

There are some fringe benefits, for instance to those who are retired, somebody who is a foster father, somebody who can send his child to college; however, there is no general tax relief in this bill.

The public began to find out what was in this so-called technical revision and the heat was beginning to mount. So they changed their strategy. They gave up the idea of bringing in a general technical revision bill. They thought they could fool the public more if they brought in here an excise tax bill that would sound sweet to the public. They took the position they could then say to the public and to the Secretary of the Treasury: "We cannot afford to lose any more money in this general tax revision bill. We do not want an increase in exemptions, we cannot afford it; we have already given in excise tax relief about a billion dollars." They do not tell us what is on the other side of the coin—what is there is an increase in excise taxes also amounting to \$1,077,000,000. That is where they changed their strategy. Of course, I did mention the change of strategy yesterday when the conference instructed them to surrender to the views of the minority. That is the real reason. I want to call attention especially to the Members on my left over here that they are going exactly contrary to the views of the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to this excise tax bill. I do not know how come, but the Secretary of the Treasury does not want to increase exemptions at the present time. What are you going to do about it? Are you going to go contrary to the views of the Secretary of the Treasury? Mr. Chairman, if the Secretary of the Treasury is so anxious to have somewhere near a balanced budget, why does he not give up the idea of giving \$850 million in tax credits to the people that own stock? Why does he not give some of that \$850 million to the average taxpayer by giving in to the proposition of raising exemptions?

Mr. Chairman, there are 47 million families in the United States, and 335,000 of those 47 million families would get 80 percent of this \$850 million in stockholders' tax benefits. Mr. Chairman, I hope that there will be a change of heart on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the Republican leadership in this Congress.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and especially its chairman, the gentleman from New York, Mr. DANIEL A. REED, for voting out H. R. 8224, that, when enacted into law, will bring about a reduction in some of the present excise taxes.

These taxes were originally intended to curtail the purchase of luxury items during the war. However, in its zeal to squeeze every penny it could from the people, the New Deal administration passed laws that imposed taxes on many items that were actual necessities, rather than luxuries.

Certainly such items as ladies' handbags, lipstick and other cosmetics and toilet articles cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered luxuries today. They are as necessary to women as their shoes, hats, and other wearing apparel.

The taxes on these, as well as many other items, including briefcases, luggage, ladies' fur-trimmed coats, telegrams, telephone calls, electric light bulbs, and transportation—to name just a few—should have been eliminated years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely regret that the committee did not report a bill entirely eliminating the taxes on the items I have named. Unfortunately, this bill, like all tax measures, comes before the House under a closed rule, which prevents anyone who is not a member of the committee from offering an amendment. If this were not the case, I most certainly would offer an amendment to remove all excise taxes from these articles. For years, I have fought for the outright abolition of these taxes, which I call antifeminine. Nevertheless, I do desire to congratulate the committee again on making a start, at least, in the right direction.

Women comprise the most powerful economic group in the United States. It has been estimated that they control, directly or indirectly, eighty percent of the country's purchasing power. They are indeed a much greater economic force than most men—who like to think they are the head of the house—realize or will admit. There is one thing I do know for a certainty: If the women were only organized on a basis similar to labor, manufacturers, and numerous other groups in the United States, excise taxes on these articles would have been repealed long ago.

Countries all over the world, to whom we have been sending billions of dollars in foreign aid, have had tax reductions. The American people should have had reductions in taxes years ago.

(Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, many of my best friends in this House sit on this side, the Democratic side, of the aisle and because of that I rather enjoy speaking when I am looking right at some of my best friends.

Mr. Chairman, a great American, a great Democrat, a great man—and we have great Americans and great men on both sides of the aisle, in both parties—once said, "Let's look at the record." I want to look at the record. I have been a Member of this House for 18 years, and during that time I have seen many things happen, and I want to look at the record. During that 18 years our national debt has risen from \$20 billion, approximately, to \$273 billion, approximately.

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

Mr. MASON. I decline to yield until I am through looking at the record.

Now, that was accomplished under the leadership of the then majority party,

now the minority party, with the aid of the, shall I say, liberals—that is a nice term—on both sides of the aisle. During that 18 years the tax load upon the American people rose from approximately \$5 billion to \$68 billion. That also happened under the leadership of the majority party then, now the minority party, with the aid of the so-called liberals on both sides of the aisle, who were pretty liberal with other people's money.

During those 18 years, individual exemptions under the income-tax law, were reduced from \$2,500 for a married couple and \$1,000 for an individual, to \$1,000 for a married couple and \$500 for an individual. That also was accomplished under the leadership of the then majority party, now the minority, with the aid of the liberals on both sides of the aisle.

During the last 10 years, we have had a giveaway program under which they gave away \$100 billion, more or less, of the American taxpayers' money. That also was under the leadership of the then majority party, aided and abetted by the liberals on each side of the aisle, who were liberal with other people's money.

Then during the last year or so, under the leadership of the then majority party, now the minority party, again aided and abetted by the liberals on both sides of the aisle, they entered into contractual obligations amounting to over \$100 billion with promises to pay attached to them, which the present majority party inherited, and were forced to honor.

During those 18 years, our two former Presidents, Presidents of the then majority party, entered into executive agreements, at Teheran, at Cairo, at Yalta, and at Potsdam. That is one reason we ought to have the Bricker amendment. Under those executive agreements Stalin, who was dictator over 300 million people at the end of World War I, became dictator over 900 million people. As a result of those agreements we have spent over \$200 billion in this cold war that was brought about because of those executive agreements. We now have boys scattered all over the earth in 49 different countries. And we have Uncle Sam today assuming the burden of the whole world, like Atlas of old. That was done under the then majority party, now the minority party, with the aid and assistance of the so-called liberals on each side of the aisle. That is the record.

I also want to clear up the record in this respect. If the majority of this House, regardless of the aisle, during those 18 years had voted as I have done on this give-away program, we would not be \$273 billion in debt, more in debt than all the other countries in the world put together. Uncle Sam owes more than twice as much as all the countries of Europe put together. I am very sorry to say, under our present administration we are not doing much to correct this give-away program. We are not doing very much to cut down on these useless expenditures. We are trying to do a little bit, not as much as I would like to do, in the tax reduction program. I was one who wanted tax reduction last year for individuals, H. R. 1. I feel satis-

fied that if that bill had passed last year we would not have the present little depression, or little recession, or temporary recession, or whatever you want to call it. I have voted against these things in the past under the past leadership, and I shall continue to vote against these things now under the present leadership, because I have to sleep with myself the rest of my days.

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

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say anything in general debate, and of course I will not be able to say anything in the reading of the bill because there will be no debate under a 5-minute rule. But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] always challenges me. I knew when he was looking over on our side and talking about some of the best friends he had in Congress over here that he would pick me as at least one; and we are friends.

I want to look at the record just a moment and say that I have heard from some gentlemen who just came out of the White House last week that it was indicated it did not make much difference what the House did on tax bills, they expected the Senate to disregard the action of the House and write the bill in the Senate as the Secretary of the Treasury and the President would like it to be written.

I have seen a great many conversions going on around here during my short years in this chamber, but I think yesterday was one of the most remarkable and most dexterous changes in position I have known to exist in quite a while. I would hazard the guess that before the big bill comes up the Republicans will have another conference, and in all probability take away a great deal of our proposed motion to recommit on that bill. I just make that as a general suggestion and maybe as a reminder.

Now with reference to this matter of a national debt of \$273 billion. Do you know why we owe that much money? I stood on the floor of the House of Representatives in 1938, 1939, and 1940 and pleaded with the isolationist Members of Congress, telling them that the world was in danger, that civilization itself stood at the crossroads, that forces were loose in the world that were going to destroy the school, the church, the state—yea, the civilization that we had built up and which we love so well. I pleaded to appropriate a few million dollars to make ourselves strong so that no international desperado would attack us. Why they said, "Nobody is going to attack us. We can wrap two oceans around us and be safe from attack from other parts of the world and so preserve ourselves." The advice of the President and the then Secretary of War, who was a Republican as you recall—and incidentally I have not heard of any Democrats being appointed to any high positions in this administration, and yet they say they want nonpartisanship—yes, they do when it suits them and when it does not suit them, then they do not want nonpartisanship—as I was saying the advice of the President and the then

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

With a local introduction

Many people have a favorite phrase they use when they want to prove a point or get to the heart of a matter. This phrase or saying is: "Let's look at the record." There's nothing special about this ~~ph~~ phrase, but it does point our thoughts in the right direction and that is what I would like to do tonight - to get our thinking going in the right direction. Let's look at the record Senator James E. Murray and his party have made over the last two decades they have been in power.

Mr. Murray has been in the United States Senate for 20 years, since 1934. That's an awfully long time. ~~Remember~~ I think it is too long. But let's look at his record and then draw our own conclusions.

First, let's look at the taxes we are paying.

During the 20 years Senator Murray has been in office there were many, many new taxes imposed and many, many tax rates boosted, but there were only two tax reductions: when the excess profits tax was permitted to lapse temporarily after World War II and when a Republican Congress cut income tax rates in 1948 over the veto of President Truman.

When Senator Murray was elected to office the national debt was about 23 billion dollars, most of this remaining from the first World War.

When the Republicans won back control of the government two years ago this national debt was bumping its inflated head against the legal ceiling of 275 billion dollars thoughtfully set by a Republican congress???. The Democrats spent and spent and built up the federal debt to a colossal figure which now amounts to \$ _____ for every man, woman and child in Montana and throughout the country. Senator Murray helped spend this money. Every year they were in power, except three, the democrats spent more ~~money~~ than the government took in. And two of these three years, when spending at least equalled revenue, were under the Republican 80th Congress! How long could you ^{Podies} ~~housewives~~ keep your home running if each month you spent ~~considerably~~

more than your husband ~~brought~~ ^{got} home in his pay check?

Perhaps for the first few months all would ~~go~~ ^{go} well. You could borrow on your home, on your car, from the bank. But ultimately you would reach the end. The well would run dry. You could borrow no more and you and your husband would be broke. That's about the condition ^{in which} the Republicans found our national treasury ~~in~~ when they ~~took~~ ^{took} over two years ago after two decades of Democrat spending. ~~spending.~~ ^{spending.}

During the years Senator Murray has been in office ~~there~~ direct tax collections from individual citizens went up from \$427,000,000 to more than \$30,000,000,000 - 70 times as much.

Tax collections from corporations went up from \$630,000,000 to more than \$21,000,000,000 - 35 times as much.

Sales tax collections - taxes on the things everybody buys - went up from \$454,000,000 to nearly \$9,000,000,000 - 20 times as much.

If you were married and had two children when the Democrats took over in 1933 and ~~his~~ your husband had a net income of \$5,000, he was paying \$68 in federal income tax. ~~at~~ ^{In} 1952 when Democratic rule ended, ~~the same man~~ ^{the} paid \$461, nearly seven times as much!

In addition your husband was paying about ten times as much tax on his liquor; fifty per cent more on his beer; twenty five per cent more on his cigarettes; three times as much on his automobile; ^{and} twice as much on gasoline, ~~twice as much on~~ ^{and} radios, ^{in addition} and he was paying more federal sales taxes on a host of things which were untaxed in 1933.

In these same 20 years, the value of ^{your} the dollar ~~you had~~ was cut in half. Food went up nearly four times. Clothing more than doubled. House furnishings went up two and a half times.

They were pretty liberal with our money during those 20 lush years! ~~but~~ under the Eisenhower administration the tax burden ^{already} is being eased to more bearable proportions ~~and~~ thanks to a solid economy program which is making sense and putting a stop to ~~a lot of~~ ^{the} reckless ~~spending~~ squandering of taxpayers' money,

But how much longer could this deficit spending ^{continue} ~~be continued~~? Not very long, or the government, like ~~ours~~ ^{ours} and

wife who continually gave more than they
earn, would have gone broke!

more than your husband brought home in his pay check?

Let's take a look at the Democrats' record in dealing with communism.

When the democrats, ~~including Senator Murray~~, took over the government in 1933 a horde of Communists, socialists and other left-wing thinkers swarmed into New Deal agencies, to spy, ^{to} plot, ^{to} report and ^{to} attempt to break down ~~down~~ the democratic form of government all of us love ~~down~~ and for which millions of our sons and fathers and daughters have fought. ~~down~~ These were the days of Alger Hiss, of Whittaker Chambers, ~~of~~ Victor Perlo, ~~of~~ Nathan Silvermaster, ~~of~~ Elizabeth Bentley, Leo Pressman,

They and a host of others were ^{busy} handing secret government documents to ~~them~~ Russian agents for transmission to Moscow. These were the days when communist spys were allowed to steal the details on the Atomic bomb, on our H bomb, on radar, ^{and} on our proximity fuses, ~~and countless others.~~ and Senator Murray voted against the Internal Security Act of 1950, designed to drive the communists ^{spies} out of government ^{and the country.}

Let's take a look at the Democrats' ^{war} record. ~~dealing with~~

~~World War II~~

Unilateral action by President Truman forced us into the thankless war in Korea with its more than 136,000 casualties ^{added} and count- less ^{added} billions ~~in~~ in war costs, ~~added~~ taxes and inflation.

World War II casualties totalled more than one million and cost the taxpayers originally \$351 billion, ^{and} ultimately the bill will be ^{an} astronomical \$1,400 billion.

* In the past 50 years there have been five republican presidents and 3 Democrats. Under the five Republican presidents not a single American life has been lost in a single war. Under all three democrats, three different wars have taken a total of 1,620,000 American casualties. That is a terrible record!

Twenty years ago, under Republican rule, the country spent only 15 per cent of its ~~\$1.1 billion~~ federal budget for defense ~~purposes.~~ By far the larger amount, 85 per cent of the total budget, was used for peaceful purposes.

