

## PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Senate approval of the public housing program, even though on a disappointingly limited basis, is gratifying to those of us who feel that this is one of the most pressing issues before the Nation. It is my earnest hope that the House will accept the Senate public housing provision so that the fight on slums can go forward. The slum situation throughout the country is a disgrace and unworthy of the American people. I ask the opponents of the program to read the following correspondence from a constituent of mine in Newark. She has just moved into a public housing project in Newark after enduring for years the following conditions outlined in her first letter to me in March:

I am the mother of five children and I have to move from where I live. I have been here since 1951. I have looked everywhere for a place. I am living in an awful place. The man will not fix it up and I have to burn the light all night to keep the rats away from my baby. They are eating my clothes too. I would try to fix it myself but I have to get out anyway so I have to find a place to go for my kid's sake. My husband looks every day after work but he can't find a place for us. I need a decent place to bring my children up and this place is too small and very hard to keep warm. So Mrs. Sanders, that's the lady upstairs decided to ask you if there was anything you could do for us as she has to move too and she has 6 children home and I in the service. Living like this is awful and no one wants children. It seems it is either that or the rent is so high that you wouldn't be able to survive so I don't know what to do. It keeps me upset all the time and the man keeps saying he is going to put us out and we want to go but we have no place to go.

I referred her to the Public Housing Authority in Newark where the capable staff under Mr. Samuel Warrence, director of relocation, promptly processed her application. She has now written me the following letter which presents the case for the public-housing program in a vivid fashion. I am glad this deserving mother can bring up her children in decent surroundings, and I hope that the countless other families still in her former predicament will have a similar opportunity. In Newark alone there are over 4,000 eligible families on the waiting list. Mrs. Mitchell's second letter read:

I want to thank you for everything you did for me and Mrs. Sanders. We were desperate and at the end of our rope. I never thought that I would be sitting up here where I can smell clean air without going outside. It is so clean and new and nice here. No rats, no leaky tubs, no runny bathroom. I feel like I am still dreaming. Mr. ADDONIZIO, I could never tell you how I feel. After where I used to live and where I live now—it is heaven on earth. Everyone is so nice and friendly, too. I am so grateful to you for making all this possible for us, we, the little people. I only hope we can prove worthy of it. If there is anything we can do for you at any time in any way just let me know. I know there isn't much we could do. We will scrub floors or something. But

that's something I just want you to know—that I am grateful to you from the bottom of my heart. My children even feel the difference. They are so proud of their own room. I don't have to worry so much over them anymore. They stay home and right outside where I can see them. And I can take a bath in the bathroom without rats and freezing to death, too. You will never know, Mr. ADDONIZIO, what it was like nor what it means to me to be here. Please accept my thanks and may God bless you and make more men like you.

## GEORGE Y. HARVEY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the board of trustees and the faculty of Southeastern University announce that the honorary degree of doctor of laws will be conferred on George Y. Harvey, clerk of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at its graduating exercises on June 9, 1954.

No honor could be more worthily conferred. As clerk of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, Mr. Harvey is one of a comparatively brief list of eminent men who have served in that capacity since the establishment of the committee in 1865, including Robert J. Stevens, 1865; James C. Courts, 1884; Marcellus C. Sheild, 1916; John C. Pugh, 1945; and George Y. Harvey, 1947.

Like his predecessors, Mr. Harvey has served under both Democratic and Republican control of the House in what is probably one of the most responsible and exacting positions on the Hill, if not in the entire Government.

The award of the degree of doctor of laws by the university is an appropriate recognition of the distinguished service he has rendered the Congress and the country.

## THEODORE W. CARLSON—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 426)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I am returning herewith without my approval H. R. 3109, 83d Congress, "An act for the relief of Theodore W. Carlson."

The bill proposes to grant to Theodore W. Carlson all of the rights, benefits, and privileges which are granted to persons who served on active duty with the United States Army during World War II, and who were honorably discharged from such service after having suffered permanent total loss of vision in one eye as a result of such service.

The evidence discloses that Theodore W. Carlson served in the Army of the United States from February 1941 to October 1941, and from February 1942 to November 1945. In February 1947, he filed a claim for service-connected

disability compensation with the Veterans' Administration, alleging an eye condition. In developing that claim, he contended that in February 1945, a foreign body blew into his right eye and had inflamed and infected it; that he was treated at his unit's dispensary and experienced some relief; that in July or August 1945, the eye condition returned, and he lost the sight in that eye for a short period of time; and that when he again visited the dispensary, he was instructed to apply warm applications, which again resulted in some improvement. In this connection, the medical records of the Army do not confirm the alleged treatment for his eye condition, and when discharged, the veteran claimed no injury to his right eye and the physical examination at that time disclosed no pathology of the eye. Mr. Carlson also claimed that after discharge he suffered recurring periods of blindness, and beginning in August 1947, his sight in that eye was limited to light perception only. He submitted affidavits from his private physicians stating that he was treated on several occasions from December 1945 to August 1947 for moderate inflammation of the eye, and that in November 1947, a diagnosis of retinal detachment and tear involving the macular area of the right eye was established. A third physician stated in 1950 that his examination disclosed an old retinal detachment in the right eye and that it was possible that this could have been produced by injury to the eye while Mr. Carlson was in service.

Since 1947 the veteran's claim for service-connected disability compensation has been very carefully considered on numerous occasions by Veterans' Administration rating boards and at least five times by the Board of Veterans' Appeals. After each consideration it was concluded that the eye disability was not shown to have been incurred in or aggravated by his military service.

The question at issue in this case is basically one of medical judgment, and should not be overruled by private legislation. The possibility raised by the last mentioned physician that Mr. Carlson's eye condition of retinal detachment could have been produced by injury to the eye while he was in service has been considered by the Veterans' Administration. However, based on sound and accepted medical principles, they have held that the evidence does not permit a conclusion that the separated retina initially diagnosed in November 1947 was due either to the inflammatory eye disease first treated approximately 2 years earlier or causally related to trauma allegedly caused by a foreign body being blown in Mr. Carlson's eye during service.

I consider it unwise to set aside the principles and rules of administration prescribed in the general laws governing veterans' benefit programs. Uniformity and equality of treatment to all who are similarly situated must be the steadfast rule if the Federal programs for veterans and their dependents are to be operated successfully. Moreover, in my opinion the present case does not warrant preferred treatment. Further, I

am informed that this would be the first case in which a World War II veteran would, in effect, be placed on the compensation rolls by special legislation. Since there are well over a half million veterans of World War II alone whose claims for disability compensation have been denied in accordance with public laws because the disabilities for which compensation is claimed were not incurred in or aggravated by their military service, approval of this bill would constitute a far-reaching precedent, which I cannot justify.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 7, 1954.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

**MRS. ANN ELIZABETH CAULK—  
VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 427)**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I am returning herewith without my approval H. R. 4532, 83d Congress, "An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Caulk."

The bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Caulk the sum of \$1,682.80 in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for non-service-connected death pension she would have received if the claim she filed on March 29, 1948, had been considered as having been filed on April 1, 1944.

David H. Caulk, a veteran of honorable service in the Spanish-American War, married the claimant on November 7, 1931, and died of a non-service-connected cause 12 days later. Mrs. Caulk's claim for death pension filed December 31, 1931, was denied for the reason that she had not married the veteran prior to the then applicable marriage delimiting date, September 1, 1922. Effective April 1, 1944, the delimiting date was extended by law to January 1, 1938, rendering Mrs. Caulk potentially eligible for death pension benefits to which she was previously not entitled. However, she did not file a new claim for death pension until March 29, 1948, and under the law, pension benefits were paid prospectively from that date.

It appears that favorable action by the committees which consider H. R. 4532 was based on the theory that the delay in filing claim was due to ignorance of the law on the part of Mrs. Caulk. This reason applied with equal force to many other claimants. Her case certainly arouses one's sympathy, but to prefer it for special treatment to the exclusion of other similar cases would be unwarranted and discriminatory. Further, approval of the bill might serve as a prece-

dent for similar legislation in other cases.

I am opposed to setting aside the principles and rules of administration prescribed in the public laws governing veterans' benefit programs. Uniformity and equality of treatment to all who are similarly situated must be the steadfast rule if the Federal programs for veterans and their dependents are to be operated successfully. Approval of H. R. 4532 would not be in keeping with these principles.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 7, 1954.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

**OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 7, 1954.

**EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, CORPORATIONS, AGENCIES AND OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955**

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8583) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JONAS of North Carolina, Mr. KRUEGER, Mr. TABER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. YATES, Mr. CANNON.

**MENOMINEE TRIBE OF INDIANS**

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2828) to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

**TAX REFUNDS ON CIGARETTES  
LOST IN THE FLOODS OF 1951**

The Clerk called the first bill, H. R. 4319, to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

**CITY OF CHANDLER, OKLA.**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1081) to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

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

There was no objection.

**EXTENDING EMERGENCY FOREIGN  
MERCHANT VESSEL ACQUISITION**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6318) to extend emergency foreign merchant vessel acquisition and operating authority of Public Law 101, 77th Congress, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the recommendation of the acting chairman of the committee that had jurisdiction of this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

**TRANSPORTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF MAILS ON MOTOR-VEHICLE ROUTES**

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2773) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756), is hereby amended by striking out that part which precedes the first proviso and by inserting, in lieu thereof, the following: "The Postmaster General is authorized to use Government-owned motor vehicles or contract for carrying the mails and postal transportation clerks on routes between points where in his judgment, conditions justify the operation of such service