required answer to the Senator from New Mexico. Permit me to say to the majority leader that, although I shall continue to speak without being interrupted, I would gladly stay here all night to discuss any situation any Senator might have in mind.

Mr. LUCAS. My question is a very simple one. I was wondering whether the distinguished Senator had finished with the senior Senator from Illinois in the statement. I have a committee meeting to attend. If the Senator has finished with me, I should like to attend it. If not, I shall stay in the Senate Chamber, of course, and enjoy the remarks.

Mr. CAIN. In the same vein, Mr. President, I think I should respond; I think that is one question I should answer. It seems that business is improving a little when the majority leader of the United States Senate asks permission of a junior Senator to go on about his business, which I assume he would do in an automatic and natural course.

The junior Senator from Washington has concluded his references to the majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very thankful to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I appreciate the Senator's question.

Mr. President, what I do know is what the junior Senator from Illinois says he is—and he has a right, comparable to mine, to believe in what he holds to be self-evident and true. I am reminded of several paragraphs in chapter IV of his book which caused me to wonder about him long before he came to the Senate. That chapter was entitled "How the Government Can Further the Interest of Citizens and Consumers." Let me provide Time magazine, and Europe, and the citizens of Illinois and America with a few comments from the author of the book, *The Coming of a New Party*, because if we are going to continue this subsidy for

Time magazine, I want that magazine to begin to tell the people overseas who actually sit in the United States Senate and what they think. Every man is entitled to think as he sees fit. In referring to the author of the book, *The Coming of a New Party*, I should like to read only two paragraphs from chapter IV, *How the Government Can Further the Interests of Citizens and Consumers*:

If the beginnings toward a genuine planned economy are, consequently, to be made, they must be carried through over the opposition of the capitalists themselves. Even if their political power were broken, as long as they were in control of industry they would resist having production quotas assigned or the elements of price control imposed by society. It seems, therefore, that a truly planned economy is almost impossible under capitalism and only practical under socialism.

I think a man ought to be very proud to believe in anything the author believes in. I simply do not happen to believe that.

Whether or not such a socialization of production should take place is perhaps the most important decision which the men and women of the present century are to make. In the United States, at least, it bids fair not to be settled at any one time by a categorical answer to the general proposition, but by the results of a series of experiments. We may have, therefore, some fumbling with an attempted public control of capitalism. What is even more needed, however, are active public efforts to socialize and reorganize specific industries which are badly in need of treatment. The public mind can grasp these problems and if the experiments are successful it will rapidly be led to favor a wider extension of social control.

#### CHAPTER XII—PRICE POLICY

The public ownership of these monopolies would seem, therefore, to be the only effective way of obtaining those flexible prices which our society needs in order to avert severe depressions. For if private profit were taken out of them, then the greatest barrier to reducing the prices of these products in periods of depression would be removed. This necessitates, therefore, socializing the ownership not only of the public utilities, but also of such great industries as the railways, electricity and gas, steel, aluminum, electrical machinery and heavy chemicals. For this is the only ultimately effective way to deal with industries which neither will compete voluntarily nor can be made to compete.

Moreover, competition in the exploitation of the great natural resources of oil and lumber results in a terrific waste of scarce products which society cannot afford. A true program of conservation calls for the public ownership of these natural resources in order to preserve the national heritage.

In other words, in order to make competition work effectively in the small-scale industries for which it is adapted, it is necessary to socialize that part which inherently tends toward monopoly. This will create new problems, but it should remove one of the great sources of disequilibrium in the society of today.

*The Coming of a New Party* ought to be read in its entirety by everyone. I say that to you, Mr. President, in your capacity both as the Acting President of the Senate and as the author, and as the junior Senator from Illinois. This book ought to be read in its entirety by everyone.

A thoughtful reading of the treatise will help any individual to more strongly support or more vehemently dissent from the views expressed. PAUL DOUGLAS can take care of himself under any circumstances but I do not think that Time magazine has devoted enough space to its subject, the junior Senator from Illinois. I am critical of this lack of attention to the Senator because I think Time magazine ought to give Europe a clearer picture of the American way of life as it is being developed and worked over by Members of the United States Senate, of each side.

Mr. President, I continue to be reminded of why the Congress thought it proper to guarantee convertibility for some American magazine investments in Europe. I will not forget that such magazines are charged with a heavy responsibility for presenting America in a true and promising way to our friends across the sea. How this can be done by endeavoring to destroy the reputations of some men in public life and by overrating others and by giving different pictures of the same men on different occasions, I do not know. From Time magazine's point of view their treatment of most of us may be cute and clever and appealing, but it is not true and it is not accurate and it does not carry out the intention of the Congress.

In recent days I have glanced through a year's file of Time magazine. I may say I did not do it very thoroughly. Here are a few brief comments made about friends of mine on both sides of the aisle, who are good Americans and responsible men:

South Dakota's headline-hunting Republican Congressman KARL E. MUNDT. MUNDT's reply put him on a par with J. Parnell Thomas as a stumbling block to a just and objective investigation of Communist activities.

We spent, as I recall, \$343,000 American dollars last year to permit Time magazine to say:

Cut it any way you want, KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, is a bad American. He stands as an obstacle against a first-rate investigation of communism.

Yet the man's life has been devoted to making this country free for Americans.

Idaho's GLEN TAYLOR, banjo-strumming refugee from Henry Wallace's camp.

I should like to say to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] that I am only surprised he was not included more often by Time, because, in slang parlance, Mr. President, you and I will agree that the senior Senator from Idaho is contrived to be "free game." He can be whacked from one side because it may be said he is not a Republican. He can be belted from the other side, because one may claim that he is not a Democrat. But GLEN TAYLOR, of Idaho, is a Member of the United States Senate; and for Time magazine to characterize him as being a refugee from anyone's camp I think leaves a very bad taste in the mouth of the informed, overseas.

West Virginia's demagogic MATT NEELY.

They dispose of him with merely one brief swat.

Indiana's ponderous—

With all its implications—

Republican HOMER CAPEHART.

Maryland's waspish MILLARD TYDINGS.

Oregon's waspish lawyer, WAYNE MORSE.

Waspish, 41-year-old BILL JENNER.

I take it the average European is just as curious as the average American. When I saw the word "waspish" being used three times, I wanted to find out what it meant. I suppose the Europeans also want to find out what it means—at our expense. If they do not, I want to say to Europe that if these three men justify the appellation given them by Time magazine, they have the following characteristics of—and, once you know what those characteristics are, Mr. President, beware not of one of the three men but of all three, for they are dangerous. One who is waspish is "quick to resent a trifling affront." Does that describe "BILL" JENNER, of Indiana, a good, solid American; or MILLARD TYDINGS, a fine American; or my friend who lives in the State of Oregon, next door—WAYNE MORSE? But, further than that, if one is a waspish sort of fellow, he is snappish, irascible; he is petulant; he is choleric; he is testy and peevish. In other words, Time magazine, in one word, says that he is no good.

Mr. JENNER. That is bad. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAIN. I think that is very interesting, because Time magazine, in its recent evaluation, has said there is a wasp among the Senate's expendables, there is a wasp here among the Senate's best 10, and there is a wasp buzzing around somewhere between heaven and earth—my colleague the Senator from Oregon, who was not listed in either category.

Senator KENNETH WHERRY, Nebraska undertaker—

I thought Mr. WHERRY was a United States Senator and the minority floor leader; but this is the way he is characterized overseas—

Senator KENNETH WHERRY, Nebraska undertaker and now the Republican floor leader, who wound up a luncheon speech by pleading "Let's smile right now."

Missouri's earnest, plodding, FORREST DONNELL. \* \* \* Philip C. Jessup was a welcome change from the windy speech-ifying of ailing Delegate Warren Austin and the arm-pumping forensics of Texas' minor statesman TOM CONNALLY.

I do not know that anyone in his right mind has ever referred to a man with a career half so distinguished through the many long years of his service as the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] as being a minor statesman. But Time magazine does so, because it thinks it has us scared to death.

Oklahoma's loud-lowing Democratic Senator ELMER THOMAS.

I could think up many things about the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], I suppose. But I do not believe, because certainly it has never happened in my presence, that he has ever loudly lowed, or lowed loudly, on any subject

on the floor of the United States Senate. My only criticism of him, as a Senator, is that I have trouble hearing him. But now we have painted for Europeans the picture of a Senator from the sovereign State of Oklahoma as "loudly lowing" his way through life.

Old TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, reacted like a punch-drunk fighter at the sound of a dinner bell. "Texas Tawm" was none too clear on what the Atlantic Pact was supposed to do.

They spell it "T-a-w-m."

We are now back to the Atlantic Pact. We are asking Europeans to assume that we know what we are doing. But Time magazine says the worthy chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, "Texas Tawm," was not certain what the Atlantic Pact was.

CONNALLY had been dozing up there on his horse (Sir Galahad's horse) all through the past 10 years.

What a beautiful comment about a distinguished American. It makes me sick to have to read it on the floor of the United States Senate.

But, orated frock-coated, windy old Senator HOEY \* \* \* supporting the appointment of Senator GRAHAM.

Mr. President, I was here. My mind tells me I was present on the occasion when the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] had some strikingly complimentary and pertinent things to say about the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] as he came to the Senate of the United States. It seems to me that we in the Senate do not share Time's criticism of the senior Senator from North Carolina when it says that "frock-coated, windy old Senator HOEY" orated on the subject of the coming of the junior Senator from North Carolina to this body.

For part of one afternoon and all of the next, Nevada's windy—

That word is used, time after time, in Time.

Nevada's windy ex-prize fighter, GEORGE MALONE, held forth, relieved at intervals by such helpful colleagues as Missouri's stuffy JAMES KEM, Montana's ZALES ECTON, and Washington's HARRY CAIN, the great friend of the real-estate lobby.

Time started to talk about "Nevada's windy ex-prize fighter," and in the same paragraph winds up with the junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, another reference to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who has just returned to the floor:

All week the Senate wrangled in organized confusion, tired of each other and dead tired of Majority Leader SCOTT LUCAS's heavy-handed efforts to keep things moving.

No Senator has ever moved so rapidly from three strikes to the head of the list as has the senior Senator from Illinois in Time's recent evaluation of him. I used to think that three strikes meant out. Apparently Time magazine does not think so.

Time refers to—

Mississippi's rabble-rousing Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND.

And then goes on to say:

On the floor of the United States Senate two aged, reactionary spillovers, both vindictive, determined, and ruthless, were waging a joint fight for power. One was 80-year-old KENNETH DOUGLAS MCKELLAR, the choleric Tennessee feudist who heads the all-powerful Appropriations Committee; the other was Nevada's silver-maned, silver-minded PATRICK A. MCCARRAN, 73-year-old chairman of the scarcely less powerful Judiciary Committee. \* \* \* Working hand in glove—

I can see them, though I have never seen either one with a pair of gloves on since I have been a Member of the Senate—

the two old demagogues had used their legislative weapons given them by seniority to crowd into the whole field of foreign and domestic policy.

Wisconsin's JOE MCCARTHY rose and swung the tails of not one, but 81 Communists and party liners.

The next week Time knows a little something about "fear itself" and says:

Wisconsin's pugnacious Senator JOE MCCARTHY glared defiantly at his tormentors. \* \* \* Ex-Marine MCCARTHY might turn out to have something after all.

There is one thing we can say about Time, and that is that, even in the face of the present terribly important question about conditions in the State Department, Time does play both sides of the street against the middle. It wants to be able to win, whether the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is pilloried from coast to coast or whether he turns out to be a great American hero of his generation.

These are but a few derogatory comments, Mr. President, out of a great many more of like character by which the European is expected to learn about the American way of life from Time magazine, and Americans generally are encouraged by the same source to sneer at and look down upon those who represent them in the United States Senate.

Abraham Lincoln once wrote a single paragraph about duty. He said:

If I were to try to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how—the very best I can—and I mean to keep on doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference.

I have made reference to this comment by President Lincoln because it expresses my own attitude and because the strange fellow who writes about us, in the Senate, for Time magazine is come to visit with me. This visit took place on Thursday, March 30, 1950. It lasted for about an hour. I will tell the Senate about it, because Senators might have reason to visit with the fellow some day and because they ought to know all about him, for he is the individual who since 1941 has written almost every word of the thousands of words which have appeared in Time magazine about the Senate of the United States and its Members.

We greeted each other pleasantly enough and then got down to business.

I wanted to know why this individual considered me to be an expendable Senator, and it developed at once that he wanted to tell me in no uncertain fashion. His greatest grievance was that I had offered the motion to recommit the displaced-persons' bill last October. He said that my vote and my conduct were not in the national interest because the Senate had a right to vote on the displaced-persons' bill and I kept them from doing so. The fact that 35 other Senators voted as I did was quite beside any point and not deserving of any argument. The author knew what I should have done about the displaced-persons' question, and that was that. He added that he had written the comment I did not agree with back in October. I probed his mind a little deeper by asking in what other particulars I, as a Senator, failed to be deserving of his support. Again he stated that I did not vote in the national interest because I had voted consistently against subsidized public housing and rent control. He volunteered the information that the junior Senator from Washington had come to Washington, D. C., with a great build-up which had been designed by Time magazine, and that I, the Senator, had since that time voted in opposition to what Time magazine, as seen through the eyes of the author, thought I should have done.

Mr. President, I am telling the Senate the truth. Pretty soon we shall make certain of that.

I was, therefore, headed for the political ash can, and no doubt about it, so far as my "Timebrat" guest was concerned.

Mr. President, I have never so enjoyed or been so literally amazed by any conversation with any author anywhere or anytime. I was so intrigued by what he said that I sat back and encouraged him to continue. He told me about the trouble he had in getting a house, which caused him to dislike me officially for my rent-control position, and he talked about the need for providing shelter for those who cannot provide shelter for themselves, when most of us know that the public housing bill, as passed, will not provide shelter for very many of the distressing welfare and relief housing cases which exist in every one of the 48 States. This fellow pointed out that he was not a Member of the United States Senate and, therefore, could only present his idea of what ought to take place, and how Senators ought to vote, through the pages of Time magazine. I have never known a man in my life who was so certain concerning the right thing to do and so convinced that anybody who did not do it in the way he thought it ought to be done was totally without virtue and should be castigated in every way, shape, and form.

Mr. President, I want to make a brief observation concerning each of the three bones of contention which have been disturbing the ulcers of my critic for quite sometime.

First, I do not know what history will say about the displaced persons bill which the Senate approved late last Wednesday night. It will, however, be certain to note

that when the Senate of the United States agreed to an eligibility cut-off date of January 1, 1949, the Senate must have known that the end result would be to bring a number of persons to America who had not even been in Italy, Austria, or Germany during the war. Such persons may be defined as being political refugees or expellees, but they never can be defined as being displaced persons. The junior Senator from Washington voted against the bill last Wednesday because the approved eligibility cut-off date, in his opinion, was unreasonable and its adoption simply meant that the Congress sought to change its immigration policy by indirection. I think that many an American will agree with my contention that we ought to have satisfied the clearly defined requirements of our displaced-persons problem before we undertook to change our immigration policy. I shall be as interested as the next person in what history says about this premise.

Second, Not many months ago the Congress and the President approved a subsidized public-housing measure which is to provide 810,000 units of subsidized low-rent housing. The junior Senator from Washington voted against that measure for two basic reasons. The first was that the housing would not provide shelter from those who today need it the most. The second reason was that housing of the character in question should not be imposed on any American community against their will or without their approval. The junior Senator from Washington offered an amendment which would have required that the citizens of any community vote on the question of whether they did or did not wish to have federally subsidized low-rent housing within the city limits. This amendment was defeated by a roll-call vote of 55 to 21. There have, however, Mr. President, been a number of referendums held throughout America since the public housing bill became law. The people of given communities have demanded their right to be heard. In seven out of eight cases the people have voted against public housing. The most recent example I know of was in Seattle, Wash., a community of more than 500,000 citizens. There the Seattle City Council, like the Congress of the United States, voted overwhelmingly for public housing. But the people wanted a chance to be heard for a change, and they were heard. They got the necessary signatures which forced a referendum. The campaign was vigorous and relentlessly pursued by both sides. Then more than 85,000 voters, by a ratio of almost 2 to 1, said "No" to the proposition. In a free election free people were given an opportunity to express their own views. I thought it unwise for the Congress to approve a public housing measure which did not reflect the will and the wish of people generally. I am overjoyed that Americans are taking the law into their own hands. City councils and commissions in a number of cities have denied socialized housing. This happened in Dunn, N. C.; Kalamazoo, Mich.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Miami, Fla.; Palestine, Tex.; Pasco, Wash.; Rockford, Ill.; San Jose, Calif.; South Bend, Ind.;

and Tucson, Ariz. For the third consecutive time, the Wyoming legislature refused to enact enabling legislation for socialized housing. When a State-wide referendum was held on the issue of socialized housing in California and New Jersey, the answer was "No." In Grand Rapids; Lubbock, Tex.; St. Paul; St. Petersburg; Seattle and Yakima, Wash., citizens forced a referendum on their city councils and voted against public housing. All of this simply means, Mr. President, that the subsidized housing legislation we passed did not turn out to be nearly so attractive to citizens at home as we had thought it would be. Why we did not have reliance, why we did not have confidence in citizens from the beginning by providing the referendum requirement, is something I shall never understand.

Third, Several weeks ago the junior Senator from Washington offered an amendment to an appropriations bill to provide the Office of the Housing Expediter with \$1,400,000 for current operating expenses as a deficiency item. This amendment was approved by the Senate and by the House and became law when agreed to by the President. The Housing Expediter had requested \$3,600,000 instead of the one million four hundred thousand which the Congress gave him. Since the passage of the 1949 rent-control law almost half of the defense rental areas of the Nation have been decontrolled. In that space of time five States of the Union have decontrolled themselves. Between now and the expiration date of the 1949 law, June 30 of this year, two other States will have decontrolled themselves and the State of New York will take over rent control from the Federal Government on May 1. All of this means that there is little likelihood that Federal rent controls will be continued. If it turns out to be so that the Federal Government will remove itself from the management of private property on June 30, it will be so because of those persons, admittedly few in number, who have been working to remove the Federal Government from managing the affairs of its private citizens since shortly after the war's end. The junior Senator from Washington has been among these persons. When I came to the Senate of the United States in 1947 I was promptly appointed to be the chairman of the Senate Banking Committee's Subcommittee on Rents and Housing. That was my first contact and introduction to Federal rent controls. I got the job, Mr. President, because some of my colleagues were long on political acumen and a trifle short of political courage. The question was, and is still to a lesser degree, loaded with political dynamite. Regardless of how long I may remain in the Senate, I shall never grapple with a problem from which I can derive more satisfaction. I have been said by many to be the No. 1 real-estate lobbyist in America. I have never resented this title. My chief concern has been with those rights which the Constitution gave to American citizens. I construe the title, with all of its implications, to cover every home owner in

the United States. If those persons, be they presently covered by Federal rent-control restrictions or not, consider me to be their friend and working in their legitimate interests, I could benefit from no greater compliment even though I remain as a Member of this body for several decades to come.

Mr. President, if it were not for the fact that this fellow is clothed with all the authority and prestige of Time magazine, there would be no conceivable excuse to talk about him. But he happens to be the head man for Time magazine here in the Senate of the United States. Though most people do not know him, he is always present or is at least lurking in the shadows somewhere. Though I think Time magazine ought to fire him because he is not qualified for the job he has—and do not think I shall not prove that—or should transfer him to some sort of a fourth-rate job he is equipped to handle, he will probably go on writing from his perch up above for some time. The very least I can do is to describe him in some detail. I shall do this by giving the answers he gave in response to the 15 questions I had prepared against his coming.

I think I ought to say, and I ought to be careful about it, that we all know this man in quite a very pleasant way. I have received three invitations, each one coming from Time magazine, toward the end of the session, signed by the author, and saying, "Come along. Let us have a laugh and enjoy some refreshment."

So we go downstairs. Where is downstairs? We go down to break bread with Time magazine. Time magazine rents a room once a year for which it pays not a farthing, because apparently it does not mind taking advantage of anyone or anything. So we go to break bread and hear someone say, "You are a great guy. Permit me to give you another drink"—in order that we may say something indiscreet that will turn up some months from now.

If I have not told the Senate before—and I think I have not—the cause of all this trouble bears the name of Frank McNaughton. If he is not now in the Senate Periodical Gallery it is not because I did not send him word this morning that I was going to talk about him this afternoon.

Frank McNaughton was born in Westboro, Mo., September 4, 1906.

McNaughton's immediate family consists of himself, his wife, and four children, all of whom are boys. Mr. McNaughton, by his first marriage, had three children. The present Mrs. McNaughton had one child by a previous marriage.

Mr. McNaughton attended the University of Missouri, but dropped out before securing a degree. He said that he had fired furnaces and waited on tables, but eventually had run short of money. At some place in our conversation he volunteered the information that because he was a modest man he had failed to mention that he had been among the top 250 students in the student body of some 2,000. I asked this question concerning education because I wanted to know what sort of man of letters was writing about us here.

We are, in fact, because we come from all over the country, an unusual assortment of Americans. Therefore, I think it takes a very unusual American, with a very keenly and broadly turned intellect, to have sufficient reason fairly to evaluate us in our work. It goes without saying that many men have been very successful who did not possess a college degree. But I am not discussing merely any man; I am talking about a fellow who has been selected by his employer, Time magazine, as being qualified to second-guess and interpret the conduct of 96 United States Senators. I would have thought that the Senate agent of Time magazine would have been a graduate of some college or university. I would have thought that he would have had sufficient curiosity and interest to have been a graduate of some college or university, or would have made up his mind to graduate from some leading American school of journalism.

Because McNaughton and I are about the same age, I know how things were in the middle 1920's. I was a product of that glorious age myself. Times were very good, jobs were very plentiful, and almost everybody who really wanted to work for and get a college degree could get it. At least that was true in the 1920's. I never knew a man who could not get a degree if he had the determination to get it. I knew if he did not get it in the 1920's, when he made a little money and got settled down in life, he would go back and get it in order to attempt to keep pace with progress, difficult though it might be to go back to get his degree. I have known many very intelligent people of that generation who failed to obtain positions they wanted because they had not gone to the trouble of staying with their universities until they were graduated. Anyway, McNaughton volunteered that he belonged in the upper 10 percent.

McNaughton presently lives at 7202 Hilton Avenue, Takoma Park, Md. He purchased the home in which he now lives about a year ago. Since coming to Washington in 1936 McNaughton has lived continuously in Montgomery or Prince Georges County, with the exception of a brief period during which he occupied a rented room in the District of Columbia.

Though Mr. McNaughton has lived for about 15 years in the free State of Maryland, he is an unimportant citizen of that State, and of the Nation, too, because he has never bothered to register as a voter. This means that his city, his county, his State, and his Nation, must be the concern of others, who are responsible, because McNaughton has no intention of assuming any real responsibility for what goes on. His answer was, as we might have expected, that he felt he could only work objectively by having nothing to do with things political. Some Senators may be satisfied with that excuse, but the junior Senator from Washington will never be. Whatever else his answers may show him to be, he is a second-rate prewar and postwar citizen, and ought to be known as such. McNaughton voted for Herbert Hoover in 1928, and for Franklin Roosevelt in 1932. He thought he might have voted

for Mr. Roosevelt in 1936, but he could not remember. This is what he actually told me, incredible as his answer, and its uncertainty, may be to my colleagues.

Mr. McNaughton came to Washington with the United Press and went to work for Time magazine, he said, sometime in the early part of 1941. He had trouble in remembering dates so I did not press him. He impressed upon me that he was the oldest and most influential Time man now employed in the Nation's Capital. I wanted to know if McNaughton had been employed continuously by Time magazine since he was first hired in 1941. His answer was, "Yes." I was driving at something, and when I was about half way through he said, "Senator, I see what you are driving at."

I said, "That is perfectly fine with me, because what I am trying to do is to nail something down, and when it is nailed down I shall seek to offer it in bold relief to my colleagues in the United States Senate, who are thoughtful men."

I wanted to know if McNaughton's assignment for Time magazine during the years 1941 through 1945 was here in Washington, D. C., or elsewhere. Many Senators were not Members of this body during those years, and we are getting more interested as to who was here, and why. It was during that period that the word "expendable" began to have a real meaning for the American people. It was during that period that many an "expendable" gave everything he had, without asking quarter or favor from any man. These "expendables" caused a Nation called America to pray and work harder, and to be grateful. McNaughton's answer was that he never left Washington during the entire period of the war. He was born in 1906.

I thought it proper to ask McNaughton, because we are of about the same age, whether he had been registered for the draft. His answer was, "Yes." I asked him what his classification was, and he said it was I-A. I suggested that it must have turned out to be something else, because I had not known that he had served his country in any military capacity. He said that he had failed to pass the physical examination, and was probably classified as II-A or III-A. He fumbled around in his pocket for a card to clarify the point, but he could not find it. I suggested that many a man with good cause had become a IV-F, and that he should not be embarrassed if that was what he was. He said he was physically impotent—I think I used the word "impotent"—for military service because of some stomach ulcers, which had resulted from trying to keep pace with the activities of the Congress and the executive branch of the Government. I am only telling the Senate what the fellow told me. Senators may well imagine, as this conversation dragged on, my sympathy for this ulcer-burdened young American who could neither vote nor fight, even in a noncombatant role.

I next inquired of McNaughton if he had ever been employed by Time magazine or any other news medium as a foreign war correspondent, and, if he had been, where did that service take him,

and for what periods of time. The answer was that he had never served in any foreign war correspondent capacity. This was to say that McNaughton, who writes about life and trouble, bloodshed and fear, and hysteria, does so vicariously because he has neither lived broadly nor ever heard a shot fired in anger. He has undoubtedly encouraged other men to die, but he has never stood on the sidelines and watched them die. He writes about the American Legion and other veterans' associations, but he is not even qualified to enter that kind of organization which are open to millions of Americans who belong to McNaughton's age and generation.

I asked McNaughton how many times he had been abroad, which countries he had visited, what was the purpose of his visits, and how long he had remained on these assignments.

Mr. President, if you forget everything else, remember this: The answer was that he had been in China, Japan, and the Pacific Islands. The year of these visits was 1946. This was at a time when peace, troubled though it may be, had been restored to the world. My colleagues all know that. There was nothing going on to frighten anyone when McNaughton traveled to the South Pacific in 1946.

Because I could not quite believe that McNaughton had been fair to himself in his previous answer, I asked him directly when he had last visited Europe. His answer was that he has never visited Europe. The chief correspondent for Time magazine in the Senate of the United States since 1941, when we have taken a calculated risk of actually bankrupting our great Nation, the man who writes about what we should and should not do, the man who has said innumerable times of those who raise questions, "The Senator from Nebraska is a reactionary," or perhaps "the Senator from Indiana"—who has been abroad—"is an isolationist"; the man who has judged us, up to this moment, has only traveled indifferently and has never fought for his life. If he is a man of letters, it has escaped me, because there is a great difference between being properly educated and being clever and facile with words. He does not vote. He has never seen that about which he so glibly writes. Oh, my. This answer by McNaughton absolutely bewildered, baffled, and practically floored me. How can any man with more than a million and a half readers talk intelligently about what the Congress ought to do for the European when that man has never been to Europe? I will tell the Senate what he can do. I again considered his grievance against the junior Senator from Washington because he, along with some other Senators, did not do very well in voting on the displaced-persons bill, and I found that of the eight expendables, as characterized by Time magazine, seven had voted to return the bill to the committee, the only exception being, for the reason I stated, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] who, in the opinion of such people as McNaughton, is fair game under any circumstances. Yet McNaughton, who has never been to Europe, can advise the American people as

to which Senators should be retired to private life because they did not vote as he wanted them to vote.

On this occasion I really wish I had words in which I could tell a story that would upset the country, that would provoke the country, that would arouse the country so that it would say to Time magazine and any other publications guilty of the same premeditated acts of maliciousness, "You had better start telling the truth and restore yourself to the age-old practice of a good newspaper, the proud and important fourth-estate, which is to give the people the facts and let them make up their minds."

In a few short weeks the Senate will debate what we ought to do next year for Europe through the ECA. Is that not right? Frank McNaughton, a most provincial individual, will write about it. I seek to do him no injury, actually I do not, but I think he is grievously miscast for the job he has, and I say so openly. But what a difference between being a Member of the United States Senate, and being a part of a masthead on page 17. I doubt very much whether Mr. Matthews, the editor, could find anyone mentioned in that masthead if he wanted to get him in a hurry. Frank McNaughton, probably the most provincial and uninformed man in either the gallery which is just above my head or on the floor of the Senate, will be read by millions of Americans and Europeans who are looking for advice and counsel and information. Now that I know, Mr. President, that Frank McNaughton is less qualified than anybody I know of to pass judgment on what the Senate does or does not do with reference to Europe I simply cannot bring myself to believe that Henry Luce, the editor in chief, and Mr. Matthews, the editor, would permit such a fraud and—I call it that advisedly—to be perpetrated on an innocent public both at home and abroad. McNaughton feels that he knows all there is to be known about the character of the legislation the Senate should pass in the name of displaced persons and yet Frank McNaughton would not recognize a displaced person if he saw one. He has never been where they congregated in camps.

O, Mr. President, I fear for the future of our great Nation if it is forced to rely on the witticisms and the catchy phrases and the evaluations of one who like Frank McNaughton has nothing but an ulcerous, clever, untravelled pen from which to form his judgments.

My long story, Mr. President, has just about come to an end. I was more than half sick before McNaughton left my office because I had been in the presence of an important man, by virtue of the magazine behind which he hides, who was totally unimportant in himself. If ever I sat with a human being who was smug, arrogant, self-centered, vain, and frustrated, that man bore the name of McNaughton. The word "frustrated" is important to me. The man must wish he had been able to keep up with his generation when it went out to do or die. He did not have what it took, and it has been gnawing in what the Navy would call his belly ever since.

During our conversation I lost the rich anger and indignation which had possessed me for several weeks. I lost even what had been my desire to laugh in the face of this pigmy. I did not even want to bat him around physically because that would have been like punching a bag of mush. I merely requested that he get out of my office and encouraged him to write what he would about anybody or anything in the future because in having gotten to know him really it would thereafter be impossible for me to be interested in anything he said.

After he went away I wrote him a letter. I let it stay on my desk for some days before I sent it. I have never previously said to any man that he was unpossessed of courage, either moral or physical. I never expected to say it to anybody and not find him try to take exception to it. But in this instance I, of course, knew my subject. It was not a letter I wanted to write but it was a letter I could not prevent myself from writing. I wanted to close the door forever on that sort of a critic who was neither a man nor a person who had a right to criticize others who had undertaken and are presently grappling with assignments which he has either avoided or with which he has had no contact. Let me read the letter:

MARCH 31, 1950.

Mr. FRANK McNAUGHTON,  
*Time Magazine, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR McNAUGHTON: Since your visit of yesterday I have tried my best to figure out what sort of a man you really are. It seems to me that your protestations of personal friendship for me simply can't be reconciled with the attitude of mind from which you write. If you have a sense of fair play I am unable to understand it and if you possess any courage, either moral or physical, it was not in evidence yesterday. Perhaps this evaluation of your character is unfair, but I presently believe it to be a fact. For reasons of my own I never waste time on anyone I can't respect and I feel this way about you. I shall never again raise any question about your criticisms because in reading them I shall be mindful of your background. I do hope that Time will provide you with a by-line, for this will encourage you to be accountable to your readers and will encourage you to stand on your own feet.

Most sincerely,

HARRY P. CAIN.

Emerson once wrote this:

Don't say things.  
What you are stands over you the while,  
And thunders so that I cannot hear what  
you say to the contrary.

A lady of my acquaintance said,  
"I don't care so much for what they say  
As I do for what makes them say it."

There are but three requests I would offer to Henry Luce, the editor in chief, and to Mr. Matthews, and I am totally uninterested in whatever action they think it fit to take.

The first is that the United States Senate and every one of its 96 Members, be they of the right or left or in between or regardless of their party affiliations, is deserving of the best and most constructive criticism Time magazine has to offer. Time magazine insults the intelligence of America and of Europe and is not entitled to accept currency convertibility guaranties from the Congress of the United States when Time magazine—I did not do this; no other Senator

did it—when Time magazine appoints as its chief representative any individual who cannot or will not fight, travel, vote, or be fair. The agent Time magazine has today was a IV-F in war and stands out as a IV-F in peace, representing Time magazine with its 1,600,000-odd subscribers. Until I analyze McNaughton's draft exemption causes, I shall assume he had some right to a IV-F category in war; I shall never agree that an able-bodied individual can justify being a IV-F in peace. There is no excuse for that.

All I ask is that Time magazine send to the periodical gallery of the United States Senate a real man to pass judgment on the real and responsible men who transact the Nation's business here below.

My second request is that Time magazine never again use the word "expendable" when and where it has been either written or recommended by an agent of Time magazine who does not know and can never grow to know what that word "expendable" stands for and means. That word was understood, and the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] certainly is among the foremost to understand it, by those who died and were mutilated in mind and body between the years of 1941 and the end of the war in 1945. I have never heard the junior Senator from Illinois quarrel over his lot in the recent war, but that he suffers physically and perhaps continually as a result of that service is self-evident. He alone never makes mention of the fact. The word "expendable" means much to those of us who fought and were so lucky as to live.

It is a treasured word to every self-respecting man and woman who did, in their limited way, everything they could do for this Nation when disaster threatened on every hand. We shall not, if we can prevent it, permit either a shallow magazine or a shallow management or a shallow staff writer to distort a word which brings to mind strong men and women who died and slaved in order that the United States might remain strong and free.

The word "expendable," Mr. President, reminds me of those among whom I was so deeply privileged to serve during wartime. They were known as the Airborne Infantry and they got where they wanted and had to go by jumping out of aircraft by parachute or by going off to a mission in their motorless aircraft called gliders. I, myself, Mr. President, was a very ordinary sort of soldier—make no mistake about that—and I make no claim of having ranked high among the many, many real heroes of the last war. I was only one of millions who did the best they knew how. But having a chance to live among men and women whose hearts were strong provided me with a memory and with encouragement I shall never forget or disregard. Air-borne troops, Mr. President, had a great creed. By it they most willingly, and happily sometimes, lived or died. It went like this: "If it be life that waits then I shall live forever unconquered. If it be death then I shall die at last strong in my pride and free."

There is no IV-F in peacetime in the world or anyone who has never had a close association with life and death, who has any right to use a word which, if used by the wrong people, defames the memory of those who died in order that that word "expendable" might be used in an honorable sense in the name of free people.

As Buzzy Cain and his father learned from Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, expendable men were left in the path of the enemy and sacrificed, according to plan, in order to gain time. There are those of us in both Houses of Congress, Mr. President, who though we may be wrong, are convinced that what we stand for is right. We fight with everything we have against proposals of the administration or of Time magazine, if you please, which we conceive to be in opposition to the preservation of freedom and stimulation of additional opportunities for every American. We shall continue to fight for what we think is right to the end of our time—today, tomorrow, 6 years from now or 25 years from now, it makes no difference. In this sense, Mr. President, I am but one of a group of others who will gladly run the risk of being an "expendable," for we seek to provide our Nation with time as a hedge against rushing headlong to the left as the rest of the world has done with such resulting evil and loss of human dignity and strength for a large part of mankind.

In hope that those of my colleagues who have not read it will read it all, I want the RECORD to carry the opening paragraphs of that book about real men, They Were Expendable. Any real soldier, be he clothed in civilian or military dress—and I think there are a great many good civilian soldiers in the Congress—is always ready to be expendable. I read now from that book:

"You don't understand," said the young naval officer, "we were expendable." He was very earnest as he lolled on the bunk in the officers' quarters of the torpedo station at Newport, along with the other three officers who had also just got out of the Philippines. I admitted I didn't understand. "Well, it's like this."

We can almost see him now. He was about 21 years of age. That is the kind of person those men were.

I read further:

"Suppose you're a sergeant machine-gunner, and your army is retreating and the enemy advancing. The captain takes you to a machine gun covering the road. 'You're to stay here and hold this position,' he tells you. 'For how long?' you ask. 'Never mind,' he answers; 'just hold it.' Then you know you're expendable. In a war, anything can be expendable—money or gasoline or equipment or most usually men. They are expending you and that machine gun to get time. They don't expect to see either one again. They expect you to stay there and spray that road with steel until you're killed or captured, holding up the enemy for a few minutes or even a precious quarter of an hour.

"You know the situation—that those few minutes gained are worth the life of a man to your army. So you don't mind it until you come back here where people waste hours and days and sometimes weeks, when you've seen your friends give their lives to save minutes."

## RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 11, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 10 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

## COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Nan Wood Honeyman, of Portland, Oreg., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 29, with headquarters at Portland, Oreg. (Reappointment.)

## IN THE ARMY

## TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

## To be brigadier generals

Col. John Max Lentz, O10343, United States Army.

Col. Riley Finley Ennis, O11854, United States Army.

Col. Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500, United States Army.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of the act of June 10, 1949 (Public Law 96, 81st Cong.):

## To be colonel

Frederick A. Ward, O7566.

## To be lieutenant colonels

Bienvenido M. Alba, O16939.

Santiago G. Guevara, O15334.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

## To be first lieutenant

William P. Goodman, JAGC, O1063003.

## To be second lieutenants

Dorothy M. Brown, WAC, L1010075.

Lola M. Ireland, WAC, L1010091.

Elsie J. Metcalf, WAC, L1010099.

Lois C. Putnam, WAC, L1010104.

Mary L. Truslow, WAC, L1010113.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Robert H. Banks.

Eugene C. Barbero, O408601.

Leland E. Beyersdorff, O540156.

Robert J. Bouchard, O945649.

Murray N. Bullard, O970481.

Terry T. Field, O453560.

Harold P. Fields, O967915.

Charles V. Follett, Jr., O1341654.

Herbert O. Graeser, O1333963.

John A. Hughes, Jr., O449092.

John J. Knight, O973364.

Charles W. Luke, O769626.

Robert B. McIntosh, Jr., O540770.

James M. Minter.

Lee B. Moore, O967766.  
Lloyd H. Newcomer, Jr., O541981.  
Jehiel Novick, O466865.  
Willard T. Pfueger, O545594.  
Tom H. Reynolds.  
Carl F. Roark, O1080478.  
Henry S. Rubenstein, O958239.  
Lawrence L. Savage, Jr., O959720.  
Donald E. Smith, O1059290.  
Gerald C. Stinson, O1019020.  
Ransom D. Stone, O974414.

The following-named distinguished military graduate for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

O'Neill Barrett, Jr.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Thomas E. Duffy, O971865.  
Wayne B. Fagg.  
John L. Fletcher.  
Gerald G. Hennis.  
Richard G. Hicks, O972238.  
James H. Hosey.  
Charles T. Hutzler, O968488.  
William J. Lockhart.  
Richard S. Miller, O957041.  
Alvin A. Poag, Jr., O974881.  
William T. Purdy, O968659.  
Hillard J. Trubitt.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1950, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

David D. Adams.  
Garner V. Allen.  
John E. Anderson.  
Samuel J. Armeni, O967278.  
Ned R. Ash, O980893.  
Robert W. Ashbee.  
Allan C. Ashcraft.  
Doyle R. Avant, Jr.  
Benjamin F. Bateman, O973355.  
John R. Berger.  
Willy F. Bohlmann, Jr.  
Charles S. Brantley, O967707.  
Haynes Brinkley, Jr.  
George S. Brown.  
William R. Brown, O978812.  
Howard D. Burtchett, O977642.  
Charles C. Bush III.  
Elwood L. Carlson.  
Richard A. Clarke.  
James P. Coffin.  
Robert E. Crosser.  
William F. Donnelly.  
John J. Douglas.  
Theodore H. Emmerich, Jr., O972378.  
Robert A. Flake.  
Herbert L. Frandsen.  
Columbus B. Fulton.  
Oved Gonzales.  
Francois D. Gravois, Jr., O954451.  
James C. Griffith.  
Melvin G. Gross.  
Frank M. Gunby, Jr.  
Julian C. Hammond.  
Frank W. Harrison.  
Robert M. Huckins.  
Eugene M. Huff.  
Roger W. Jepsen.  
David E. Kettlewell, O967997.  
Constantine W. Koines.  
David J. Kreager, Jr.

Laurence D. Krentzlin.  
Elvin R. Kromer, Jr.  
Osborne Lawes, O971644.  
George S. Lokken.  
Orville W. Love.  
John M. Mays, O971233.  
Norman W. McNabb.  
Richard S. Medding.  
James C. Morris.  
Paul Morris.  
William C. Myre.  
William E. Nichols.  
Billy L. Odneal.  
Macyl K. Orman.  
Max F. Paehl, Jr.  
Patrick E. Parkes.  
William G. Phelan.  
John M. Pickarts.  
James M. Pierce.  
Roy E. Platt, Jr.  
Joseph H. Powell.  
Jip M. Pruden II, O960168.  
Anthony L. Pullano.  
Ernest A. Rajala, O978327.  
John R. Randolph.  
Neil A. Reilly.  
Robert B. Rigler.  
Robert A. Roseberry.  
Roy W. Roth.  
Joseph T. Ryan.  
Erle O. Sandlin, Jr., O975733.  
Walter J. Sinclair.  
Stanley W. Smith, O978505.  
Clayton O. Spann.  
Wayne M. Stevens.  
Reginald N. Timberlake.  
Gramount D. Twitty.  
Joseph Veltri.  
Walter D. Welti.  
Edward J. Yost.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment as second lieutenant in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1950, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Donald E. Haskins.  
John E. Scanlon, O955930.

#### IN THE COAST GUARD

The following two officers of the United States Coast Guard for promotion to the permanent grade of rear admiral:

Raymond J. Mauerman  
Alfred C. Richmond.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 10 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD  
W. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Frank Pace, Jr., of Arkansas, to be Secretary of the Army.

#### IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Maj. Gen. Walter Duncan Love, O11506, Dental Corps, United States Army, for appointment as assistant to the Surgeon General, United States Army.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

#### To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Arthur Raymond Gaines, O6261.  
Brig. Gen. Leonard Dudley Heaton, O16960.

#### To be brigadier generals

Col. Maxwell Gordon Keeler, O6620.  
Col. James Patrick Cooney, O17338.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS, REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mej. Richard Walsh Fitch, Jr., O52064.  
Maj. Anthony Jackson Race, O52163.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) have been examined for physical fitness and found physically qualified for promotion. All others are subject to physical examination required by law.)

#### To be majors

X Charles Edwards Branson, O30805.  
X Wilson Harold Kayko, O38841.  
X Aaron Peter Ross, O51794.  
X Allen Templeton Samuel, Jr., O40049.  
Hilwert Schuyler Streeter, O20300.  
X William Barret Sullivan, O20352.

#### To be majors, Veterinary Corps

X Charles Wilbur Gollehon, O30918.  
X David Samuel Hasson, O22884.  
X Herbert Franklin Sibert, O30922.

#### To be majors, Medical Service Corps

X Louis Emery Mudgett, O31069.  
X Barj Aaron Rustigian, O31068.

#### To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Theodore Edwin Blakeslee, O56970.  
X Douglas Charles Chitwood, O56248.  
X Paul Ambrose DuMond, O37607.  
James Lee Fink, O37604.  
X Edward James Hanna, O37610.  
X Dan George Kadrovach, O37613.  
X Edward James Keating, O37611.  
X John Eugene Mathis, O56251.  
X Clarence Horace Piercy, Jr., O37603.  
X Joseph Peter Salvo, O56246.  
X Charles Robert Smith, O37608.  
X John Franklin Waters 2d, O37605.  
X Norman Ernest Wood, Jr., O37596.  
X John Henry Wrigley, O41161.

#### To be lieutenant colonels, Chaplains

X Robert Joseph Hearn, O51131.  
X Charles Wesley Lovin, O51132.  
X Robert Leland Schock, O22757.

#### To be major, Chaplains

X Wilbur Kenneth Anderson, O43126.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

#### To be first lieutenants

Bernard William Abrams, O50736.  
Joseph John Addison, O50704.  
Richard Herman Allen, O50963.  
Merlin Willard Anderson, O50584.  
Robert Jacob Baer, O50684.  
Harry Polk Ball, O50672.  
Hugh James Bartley, O50621.  
Calvin Leland Bass, O50761.  
Roger Redmond Bate, O50583.  
Earle LeRoy Bathurst, Jr., O50776.  
Arthur Andrew Becker, O50591.  
Thomas Edward Benson, O50691.  
Ralph Harold Beuhler, O50729.  
Theodore Chester Bielicki, O50825.  
Shelton Brant Biles, Jr., O50593.  
George Earl Bland, O50821.  
Junius Jay Bleiman, O50581.  
Frank Coulter Boerger, O50579.  
Philip Thomas Boerger, O50618.  
Otis Evan Brannon, Jr., O50783.  
William Donald Brown, O50828.  
Jean Prosper Burner, O50722.  
Donovan Finley Burton, O50622.  
James Lee Bushnell, O50697.  
Paul Charles Callan, O50833.  
William Albert Carpenter, Jr., O50813.  
Jerome Boris Christine, O50597.  
Willis Howell Clark, O50686.  
William Fortune Coghill, O50753.  
Robert Bernard Coleman, O50852.  
William Edmond Conger, Jr., O50858.

William Lamble Cooper, O50864.  
 James Christopher Cosgrove, C50/63.  
 William Bernard Cronin, O50787.  
 Stanley Warfield Crosby, Jr., O50845.  
 John Edward Culin, O50654.  
 Paul J. Curry, O50629.  
 Robert Thornton Curtis, O50834.  
 Glenn Woodward Davis, O50873.  
 Bernard Figueredo de Gil, Jr., O50794.  
 John Delistraty, O50706.  
 Donald Marvin Dexter, Jr., O50834.  
 Robert Francis Draper, O50857.  
 Jack Van Dunham, O50668.  
 Richard Earl Dunlap, O50719.  
 Gordon James Duquemin, O50784.  
 James Eugene Edington, O50734.  
 James Betts Egger, O50595.  
 Henry Everett Emerson, O50868.  
 Robert Bruce Fahs, O50824.  
 John Carter Faith, O50590.  
 Thomas Long Flattery, O50811.  
 Stuart Gregory Force, O50769.  
 James Franklin Fraser, O50589.  
 Herschel Everett Fuson, O50718.  
 John Griffin Gaddie, O50710.  
 Bernard Jay Gardner, O50679.  
 Robert Miller Garvin, O50712.  
 Albert John Geraci, O50786.  
 John Love Gerrity, O50648.  
 David Welty Gibson, O50830.  
 Warren Robert Gossett, O50676.  
 William Douglas Grant, O50716.  
 Bernard Michael Greenberg, O50602.  
 Edwin Borchard Green, O50623.  
 Harold Walter Grossman, O50677.  
 Alexander Meigs Haig, Jr., O50790.  
 Raymond Richard Halls, Jr., O50641.  
 Robert Haldane, O50742.  
 Milton Leland Haskin, O50637.  
 Kenneth Martin Hatch, O50640.  
 Wayne Otis Hauck, Jr., O50807.  
 George LeRoy Haugen, O50643.  
 Thomas Francis Hayes, O50800.  
 Rolland Valentine Heiser, O50738.  
 George Duane Heisser, O50805.  
 William Sylvester Henry, Jr., O50814.  
 Dandridge Featherston Hering, O50696.  
 Henry William Hill, O50755.  
 Bennet Norman Hollander, O50693.  
 John Elwood Hoover, O50620.  
 Richard Motley Hutchinson, Jr., O50822.  
 Julius Frederick Ickler, O50687.  
 Carroll Christian Jacobson, Jr., O50612.  
 Leon Joseph Jacques, Jr., O50861.  
 James Allen Johnson, O50638.  
 Wilber Glenn Jones, Jr., O50863.  
 Peter Karter, O50592.  
 James Byron Kennedy, O50607.  
 Robert James Kennedy, O50610.  
 Graham Gunther Kent, O50859.  
 Robert Adair King, O50797.  
 Willis Hickam Knipe, O50829.  
 Robert Joshua Koch, O50874.  
 Donald Warren Krause, O50872.  
 Robert Peter Lane, O50705.  
 Wells Brendel Lange, O50767.  
 John William Lauterbach, Jr., O50727.  
 Melvin Vernon LeBlanc, O50690.  
 Alexander Lemberes, O50754.  
 George Levenback, O50689.  
 Selby Francis Little, Jr., O50860.  
 Richard Alan Littlestone, O50653.  
 Walter Patrick Lukens, O50801.  
 George Anthony Lynn, O50593.  
 Richard Freeman McAdoe, O50809.  
 Robert Ewing McCord, O50803.  
 John Warwick McCullough, Jr., O50867.  
 Oliver Louis McDougell, O50812.  
 William Gabriel McGee, O50855.  
 Robert James McNeil, O50756.  
 Henry Tomlinson MacGill, O50808.  
 Arnold William Mahlum, O50751.  
 Robert Anthony Mahowald, O50796.  
 LeRoy Emil Majeske, O50733.  
 Charles Stuart Todd Mallett, O50819.  
 George Aloysius Maloney, O50862.  
 Martin Michael Maloney, O50758.  
 John Wayne Mastin, O50582.

James Philip Mattern, O50713.  
 Harrison Franklyn Meadows 3d, O50839.  
 John More Miller, O50692.  
 Robert Miller Montague, Jr., O50578.  
 Charles Augustus Munford, Jr., O50838.  
 John DuBois Naill, Jr., O50813.  
 William Wallace Nairn 3d, O50720.  
 Wallace Eugene Nickel, O50695.  
 Robert Lynn Ozier, O50763.  
 Henry Cantzon Paul, O50725.  
 John Guilford Paules, O50881.  
 Robert DeWayne Peckham, O50740.  
 Tom Judson Perkins, O50781.  
 Milum Davis Perry, Jr., O50594.  
 Louis Rachmeler, O50666.  
 John Richard Rantz, O50826.  
 Kermit Dean Reel, O50632.  
 John Brooks Reese, O50596.  
 Hal Clyde Richardson, Jr., O50662.  
 James Russell Robinson, Jr., O50588.  
 Thomas Edmund Rogers, O50785.  
 Melvin Alfred Rosen, O50580.  
 Norman Robert Rosen, O50600.  
 Carl Kamp Russell, O50777.  
 Norman Junior Salisbury, O50802.  
 Howard Leroy Sargent, Jr., O50586.  
 Donald Verner Schnepf, O50698.  
 William Jackson Schuder, O50611.  
 Richard Henry Sforzini, O50624.  
 Robert Warren Short, O50871.  
 James Emerson Smith, Jr., O50798.  
 William Smith, O50717.  
 Ira Warren Snyder, Jr., O50759.  
 Theodore Solomon Spiker, O50774.  
 Sam David Starobin, O50601.  
 Richard Joseph Steinborn, O50616.  
 Donald Harry Steininger, O50599.  
 Marvin Henry Stock, O50633.  
 Gordon Malin Strong, O50835.  
 John Joseph Sullivan, O50627.  
 William Michael Sullivan, O50750.  
 James Bernard Tatum, O50846.  
 Harold Stan Tavzel, O50730.  
 Frank Leonard Taylor, O50730.  
 Jack Mathew Thompson, O50608.  
 Gerald Ross Toomer, O50707.  
 Albert Archer Van Petten, O50674.  
 Wallace Francis Veaudry, O50820.  
 William Loyd Webb, Jr., O50652.  
 Carlton Juan Wellborn, Jr., O50665.  
 William Irvine West, O50732.  
 Meade David Wildrick, Jr., O50827.  
 VanCourt Wilkins, O56768.  
 Joseph John Williams, O50810.  
 William Dawes Williams, Jr., O50877.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be captains, Army Nurse Corps*

Anna Marie Bisignano, N763.  
 Mary Jean Carsey, N1429.  
 Dorothy Ellen Crist, N935.  
 Irene Irma Desrosiers, N1593.  
 Mary Norma Donato, N767.  
 Maxine Helen Fell, N1425.  
 Barbara Mae Hogan, N1433.  
 Johanna Helen Jakubaitis, N1431.  
 Nancy Cray Kermott, N1685.  
 Carolyn Bergeron Rahm, N1684.  
 Lucile Standley, N1679.  
 Sylvia Mildred Stivlen, N1432.

*To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps*

Margaret Burk Beavers, N1629.  
 Therese Evelyn Daley, N1527.  
 Alma Elizabeth Guinn, N1628.  
 Zita Josephine Ierino, N1190.  
 Pearl Idell Jank, N1631.  
 Ruth Margaret Leahy, N1528.  
 Roberta Whitehouse Smith, N1526.

*To be captains, Women's Medical Specialist Corps*

Marcel Binning, M10011.  
 Betty Jane Snyder, M10085.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE GRADES AND CORPS SPECIFIED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 381, 80TH CONG.), AND TITLE II OF THE ACT OF AUGUST 5, 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 365, 80TH CONG.), SUBJECT TO PHYSICAL QUALIFICATION

*To be majors*

John Y. Battenfield, MC, O356872.  
 Joseph A. DeBlase, MC, O368572.  
 Thomas F. McKellar, MC, O367396.  
 John L. Mothershead, MC, O355922.  
 John B. Plum, MC, O341182.

*To be captains*

Robert C. Allif, MC.  
 Donald T. Book, MC, O435439.  
 Eston R. Caldwell, MC, O1736369.  
 Americo J. Castagno, MC, O1706176.  
 Stanley J. Galuszewski, DC, O1765915.  
 Franklin F. Hulswit, DC, O963001.  
 Charles W. Kraul, MC, O1726114.  
 Ivan W. Kuhl, MC, O1716792.  
 Herbert L. Ley, Jr., MC, O1746828.

*To be first lieutenants*

Benjamin K. Ammenwerth, DC, O975823.  
 Walter E. Benson, DC, O945588.  
 Thomas W. Brenhm, DC, O965560.  
 Robert F. Campion, DC, O966001.  
 Merida W. Castleberry, VC, O929807.  
 Donald E. Clark, MC, O958517.  
 John Clarkson, DC, O976549.  
 Stanley S. Cohen, DC, O833896.  
 Walter T. Colbert, MC.  
 Joseph M. Damron, MC, O954957.  
 James B. Earle, JAGC, O1290920.  
 John E. Egdahl, MC, O960464.  
 Rawls H. Frazier, JAGC, O981502.  
 Robert F. Grabb, JAGC, O559841.  
 Lawrence P. Hansen, JAGC, O1105493.  
 Frederick L. Harcourt, MC, O936123.  
 Edward W. Haughney, JAGC, O117773.  
 Joseph A. Hill, JAGC, O1049888.  
 Thomas H. Hooten, JAGC, O557369.  
 Niklaus J. A. Keller, MC, O958511.  
 Joseph A. Latteri, MC, O958570.  
 Jack P. Lawler, JAGC, O981789.  
 Harold E. May, MC, O977690.  
 Leonard W. Melander, Jr., MC, O963435.  
 Richard F. Seibert, JAGC, O524168.  
 Paul H. Schroy, JAGC, O982824.  
 Francis H. Vonnahmen, DC, O959939.  
 Wendell J. White, MC, O958931.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Remer Y. Brinson.  
 Andre M. Kahn, O978631.  
 Vaughn L. Maxwell, Jr.  
 Thomas A. Murphy.  
 Neil H. Triner, O958005.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Josiah C. Campbell, Jr.  
 William B. Fesperman.  
 Conrad L. Hall.  
 James G. Hickerson.  
 George E. Peters, Jr.  
 Robert L. Peters, O975328.  
 John S. Quarles.  
 Richard H. Sawyer.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1950, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of

1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Samuel F. Burt.  
Robert J. Douglas.  
William W. Gilleland.  
Frederick H. Griswold, O972718.  
Hugh M. Hardaway.  
William B. Neal.  
William D. Walker.  
Joe D. White, O968238.

APPOINTMENTS AS SECOND LIEUTENANT IN THE CORPS SPECIFIED, REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 36, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, SUBJECT TO PHYSICAL QUALIFICATION

Jannette M. Andrews, ANC, N774610.  
Anne Currier, ANC, N804245.  
Eleanor R. Gallagher, ANC, N792156.  
Shirley M. Gilson, ANC, N754995.  
Gladys F. Hall, ANC, N768831.  
Aloha B. Hammerly, ANC, N783896.  
Eva M. Hathcock, WMSC, M2523.  
Bernice LaRocque, ANC, N792907.  
Martha E. Mayfield, ANC, N794689.  
Lois J. Moore, ANC, N792741.  
Irene R. Z. Pishak, ANC, N796677.  
Margaret L. Rau, ANC, N792327.  
Dorothy J. Rocovich, ANC, N792865.  
Minerva A. Senn, ANC, N794796.  
Elizabeth W. Smith, ANC, N792867.  
Margaret Z. Smith, ANC, N792835.  
Ouida Weimer, WMSC, R2523.  
Lenora B. Weirick, ANC, N776692.  
Helen L. Wick, ANC, N778794.

#### IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Oscar C. Badger, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander Eastern Sea Frontier.

Vice Adm. Harry W. Hill, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Superintendent, United States Naval Academy.

Admiral Richard L. Conolly, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, United States Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean.

Capt. Harold W. Johnson, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy.

Capt. George R. Cooper, United States Navy, for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy.

The following-1. med officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty, for temporary appointment to the grade of commander, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

#### FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

Carlton F. Alm  
Fred G. Archbold, Jr.  
Theodore J. Banvard  
Walter G. Barnes, Jr.  
Langford W. Bates  
Edward H. Bayers  
Edward W. Bergstrom  
Thomas E. Blade  
Clarence A. Blouin  
David Bolton  
William G. Boyer  
Wilfred K. Bradbury  
Howard H. Brandenburg  
James A. Brough  
Herbert S. Brown, Jr.  
Robert B. Buchan  
Howard U. Bush  
Congrave C. Callaway  
Lucius D. Campbell  
Felix Caracciolo  
David C. Carmichael

Morris G. Duchin  
Alexander B. Dusenbury  
Gordon K. Ebbe  
Willard E. Eder  
Andrew M. Egeland  
Albert M. Ellingson  
Thomas B. Ellison  
Clifton Evans, Jr.  
John S. Eversole  
John H. R. Fehler  
Gordon E. Firebaugh  
Hubert W. Fisher  
Richard W. Fleck  
Wilford E. Fleshman  
Charles T. Foley  
Richard B. Forward  
Maynard M. Furney  
Louis S. Gard  
Charles A. Gearhart  
Harold H. Gearinger  
Lester E. Geer  
Wilfred H. Genest  
William Godwin  
Frank G. Gooding, Jr.  
Earle C. Gordon, Jr.  
Frank D. Gorman  
John H. Graves, Jr.  
Frank O. Green  
Francis J. Grisko  
Richard D. Gruber  
Joseph L. Hall  
Robert M. J. Halman  
Herbert E. Hanset  
William T. Hardaker  
William E. Hardy  
Robert H. Hare  
James C. Hargreaves  
Edward F. Harschutz  
Rolland Hastreiter  
Rupert D. Hawley  
Daniel W. Heagy  
Harold N. Heisel  
Stanley E. Herbst  
Elof W. Hermanson  
Dermott V. Hickey  
Harlow Hines  
Ronald W. Hoel  
Charles C. Hoffman  
Glen E. Hoffman  
Melvin C. Hoffman  
Edward T. Hogan  
Guy Howard  
Herbert B. Howard  
David R. Howser  
Richard C. Hunt  
Thomas W. Hunt  
Charles D. Huston  
Walter E. Hutchens  
Arthur L. Jacobsen  
William Janeshek  
Oliver P. Johnstone  
Ira L. Jones  
John C. Keatts, Jr.  
Robert H. Keehn  
LeRoy W. J. Keith  
Joseph M. Kellam  
Charles B. Kelly  
John S. Kilner, Jr.  
Willard D. King  
Paul J. Knapp  
Lincoln C. Koch  
Nils R. Larson  
Frank L. Lawlor  
Forrest A. Lees  
George S. Leonard  
William R. Leonard, Jr.  
Edward N. Little  
Robert W. Lund  
Norris L. McComb  
Elbert S. McCuskey  
Noel W. McDaniel  
Edward L. McDonald  
Henry G. McDonough  
Paul W. McEntire  
Craig McKee  
Harold W. McKinney

Martin P. MacNair  
Frank Malinasky  
Theodore W. Marshall  
Guilbert W. Martin  
Ray P. Minniear  
John D. Moroney  
Phillip C. Morris  
Marvin P. Morton, Jr.  
Wilbur Y. Morton  
Walter J. Murphy  
William G. Neese  
Robert U. Nolen  
John E. Odell, Jr.  
Herbert E. Ost  
Gordon N. Owens  
Ralph H. Packer  
William B. Paulin  
Douglas G. Phillips  
Albert D. Pollock, Jr.  
James A. Potter III  
William O. Powell Jr.  
Louis P. Pressler  
Samuel L. Prickett, Jr.  
Fred H. Rand  
James T. Reed  
Ira F. Reese  
Charles E. Rice, Jr.  
Carl W. Rinehart  
Albert D. Robbins  
Robert W. Robbins  
John C. Roberts, Jr.  
Harold A. Robinson  
William H. Robison  
Sydney G. Rubinow, Jr.  
Richard S. Roberts  
Dexter C. Rumsey II  
Edward E. Sack  
Robert L. Sage  
William E. Scarborough  
Herbert T. Schmidt  
Irving J. Schuyler  
Erwin G. Schwab  
Leo R. Schwabe  
Frank M. Screws  
Norman V. Scurria  
John G. Sheridan  
Gordon A. Sherwood  
Charles A. Shipman  
Jerry R. Siefert  
John K. Sloatman, Jr.  
Charles C. Smith  
Eugene C. Smith  
Joseph G. Smith  
Leonard B. Smith  
Robert R. Snyder  
David L. Soper  
Henry E. Staley  
John M. Stuart  
William T. Sutherland  
Robert J. Sutherland  
Winford A. Swenson  
Robert Wagner  
Charles A. Walruff  
Joseph T. Watson, Jr.  
John B. Wayne  
Grayston H. Weber  
Paul T. Weber  
Robert W. Weber  
James F. Wilbur, Jr.  
Lawrence B. Williamson  
Max D. Wiviott  
Dick M. Wheat  
Bacil C. Wheatley  
William S. Woollen  
Spencer D. Wright  
Whitney Wright  
William P. Tanner, Jr.  
Harry B. Taylor  
William N. Thies  
Charles Timblin  
Ralph A. Turner  
Karl S. VanMeter  
Raymond V. vanWolken  
Jay B. Yakeley  
Alan H. Yates

#### FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVAL RESERVE

Arthur B. Bennett  
William M. Bliss  
George H. Bond  
Griswold L. Boutellier  
Frank T. Callahan  
Fred A. Camp  
Francis W. Council  
Richard T. Cowden  
Philip Y. Craig  
Richard Doughton, Jr.  
Wayne F. Eckley  
James R. Fogarty  
Archie T. Ford  
Robert E. Henderson  
Arthur C. Hillner  
Jesse G. Holland  
Alfred F. Holzappel  
John C. Hunt

Louis J. Kulot  
Richard Linthicum  
Daniel J. Lynch  
John B. Miller  
Ralph H. McKee  
Robert A. Noe  
Kenneth J. Nordstrom  
Alfred J. Quinby  
Samuel R. Sanders, Jr.  
George A. Schoene  
Harry F. Snyder  
Rinaldo V. Taborelli  
William S. Taylor  
Marvin L. Thornton  
Harvey W. Thurston  
John P. Vaughan  
Elmer Walls  
John G. Watterson

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

John M. Aungst  
William C. Bailey  
Raymond H. Barker  
Robert W. Barnard  
Robert W. Barnhart  
William R. Barrett  
James W. Basham  
Frederick C. Bereswill  
William F. Bethmann  
James E. Bigler  
Dean T. Bowen  
John R. Brinkley  
William B. Browne  
Billy M. Burt  
Thomas J. Cabelus, Jr.  
Michael Clarke  
William L. Cleland  
Denzel L. Crist  
Robert M. Dagg  
Richard S. Davidson  
Frederick P. Davis  
Michael A. DeCarlo  
Melvin R. DeMond  
Warren C. Dukes  
Walter H. Eells, Jr.  
William H. Ellis  
Paul H. Engel  
Robert S. Estes  
Glenn T. Farnworth  
Guthrie E. Farrar  
Richard F. Fassula  
Richard C. Fenner  
Morris N. Finisy  
Alden G. Finley  
James I. Fiscus  
William O. Fleming  
Forrest Forsythe  
Marion Furrow, Jr.  
Roland M. Gerdes  
Paul H. Gilbert  
Albert H. Giles  
Edmund E. Goodwin  
Harvey W. Graf  
Robert B. Habeck  
Paul B. Hamilton  
Corydon C. Hardy  
John Harris  
Stanley W. Henderson  
Thomas "A" Henderson  
Harry K. Herrmann  
Allen E. Hill  
Carl O. Hitchcock  
George H. Holloman  
William E. Holmes  
William P. Ilgen, Jr.  
Frederick T. Jamieson  
Richard L. Johnson  
John P. Jones  
Richard Kaiser  
Donald J. Keefe  
Stephen B. Kiedrowski  
Herbert W. Kiker, Jr.  
Charles E. Knighten  
Keith R. Knott  
Fredrick D. Koehler  
Bradley D. Kowalsky  
David E. Leue  
Wilson McCulley, Jr.  
Richard W. McKee  
Thomas C. Mauney  
Harry L. May  
Edward G. Milway  
James A. Morrison  
John Mudrock  
Ralph E. Neiger  
Sherwood A. Nelson  
James L. Newman  
Richard T. Newman  
George E. Niver, Jr.  
Cutlar J. Nordyke  
Jack Norton  
John W. O'Brien  
William J. O'Donnell  
Charles A. Peacock  
Fred J. Pester  
Edward E. Peterman  
James H. Popejoy  
Edward B. Powell  
Eugene H. Prange  
Philip S. Randolph, Jr.  
Donald G. Raskob  
Lawrence H. Resek  
Joe "E" Richardson  
John "D" Richardson  
Clayton R. Robinson  
John D. Rowe  
Robert Rudman  
Bryan C. Rudy  
Rayford R. Sanders  
Robert L. Schaub  
Kenneth C. Scholl  
Kenneth R. Seal  
Merritt J. Sharrett  
Benjamin F. Shaw  
William D. Smith  
David A. Soullinger  
Walter E. Southall, Jr.  
Aldean H. Steves  
William M. Stollenwerck  
Gerald J. Sullivan  
Allen LaF. Sweet, Jr.  
John A. Thompson, Jr.  
David K. Trubey  
James J. Tyson, Jr.  
Xavier V. Villanueva  
Robert C. Wagner  
Clarence E. West  
Ralph E. White  
Harley D. Wilbur  
Jacob L. H. Wink  
Gerald W. Wise  
John J. Wojnar  
Richard F. Woodruff  
Robert T. Wooley  
Robert H. Wright  
Paul S. Wuesthoff  
Henry K. Wylie

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Thomas A. Glennon

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert E. Fairchild Denton E. Kuhn  
John N. Gossom John W. Pentecost  
Frederick W. Koester

III

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Eleanor J. Brown Nancy E. Martin  
Rose M. Clemens Virginia P. Shortell  
Ruth A. Higgins Mildred M. Smith  
Geraldine F. Johnson Vivian E. Smith  
Judith A. Johnson Patricia A. Wywiorski

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grades and corps indicated.

The following-named officer for temporary appointment.

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS

Greydon G. Boyd

The following-named officers for permanent appointment:

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Greydon G. Boyd

LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS

Joseph S. Burkle  
Richard H. Tullis, Jr.  
William R. Walsh

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), MEDICAL CORPS

Richard E. Lieurance  
George E. Magnin

LIEUTENANTS, NURSE CORPS

Evelyn A. Bremer Ernestine C. Hess  
Bernadette E. Golbach Leona T. Radzai

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), NURSE CORPS

Eleanor R. O'Donnell

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George N. Carroll Richard E. Thompson  
Clyde T. Mattison Willard C. Fiske  
Raymond B. Hurst Robert C. Walton  
Robert E. Cushman, Jr. Stanley W. Trachta  
Arnold F. Johnston Carey A. Randall  
Robert A. Black Ronald B. Wilde  
Gordon E. Hendricks William S. McCormick  
Charles W. Shelburne William F. Van Ryzin  
Richard G. Weede Albert F. Metzke  
Richard D. Hughes Joe C. McHaney  
Charles O. Bierman Gould P. Groves  
Frederick A. Ramsey, Jr. Donn "C" Hart  
William N. McGill Wilmer E. Barnes  
Kenneth D. Kerby Kenyth A. Damke  
Carl A. Laster Raymond L. Murray  
Michael S. Currin John S. Oldfield  
Leonard K. Davis Kenneth A. Jorgensen  
Elmer T. Dorsey Alexander B. Swenceski  
Earl A. Sneiderger Hoyt McMillan  
Merlyn D. Holmes Peter J. Negri  
Lewis J. Fields Frank P. Hager, Jr.  
Harvey S. Walseth Eimer E. Brackett, Jr.  
Bruce T. Hemphill William T. Fairbourn  
Edwin P. Pennebaker, Jr. Custis Burton, Jr.  
Wallace M. Nelson Clayton O. Totman.  
Leonard F. Chapman, Jr. Bruno A. Hochmuth  
John E. Weber Thomas F. Riley  
Gallais "E" Matheny Frederick P. Henderson  
Herman Nickerson, Jr. Donald J. Decker  
Richard H. Crockett Frederick E. Leek  
Wesley M. Platt William R. Wendt  
George A. Roll Robert A. McGill  
Floyd R. Moore James M. Clark  
Marshall A. Tyler Peter J. Speckman  
Marvin H. Floom Roy L. Kline

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Robert A. Merchant, Leyton M. Rogers  
Jr. Alexander R. Benson  
Walter L. Eddy, Jr. John H. Jones  
Hugh J. Chapman John F. Holt  
John E. Decher, Jr. Thomas J. O'Connor  
John L. Donnell Clyde P. Ford

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Walter E. Anderson  
Lee Moberly

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Max R. Read William T. Herring  
William A. Houston, Edward S. Dzura  
Jr. Francis F. Parry  
Homer W. Sharpenberg William P. Pala  
Thomas J. Cross Hubert C. Lattimer  
Henry M. Wellman, Jr. John H. Ellis  
William G. Tinsley Raymond D. Wright  
Louis E. Hudgins, Jr. Wilbert T. Shafer  
John D. Wiggins Robert J. J. Picardi  
Herman Hansen, Jr. Charles H. Brush, Jr.  
Elmer G. Glidden, Jr. William P. Alston  
Loren D. Everton Allan L. Feldmeier  
William C. Chamberlin Clyde A. Brooks  
James M. Watkins, Jr. Arthur C. Lowell  
James A. Donovan, Jr. James M. Johnson  
Robert C. Walker Harry T. Marshall, Jr.  
Harold K. Throneson Donald R. Kennedy  
Jack A. Witherspoon Regan Fuller  
Donald B. Hubbard Andrews M. Wilkinson  
Michael P. Ryan Fenlon A. Durand  
Gordon H. West Noel C. Gregory  
Armond H. Delallo Roscoe C. Cline, Jr.  
Harvey A. Feehan Frederick M. Rauschenbach  
Bruce Prosser Hal R. Kolp  
Douglas B. Lenardson Joseph H. Reinburg  
Harry B. Hooper, Jr. Honore G. Dalton  
Robert W. Greeley Walter C. Wells  
Hensley Williams Max H. LaGrone  
Robert L. Schreier Arthur E. Holdt  
Arthur E. Holdt John R. Chaisson  
Nat M. Pace Frederick S. Aldridge  
Claude H. Welch Harold R. Thorpe  
Vance H. Hudgins John C. Jordan, Jr.  
Wilson E. Hunt William A. Wood  
Earl J. Rowse William H. Atkinson  
Manual Brilliant John S. Dewey  
Alexander W. Gentleman John D. Bradbury  
William M. Miller Robert A. Churley  
Charles E. McLean, Jr. William H. Junghans,  
Roland J. Spritzen Jr.

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major for limited duty:

Irving N. Kelly

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Joseph Keller Robert G. Klein  
Karl T. Keller Gerald J. Maire  
Earl W. Cassidy William W. Eldridge,  
Donald C. Mitchell Jr.  
James E. Graaff Richard A. Polen  
Raymond E. Wase George A. Parant  
Raymond E. Demers Herbert C. Reed  
Malcolm G. Moncrief, Edward W. Turcotte  
Jr. Lloyd B. Dochterman,  
Otis E. Millenbine Jr.  
Alexander J. Gillis, Jr.  
George L. Winneberger Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain for limited duty:

Kenneth A. Walsh  
Edwin M. Clements  
Reginald M. George

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George F. Thayer Joseph S. Bartos, Jr.  
John W. Drury Kenneth W. Henry  
Esten C. Carper, Jr. Donald W. Tardif  
Peter W. Adams Robert B. Pohl  
Roscoe F. Good, Jr. Robert L. Nelson  
Harold D. Fredericks Robert M. Lucy  
Karl D. Morrison John H. Affleck  
Edward G. Jernigan Melvin W. Snow  
William J. Davis Robert H. Rea  
Thomas E. Dawson Richard W. Crowley  
George C. Fox Melvin G. Hector  
Forest J. Hunt Floyd H. Wardrop  
Donald B. Thomas Charles A. Cothran  
Philip D. Shutler Thomas E. Vernon  
George W. Allen David A. Strausz  
Michael M. Ameen, Jr. Boyd B. Sibert, Jr.  
Robert E. Izzo William F. Wagner  
Justin H. Wenger Baldomero Lopez  
Paul R. Uffelman Jack W. Harris  
Floyd A. Cuff Frank Y. Dill  
William A. Reavis Martin Pearson  
Thomas H. Galbraith Joseph M. Vosmik  
Ezra H. Arkland Edward Y. Holt, Jr.  
David W. Walsh Donald L. Evans, Jr.  
David A. Lowe Bonner R. Bell  
Cullen O. Henry Thomas E. Murphree  
George A. Bacas Jack T. Baker  
William L. Jesse Otto L. Marx  
George C. Kliefoth Edgar A. Hollister  
Anthony V. Messina Jesus R. Flores  
Albert F. Belbusti Edmund W. Jaworski  
Manuel F. Castro Francis B. Carlson  
Edward A. Timmes Donald A. Chiappetti  
Carl H. Strandberg Carl R. Dennis  
Parks H. Simpson George R. Earnest  
Harold K. Thompson, Jr. Robert C. Sebillian  
James W. Epley Eugene R. Puckett  
Robert E. Steed Jack J. Petska  
Robert W. Holding Jack Westerman  
John A. Buck Lloyd L. Seaward  
Jerome N. Pieti Charles J. Schneeman,  
John J. Walsh Jr.  
Charles H. Dean, Jr. Philip Hanna, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant for limited duty:

James B. Darnell Doyle Grimes  
Robert L. Neef Clifford A. Youngs

The following-named officers (civilian college graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

John C. Drenning Charles V. Jarman  
Walter A. Gagne, Jr. Elliott R. Laine, Jr.  
John W. Haggerty III Thomas G. Snipes

The following-named civilian college graduate for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Rodney C. Dench.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of commissioned warrant officer, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Albert H. Battle Howard W. Harrington  
George J. Pelletier Edward B. Hamilton,  
Frederick J. Bollette, Jr.  
William W. Draper Darrol Lewis  
Victor T. Garrison Gilbert D. Schryver  
Donald E. Morgan Charles E. Hazen  
Homer D. Lyke Joseph A. LeBlanc  
Chalmers H. Given Harvey King  
Algie W. Thornton William T. Long, Jr.  
Robert L. Martin, Jr. Dee R. Yancey  
Ralph P. Dempsey Arnold L. Charlton, Jr.  
Charles H. Monteith Francis L. Downing  
George B. C. Dangerfield, Jr. Gerald W. Garrison  
Harold F. Wandron William J. Bott  
James L. Fountain

Hobart H. Budlong  
 Raymond E. Streeter  
 John C. Smith  
 Frank A. Bartuck  
 Robert E. Trometter  
 Andrew L. Heaton  
 Robert E. Ouellette  
 Thomas R. Van Fleet  
 Alex H. Touchton  
 Raymon A. Clark  
 Ray N. Herrell  
 Costanzo Cellucci  
 Jesse C. Quattlebaum  
 Jr.  
 Reble A. Windsor  
 Joseph H. Malone  
 William C. Koch, Jr.  
 Donald M. Stone  
 Cecil H. Santrock  
 Wilfred D. Holdren  
 Stanley A. Lahendro

Joseph A. Corvi  
 George W. Kreisheimer  
 Edward W. Mooney  
 Talmadge R. Liles  
 Rupert L. Fogle  
 Anthony W. Livingston  
 Medford D. Good  
 William Dickison  
 Walter L. Czechowski  
 Kenneth E. Williams  
 Willard J. Reid  
 Walter Pietrzak  
 Jérôme Ross  
 Louis L. Noe  
 Harold J. Michael  
 Fred S. Huneycutt  
 Willard C. Downs  
 Matthew A. Propotnik  
 Obie E. Newcomb, Jr.  
 Ovel L. Ewing, Jr.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

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

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

Eternal Spirit, hope of the souls that seek Thee, strength of the souls that find Thee, grant unto these chosen servants of the Commonwealth, pushed and pressed by grave questions and vexing problems, the refreshment and renewal which shall make them adequate to serve the present age. Make them conscious of eternal verities that outlast the strident noises of any day.

We cannot adequately face such a world so full of violent and dark deeds and make our humble contribution to the healing of its tangled, tragic state unless we keep untarnished our faith in Thy power to make even the wrath of men praise Thee, and in Thy ultimate purpose for mankind. Give to us peace in our time, O God. To our stricken generation may there come peace with honor, with human dignity vindicated and social justice the panoply of all the nations. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Monday, April 10, 1950, 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.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LONG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and the remainder of the week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TOBEY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from the close of business today until April 22.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	McKellar
Benton	Hayden	McMahon
Brewster	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Malone
Bridges	Hill	Maybank
Butler	Hoey	Morse
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Cain	Ives	O'Connor
Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Darby	Kerr	Stennis
Donnell	Kilgore	Taft
Douglas	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Leahy	Tobey
Ferguson	Lehman	Tydings
Frear	Lodge	Watkins
Fulbright	Lucas	Wherry
George	McCarran	Wiley
Gillette	McCarthy	Williams
Graham	McClellan	Withers
Green	McFarland	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

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

PROPOSED LOAN OF BELL BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting

Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the city of San Francisco had requested the loan of the bell of the U. S. S. *San Francisco* pending the activation of that ship, at present in the Philadelphia group, Atlantic Reserve Fleet, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

### MEMORIALS

Memorials were presented and referred as indicated:

#### By Mr. TYDINGS:

The memorial of Earle T. Hawkins, and sundry other members of the faculty of the State Teachers College, of Towson, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of section 106 of the bill (H. R. 6000) to extend and improve the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, to amend the public assistance and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the Rotary Club of Federalburg, the Talbot County Women's Club, the Baltimore County Medical Association, the Lutheran Club of Baltimore, the Sons of the Revolution in the State of Maryland, and the Nurses Alumni Association of University Hospital, of Baltimore, all in the State of Maryland, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

### PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by Darion T. Woods and 35 other citizens of Gibson County, Ind., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 1847, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

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

THE OWENSVILLE METHODIST CHURCH,  
 Owensville, Ind., January 13, 1950.

To Hon. WILLIAM E. JENNER,

Senator from Indiana:

We, the undersigned, legal voters of Gibson County, Ind., respectfully urge you to support Senate bill 1847, known as the Langer bill, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising and to stop its broadcasting over the air. We feel that you can render no more important service to your country and to your constituents.

We further request that this petition be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

### MARITIME COMMISSION DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS—INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 153)

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 52, Eighty-first Congress, an interim report, which represents the hearings by the subcommittee on investigations in connection with the Maritime Commission delinquent accounts.

I shall not summarize the report, but ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document, and also that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.