

of the Military and Naval Academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3235. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of Montana with respect to offenses committed within Indian country within such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 3236. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Gen. Douglas MacArthur National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 3237. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to add to the free list articles temporarily imported for display at shows, fairs, expositions, and other exhibitions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3238. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3239. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require United States obligations to be sold at not less than par value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy by controlling credits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. J. Res. 204. Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRANAHAAN:

H. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution to strengthen the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 3240. A bill for the relief of Milos Hamza and Mrs. Jirina Hamza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENWOOD:

H. R. 3241. A bill for the relief of Miss Marie Kleeman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 3242. A bill for the relief of Baldassarre Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3243. A bill for the relief of Milton Bass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

120. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution requesting the Members from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to support and work for the passage of H. R. 510, a bill relating to the compensation of laundry employees at United States naval hospitals, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the January session on March 7, 1951; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

121. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution by the Racine County Medical Auxiliary to reaffirm faith in the American, voluntary way to safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally oppose any form of national

compulsory health insurance as a dangerous step toward complete acceptance of a planned, socialistic economy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

122. Also, resolution by the Racine Chapter, D. A. R. to reaffirm faith in the American, voluntary way to safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally oppose any form of national compulsory health insurance as a dangerous step toward complete acceptance of a planned, socialistic economy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

123. Also, resolution by the American Legion Auxiliary to Post 76 to reaffirm faith in the American, voluntary way to safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally oppose any form of national compulsory health insurance as a dangerous step toward complete acceptance of a planned, socialistic economy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

124. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Harold E. Alwes, secretary, Honest Abe Council, No. 109, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Louisville, Ky., requesting passage of House bills 85, 92, 468, 1037, 1191, 1939, and House Joint Resolutions 19 and 26, and asking for the defeat of House bills 400, 1177, and 2242, and Senate bill 663; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1951

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

O God of grace and glory, we would yield our flickering torch to the flame of Thy redeeming love. Thou hast taught us that our lives are made to be the temples of Thy holy presence. Against the defilement by impious hands of that sacred inner shrine, we pledge a sacrifice from which no Gethsemane or Calvary can hold us back.

Forbid that any actions or attitudes of ours should ever deny or betray the white principles for which on land and sea, under alien skies, so many of our sons in arms are paying the last full measure of devotion. Along the road of this day and of every day may we walk with Thee in the bright fellowship of those who seek a just and righteous peace, and who, for the attainment of that golden goal, will fight the good fight and keep the faith. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 14, 1951, 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. Hawks, 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 amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1498) to provide compensation for duty voluntarily performed on their days off by

officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3020) to authorize the printing of the annual reports of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America as separate House documents, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2268) to authorize the payment of interest on series E savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

MORNING BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate meets this morning following an adjournment. The first order of business is petitions and memorials.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, expressing sympathy and support for the men in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. YOUNG on March 12, 1951, p. 2218, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the Senate of the State of North Dakota, relating to the taking of lands needed for river development by purchase or condemnation without acquiring natural liquid mineral, oil, or gas rights therein; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. YOUNG on March 12, 1951, p. 2219, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relating to the creation of a National Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on March 14, 1951, p. 2357, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Finance.

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress to defeat the proposal of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to make the income from future issues of State and municipal bonds subject to the Federal income tax

"Whereas the unhampered power to raise money for governmental purposes is a vital attribute and the essence of sovereignty; and

"Whereas the bonds of the several States and municipalities have always been exempt from taxation by the Federal Government in recognition of this principle; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States has proposed to the Con-

gress that the income from future issues of State and municipal bonds be subject to the Federal income tax, and the Congress now has under consideration that proposal; and

"Whereas such taxation and a potential future taxation would violate the principle of intergovernmental immunity which is the keystone of our Federal system of government and the relationship between the several States and the central government, with the inevitable result in the long run of weakening the ability of local government to perform the essential services required of it for the welfare of its citizens; and

"Whereas the weakening of local government increases the tendency to centralization and a strong central government to an unhealthy degree; and

"Whereas the taxation of State and municipal bonds would greatly increase the cost of financing public works by the raising of interest rates and, to this extent, would hamper the performance of the functions of local government; and

"Whereas the effect of the raising of interest rates in these times, when the decreased purchasing power of the dollar makes the cost of public construction many times what it has been in the recent past, would multiply the evil effects; and

"Whereas the taxation of the income from future interest of Government bonds would, for many years, result in a negligible increase in the income of the Federal Government, the estimate is that the yearly issue of such bonds is approximately \$1,000,000,000, with an average interest rate of less than 3 percent, and the income from said bonds would be about \$30,000,000 a year, of which scarcely more than \$10,000,000 would flow in taxable income to the Federal Government by reason of the holding of many of such issues by tax-exempt institutions and funds; and

"Whereas this practical increase in Federal revenues is so negligible, and the potential evil of the taxation of State and local bonds is so great and so pernicious: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the State of Maryland is emphatically opposed to the Federal taxation of State and local bonds, and requests the Congress to defeat the proposal of the Treasury Department for the taxation of such bonds; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives are hereby requested to give active opposition to all pending and proposed measures which would subject State and municipal bonds to Federal taxation; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives from Maryland in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. GEORGE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Resolution 125

"Whereas cotton is one of the basic industries of this Nation; and

"Whereas cotton has long been the basis of Georgia's economic life and the growing and processing reaches into every phase of the life of the citizens of Georgia and the Nation; and

"Whereas the United States of America is in a critical period and cotton is essential to the national defense effort; and

"Whereas at the present time cotton is in temporary short supply and the cotton farmers and producers of Georgia and the Nation have been asked to produce more than 16,000,000 bales of cotton as a part of the national defense effort which is a 60-percent increase in production; and

"Whereas due to recent Federal regulations as contained in the order from the Office of Price Stabilization issued January 25, 1951, free trade and the free flow of this commodity is at a complete standstill and conditions have been chaotic, adversely affecting the farmers, cotton merchants, manufacturers, ginnermen, warehousemen, bankers, transportation systems, and directly or indirectly, all phases of normal business: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the house of representatives (with the senate concurring) request that the President of the United States and the proper governmental agencies, including the United States Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Stabilization, to immediately modify or remove the present unworkable order pertaining to cotton in order to permit the resumption of normal distribution and processing of raw cotton; to assure the cotton farmer that the 16,000,000 bales he has been asked to produce by the Government will move readily as in the past; and therefore be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives and the secretary of the senate immediately transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the United States Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan, the Administrator of the Office of Price Stabilization, Michael DiSalle, and to the Georgia Members of Congress.

"In house, read and adopted February 12, 1951.

"JOE BOONE,

"Clerk of the House.

"In senate, read and adopted,

"GEORGE D. STEWART,

"Secretary of the Senate."

PARK RIVER—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, WALSH COUNTY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Walsh County, N. Dak., relating to the clearance of the main channel of the Park River, N. Dak., to assist in flood control work.

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

Whereas, because of the blocking of the main channel by fallen trees and other debris, the Park River has in many places left the main channel and has flooded adjacent lands, causing highways, bridges, and culverts to be destroyed and also caused other channels to be opened by erosion, rendering parts of the main channel inoperative. This condition is particularly critical from the city of Grafton downstream to the Red River of the north;

Whereas the Board of County Commissioners of Walsh County, N. Dak., upon the recommendation of the county engineer request that the Park River, at least between the above mentioned points, be cleared of such debris as may cause interference with the flow in the main channel. By such clearing, it is the belief of the county engineer that the main channel will be allowed to carry its share of normal flood waters, therefore, returning more rapidly to the water course, and assisting in the control of erosion by such impeded waters opening new channels across adjacent lands and also a faster runoff during flood conditions in the city of Grafton: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators and Representatives and to the State Water Com-

mission of North Dakota with the request that they act upon this resolution by bringing it to the attention of the Congress of the United States with the intention of obtaining Federal aid in alleviating the flood conditions as set forth.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF BALTIMORE (MD.) ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, as the home of one of the leading ports on the Atlantic seaboard, the State of Maryland has an immediate and a vital interest in proposals for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

In a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce recently there is pointed out, in succinct fashion, the basic reasons why the seaway should not be built. I present the resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Resolution on proposed St. Lawrence waterway adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce January 26, 1951

Whereas this association has repeatedly taken a stand in opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway, which is now being again urged as an aid to national defense; and

Whereas it is manifest that it would take years to complete the project and would divert large sums from much more pressing and immediate needs for national defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association renews its opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway; further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Maryland delegation in Congress.

SALARY INCREASE FOR CERTAIN STRIKING WOOLEN AND WORSTED WORKERS—RESOLUTION OF STRIKING WORKERS IN AREA OF GREATER LAWRENCE, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the striking woolen and worsted workers of the Greater Lawrence (Mass.) area, concerning the gravely menacing increase in living costs.

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

Whereas the Wage Stabilization Board has bowed to the will of big business in approving a 10-percent increase for workers who have not received a wage increase since January 1950 thereby imposing a terrific burden on the American working man and woman; and

Whereas our Government has not frozen the prices of food, rents and many of the very necessities of life; and

Whereas the daily papers and radio stations continue to announce further price increases in hundreds of items needed by the average American family; and

Whereas Price Stabilizer Michael DiSalle has stated publicly that by midsummer

prices would be up another 6 percent or more; and

Whereas the press announces daily the tremendous profits being made by big business; and

Whereas it becomes clearer and clearer daily that only the working people in our country are expected to make the sacrifices necessary to mobilize our Nation's resources in our present emergency; and

Whereas there are certain forces at work in our country who are trying to use the present emergency to enrich themselves at the expense of the American people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the striking woolen and worsted workers of the Greater Lawrence area commend Messrs. Rieve of the CIO, Bates of the AFL, and Walker of the IAM, and approve their action in refusing to bow to the interests of big business and who tendered their resignations as members of the Wage Stabilization Board rather than become subservient to influences which are alien to the needs of all Americans; and be it further

Resolved, That this meeting call upon President Truman to take the necessary steps immediately to end the unrealistic attitude of the other members of the Wage Stabilization Board and to appoint to the various governmental agencies charged with mobilization the caliber of men who will serve the interests of all Americans rather than those of a small minority; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President Truman, Vice President Barkley, Senators Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and Leverett Saltonstall and Congressman Thomas J. Lane and Congressman George J. Bates and to the radio and press.

UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP FOR CERTAIN MOTHERS AND FATHERS—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on January 25, 1951, I sponsored a bill in which I was joined by the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], which would change the immigration laws so that parents of sons who lost their lives in the service of the Armed Forces in war should be allowed to become United States citizens regardless of their inability to speak, read, or write English. It seemed to us that this was a most elementary justice to these people who had given of their flesh and blood to our country. I am glad that the Massachusetts Legislature has seen fit to recognize the debt which our country owes to these mothers and fathers by adopting resolutions memorializing Congress in favor of legislation along the lines of this bill which was originally suggested to me by State Senator Michael LoPresti, of Boston. I present these resolutions for myself and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and ask that they be spread upon the records of the Congress at this point and that they be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution memorializing Congress for legislation whereby certain mothers and fathers may be granted United States citizenship

Whereas many mothers and fathers whose sons have made the supreme sacrifice in

the service of the Armed Forces of our country during World War II and during the Korean campaign are resident aliens desirous of embracing United States citizenship, but are unable to do so because of their inability to comply with certain educational requirements in our naturalization law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation whereby alien mothers and fathers whose sons lost their lives in the Armed Forces of the United States in time of war may be granted United States citizenship, notwithstanding their inability to speak, read, or write the English language or to sign their names; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted March 5, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence March 7, 1951.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

A true copy.

Attest:

[SEAL] EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

ITALY AS MEMBER OF UNITED NATIONS—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on January 4, 1951, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State requesting that he at once initiate steps to make it possible for Italy to become a member of the United Nations. I pointed out that previous efforts for the admission of Italy had been vetoed by the Soviet Union and I suggested that a procedure be adopted whereby the General Assembly by a majority vote could pass on questions of new membership when there was a deadlock in the Security Council. Now comes the Legislature of Massachusetts with resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress in favor of the admission of Italy into the United Nations. The legislature has acted wisely and I am delighted to spread these resolutions upon the record of Congress for myself and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and ask for their appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to instruct delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof

Whereas Italy is now receiving aid under the Marshall plan; and

Whereas Italy is acting in consort with the free nations; and

Whereas Italy has succeeded in freeing itself from the domination of Communist countries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the President of the United States and the Congress to instruct the delegates to the United Nations to propose the membership of Italy in the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the

United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted March 5, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, Clerk.

In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence March 7, 1951.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, Clerk.

A true copy.

Attest:

[SEAL] EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 177).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 672. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928; with an amendment (Rept. No. 178).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1124. A bill to amend section 201 (1) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, relating to Federal contributions to the States for civil defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1125. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, to provide, for certain individuals who have completed 30 years of service and attained the age of 60, minimum annuities equal to one-half of the average compensation received by them during their 5 highest years of earnings; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1126. A bill for the relief of Vera Sarah Keenan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 1127. A bill for the relief of William T. Kreh, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1128. A bill for the relief of George Vatakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1129. A bill to create the position of mail handler-in-charge in the postal transportation service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENTON:

S. 1130. A bill for the relief of Ruzena Stransky;

S. 1131. A bill for the relief of W. H. Tan, his wife, May, and his children, Robert and Ellen;

S. 1132. A bill for the relief of Gudrun Christiansen; and

S. 1133. A bill for the relief of Sophie Strauss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. Ives, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. DUFF, Mr. BENTON, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 1134. A bill to establish principles and policies to govern generally the management of the executive branch of the Government in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 1135. A bill to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1136. A bill to place in the Administrator of General Services responsibility for coordination of certain miscellaneous activities in the District of Columbia in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1137. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. BENTON):

S. 1138. A bill creating a Veterans' Insurance Corporation in the Veterans' Administration to exercise all of the functions with respect to Government life insurance and national service life insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1139. A bill making certain changes in laws applicable to regulatory agencies of the Government so as to effectuate the recommendations regarding regulatory agencies made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. BENTON):

S. 1140. A bill to establish and to consolidate certain hospital, medical, and public-health functions of the Government in a Department of Health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. (See remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. IVES, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1141. A bill to expand the activities of the Department of Commerce in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch

of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 1142. A bill to expand the activities of the Department of Labor in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 1143. A bill to effectuate recommendations relating to the Department of the Interior of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1144. A bill to provide for the creation of a Board of Analysis for Engineering and Architectural Projects and Drainage Area Advisory Commissions, in accordance with recommendations of the Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. BENTON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1145. A bill to establish a Department of Social Security and Education in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. THYE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1146. A bill to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LODGE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1147. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Displaced Persons Commission and the War Claims Commission to the Department of State, in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(See remarks of Mr. O'CONOR when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LODGE, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. IVES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1148. A bill making various changes in laws applicable to the Post Office Department in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. IVES):

S. 1149. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1150. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of the Treasury in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

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

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. BENTON):

S. 1151. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Veterans' Administration in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

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

By Mr. LODGE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IVES, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION BY IRELAND

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution favoring the right of self-determination by Ireland of its form of government, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Maryland. The Chair hears no objection.

The resolution (S. Res. 100) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the United Nations Charter, article I, paragraph 3, declares it to be the intention of member nations "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of self-determination"; and

Whereas the Atlantic Charter, in listing the objectives to be sought by the United States and Great Britain declares "respect for the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live" and expresses the wish "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them"; and

Whereas the unnatural division of Ireland is the result not of the express wishes of her inhabitants but of arbitrary action which has operated to "forcibly deprive" the people of Ireland of their inherent right of self-determination; and

Whereas use of the veto by Communist Russia to deprive Ireland of United Nations membership is the most persuasive recommendation the Republic could have for fair treatment by the free nations of the world; and

Whereas while Ireland naturally belongs to the Atlantic Pact, where its advantageous location would offer vital air and shipping bases, it is forced to abstain from membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization because part of its territory is occupied by one of the participating powers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Republic of Ireland should enjoy the same right of self-determination as to the form and extent of its government as is guaranteed to all nations under the United Nations and Atlantic Charters, and that, in the spirit of and under the authority of these Charters steps should be initiated looking toward a general plebiscite at which the people of all 32 counties of Ireland could be given opportunity, free of coercion or outside intervention, to declare for or against the union of the counties of Northern and Southern Ireland.

The statement presented by Mr. O'CONOR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Saturday is St. Patrick's Day, a day that commemorates the memory of Ireland's great Patron Saint. It is an occasion that serves also to give expression to sentiments of respect and high regard which many persons of other nationalities have for those of Irish birth or descent amongst us.

In this time of world unrest, all the energies of our own and other free nations are being directed towards preservation and restoration of the rights of threatened or conquered nations throughout the world. What more appropriate time could be chosen, therefore, than the approach of St. Patrick's Day for the Senate of our country to voice to the people of the Emerald Isle our interest in their progress and advancement, and our desire that they be privileged to enjoy the right of self-determination to which, under the United Nations Charter and the Atlantic Charter, this great Nation has pledged itself with respect to all the nations of the world.

It is with such considerations in mind that I send to the desk a Senate resolution which would place the Senate on record to the effect that the Republic of Ireland should be accorded the right of self-determination which we have espoused with regard to other nations. Further, it would declare that, in the spirit of and under the authority of these historic charters, steps should be initiated on the proper level looking toward a plebiscite at which the people of Ireland might decide for themselves, without outside intervention, their wishes regarding unity, the lack of which has tarnished the prestige and hampered so greatly the forward progress of the Republic of Ireland within the family of nations.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. KERR) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3020) to authorize the printing of the annual reports of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America as separate House documents, was read twice by its title, and 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, and withdrawing the nomination of a postmaster, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NECESSITY FOR PREPAREDNESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DUFF

[Mr. DUFF asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of preparedness, delivered by him at the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin Forum, held at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., March 13, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

FALLACY OF SOCIALISM—EDITORIAL FROM THE ARKANSAS DEMOCRAT

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Teacher Shows Fallacy of Socialism," published in the Arkansas Democrat of March 12, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMAMENT TO MEET AGGRESSION

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Urges Rapid Arming in Face of Aggression Threat," written by Anthony Leviero, and published in the New York Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFENSE AGAINST COMMUNIST AGGRESSION—RESOLUTION BY THE COUNCIL AGAINST COMMUNIST AGGRESSION AND ARTICLE BY KARL A. WITTFOGEL

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Council Against Communist Aggression and an article by Prof. Karl A. Wittfogel entitled "A New Policy for Asia," published in the New Leader for February 19, 1951, which appear in the Appendix.]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—ARTICLES BY SELIG GREENBERG

[Mr. PASTORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles in the series Medicine in Crisis, by Selig Greenberg, the first under the headline

"Curbs on medical training are laid to restrictionism," published in the Providence Journal of March 3, 1951, the second under the headline "Doctors control channels leading to medical career," published in the Providence Evening Bulletin on March 5, 1951, which appear in the Appendix.]

USE OF AMERICAN TROOPS IN EUROPE—LETTER FROM KATHARINE S. EAKIN

[Mr. WELKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Katharine S. Eakin, superintendent of schools of Jerome County, Idaho, containing excerpts from a letter she received from a friend in France, with respect to our current and proposed foreign policy, which appears in the Appendix.]

EQUALITY AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Color Line," published in the New York Times of March 4, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

WALTER E. COSGRIFF—LETTER FROM SENATOR BENTON

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by him to Senator WATKINS regarding Walter E. Cosgriff, a member of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRUSADE AGAINST ACHESON—ARTICLE BY ELMER DAVIS

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Crusade Against Acheson," written by Elmer Davis, and published in the current number of Harpers magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GREAT SOVIET ENCYCLOPEDIA—ARTICLE IN THE DAILY EXPRESS OF LONDON

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding The Great Soviet Encyclopedia, published in the Daily Express of London, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHINESE STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES—ARTICLE BY JAMES RESTON

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Chinese Students in Country Stir Fight of United States Agencies," written by James Reston and published in the New York Times of March 9, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement. It had been the intention to take up Senate Resolution 99 today, but the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has had little time to prepare his opening statement on that resolution, and for that reason I hope that we may make it the unfinished business, after we take up one or two other small bills and dispose of them.

I should like to say for the benefit of the distinguished minority leader that it is our intention immediately to proceed with the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, after disposing of Senate Resolution 99, and I shall so move, or the Senator from Texas will, or if we do not, we will give the oppor-

tunity to the minority leader of doing so. At any rate we will proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 immediately after the vote on Senate Resolution 99.

It is my hope, I may say to the distinguished minority leader, that it will take very little time to dispose of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 after we dispose of Senate Resolution 99.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the announcement of the majority leader that after Senate Resolution 99 is made the unfinished business, and a determination is had on it, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the majority leader, or the minority leader, will have the right to move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, without any other measure being taken up.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; unless it be done by unanimous consent, or another agreement is worked out in the meantime.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I think it is proper to proceed as suggested. In that way every Senator will have an opportunity to vote on the Senate resolution and the concurrent resolution. Inasmuch as it was announced previously that we would proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 99 this morning, and it is now planned to consider other legislation, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether he intends to suggest the absence of a quorum before he makes his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McFARLAND. I had intended to do so later, but I shall be glad to do it now.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it would be better to have a quorum call at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that Senate Resolution 99 will be made the unfinished business after the other legislation, to which the majority leader has referred, has been disposed of, but that we shall not proceed with debate on Senate Resolution 99 until tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct; we will proceed with the debate tomorrow.

Mr. President, 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	Cordon	Hendrickson
Anderson	Dirksen	Hennings
Bennett	Douglas	Hickenlooper
Benton	Duff	Hill
Brewster	Dworshak	Hoey
Bricker	Ecton	Holland
Butler, Nebr.	Ellender	Humphrey
Byrd	Ferguson	Ives
Cain	Flanders	Jenner
Capehart	Frear	Johnson, Colo.
Carlson	Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.
Case	George	Kem
Chavez	Gillette	Kilgore
Clements	Green	Knowland
Connally	Hayden	Langer

Lehman	Monroney	Smith, Maine
Lodge	Morse	Smith, N. J.
McCarran	Mundt	Smith, N. C.
McCarthy	Murray	Stennis
McClellan	Neely	Taft
McFarland	Nixon	Thye
McKellar	O'Connor	Watkins
McMahon	Pastore	Welker
Magnuson	Robertson	Wherry
Malone	Russell	Wiley
Martin	Saltonstall	Williams
Maybank	Schoeppel	
Millikin	Smathers	

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate in attendance on the sessions of the Committee on Organized Crime in New York City.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

PUBLIC HEALTH ASSISTANCE TO STATES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is my intention to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 445, Calendar No. 92. There is another bill on the calendar, House bill 2615, Calendar No. 167, relating to peanuts. If Senators who are interested in Calendar No. 91, Senate bill 337, were ready, we might take up that bill after disposing of the other two bills. I do not know whether they will be ready or not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Which bill is the Senator now moving to take up?

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 445, Calendar No. 92.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 445) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and their subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public-health units, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment, on page 16, line 19, after

"July 1", to strike out "1950" and insert "1951", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Local Public Health Units Act of 1951."

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE

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

(1) adequate protection of the Nation's health is essential to the security and well-being of our country and cannot be achieved unless public health services are available in every locality through adequately staffed and properly equipped local public health units;

(2) at present more than 40,000,000 persons in the United States live in areas not served by local public health units and less than 10,000,000 persons live in areas served by units which meet minimum public health standards;

(3) many areas cannot support local public health units staffed and equipped to the extent necessary for the provision of the public health services essential to the well-being of the community.

(b) It is therefore the policy of the Congress, and the purpose of this act, in the promotion of the general welfare and in the interest of national security, to assist the States, through the measures provided for in this act, in developing and maintaining local public health units organized to provide full-time public health services in all areas of the Nation and in the training of all types of personnel for local public health unit work.

STATE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES AND LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH UNITS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 315 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended by redesignating such section as section 304.

(b) Part B of title III of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"GRANTS TO STATES FOR STATE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES AND LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH UNITS"

"SEC. 315. (a) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'local public health unit' means the governmental authority of a local area authorized to provide in such area the public health services for which funds are made available under this section (including a unit of a State government specifically assigned responsibility for the provision of public health services in a local area and including the District of Columbia), or a combination of the governmental authorities of two or more contiguous local areas authorized to provide such services in such combined area;

"(2) the term 'population' (A), as applied to a State, means the population thereof according to the latest estimates available from the Department of Commerce on August 31 of the year preceding the fiscal year (or portion thereof) for which a determination with respect to such population is made under this section, and (B), as applied to less than State-wide areas, means the population of such areas according to the most recent decennial census figures certified by the Department of Commerce that are available on August 31 of the year preceding the fiscal year (or portion thereof) for which a determination with respect to such population is made under this section, increased or decreased in proportion to the increase or decrease since such census of the population of the State as estimated in accordance with clause (A) hereof;

"(3) the average per capita income of the United States or the average per capita income of a State, as the case may be, means its average per capita income for the three most recent consecutive years for

which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce on August 31 of the year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made, except that the average per capita income of Hawaii shall be deemed to be equal to that of the continental United States (excluding Alaska) and the average per capita income of Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands shall be deemed to be equal to one-half of that of the continental United States (excluding Alaska).

"(b) To enable the Surgeon General (1) to assist the States in establishing and maintaining adequate public health services and (2) to assist the States and their subdivisions in establishing and maintaining adequately staffed and equipped local public health units for the provision of public health services, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, such sums as may be necessary to carry out such purposes, respectively. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Surgeon General, State plans for carrying out the purposes of this section.

"(c) Within 6 months after the enactment of this section, the Surgeon General shall by regulation prescribe with respect to local public health units—

"(1) the minimum population to be served by each public health unit, with variations for different types of areas, but such units shall not exceed in any State more than 1 for each 35,000 population, except that in States having less than 12 persons per square mile they shall not exceed 1 for each 20,000 population; and the minimum number and types of full-time professional and other personnel which local public health units in various types of areas must employ; including conditions under which and the extent to which compliance with such requirements may be postponed;

"(2) subject to the limits set forth in subsection (d) (7), general methods of administration necessary to assure efficient and economical provision of public health services under State plans, including the conditions under which and the extent to which compliance with such methods may be postponed;

"(3) the types of services which shall be considered 'public health services' for which Federal funds provided under this section may be expended under State plans, which may include services dealing with the diagnosis and prevention of disease, the control of communicable disease, health education, demonstrations, sanitation, vital statistics, the training of personnel for State and local public health work, and other aspects of preventive medicine, but shall not include medical, dental, or nursing care except in the diagnosis or prevention of disease or the control of communicable disease or the promotion, establishment, or maintenance of industrial accident prevention programs.

"(d) In order to be approved under this section, a State plan shall—

"(1) set forth a program for establishing and maintaining adequate State public health services, including programs in mental health;

"(2) set forth a program for establishing and maintaining adequate State public health services, including health units for the provision of public health services; *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the State from including other aspects of health activities in its plan, if the expense thereof is borne by the State and its subdivisions and not included in the term 'expenditures' for the purposes of subsection (e) hereof;

"(3) provide for the extension of the program referred to in paragraph (2) of this subsection so as to assure coverage under the program of all areas in the State at the earliest practicable date;

"(4) contain satisfactory evidence that the State health authority and the local public health units of the State whose populations are covered by the program referred to in paragraph (2) of this subsection will have authority to carry out the program in conformity with the provisions of this section and regulations prescribed thereunder;

"(5) provide, subject to regulations prescribed under subsection (c), that each local public health unit providing public health services under the plan have sufficient financial resources to assure efficient and economical administration of such health services;

"(6) provide for the allocation of all funds received by the State health authority for carrying out the program referred to in paragraph (2) of this subsection, to local public health units participating in the State plan, in accordance with methods that will assure equitable distribution and the effective use of such funds in the extension and expansion of public health services, and provide that all such funds shall be used by such units solely for the provision of such services;

"(7) provide such methods of administration of the State plan, including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis (except that the Surgeon General shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, or compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods), as may be necessary to assure the efficient and economical provision of public health services under the plan;

"(8) provide that the State health authority will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Surgeon General may from time to time reasonably require, and give the Surgeon General upon demand access to the records upon which such information is based.

"The Surgeon General shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of this subsection and regulations prescribed under subsection (c).

"(e) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to this section for each fiscal year for carrying out the program referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of this section, the Surgeon General shall, from time to time and for specified periods, make allotments (including amounts allotted from such sums for any prior period in the same fiscal year and remaining unpaid to the States) to the several States on the basis of (1) population, (2) average per capita income, and (3) special factors relevant to the extent of the health problem in each such State. The amounts to be paid to each State having an approved plan from the allotments to such State shall be paid upon the condition that there shall be spent by the State for carrying out the approved plan for the purposes of the program referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of this section, an amount determined in accordance with regulations.

"(2) From the sums appropriated pursuant to this section, each State which has a State plan approved in accordance with subsection (d) shall be entitled to receive for each fiscal year, for carrying out the program referred to in paragraph (2) of such subsection, an amount which bears the same ratio of one-third of the total expenditures for such purpose for such year under the plan as the average per-capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska) bears to the average per-capita income of such State, except that (1) in no case may the amount paid to such State for a fiscal year exceed two-thirds of the expenditures for such purpose under the State plan for such year, and (2) there shall not be counted as expenditures under the State plan for such purpose for any fiscal year any sum in excess of \$1.50 (or such higher amount as may be specified in the appropria-

tion pursuant to this section for such year) expended by any local public health unit participating in the State plan, multiplied by the population of the area of such unit. If, during the fiscal year, the areas covered by the State plan are changed, appropriate adjustments, prorated in accordance with the time the change becomes effective, shall be made in determining the maximum amount of the expenditures. If for any fiscal year appropriations pursuant to this section for carrying out the program referred to in paragraph (2) of subsection (d) are less than the Federal proportion under this paragraph with respect to total estimated expenditures (as of the beginning of such fiscal year) for such purpose for such year under State plans the amount to which each State is entitled under this paragraph shall be reduced proportionately.

"(3) No expenditures from grants received from the Federal Government under any provision of law (other than pursuant to this section) and no expenditures made by the State or by its subdivisions which have been reported as expenditures for the purposes of any other program aided by Federal grants, shall be counted as expenditures under the plan.

"(4) The Surgeon General may, by regulation, prescribe the extent to which the cost of services, facilities, and equipment utilized by a State or its subdivisions in carrying out a State plan approved under this section and utilized in addition in carrying out one or more State programs approved under other provisions of law providing for Federal grants to assist States or their subdivisions in carrying out health programs, shall be deemed to constitute expenditures under this subsection, and such regulations may provide that, if the major utilization of such services, facilities, and supplies is in carrying out a State plan approved under this section or is so divided among other programs as to make an apportionment thereof impracticable, the entire cost thereof shall be deemed to constitute an expenditure for the purpose of this subsection.

"(f) The Surgeon General shall, prior to the beginning of each period for which a payment is to be made, estimate the amount to be paid to the State for such period pursuant to subsection (e), and shall then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated, increased or decreased, as the case may be, by any sum by which he finds that his estimate for any prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State under subsection (e) for such period. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Surgeon General, the amount so certified.

"(g) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the health authority of the State finds—

"(1) that the State plan has been changed so that it no longer complies with the requirements of subsection (d); or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by subsection (d) to be included in the plan; or

"(3) that the State plan has ceased to comply with regulations under subsection (c): *Provided*, That no changes in a State plan shall be required within 2 years after initial approval thereof, or within 2 years after any change required therein by reason of any change in the regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (c), except with the consent of the State or in accordance with further action by the Congress;

the Surgeon General shall notify such State health authority that further payments will not be made to the State from appropriations pursuant to this section (or, in his discre-

tion, that further payments will not be made to the State from such appropriations for activities or areas in which there is such failure) until he finds that the plan again complies with such requirements or until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he so finds, or is so satisfied, the Surgeon General shall make no further certification for payment to such State from appropriations pursuant to this section, or shall limit payment to activities or areas in which there is no such failure.

"(h) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action under subsection (g) of this section, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Surgeon General shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

"(2) The findings of fact by the Surgeon General, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Surgeon General to take further evidence, and the Surgeon General may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

"(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Surgeon General or set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code."

AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 314 OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (c) of section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to enable the Surgeon General to provide demonstrations and to train personnel for State and local health work and to meet the cost of pay, allowances, and traveling expenses of commissioned officers and other personnel of the Service detailed to assist the States and their local subdivisions in carrying out the purposes of section 315."

(b) The first sentence of subsection (d) of such section 314 is amended to read as follows: "For each fiscal year, the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, shall determine the total sum from the appropriation under subsection (a) and the appropriation under subsection (b) which shall be available for allotment among the several States."

(c) Subsection (g) of such section 314 is amended (1) by striking out "or subsection (c)."; and (2) by striking out the following: ", and, to the extent that any such plan contains provisions relating to mental health, by the mental health authority of such State."

(d) Subsection (h) of such section 314 is amended by striking out "(c).",

(e) Subsection (i) of such section 314 is amended (1) by striking out "or, where appropriate, the mental health authority; (2) by striking out "or subsection (c)."; and (3) by striking out "or mental health authority."

(f) Subsection (j) of such section 314 is amended to read as follows:

"(j) All regulations and amendments thereto with respect to grants to States under this section or section 315 shall be made after consultation with the State health authorities and, in the case of regulations or amend-

ments which relate to or in any way affect grants for work in the field of mental health, the State mental health authorities. Insofar as practicable, the Surgeon General shall obtain the agreement, prior to the issuance of any such regulations or amendments, of the State health authorities and, in the case of regulations or amendments which relate to or in any way affect grants for work in the field of mental health, the State mental health authorities. Except in case of emergency such regulations shall be issued only after thirty days' notice to, and presentation to the annual conference of, such health authorities."

(g) The amendments made by this section shall take effect July 1, 1951. Any amount paid to a State for carrying out the purposes of subsection (c) of section 314 of the Public Health Service Act prior to July 1, 1950, and remaining unexpended on that date shall remain available for expenditure by the State for State public health services in accordance with a plan approved under section 315 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this Act, but shall be deducted from the payments to which the State would otherwise be entitled under section 315.

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words about the remarks made yesterday afternoon by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. I wish to point out a few salient facts which I think should be mentioned before the minds of the people are made up on the subject of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

First, let me say that I am not prepared at this time to go into a thorough discussion of the entire subject. I think such a discussion at this time would be premature. The subcommittee has not yet completed its work. However, suddenly there has been a rash of resolutions calling for the abolition of the RFC. Yesterday the Senator from Ohio made quite an extended speech on the subject.

I point out that in the Eightieth Congress this subject was gone into by the Committee on Banking and Currency. A special subcommittee to investigate the RFC was authorized to make a study under the chairmanship of then Senator Douglas Buck, of Delaware. On that subcommittee there were the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and myself.

That subcommittee submitted to the Senate a very fine report to accompany Senate bill 2287. Calendar No. 1017. The report was No. 974, of the Eightieth Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the first 14 pages of that report, simply for the information of the Senate. These reports are not readily available to Members, and I think it would be a matter of convenience to Senators and the public to see what the Eightieth Congress and what the Buck committee had to say about the RFC.

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

Senate Resolution 132, Eightieth Congress, first session, directed the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to conduct a full

and complete inquiry into the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (hereinafter referred to as "RFC" and "the Corporation") and its subsidiaries, and to report its findings together with the recommendations for such legislation as it deemed advisable not later than March 1, 1948. The time for reporting was extended to April 1, 1948, by Senate Resolution 203, Eightieth Congress, second session. Pursuant to this direction, a subcommittee has held hearings on the operations of RFC. The Committee on Banking and Currency has considered the subcommittee's findings and recommendations and reports favorably a bill to amend certain sections of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and recommends that the bill do pass.

HISTORY OF RFC

RFC was created by an act approved January 22, 1932. Thereafter its powers and functions were expanded and modified from time to time by amendments to the RFC Act and by separate statutes. Public Law 132, Eightieth Congress, approved June 30, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the "1947 act"), substantially repealed the prior legislation affecting RFC and provided in effect, a charter for the Corporation containing its basic authority. Under the 1947 act, the Corporation has succession through June 30, 1948.

Since its inception, the Corporation has performed various types of functions. It has engaged in extensive lending operations; it has been used by the Congress as a ready source of funds for the financing of other Government corporations and agencies, and of projects carried on under the direction of other governmental departments; it also engaged in extensive operations in support of the war effort.

The act of 1947 removed all of the Corporation's war powers. At the present time, there is no general power given to the Corporation by which it may provide funds for the financing of other Government corporations and the like. Such aid has been provided in specific cases, however, as in the case of the initial financing for the emergency European aid. In that case, the Corporation was authorized by the Congress to make advances not to exceed \$150,000,000 at the direction of the President until the necessary appropriations were made. Except for the liquidation of some of its wartime activities, the Corporation's functions have been limited by the 1947 act to lending activities, to the priority purchase of surplus property for small business, and to the operation of its wholly owned subsidiary, Federal National Mortgage Association.

Lending authority prior to 1947 act

The Corporation's lending authority under the legislation applicable prior to the 1947 act, enabled it to extend financial aid to the following types of institutions:

(a) Banks and other financial institutions; (b) railroads; (c) public agencies; (d) business enterprises. It also had authority to make (e) catastrophe loans. Further, the Corporation was authorized to subscribe for the stock of national mortgage associations organized under the National Housing Act. Pursuant to this authority, the Corporation subscribed for the stock of the Federal National Mortgage Association, which made and purchased (f) housing loans secured by mortgages on real estate. RFC also subscribed to the stock of the RFC Mortgage Company, which was organized to assist in establishing a normal mortgage market. Subsequently, the RFC Mortgage Company provided a secondary market for Veterans' Administration guaranteed home loans pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 656, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session. Federal National Mortgage Association has provided a similar market for FHA mortgage loans.

Lending authority under 1947 act

Under the 1947 act, the Corporation's lending authority may be used to aid the following:

(a) Business enterprises, including railroads; (b) financial institutions; and (c) public projects. The Corporation also has authority to make (d) catastrophe loans.

The 1947 act abolished the RFC Mortgage Company. Further, the Corporation's authority to purchase loans insured or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration was removed. The Federal National Mortgage Association, however, was not disturbed and continues to operate with the authority provided in the National Housing Act.

A comparison of RFC's lending authority prior to the 1947 act and under that act shows that the fields in which the Corporation may engage in lending operations remain substantially unchanged. There was, however, one important change in the form in which RFC aid may be provided. Under the prior laws, the Corporation had authority to aid banks and insurance companies in appropriate cases by the purchase of preferred stock of those institutions. The 1947 act permits aid to such institution only in the form of loans.

Except in these particulars, (1) the removal of the authority to provide secondary market for Veterans' Administration-guaranteed home loans, (2) the elimination of the authority to purchase the preferred stock of banks and insurance companies, and (3) the repeal of various provisions under which RFC had made funds available to other Government corporations and departments, the present RFC act of 1947 made no substantial changes in RFC's basic authority, but did constitute a major revision and codification of a considerable number of separate acts all dealing with RFC.

RFC business loans

RFC has had authority to make business loans directly, by participations with other institutions, and by agreements to participate. It is important for an understanding of the data contained in the hearings before the subcommittee to understand the nomenclature used to identify these various forms which the business loans have taken. A loan in which RFC disburses the full amount of the loan is called a direct loan. When RFC participates with a bank in making a loan, the bank and RFC both disbursing their respective shares of the total loan, it is called an immediate participation. RFC has also made agreements to participate in business loans by which the originating bank disburses the full amount of the loan and RFC agrees to take up its share of the loan on demand. These are called deferred participations.

In compiling its data, RFC has generally included its immediate participations with its direct loans since both represent actual disbursements by RFC. Data on participations usually refer to the deferred participations unless it is specifically indicated that immediate participations are included.

In addition to the regular deferred participations, RFC has made deferred participations under two plans: The blanket participation agreements (BPA) and the small-loan program (SLP). Under the former, which was instituted in March of 1945 to make credit readily available for the reconversion of industry (hearings, p. 37), RFC entered into agreements with banks by which it agreed to participate up to 75 percent, in any loan made by a bank on the bank's notifying RFC of its desire to obtain the participation. This program was discontinued in January 1947, and the small-loan program was inaugurated in its place. The latter is a simplified procedure, limited to applications for loans of \$100,000 and under, in which a bank takes at least 25 percent. The bank, rather than the prospec-

tive borrower, makes the application for the participation.

These three types of loans—direct, immediate participations, and deferred participations—are made up of both regular and national defense business loans. This distinction is important because the authority to make national defense business loans did not require that the proposed loan meet the credit standards which were applicable to loans made under the regular business loan authority.

RFC has 31 loan agencies located throughout the country. Applications for business loans are processed originally by one of these local loan agencies which have authority to approve any direct loan up to \$100,000 and any participation loan up to \$350,000, provided the participating banks take at least a 25-percent share. All other business-loan applications and all such applications which are declined by the local agency are forwarded to Washington for final consideration (hearings, p. 32).

Each local loan agency has an advisory committee consisting of bankers and businessmen in the area. From time to time some of the members of the local committee meet to pass on applications for direct loans over \$50,000 which have been approved by the local loan agency, and on all applications for direct loans exceeding \$100,000 whether approved or declined by the agency. The advisory committees pass on deferred participations of the same character except those under the small-loan program which are not passed on by the committees at all (hearings, p. 590).

The business-loan procedures have been described in some detail because, as will appear in the discussion which follows, RFC's present lending activities are confined almost entirely to business loans.

National defense and war activities

Under the national-defense powers the Corporation had authority to create corporations for the purpose of producing, acquiring, and carrying strategic materials and of constructing plants to be used in the manufacture of equipment and supplies necessary to the national defense. Pursuant to this authority RFC created the following subsidiaries: Metals Reserve Company to aid in the procurement of strategic metals and minerals; Rubber Reserve Company and Rubber Development Corporation for the purposes of purchasing and stock piling natural rubber, of processing natural rubber from foreign sources, and of operating the synthetic-rubber program; Defense Supplies Corporation to buy, sell, produce, or otherwise deal in strategic and critical materials; and Defense Plant Corporation to construct and acquire the industrial facilities necessary to the national defense. These subsidiaries, except for Rubber Development Corporation, which is now in liquidation, were dissolved into RFC by an act of Congress in 1945.

RFC also operated the War Damage Corporation, U. S. Commercial Company (during part of its existence), and the War Assets Corporation, and performed some of the functions of the Smaller War Plants Corporation which were transferred to it in December of 1945. The issuance of policies under the War Damage Insurance program was terminated in March of 1946. The activities of the U. S. Commercial Company are being liquidated at the present time and that corporation's succession expires on June 30, 1948, under the 1947 act. In March of 1946 the functions of the War Assets Corporation were transferred to the War Assets Administration and the War Assets Corporation was dissolved. The powers which had been transferred from Smaller War Plants Corporation expired by operation of law on December 31, 1946. The only important wartime activities now in operation are the

Texas City tin smelter and the synthetic rubber plants. Pursuant to Public Law 125, Eightieth Congress, first session, RFC continues to operate the tin smelter until June 30, 1949. The authority to conduct the synthetic-rubber plants was extended to March 31, 1948, by Public Law 24, Eightieth Congress, first session (hearings, p. 249). At the present time, a subcommittee of this committee is engaged in holding hearings on the question of the disposition of these projects. In view of these special studies, the committee has not concerned itself with those activities in this study.

A full discussion of the various powers which RFC has had from time to time is contained in exhibit 3 in the hearings before the subcommittee (p. 153).

GENERAL STATEMENT

RFC was created during a national emergency when many banks were experiencing acute difficulty as a result of a general shrinkage of deposits and a shrinkage in the value of their outstanding loans and investments. Its principal activities in this early period consisted of loans to, and the purchase of preferred stock of, banks and other financial institutions. By December of 1934, these outstanding loans and preferred-stock purchases amounted to \$1,724,000,000 (exhibit 5F, hearings, p. 180). The largest amount that RFC has had outstanding in all of its loan categories was \$2,288,000,000, in September of 1935 (exhibit 5A, hearings, p. 180).

A graphic picture of the amounts which RFC has had outstanding from time to time in the various loan categories is presented by exhibit 5A (hearings, p. 180). The graph shows that loans to railroads were the second most important activity during those early years.

As of June 30, 1947, disbursements in these two categories, financial institutions and railroads, had amounted to 52 percent of the total disbursements in all loan categories (table 9, hearings, p. 163). However, from June 30, 1945, to October 31, 1947, only two loans were authorized in that first category, these being two loans to one insurance company; and only two were authorized to railroads. During that recent period, RFC's new loans have been limited almost exclusively to loans to business enterprises and to the purchase of Veterans' Administration guaranteed mortgages, this latter authority having been removed by the 1947 act (table 10, hearings, p. 163; exhibit 11, p. 212).

Reasons for continuing RFC

From the foregoing, it is clear that the need which led to the creation of RFC in 1932 is no longer present, and that continuation of RFC must be justified on a basis other than that upon which its original creation was justified, and with the realization that its activity under conditions prevailing today will be limited principally to loans to business enterprises. The committee has concluded, however, that there are sound reasons which justify the continuation of RFC on a permanent basis. Those reasons may be summarized as follows:

(1) RFC performed an extremely useful and vital function during the emergencies of the last depression and of the war. Should such events recur, the existence of such an agency, already established, will permit more prompt and effective action than would be possible if an agency had to be re-created.

(2) There are some limited functions which such an agency can usefully perform during periods which cannot be characterized as times of economic depression or national emergency.

The hearings held by the subcommittee disclose almost complete unanimity of opinion that RFC performed an extremely useful function in the depression of the early thirties by the assistance which it gave to the country's financial institutions. Banks which were in difficulty as a result of illi-

quidity of assets were able to obtain loans from RFC on the security of such assets and thus avoid their costly forced liquidation. Banks which were forced to write down the value of their loans outstanding were able to avoid insolvency and a shut-down by obtaining capital funds through the sale of preferred stock to RFC. These loans and preferred-stock purchases undoubtedly saved many of these banks and their depositors from disaster. RFC's records indicate that this was accomplished without loss to the Government. Should the economy of the country take such a turn in the future, the existence of RFC will make it possible for the Government to provide immediate aid of the type which proved so beneficial in the thirties.

There is no way of determining whether the extent of that spiral might have been reduced had RFC aid been provided in the very early stages. It is probable, however, that such would have been the case. It is also probable that the same results could have been achieved with less effort on the part of the Government had such aid been more timely.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to identify unmistakably the beginning of such an economic downturn. The possibility that those signs will be recognized in time to permit recreation of such an agency in the early stages when its activities can provide the most effective relief, is remote enough to make it inadvisable to chance the country's welfare on the occurrence of that possibility. If at the first unmistakable signs of such a cycle, it were necessary for Congress to reenact RFC legislation and for such an agency to be reestablished out of whole cloth, the attendant delays could only make the accomplishment of its task more difficult and more costly. The severity which such cycles have achieved, the alleviation which can result from Government activity of the nature performed by RFC, and the possibility that the severity of any such decline may be reduced through immediate aid by such an agency make it advisable to continue RFC as a stand-by against any such contingency. It is the opinion of the committee that RFC provides an inexpensive check against such national economic distress.

The fact that RFC was available in 1940 and 1941 to provide speedy financing without direct appropriation enabled the Government to proceed rapidly with the preliminary steps necessary for the country's national defense. Should such an emergency arise again, the presence of RFC will enable the Congress to act promptly in taking such steps as appear necessary for the protection of the Nation.

The results of surveys of the Nation's banks and of RFC Advisory Committee members, which were conducted by the subcommittee's staff, disclose that banks occasionally decline business loans which a Government agency may make without competing with private sources of credit and without exposing the Government to undue risk of loss of the taxpayers' money (exhibits 38A, 66, hearings, pp. 472, 590).

Commercial banks are engaged in making loans of moneys which are deposited with them subject to withdrawal on demand. Since the deposits are subject to immediate withdrawal, there is a reluctance on the part of some commercial banks to tie up any large portion of their depositors' money in long-term business loans. Many of the banker members of the RFC Advisory Committee expressed the opinion that commercial banks cannot properly engage in the making of business loans with maturities of long length, for example, over 5 years, because of the nature of their deposits (hearings, pp. 592-593).

The bank survey shows that banks turn down reasonably sound loan applications for other reasons, which are not directly concerned with the risks involved (hearings, pp.

474-475, 482). It is possible that an applicant, who is turned down by one bank because of one or more of those reasons, may be able to find another bank which will make the loan despite that objection. However, banks rely a great deal on the first-hand knowledge and confidence in their prospective borrowers which they gain as a result of customer relationships with those borrowers. Realistically, therefore, some borrowers may have only their regular banks to which they can look in case of a need for credit.

The extent of such "gaps" in the private credit structure may vary with geographic area, size of borrower, general economic conditions, and so forth. Under present conditions they are probably very small. There are some places, however, where even today a meritorious application is declined. The committee believes that the public interest will be served by the presence of a Government lending agency to which an applicant who has been declined credit among private sources of credit may go for a reconsideration of his proposal.

In the past RFC has made loans to provide funds for public projects such as the San Francisco Bay Bridge and the Pennsylvania Turnpike (hearings p. 431). Such loans have been made on revenue bonds, repayment to be made out of the receipts from tolls. It is not difficult to believe that private capital is frequently reluctant to make the initial investments in such projects. An agency such as RFC can perform a useful public purpose by providing the initial funds for such projects, large and small.

Catastrophes such as the Texas City disaster and the fire at Bar Harbor, Maine, may be visited upon the country at any time. By its catastrophe loans RFC can help to relieve the public hardships attendant upon such disasters.

This discussion of the types of loans which RFC can usefully make in times which cannot be termed "emergency," is not intended to be all-inclusive. However, it will serve to give some indication of the permanent service which such an agency can perform.

Despite the existence of these fields in which RFC may make loans in what might be termed "normal times," the committee believes that the first reason for continuing RFC—its readiness to go into action during times of national emergency—is the far more important one. During times such as the present, characterized by an abundance of funds in the lending institutions of the country, high national employment, high national income, demand for goods in excess of supply, the committee believes that lending by RFC should be curtailed. Applications should be carefully considered to determine whether the interests of the public will be served by extending the financial aid requested. Applications which do not serve those interests should be declined.

The committee has given careful consideration to the problem of continuing RFC on a stand-by basis. Although the opinion that RFC should be continued as a stand-by organization appears in numerous places in the hearings before the subcommittee, no plan was suggested by proponents of this approach as to how this might be accomplished.

If RFC's lending powers were taken away, it is readily apparent that its organization would stagnate. As a result, its ability to cope with emergencies would be considerably impaired. The committee, therefore, believes it advisable to continue those lending powers, especially since they can be exercised usefully even in normal times, in order that a functioning organization will be preserved.

The legislation dealing with the lending powers might be hedged around with qualifications and conditions. No logical basis has been found, however, in the light of which such qualifications and conditions could be intelligently drafted. The imposition of arbitrary restrictions might reduce the operations

to a stand-by basis, but probably at the expense of the efficiency and usefulness of the operations.

The committee has concluded that RFC can perform its intended functions, both in normal times and in emergencies, only if it is equipped with adequate powers unhampered by arbitrary qualifications and conditions. The existing law with the amendments proposed by the committee will, therefore, provide RFC with substantially the same powers as it had during the depression period.

External controls of RFC operations

There are, however, certain controls which the committee believes will have the desired effect of curtailing the Corporation's activities in times such as the present. The first of these is the limitation imposed upon the amount of loans which RFC may have outstanding at any one time. By setting this limitation at a low level Congress can force RFC to operate within limited boundaries. When conditions change so as to require expansion of RFC's activities, this limitation can be raised by the Congress.

The second control is through examination of RFC's activities by Congress. Amendments proposed by the committee require the Corporation to file annual reports with Congress disclosing the operations for the year. These will enable the Congress to keep an eye on the extent of the activities. Further, should the Corporation feel that a raising of the over-all limitation previously discussed is advisable, it will have to present the matter to the Congress, at which time it should be required to show the disposition of its outstanding loans among the various loan categories and to explain fully the necessity for any increase in this limitation. This will provide the Congress with an opportunity to review the activities and the over-all need. It is the belief of this committee that a thorough inquiry into the operations of the Corporation, such as was made by the House Committee on Banking and Currency last year and by this committee this year, should be made at least once every 4 years. In this manner Congress can be assured that the activities of the Corporation are accomplishing their purpose and are not exceeding the intended bounds.

The third control is an economic one, the influence of which has already been felt by RFC. During the past 2 years the demand for loans in all fields but the business lending field has declined sharply. This has of necessity resulted in a curtailment of activity.

The fourth control will result from compliance with what this committee believes to be the basic principles which should govern the operations of a Government lending agency such as RFC. Those principles are three in number and are as follows:

First. Such activities should not be carried on in competition with private sources of credit.

Second. In deciding whether to grant a loan, the primary consideration should be the interest of the general public rather than the interest of the individual borrower.

Third. Under normal conditions the activities should be conducted so as to make them self-sustaining insofar as it is possible.

The laws governing RFC have always contained a direction that its financial assistance shall not be extended unless it is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. Our system of free enterprise should not be subject to competition from Government. The above limitation is therefore a vital one.

In the bank survey, the banks were asked if RFC had ever made loans which they were willing and able to make. Only 2.4 percent answered this in the affirmative and only 0.3 percent said that this occurred other than in isolated cases (hearings, p. 479). A good many of the bankers complimented RFC on

its compliance with this limitation. In some cases RFC has been able to set up a loan, previously declined by a bank, in such manner that it was able to persuade the bank to make the entire loan. (hearings, p. 508). The committee believes that, by and large, RFC has carefully complied with this statutory enjoiner that its aid not be granted unless the credit is not otherwise available.

In the field of deferred participations, however, RFC's activities may have been in direct competition with private sources of credit. In answer to the question, "Does RFC take deferred participations which other (and generally the larger) banks are willing and able to take?" Several of the advisory committee members suggested that the participations had never been offered by the originating bank to a correspondent bank, and that in many of those cases correspondent banks would have been willing to take the participations (hearings, pp. 598-599). Comments of a similar nature were made by some of the respondents to the bank questionnaire (hearings, p. 493).

The blanket participation agreements permitted a bank to obtain a deferred participation from RFC without ascertaining whether a correspondent bank might have been willing to participate in the loan. Under the small-loan program, RFC makes no independent check to see if the originating bank has attempted to place the participation with a correspondent (hearings, p. 276). It is therefore possible under the small-loan program for a bank to avoid offering a participation to a correspondent bank.

In the case of a deferred participation, the originating bank disburses the entire loan and is paid interest by the borrower, at 4 percent on that share of the loan for which RFC is obligated under its deferred participation. If RFC's participation is 75 percent of the loan, the bank, at the present time, pays to RFC three-quarters of 1 percent as a fee for the participation until such time as RFC is called upon to disburse its share of the loan to the bank. The bank, therefore, receives a gross return of 3¼ percent on the guaranteed portion which is, in effect, money lent on a security of the Government. The originating bank, however, assumes the expense incident to the making and servicing of the entire loan.

The bank may treat the amounts of its loans which are backed by an RFC deferred participation as though they were cash or Government obligations. These amounts need not be included in determining whether the maximum amount which it may safely lend out at risk has been reached. Therefore, by means of deferred participations a bank may lend out at 4 percent funds which it would otherwise have to maintain in cash or readily convertible Government securities.

If the participation had been taken by a correspondent bank, that bank would actually disburse its portion of the loan. The originating bank would disburse only its portion of the loan and receive only the interest on its share.

From the foregoing, it is apparent that a deferred participation from RFC is more advantageous for a bank than an immediate participation from a correspondent bank. It is, therefore, not difficult to believe that the banks, if permitted to do so, will submit loans to RFC for deferred participation without making a serious effort to obtain a participation from private sources.

Exhibit 5b (hearings, p. 180) shows graphically that the regular business lending of the Corporation, both direct loans and participations, has not varied a great deal since 1938, except for a very great expansion of participations through the blanket participation agreements and the small-loan program, the first of which was inaugurated in March of 1945 (hearings, p. 37). Such a marked increase in the normal business lending may have been the result of a relaxing of the

requirement that such participations be unavailable among private sources of credit.

The committee is not opposed to the principle of deferred participations, which are, in effect, loan guaranties. Under that practice a local bank considers the application and approves the loan to the extent that it will risk its own funds for at least a portion of the loan. RFC thereby gains the benefit of the knowledge and experience of the local bank. However, the committee believes that such deferred participations should be made available only when correspondent banks will not take the participation and that the granting of such participations on any other basis is a violation of the provisions of the existing legislation. The practice should be designed to assist the ultimate borrower, who is unable to obtain his entire credit from private sources, and not as a service for the benefit of the banks. The attention of the Corporation's Board of Directors has been called to this situation, and they are being asked to look into the matter and to take such steps as may be appropriate to correct such a condition if in fact it does exist.

RFC has not considered that an applicant is unable to obtain credit from private sources if his only difficulty results from an unwillingness to pay the interest rate at which the credit is available among private sources. Unless the interest rate at which the credit is made available is clearly unreasonable, the Corporation's position in this regard is a proper application of the statutory standard.

The committee believes that the language of the existing legislation is sufficient to proscribe any activity by RFC which might compete with private sources of credit. It is only necessary that there be a strict adherence to that proscription. From time to time Congress should assure itself of that continued adherence.

Importance of public interest

The second principle which should apply to lending operations by RFC is that, in deciding whether to make or decline a loan, the interest of the public should be considered primary and the personal interests of the particular borrower should be considered secondary. The committee believes that RFC should not engage in lending of a purely private character where the benefit to the general public is remote, whether the loans be large or small. The proposed amendatory legislation authorizes RFC "to aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry; to encourage small business; to help in maintaining the economic stability of the country; and to assist in promoting maximum employment and production." Each application should be measured against the above-quoted language and considered in the light of this second principle.

Admittedly the above guide is a broad one. However, it is obvious that the purposes to be served by loans of the type made by RFC cannot be reduced to exact language by which the propriety of each loan can be determined with exactitude. In order to provide the flexibility which is necessary to enable the Corporation to provide financial aid to many types of institutions under widely varying conditions, the definition of the purposes to be served is necessarily broad.

Although the statutory guide contains no express reference to the public interest, it should be apparent that the service of that public interest is the paramount purpose of governmental operations of the nature conducted by RFC. The RFC loan to Glenn L. Martin Co. is a good example of a loan which is serving those interests. The hearings before the subcommittee disclose that the Glenn L. Martin Co. contemplated the construction of aircraft for use by the commercial air lines, that those air lines were and are badly in need of aircraft of the contemplated type, and that Martin's attempts to

obtain private financing were extensive but unsuccessful (hearings, pp. 319-322, 335-342). RFC made a loan to the Martin Co. to finance the building of the commercial aircraft when the efforts to obtain private financing proved futile. The production of such aircraft should serve the public interest in two ways: It will enable a manufacturing company to keep together a nucleus of personnel whose training and skill will be vital should the country ever again have to begin the large-scale production of aircraft for defense purposes; and it will provide the commercial air-lines industry with a source of much-needed new and modern equipment.

In the case of the Martin loan the interest of the public is readily apparent. In other cases, especially in the smaller loans, the interest of the public will not be so clear. In many cases a loan will not serve a public interest as clearly defined or as national in scope as that served by the Martin loan. In the last analysis the determination of whether or not a particular loan will serve the public interest, must be left to the discretion of the Directors of the Corporation.

In the exercise of this discretion, RFC has decided as a matter of policy not to make loans to the press or radio. It cannot be denied that a loan to a newspaper under certain circumstances might serve a very useful public purpose. It is more important, however, for the Government not to become financially concerned with the success of any industry which is engaged in the exercise of our very jealously guarded rights of freedom of speech and press. The committee believes that RFC should have the discretion to make policy decisions of this character. In isolated cases under the BPA program, RFC has participated in loans to night clubs. It seems to the committee that the public interest is only remotely served by the financing of such places of entertainment. The committee believes that RFC can and should decide as a matter of policy not to engage in financing in fields where the national and local interests of the public are served only remotely.

The committee has considered the problem of coordinating the operations of RFC with the monetary and fiscal policies of the Government. RFC has already proved its willingness and ability to cooperate in the carrying out of those policies. During recent months the Government announced an anti-inflation policy. RFC responded promptly by notifying all of its agency managers that RFC activity should not be permitted to nullify the effect of that policy and that inflationary loans should not be made (hearings, pp. 44-45). If banks, in compliance with a governmental policy of credit restriction, decline loans which they might have made in the absence of such a restriction, it is probable that RFC will receive many more applications than it might otherwise have received. If RFC adheres to the policy of not making inflationary loans, it will find it necessary to decline most if not all of those additional applications. It is believed that the existing legislation, with the proposed amendments, provide a guide by which RFC can coordinate its activities with the credit policies of the Government.

In view of the foregoing, the committee feels that it is unnecessary to impose direct controls on RFC for the purpose of making its operations subject to the policy of the fiscal agencies of the Government, such as the Secretary of the Treasury or the Federal Reserve System. Any such efforts would result in a division of RFC responsibility which the committee believes is undesirable.

Operations should be self-sustaining

The third principle which should govern the operations of RFC is that its lending activities under economic conditions such as prevail today should be conducted, insofar as is reasonably possible, on a self-sustaining basis after taking into consideration

the operating expenses and reasonable reserves for losses.

The present law requires that RFC's loans be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment. The committee believes that a fair application of this standard will yield the desired results.

The three principles just discussed are, in the opinion of the committee, of equal importance. Loans must not be made in competition with private sources of credit. They must meet the requirement that the public interest be served. They must measure up to the credit standards set forth in the act. If an application for financial assistance is deficient in any of these respects, it should be declined despite the fact that it may eminently qualify under the remaining two principles.

Decisions of RFC directors

The responsibility for the application of these three principles lies with the directors of RFC. They should, therefore, be free to use their best judgment in the application of those principles to the loans which they consider. The danger attendant upon the interference with that exercise of judgment is illustrated by the loan which RFC made to the Lustron Corp. in June of 1947. The loan was made to finance the manufacture of prefabricated houses. RFC agreed to advance \$15,500,000 as against the advance of slightly less than \$1,000,000 by the equity interests (hearings, p. 359). Application to RFC for the loan was apparently made at the suggestion of the Housing Expediter. The loan was made by RFC under its national defense authority at the urging of the Housing Expediter who had the authority under the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act to issue directives to other Government agencies to exercise their powers in aid of veterans' housing. RFC was undoubtedly motivated by the fact that the Housing Expediter had that authority.

It is the opinion of this committee that, in those fields in which RFC has the responsibility for its actions, it should be allowed to exercise its discretion free from interference by other governmental agencies and departments and, for that matter, free from all influence whether from officials in the Government or from Members of Congress. Only under those circumstances can RFC be expected to do its job properly and with full accountability. Attempts to influence the business judgments of RFC by the use of political influence, even though well intended, are a constant menace to sound administration. While the general policies of the RFC, like those of other Government agencies, should be reviewed and coordinated by the President, this general review should not extend to particular loans. The business decisions of RFC should be the independent judgments of its Board of Directors.

Record of financial success of operations

As previously indicated, the committee believes that RFC should conduct its operations without loss, at least in times like the present. In order that all costs will appear in RFC's statements, the committee is proposing amendments which will reduce the funds which the Corporation uses, without payment of interest to the Treasury, to \$100,000,000 of capital and a maximum of \$50,000,000 of surplus. Prior to the 1947 act RFC paid a rate of interest on its borrowings from the Treasury which was lower than the average rate at which the Treasury was able to borrow. Section 7 of the 1947 act requires that RFC future borrowings should bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury after taking into consideration the current average rate on marketable obligations of the United States. This left unchanged RFC's notes in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000,000 which were

outstanding as a result of the regular lending operations prior to the effective date of that act. In order that RFC's statements may reflect a truer picture of the income or cost to the Government, the committee felt that these old borrowings should bear the current rate of interest paid by the Treasury. RFC has assured the committee that it will renew those notes on the effective date of the proposed amendatory legislation at the going rate of interest.

As a result of these changes, RFC's annual statements will include substantially all the costs involved in the conduct of the operations. It should then be possible to obtain from these statements a true picture of the financial success of the over-all operations. An amendment proposed by the committee requires RFC to include in its annual reports an analysis of the accumulated net income. This analysis will show the changes in net income as a result of the year's operations.

The committee believes that RFC should maintain its accounts so that the net result of each of its major activities can be readily determined from its annual statements. RFC has not maintained its books in a manner which will permit an appraisal of any particular lending activity. For example, it is not possible to determine with sufficient accuracy what financial success RFC has heretofore enjoyed in the business lending field. An appraisal of that financial success would be especially useful at this time since the bulk of RFC's present activity is in that field.

Reference has previously been made to the fact that the maximum outstanding to banks and other financial institutions at any one time was \$1,724,000,000. In contrast, the maximum outstanding at any one time in direct business loans, other than national defense loans, was only \$156,000,000 (exhibit 5b, hearings, p. 180). In addition to these direct loans, RFC has had regular deferred participations as well as BPA and SLP deferred participations. These amounted to only \$311,000,000 as of June 30, 1947 (exhibit 5a, hearings, p. 189). As of that date, RFC total disbursements (authorizations in the case of deferred participations) in the field of business loans, except for national defense loans, amounted to only 16 percent of RFC's total disbursements in all categories (table 9, hearings, p. 163).

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that continuous losses in the field of business lending may have been absorbed by successful operations in the other fields of activity. Therefore, the Corporation's accumulated net income of \$550,000,000 as of June 30, 1947, is not, of itself, a satisfactory indication of the financial success of the business lending.

From the results of the bank survey, from the results of a study in 1941 of a sample of RFC business loans, and from the testimony of the RFC Chairman, it appears that RFC borrowers are substandard from the standpoint of bank credit (hearings, pp. 475, 287, 35). The committee believes that the usefulness of RFC's business lending is measured by the success which those borrowers achieve in rehabilitating themselves and in paying off their loans. The success of the borrowers in that regard will be reflected directly in the surplus or deficit which results from the RFC operations. The absence of separate accounting information as to the results of the business lending forecloses an appraisal of the value of RFC's activities in that field in the light of its financial success.

The committee considered a requirement that RFC maintain its financial records in accordance with cost-accounting principles so that such information might be available in the future. RFC has, however, undergone some fundamental changes in its accounting practices in the last 2 years, and has recently undertaken a large-scale plan of decen-

tralization. In view of the foregoing circumstances, the committee has decided against recommending the inclusion in the statute of a mandatory provision for such accounting, and in favor of allowing RFC to complete and absorb its present changes and to set up at its earliest convenience a practical method for ascertaining the net result for each of the major categories of loans and other activities, based upon income, loss, and some appropriate distribution of administrative expense.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] was a member of that committee. The question of the abolition of the RFC was studied with great care. Senators will recall that the Eightieth Congress was dominated by and under the control of the Republican Party. They did not recommend the abolition of the RFC, in fact they specifically recommended that it not be abolished, extended its life for 6 years, I believe it was, until 1954.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator will remember, I think, that as a member of that subcommittee I was at that time, as I said yesterday, in favor of abolishing the RFC as a direct lending power, and if we could not abolish the whole direct lending power, that it be limited to participating in loans with banks participating with the RFC. I was in a minority on the committee. The committee did recommend as the Senator stated, but not with the vote of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot recall how the Senator from Ohio voted individually. I cannot recall that there were any minority views filed by the Senator, or that he made any particular fight on the subject. All I know is that the Senate was under the control of the Republican Party. They studied the matter seriously. They took a poll of all banks in the country. They had a very competent staff.

It is true they did not approach the matter in the same way the present subcommittee has. They did not approach it from the point of view of individual cases. They did not undertake to examine the application of the principles which were set forth in its report. That is a difference of procedure. But what I do not appreciate in the remarks of the Senator from Ohio are the implications, throughout his speech, that I and the subcommittee, at least the Democratic members, are seeking to stop this investigation for political reasons; that we are seeking to whitewash any phase of this matter. On the contrary—

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not now. I shall yield in a moment. On the contrary, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to what the subcommittee has done in contrast to what the subcommittee of the Republican majority did in the Eightieth Congress. I think any fair-minded person will concede that the present subcommittee has done nothing of the sort—that is, we have not whitewashed anything. Many of the loans under consideration were made during the period when the Eightieth Congress,

the Republican Congress, was in control. I do not recall that they made a single effort at improving conditions, or that any criticism whatever was leveled at anything that had gone on in that agency.

Mr. President, it is very strange to me that now all of a sudden the Republican Party in both Houses has taken formal action recommending the abolition of the RFC. It is not only the Senator from Ohio who has done so. I mention it only because the Senator was a member of the subcommittee, and he made a speech yesterday. I desire to refer to several passages in his speech which left the implication that I am favoring the shutting down of this inquiry because it might reveal something derogatory to the Democratic Party. I think that is absolutely unjustified. I think this subcommittee has leaned over backward to keep politics out of the inquiry. As a matter of fact, I am quite prepared to say, and I believe, that this sudden interest on the part of some of the Members on the other side is inspired by political considerations rather than any welfare of the public or in the public interest.

Mr. BRICKER and Mr. KEM addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. If the Senator from Arkansas will read the complete record of the discussion yesterday, at the time I was speaking, which occurred between the Senator from Oregon and myself, he will find that I very clearly said there was no political consideration on the part of the chairman of the committee or the members of the committee in not continuing this investigation; but I said, on the other hand, that the chairman of the committee, and the members representing both sides of the aisle, had done a most excellent job in the investigation. I did say, however, in response to a question from the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that there might be a public attitude or a public reaction to the stopping of the investigation at this time that it was done for political reasons. But I myself very clearly made the statement that that is not the situation, and I am glad to reaffirm my position on that point, and to compliment the chairman on the excellent job he has done thus far in the investigation.

Let me refer for a moment to the investigation during the Eightieth Congress. The subcommittee was not investigating, as the chairman of the present subcommittee has well said, individual cases or individual loans. It was only going into the question of the propriety of continuing the RFC, either of limiting their loaning authority or of giving them additional money to lend or authority to continue. It was the opinion of the majority at that time that the RFC should continue in operation, that it should be given more lending authority, and there was a great deal of discussion of the question whether or not the loans should be limited to participation loans. If the chairman will remember, I think he will agree with me that there was a

great deal of opposition to discontinuing the lending authority on the part of Senators from certain sections of the country wherein they said there was not at that time—and I presume the situation still prevails—adequate lending authority in the local financial institutions to take care of the needs of their communities which were trying to build up their industries. They said there was not sufficient lending power for that purpose. In the question of bank participation they said their banks were limited in capital and in assets so that they could not participate to any great extent in the loans which were necessary for building up the various communities.

So the Senator is very wrong if he imputes to me any statement or any inference that there was any political consideration either in the investigation or in the discontinuance of the investigation at this time.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield in a moment. I desire to make a few points first. Both the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Ohio made long speeches on the subject. I have not made a speech on it. I think it is premature to do so on my part, at least. I intend to make a speech on the subject of Reorganization Plan No. 1, and also to make a suggestion as to what the Congress may do if it is genuinely interested in trying to improve the moral standards of the governmental service. But, as I said, I am not yet prepared to go into either of these subjects thoroughly.

With regard to the Senator's remarks made on yesterday, it is true that in one place he paid the committee and the chairman a compliment. But running through his remarks, and particularly also the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], there are very clear implications about the matter. I shall take them in order and point out one or two instances. For example, the Senator from Oregon, as appears on page 2403 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in a colloquy with the Senator from Ohio, said:

It is bound to reflect to the detriment of the committee—

That is, my committee—

because many people will think that the issue became a little too hot for complete investigation, and that the investigation was stopped for political reasons.

Then the Senator from Ohio very graciously said:

I doubt if one could attribute that purpose to the chairman.

However, it leaves the implication that somebody may have such an attitude.

Then later, as appears on the same page, the Senator from Oregon said:

My point is that there is danger that the public may get the impression that the investigation was stopped for political reasons.

That reiterated the same thing.

The Senator from Ohio, as appears on the same page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said:

Our constituents expect us to perform that duty. They will not, and should not, accept any whitewash or any insipid reforms which will not prevent similar scandals in the

future. The time for action is now. On this issue every Member of Congress must take an unequivocal stand.

That statement carries the very clear implication that the committee's procedure is a whitewash and that these are insipid reforms.

I submit to the Senator from Ohio, who became a member of the subcommittee only the first of this year, that it is not very becoming of him to be so critical of the subcommittee. He must understand that really we have been working on this matter for 2 years; some of us have been working on it for that long, and we have been working on it with the staff for over a year. The Senator from Ohio did not go through all the preliminary work and all the executive sessions in which the evidence was sifted and in which other issues, aside from the matter of influence, were carefully studied. I think the Senator from Ohio is jumping to conclusions which are not warranted.

There is much more to the RFC than has been shown by the recent hearings. It is true that a mink coat gave the RFC a certain amount of publicity, but that is a relatively minor part of our studies. I do not think the Senator from Ohio is justified in jumping upon the subcommittee with both feet, in connection with this matter, before we have had an opportunity, subsequent to the completion of our hearings, to study it and prepare and submit some kind of a report.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question. I wish to complete my own remarks. I am not prepared to make a speech on the subject.

Mr. BRICKER. My question is this: Does not the Senator from Arkansas understand that I was not talking about the subcommittee or about the Committee on Banking and Currency; but in the portion of my remarks which the Senator has noted in the Record, I was talking about the duty of the Congress of the United States, not about the subcommittee or its report. In fact, I think the Congress of the United States should act, and act promptly, and act in a determined way, in regard to the report of the subcommittee which shows the corruption I have mentioned.

Had it not been for the report of the subcommittee and the hearings which are being held under the able leadership of its chairman, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, there would not be any material for the Congress to consider.

My point is that it is the duty of the individual Members of Congress to their constituents to see to it that the sort of thing that has been revealed by the chairman of the subcommittee and his subcommittee is ended.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I think the Senator from Ohio has been unduly impressed by some of the instances we have discussed recently. Perhaps he can say that I have become callous about such matters, but I do not think so. I believe it is a matter of putting these instances in their proper perspective.

I say now that I do not approve of the Senator's proposal to abolish the RFC. I think the proper procedure is to improve the RFC.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri in a moment, but first I wish to make some of my own points.

The Senator from Ohio had much to say about the Hoover Commission's report. A person who had not read that report could easily gather from the remarks of the Senator from Ohio the impression that the Hoover Commission approved the abolition of the RFC. However, it did no such thing. The task force did; but the Hoover Commission, having that matter clearly before it, did not recommend the abolition of the RFC. On the contrary, it recommended its continuation, but recommended that it be transferred to the Department of the Treasury. That recommendation is very different from the impression, at least, which is left by the remarks of the Senator from Ohio. I do not think he intended to do that; but I am sure that from a casual reading people would gather the impression that that was the effect of the report of the Hoover Commission. However, that is not the case at all.

Again, I say that, by implication, the Senator from Ohio has left the impression that our committee has been engaged in whitewashing this matter. I wish to read one paragraph appearing on page 2405 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The American people will reject any face-saving reforms. They demand drastic action. The election in Maryland last year showed how the people feel about whitewash investigations.

Mr. President, I do not appreciate those remarks at all, regardless of the Maryland election, with which I have had nothing whatever to do, not even remotely, in either one way or another. I am not particularly impressed by the procedures which apparently were followed in that case. Nevertheless, the comparison of our subcommittee with any committee which the Senator characterizes as having engaged in a whitewash, I think, is wholly unwarranted.

I merely wish to say that I think this is a serious matter. I believe the question of the ethical standards of conduct in the Government service is something which should not be brushed off by a very sudden move to abolish the RFC. That is not the way to dispose of this question.

This question goes much further than the RFC, which is only one segment of our Government. To proceed on the basis of the statement, "We find something wrong with the RFC, so we will abolish it," I think would be an immature way of handling a problem of this kind. The same thing might be said of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. As a matter of fact, some of our inquiries have led us to the Bureau of Internal Revenue as possibly being a source of irregularities. Another investigation has led us to the Maritime Commission as being a place

which possibly is subject to irregularities. Certainly no one would say that we should abolish either the Maritime Commission or the Bureau of Internal Revenue—or, at least, certainly not the Bureau of Internal Revenue; I will not go quite that far with respect to the Maritime Commission.

However, certainly the proper procedure is to seek to improve the Government service. For instance, some persons may criticize the Senate, but that is no reason for abolishing the Senate.

There is always room for improvement, I suppose. I am perfectly willing to work to improve the ethical standards of the various parts of the executive branch and all other branches of the Government as much as anyone else wishes to.

We have continually been running up against certain areas in which we have no right to inject ourselves, such as the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I shall make those points at a later time.

At this time I merely wish to say that I do not appreciate the premature attacks upon the work of the subcommittee. I think we have done a fair job. Certainly we have spent a great deal of time on it, and I have spent much of my time in the course of 2 years on it.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I promised to yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question; and I now yield to him.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

Before I put my question, I wish to say, Mr. President, that I think the Senator from Arkansas and his subcommittee have done and are doing a fine job, and I hope they will continue what they are doing.

When the Senator from Arkansas referred to the fact that there was some political move behind the demand for abolition of the RFC, I wondered whether the Senator from Arkansas heard the able address on that subject delivered yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I say to the Senator from Missouri that, unfortunately, I had a committee meeting at that time, and I did not hear either the address of the Senator from Virginia or the address of the Senator from Ohio. However, the speech of the Senator from Ohio was called to my attention this morning.

Mr. KEM. Let me invite the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to the address delivered yesterday by the Senator from Virginia. It is well worth reading. It appears on page 2384 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion, and I say to him that I shall read that address.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether he thinks the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia was impelled by any political motives in what he said.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I would not attribute that to the Senator from Virginia. I have not read his speech, but the senior Senator from Virginia is a

very distinguished and fine statesman, of the highest order.

Mr. KEM. I should also like to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether he thinks the former Chairman of the RFC, the Honorable Jesse Jones, was impelled by political motives in the demands he has frequently made, running back to last April, for the abolition of the RFC.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I do not think so. Mr. Jones is not in politics. However, that does not mean at all that the present Members of this body, who are very much interested in politics, may not be inspired by such motives.

What I had reference to primarily, in referring to the matter of political motives, was both the speech in regard to the abolition of the RFC and the attempt to mix up that issue with the effort to reject Reorganization Plan No. 1.

My own analysis of the situation is that the Republicans, having caucused and having agreed as a party matter to destroy the RFC, have agreed to vote to reject Reorganization Plan No. 1. I think that is a very unjustified approach to the matter. They have no assurance at all that they can destroy the RFC by abolishing it. In the meantime, if they have any interest in improving the public service, they should permit a reorganization to occur under that plan. Then they can approach the matter of abolition.

Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KEM, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether it is not a fact that, if the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 were rejected, the result would be that the present 5-man Board would be continued, and the RFC would go on?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the Senator from Arkansas, after studying this subject—and he has studied it far more than anyone else in this body—considered that it would be better to concentrate the responsibility upon one man, so that he could not evade responsibility for decisions, and does not the Senator also believe that if only one man were appointed, it would be possible to get a better type of administrator? Is not that the conclusion?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. That is the conclusion of the subcommittee, with one exception. There was but one dissent, that of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], on that very proposal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a further fact that the Senator from Arkansas has supplementary legislation, so that, if Reorganization Plan No. 1 does go into effect and the situation is thus improved with respect to administration, this supplementary legislation will clean up a great many of the defects which have been disclosed in the investigation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. That bill has already been reported to the full committee. It deals with some of the matters which the Senator from

Ohio mentioned in his speech, which would indicate to me that the Senator from Ohio has not yet had an opportunity of reading that bill, which is now pending before the full committee. I have reference particularly to the item with regard to the method of financing the RFC.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator was not on the floor yesterday. Is he familiar with the fact that, when he accuses the Republican Party of wanting to abolish the RFC, the bill to abolish it was introduced by a Democrat, the senior Senator from Virginia?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood the Senator from Missouri had introduced the first one. There have been bills all over the place, with several in the House of Representatives, but the first one in the Senate was, I think, introduced by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Arkansas think it quite fair to brand every Republican as being opposed to RFC, when as a matter of fact I rose on the floor of the Senate yesterday and promptly said that, as a Republican, I was certainly going to do all I could to maintain the RFC?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that, whenever I refer to Republicans, I always have the reservation as to the Senator from North Dakota, who is an independent statesman. [Laughter.] So I did not intend to impute that to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McFARLAND. Now, wait.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before I wait, and before I forget it, I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of my remarks a statement entitled "Our Sleepy Guardians," written by Joseph C. Harsch, in which Mr. Harsch makes the point quite well that it is a strange thing that the Republicans, who are now the opposition party, but in the Eightieth Congress were the majority party, drifted along and never uncovered any of the matters to which we have been referring, and now have become so shocked by the revelation of the misdoings of certain persons and have become so concerned about abolishing the RFC. The real function of the opposition is to keep the majority in line, to see that the majority does not permit such wrongdoing as has been revealed. It makes a very powerful argument in favor of the proposition that the Republicans are quite as much at fault as are the Democrats in permitting the growth of any such activities in the Government.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that very point for a question?

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois for one question, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Chair correct that the Senator asked that the article referred to be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request?

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

STATE OF THE NATION—OUR SLEEPY GUARDIANS

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

An American can only observe ruefully that the Chinese and the Filipinos who told us to look to our own household when we criticized them for graft and corruption spoke with more justification than we assumed at the time to be the case.

The smell of favoritism and undue political influence which has emerged from the opened lid of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is not a pleasant thing. As yet we do not know the whole story. As yet we do not know whether the things done are in actual violation of law or only in that twilight border line around the law where shrewd people are able to operate without breaking the letter of the law. It remains for a grand jury to decide whether there is an indictable case. And it remains for a trial jury to determine the final degree of guilt.

In the meantime, however, there can be no doubt that Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas has brought to the public gaze a condition which shows that something is lacking in Washington's present standard of public morals. It may be legal for a Government official to accept the hospitality of an expensive Miami Beach hotel, but he would be wiser if he did not. That is precisely the sort of thing which "Caesar's wife" was expected to avoid. When it is a matter of public office it is not enough to avoid the doing of evil. It is also necessary to avoid the appearance of evil. Whether evil was done remains to be tested in the courts. That there has been the appearance of evil cannot be denied. The Truman administration has been caught allowing an insufficiently guarded public money trough to exist too near to the White House.

If one wishes, one can think of a number of ameliorating considerations. Mink coats and free hotel rooms are not on the same scale as whole oil fields. The loan record of the RFC has, on the whole, been good. Most of the loans have been repaid. Neither Congress nor the press has the time to watch every agency of Government all the time. There are too many of them. Every agency of Government goes through cycles from that of original crusading earnestness in its youth to laxness and lassitude in its old age. Washington has been much too busy of late trying to build the defenses of the free world to be able to devote the time it should to keeping up the moral tone of those agencies which have long since become routine.

There is some merit, or mitigation, in all these arguments. However, when they have all been said the fact remains that the RFC affair has loosed on Washington, and from Washington, the most unpleasant smell since the days of the Teapot Dome scandals. There is no denying or covering up the fact that it exposes a standard of public morals lower than it should be, and lower than America expects of its public servants.

In this reporter's opinion, the most shocking thing about it is that it remained for a political maverick to uncover the condition. Senator FULBRIGHT is a Democrat, but not a regular one. He has had differences with the administration since 1946. But he is not one of those Democrats who play close to the

Republicans. Our two regular political parties have distinguished themselves equally in this case by their reluctance to make a record of uncovering the condition. Republicans are beginning to show some interest now that Senator FULBRIGHT has turned up what looks like a public scandal. But not until the past week did Republicans show themselves less reluctant than Democrats to get this whole story out into the open. Partisan rivalry in protecting public morals can be the first guardian of those morals. But it takes a zealous opposition party to keep government living in a state of moral decency.

We have a complaint against the Democrats for maintaining an unguarded money trough in Washington. We also have a complaint against the Republicans for leaving it to a Democrat to uncover the condition. There has been a failure on the part of the majority party to keep its standard up to a minimum level of public decency. There has been a failure on the part of the opposition party to perform its traditional policing role. Senator FULBRIGHT's investigation shows that we have been let down by both of our great political parties.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield, for one question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the Senator from Arkansas has said that the Republican Party has not taken the lead in exposing abuses, but rather, though he was too modest to say so, himself, it had been the Senator from Arkansas, does this perhaps fit into the aphorism that the general rule by which the RFC has proceeded is that the Republicans get the money, and the Democrats get the blame?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that is a very good characterization of the situation. I promised to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether he knows anyone who suggested the abolition of the RFC prior to the time it was suggested by the Honorable Jesse Jones, former Chairman of the RFC, and a member of the Senator's own party? I should also like to ask the question, if the Senator does not impute political motives to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], or to the former Chairman of the RFC, Mr. Jones, why does he impute political motives to the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], or to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do that from reading the speech by the Senator from Ohio. A moment ago I mentioned a few passages of it in which he, with no justification, I think, implies we are planning to stop this inquiry and to whitewash the whole situation. I can see no other motive than a political one in such a statement.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Indiana, has been on his feet, and I did not yield to him. I first yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am a member of the subcommittee, and I want to say, so that everyone may hear me, that I have nothing but praise for

the method followed by the able Senator from Arkansas in conducting the work of the subcommittee. I have at no time seen anything which would indicate that he was playing politics in any respect. He has done a remarkable and an efficient job, he has worked hard, and he has had an efficient staff. Of course, it is public knowledge that he and I disagree on what should happen from this point on. I think the President's reorganization plan and the reorganization plan of the able senior Senator from Virginia are designed to eliminate the RFC. I think they are all premature, including the able Senator from Missouri and the able Senator from Ohio, because I feel that the life of the subcommittee should be extended, that the Senate should give it more money so that it may continue for at least another 90 days or 6 months studying the problem, before any action whatever is taken in respect to RFC.

The President, however, as Senators know, has sent to the Senate a reorganization plan. To that, I am opposed, as the able Senator from Arkansas knows. As the ranking Republican member of the committee, he and I have worked together perfectly. We have not disagreed at all, other than on that one thing.

I should like to suggest to the able Senator that he submit to the Senate a request, in the form of a resolution, that his subcommittee be continued for another 6 months, and that it be supplied with ample funds properly to investigate every phase of RFC; at the end of which time, the Senate could decide what action should be taken, whether it should appoint a one-man director, or whether the RFC should be completely eliminated.

Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. KEM addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield first to the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has suggested he would have no objection to proceeding to an investigation of the ethical standards of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of the Government. I did not say the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator mentioned the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I included the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well, including the Senate. I regret very much that a statement of that kind should be made on the floor of the Senate. I have the greatest admiration for the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, but I say to the Senate and to the world that I know of no higher ethical standards among any group of men than are to be found in the Senate of the United States and in the Congress. Any suggestion that the Senate should be investigated, or any inference that the Congress needs to be investigated is unfortunate and is to be regretted. I say this because the people are looking to us; to their legislative representatives for leadership.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will wait a moment, I wish to put the situation in the proper perspective. I did not initiate the request for an extended investigation. All I did was to announce through the press that I thought our immediate study had been completed, and that we knew all we thought it was necessary to know about the RFC.

I may remind the Senator that the question regarding senatorial relationships arose from a request by the President of the United States for all the letters written by Senators and others, including Representatives, to the RFC. The press, in many cases, then decided that this matter should be examined, and that my committee could not possibly stop without going into all the letters. I say that it is not the proper function of a subcommittee on the RFC to go into those letters at all. It would leave a very false and misleading impression if all that was done without a statement of facts in each case to which the letters related.

I am not the one who is demanding any such investigation, but I also say that I do not believe the Senate or any other body should take the attitude that it is so perfect that no one dare suggest that it should be examined. I am perfectly willing to have anything I have done examined into. I do not feel that the Senate should be so high-minded that it cannot be investigated.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may complete my statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know anything about this letter controversy. If anyone desires to examine my letters to or from the RFC, he is welcome to go over to my office and look at them right now. I am talking about investigating the ethical standards of the Senate of the United States, or investigating the morals of the United States Senate or of the Congress. I am responsible to my constituents, and every other Senator is responsible to his constituents, and our constituents will do the investigating as to whether we have proper ethical standards. They are the ones to whom we have to answer.

Thus far I have not tried to interfere with or stop any of the multitude of Senate investigations now being conducted and I do not know that I shall, but the time is coming when the Senate had better become active in considering and passing legislation, instead of doing so much investigating.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me complete my statement. I do not have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona does not have the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. In my judgment, we had better attend to our own knitting a little more. If we do not, the people will attend to us.

Of course we have to have certain investigations; one of our functions is to investigate for the purpose of formulating legislation. Perhaps it should be

emphasized that is the sole legal purpose of a congressional committee investigation. It certainly is not for the purpose of making policemen out of legislators.

However, I understand the object of the investigation of the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas was to determine whether or not there should be remedial legislation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct—legislation regarding the RFC.

Mr. McFARLAND. Any investigation of that kind, to determine whether there should be any legislation, is a proper one and is within the duty and responsibility of this body.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may state to the Senator that we have already reported the bill, and it is now merely a matter of ending up that particular study.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely wanted to make it plain that so far as I am concerned, so long as I am a Member of the Senate, I shall oppose any suggestion that the morals or the ethics of the Senate be investigated, because I believe them to be as high as those of any group or body I have ever known.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. About a year ago I was appointed as a member of the Reconstruction Finance Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I have been fairly intimately connected with that investigation, and have been able to follow it in detail, to take a minor part in its conduct, and to work very closely with the chairman, the Senator from Arkansas.

In my opinion the Senator from Arkansas has set an example of energy, honesty, and complete fidelity to duty. He has given up virtually every other interest which he has had. He has spent days and nights, yes, months, at this work. He has directed a staff of assistants. He has pulled no punches whatsoever. He has shielded no one. If there had been any thought of considering the purely political effects of the investigation, there are many witnesses who have been summoned who would not have been summoned, and a great many cases which have been investigated which would not have been investigated. The Senator from Arkansas has been completely impartial and, as a matter of fact, has leaned over backward in his desire to be fair.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to complete my statement, if I may.

We have had in our possession information as to facts about certain loans which might have affected adversely the opposing political party. Had there been any desire to smear, the chairman of the subcommittee would have brought those loans out into the open. He did not do so. He leaned over backwards, as a matter of fact, to protect the members of the opposition party who might have been accused, justly or unjustly,

of trying to get favoritism in RFC loans, and he was unsparing in the effort which he made to see that anyone who was guilty of unethical conduct, whatever his connection, should be put on the stand and interrogated.

Mr. President, I am aware that the RECORD is technically correct about the Senator from Arkansas, but I wish to add a word from my heart. He has been an incorruptible and honest investigator, and I do not want to have even an imputation made about his character.

I was very happy yesterday morning when I read an article in the Baltimore Sun, which is an extremely reputable paper, and I should like to read into the RECORD at this point in my remarks, if I may, certain comments which John W. Owens, who wrote the article, made about the Fulbright inquiry. The article, under the headline "The Fulbright inquiry sets example," reads as follows:

Senator FULBRIGHT's manner has been as good as his material.

He has come as near to conducting a congressional investigation in the manner of a judicial proceeding as any other Senator or Representative in memory. And he has proved that his congressional investigation so conducted can be as effectual as one of those affairs in which the observer has some trouble in making out whether the object is disclosure of relevant facts or accumulation of sensational headlines. The results of the Fulbright committee's work are as positive—in the effect on public opinion, and in the effect on officials charged with enforcing laws—as have been the results of work by any of the investigating committees in which shouting matches between members of committees and lawyers were commonplace; in which bullying of witnesses was commonplace. Everybody in this country who has bothered to follow the work of the Fulbright Committee knows that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is in need of overhauling and ventilating. Everybody who has followed the committee's work knows that, in one way or another, there will be reform in the organization and the procedure of the corporation—if it is continued in existence.

Probably such results are surer because of the manner in which the Fulbright committee produced material. People's minds are not muddled because disapproval of the play of "influence" is complicated by annoyance at high-handed methods of inquiry and disclosure. There have been few, if any, shouting matches. There has been no evidence in the news reports of bullying of witnesses. Senator FULBRIGHT at times seemed to go out of his way to keep evidence within proportions. He has drawn lines carefully between illegality and impropriety. On occasion, he has been at pains to keep "inferences" from running wild. In consequence, as the committee's work nears end, people who have followed the proceedings feel that they have been looking at facts. They know what they think about the facts.

Congressional investigations which can be trusted—trusted on the one hand to bring out facts and trusted on the other hand to stick to the facts—are an absolute necessity in big government as it exists in this country. The size of government as government calls for the investigating arm of Congress, in numerous instances, if no more is to be done than to make sure that normally good management prevails in day-to-day operation. But there is much more that calls for congressional investigation as a function in the operation of government.

Big government today touches the daily economy of the country in all sorts of regulatory ways; and, beyond that, big government touches large sections of the economy

in financial ways. Big government builds and operates; it loans and it subsidizes—to the tune of millions which run into billions. As surely as the sun rises and falls, there will be men who can see a profit for themselves in the building and the operating of big government—in the loaning and the subsidizing. Times without number, perception of opportunity for profit will be followed by legitimate action. But there will always be men and occasions when perception of opportunity for profit will result in intensive search for influence—for the inside track which will produce indulgent terms. There will always be occasions when this demand for influence will result in efforts to provide a supply of influence.

In the labyrinth of influence which is thus brought into being, nothing that is available to the American people remotely approaches the congressional investigation as a means of overhauling and ventilating—nothing approaches the congressional investigation as a means of turning on light in a manner which will keep people inside government and outside government aware not only of laws, but of proprieties and decencies. And to say that is to say that dignity in the congressional investigation—decency in the investigation—has become a necessity of good government. For, without dignity and decency, the congressional investigation may defeat itself.

Mr. FULBRIGHT could have made a Roman holiday of the complex of White House influence, congressional influence, and plain smart-fellow influence which has played around the RFC. Instead, he piled up the facts and let them speak for themselves. In so doing, Mr. FULBRIGHT did an exceptional work of investigation. But he did more. He set an example.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's reading the article into the RECORD, and his very kind remarks. At an appropriate time I shall pay him the tribute due him for his counsel and support, without which the committee's work could not have been accomplished. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, first I should like to commend the able and distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for his fine work. He has done a very efficient job in reestablishing the confidence of the public in this great legislative body by the unbiased and impartial manner in which he has proceeded with his investigational activities. Does the Senator think that the investigation which has been conducted up to now has rolled the rug all the way back and exposed all that is under the rug? Some people seem to think that it has not been rolled all the way back.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that he has touched on a subject which I intend to discuss at some length in the near future. I cannot go into all of it at this time, but since the Senator has raised the question I will say to him that I feel, insofar as the RFC is concerned and insofar as any constructive suggestions as to reforming the RFC are concerned, we have gone as far in our investigation as we can go, and have uncovered as much as can be of value to us at this time.

I have no doubt that if we rehired the staff, which has been dissipated under the understanding in effect prior to this sudden great interest in extending the

investigation, we could make a new start and perhaps uncover additional cases of lawyers getting big fees, and similar cases. I think it would be repetitious. So far as the RFC is concerned, I am certain that we have uncovered all we can. However, there are other activities of the Government which our investigation indicates are implicated. For example, several cases have been mentioned in which some of the RFC aspects have led into the field of internal revenue. We had such a case only the other day. In fact, we have had two or three such cases which led in that direction. I do not think it is proper for my committee to go into the Internal Revenue Bureau and ask officers or employees of the Internal Revenue Bureau if they gave favorable rulings to certain people, for example.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First I should like to continue. The same would be true of the Maritime Commission. We are now faced with the question of whether we should demand the names of the stockholders of a company which bought ships from the Maritime Commission. One stockholder, who was involved in the RFC investigation, had such a connection. It is a difficult question to decide. I am inclined to think that we would be going beyond our jurisdiction if we asked for any such material. If the Senate or Congress wants to broaden the inquiry, I am perfectly willing to go along. I think that our study has reached the end of its fruitful activity. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas feels that his committee has gone as far as it can go, would he recommend any committee which could go all the way? It is apparent that the investigation should be continued.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is forcing me prematurely to discuss a subject which I have every intention of discussing at some length, perhaps next week. However, I will indicate to the Senator that there are two ways to proceed. One is through a standing committee, which has jurisdiction over the whole gamut of Government activities. It is the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. A subcommittee of that committee is studying the subject. That is one approach.

If it is decided that such an investigation is not sufficient. I think it is at least worthy of consideration whether we should have an independent commission do the work. We have used that kind of commission in the past. I am thinking of the Hoover Commission and the old Wickersham Commission. There were other similar commissions, whose names escape me at the moment. I think good results were obtained in that way. The scheme has been used in other parliamentary systems.

I think it would be highly beneficial to study the question. Therefore, I must take issue, most respectfully, with the distinguished majority leader. I do not wish to have it understood that I am

above any criticism at all by an impartial commission. I am not above any study being made of my activities by an impartial commission. I do not feel that I, as a Senator, any institution in our country, or any democratic system is above, or should be above, a legitimate, serious inquiry.

Let us consider what has been going on among college students. This may be going far afield, but what has been revealed along that line is an indication of the feeling of our people. I was shocked, as I am sure every other Senator was shocked, at the revelations which were made in the field of college basketball. Another investigation is bringing out the extensive gambling which is going on in the United States. I am not sure at all that the public would not be benefited by a study, conducted on the very highest level by an independent people, of the general ethical standards prevailing in our country. I do not make the suggestion with any view of centering it on any individual, or any group, but rather as an examination of some of the fundamental precepts on which we have always considered our country to have been built and as being basic to our philosophy.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to yield the floor.

Mr. THYE. I would appreciate if the Senator would yield for one more question before he yields the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield further to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator has referred to what we have seen happen among college students. Any feeling that our Government would tolerate any shadiness on any level of Government would naturally reflect itself in the minds of the youth of the country. They would naturally feel that if the Government can do it, they can stoop a little, too, and possibly benefit just a little by lending themselves to what is suggested to them by certain persons. For that reason it is very important that we erase any suspicion or doubt that any Member of Congress had been benefited from any transaction at all on the part of the RFC.

It is for that reason that I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Arkansas continue his splendid work, so that we may get to the bottom of the whole thing. If anyone in Congress has been guilty of exerting undue pressure he should stand up and answer and account for his actions. It should be shown how much he was involved and to what extent, if any, he benefited.

Mr. President, I say again that the Senator has done a splendid and commendable job. I believe the public would have greater confidence if we voted additional funds to the subcommittee and authorized it to go about its job of rolling the rug all the way back, to see what was swept under it in the past.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows that an election is coming up.

Mr. THYE. I am to be in that election.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it would be impossible for such a matter to be carried on right up to the time of the election, which is apparently the intention of some people who are supporting such a procedure. It could not help become involved in a political way. The point is that a prolongation of this study would be bound to result in what has been termed a political Roman holiday, and I do not think it is wise to do it. If it is to be investigated it ought to be done by an impartial commission—certainly a nonpartisan commission.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish word could be sent to the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to return to the floor if he is nearby, because I should like to clear up something which the able senior Senator from Illinois intimated, to the effect that the able chairman of the subcommittee had shielded and covered up certain Republicans. I do not believe he intended to say that, because I am a member of the committee, and have been a member since it was formed. I have seen no signs to indicate that the able chairman, the Senator from Arkansas, had done any such thing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe the Senator from Illinois intended to say that. He has discussed the subject with me. I agree with the Senator from Indiana that at least if it was done, it was done wholly unconsciously on my part.

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot let the statement of the able Senator from Illinois go unchallenged, because it is made a part of the Record. I wish to say that if the able Senator from Arkansas, the chairman, or the able Senator from Illinois covered up any Republicans they certainly did it without my knowledge.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator that I did not do it. If it was done, it was done without my knowledge; but I do not think it was done.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is my impression and best knowledge that if it was done it was done without the Senator's knowledge.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I think the Senator from Illinois meant to say was that there were opportunities which, if we had cared to do so, we could have taken advantage of in an unjustifiable manner. We might have made a great deal of the fact that Mr. Gabrielson was concerned with a certain loan, even though very remotely. I believe that what the Senator from Illinois intended to say was that such a thing could have been done if we had no sense of restraint.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am the one who brought out the situation to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I realize that. The Senator from Indiana has certainly been cooperative on the committee. I have no complaint whatever about the Senator. He has done a very conscientious job.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Record showed that the able Senator from Illinois [Mr.

DOUGLAS] intimated that the chairman of the committee had covered up certain Republicans, and that had he wanted to do so he could have uncovered them. I wish to say I do not believe that is true. I do not believe that the chairman of the committee covered up any Republicans.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe that the Senator from Illinois intended to say that. I agree that his remark might be subject to that interpretation, but I do not believe that he really intended to say so.

Mr. CAPEHART. I hope the Senator is correct, and that he did not intend it, because I am certain that the Senator from Arkansas did not do any such thing. If the able Senator from Illinois knows of any instances in which Republicans were covered up, I shall have to request—I was about to use the word "demand", but I should not do that—I shall have to be insistent that we hold hearings and take up the specific instances in which Republicans were covered up in the past by the chairman. I do not believe that any such thing happened.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know of any such instance.

Mr. CAPEHART. Neither do I; but I did not want the record to go unchallenged.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator to yield so that I may put a series of questions to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to yield for that purpose if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Arkansas has cast some reflection on the motives which impelled certain Members on this side of the aisle with respect to certain bills which were introduced with reference to the abolition of the RFC. I am sure that the Senator from Arkansas has not in mind indulging in a hit-and-run performance. I am sure that he will accord me the courtesy of allowing me to ask certain questions relative to the statement which he has made.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not quite clear about the Senator's statement. I had reference, first and foremost, to the speech of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], which is subject to the interpretation, I think, that the committee is whitewashing certain matters. I believe that that speech could be considered to have political implications. I do not believe that I questioned the motives of the Senator from Missouri in introducing a bill to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Let me make myself clear. I believe that the move to defeat Reorganization Plan No. 1 is in error. I believe that that move is not a clear-cut approach to the question of abolition. I believe that there are Members of the other House—certainly I so understood from the discussion in the House of Representatives—who were voting to defeat Reorganization Plan No. 1 on the theory that

that would contribute toward the abolition of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I believe that that is a false approach. I have no objection to anyone who conscientiously believes that it ought to be abolished, following the procedure suggested by the able Senator from Missouri. That is an outspoken and plain approach to the matter.

Mr. KEM. I know that the Senator from Arkansas does not feel, or does not mean to be understood as saying, that language has been used by the Senator from Missouri which is unduly critical of the operation of RFC.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not quite aware what language the Senator has in mind.

Mr. KEM. I understood the Senator to say that some of us on this side of the aisle who are interested in introducing legislation to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had used language unduly or improperly critical of the operations of the RFC. In that connection I ask the Senator from Arkansas if he knows of any language in connection with the operations of the RFC which has been more critical or more unbridled than the language used by the former Chairman of the RFC, Mr. Jesse Jones, in connection with its recent operations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I believe that Mr. Jones has been very positive in his views. What I said with regard to the political implication was that it seemed to me a little unbecoming in the minority party, in view of its record in the Eightieth Congress, now suddenly to jump upon the RFC with all four feet, demanding its abolition. I believe that the minority ought to be a little more restrained in its approach, because, after all, Republican Members studied the situation. In the first place, they did not dig up very many things that were wrong with the RFC. They accepted testimony from the RFC practically as it was presented. The minority members made no move to do anything about the situation. Now, as soon as we bring out something derogatory without further ado, the Republican Members want to abolish it.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Arkansas want us to understand that he has some private-property rights in the information which he has elicited as chairman of the committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I have no property rights in such information. However, I think it is a little precipitous, and not too becoming, for the Republicans to become so interested in view of the opportunities they have had in the past.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, let me answer—

Mr. KEM. Let me finish.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me answer one of the statements of the able Senator from Arkansas. He stated that he was a little surprised that the Republicans now want to abolish the RFC because they did not want to do so in the Eightieth Congress. Neither the Republicans nor the members of any other party in Congress knew what was going on in the RFC, and what has gone on since the close of the Eightieth Congress. It will be remembered that there is a great deal

of information to the effect that Mr. Dawson, one of the President's assistants who has charge of personnel, is very much involved with the RFC. In fact, it will be found that most of the skulduggery has occurred in the past 2 years. I am as confident as that I am standing here that there is not a single Member of the Senate on either side of the aisle who would have voted to continue the RFC 2 years ago or 4 years ago if he had known what was going on in the RFC, and what, in my opinion, is going on at the moment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why did the Republicans not find out what was going on when they were in charge of the committees, with all the power to find out?

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

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The Chair insists upon some semblance of order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The rule, as applied to Members on the other side of the aisle, has been expanded during various discussions and colloquy on the other side. Should not Senators whose motives are impugned have the right to answer some of the challenges? I am in complete agreement with the distinguished Presiding Officer with reference to the rules. I do not believe that this is the time to relax the rules. But time and time again the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has made a campaign speech against the Republicans, and the investigations of the Democrats of themselves, and blamed the Republicans for it.

The motives of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] have been challenged. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has tried time and time again to get an opportunity to ask a little question, and the Senator from Arkansas has yielded to a number of Senators other than the Senator from Missouri. He has yielded to the Senator from Illinois three or four times.

I merely say to the distinguished Presiding Officer, who is a very fair man—I know him personally—that I would not want to see him relax the rule now until several Senators who wish to do so be given the chance to answer some of the insinuations that have been made from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yielded to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. The Senator from Nebraska is wrong about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The Chair insists on order. The Chair rules that the Senator from Nebraska is not presenting a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Well, it is a pretty good speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will admit that. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Indiana yields the floor?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I yield the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have asked for recognition for the purpose of continuing some inquiries of the Senator from Arkansas. The Senator from Arkansas has made statements which contain implications with respect to Members on this side of the aisle. Suddenly he owes a great affinity for his seat and, instead of answering the questions, he seems to want to close the discussion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator I am getting old and tired.

Mr. KEM. It is early in the afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is admonished that a Senator who has the floor is not permitted, under the rule, to ask questions of another Senator.

Mr. KEM. I want to continue my observations, then, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the distinguished Senator from Missouri ask the Senator from Arkansas to yield so he can ask him questions, by unanimous consent?

Mr. KEM. Certainly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas be permitted to resume the floor and answer some questions that may be put to him by various Senators on this side of the aisle.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to ask the Senator from Arkansas certain questions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; to yield to me the floor. I accept the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not put such an interpretation on it. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent that, without losing his rights to the floor, he may be permitted to interrogate the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Reserving the right to object; the Senator from Missouri did not ask that. I ask the Senator himself, Did he not ask unanimous consent to yield the floor to me so that he could ask me questions?

Mr. KEM. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas will not want to avail himself of any technicality to avoid answering the questions the Senator from Missouri has in mind to ask.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Arkansas said that he felt that certain Members on this side of the aisle had been unduly critical or unduly severe in the language that they used in reference to the operations of the RFC; or at least I understood him to say so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. I ask him if he knows of any language more severe than that imputed recently to Mr. Jesse Jones, who is reputed to have said that the rats have now found the cheese?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In fact I think he said that in a letter to me. Yes, that is quite correct.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator recall any Member on this side of the aisle using any more critical or more severe language than that?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, but I do not follow the Senator. I did not say that Senators on the other side of the aisle had said the worst things that had ever been said about the RFC. I was complaining about what was said about the committee of which I have been the chairman. I do not believe the Senator followed me.

Mr. KEM. I should like to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I have not said anything about the committee or of the chairman of the committee except things that are highly complimentary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator must have misunderstood me.

Mr. KEM. But there was an imputation in what the Senator said that in introducing a bill for the abolition of the RFC I was impelled by motives purely political. Now the Senator from Arkansas made that statement and I want to continue to interrogate him in regard to it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I will say to the Senator I do not believe he is correct. I do not think that is what I said. If I did I certainly did not have the Senator from Missouri in mind. I tried to explain a moment ago that I think the great desire to continue the investigation by the subcommittee is very largely inspired by political motives. That is not what the Senator now says I said. In other words, I am frank to say that I think the great interest on the part of those who have been most outspoken about continuing the subcommittee investigation of the RFC is largely political. I think they would like to see it run until just before the election in 1952.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. No, Mr. President, I prefer not to yield. I want to ask the Senator from Arkansas some more questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14, page 2384, on which the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recorded as referring to the machinations of the RFC as vandalism. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he thinks the Senator from Virginia was

impelled by political motives when he used that language?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I stated a moment ago that the senior Senator from Virginia is one of the most high-minded statesmen I know of. There happens to be a coincidence in this case. He is not impelled by political reasons, but, by a coincidence, his purpose in this proposed legislation on this subject is the same as that of other persons. He has a well-known background on matters of that kind. We have differed often. He feels that Government has often been expanded in places it should not be. I have agreed with him in many cases, but I happen to think that in the case of the RFC it has done a great deal of good, particularly in the less fortunate areas of the United States, including the South. I will put it this way: My State, for example, has been a part of the colonial area of the northeastern section of the United States. We have been exploited for 150 years, and most of our capital now resides in Philadelphia, Boston, and New York. It is very important for us to have access to some place where a borrower, a man who is expanding his business, can secure a little capital. It is very difficult to get it in New York.

The senior Senator from Virginia has a different outlook as to the RFC. It is not so important to Virginia as it is to Arkansas. There is nothing very serious as to why some of us want to have a place where our people can go in case they have need for money for industrial purposes. That is about all. It is very simple.

Mr. KEM. It may be simple, but it is difficult to understand—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not questioning the Senator's motives.

Mr. KEM. Why the expressions of the Senator from Virginia should be considered high-minded, when the language to the same effect, used by a Member on this side of the aisle, should be denounced as political.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator seems to be unable to follow my distinction between those who wish to abolish RFC and those who wish not only to abolish the RFC but also to extend the investigation by the subcommittee, and to defeat the reorganization plan. It is the extending of the investigation, the prospect of a slow but continual revelation of a little dirt, which might have some bearing upon the next election, which I say is political. I do not say a thing about those who merely wish to abolish the RFC.

Mr. KEM. I am glad to hear the Senator say this. So far as I am personally concerned I am satisfied by the Senator's statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what I said in the beginning. The Senator misinterpreted what I said.

Mr. KEM. I yield the floor.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has yielded the floor. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for a

moment? I shall not take more than a minute of time.

Mr. BRICKER. What is the purpose?

Mr. THYE. The purpose is to make a brief statement. The able and distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] stated that many of us on this side who have made comment about the RFC have been politically minded. I desire to assure the Senator from Arkansas that there has been just enough uncovered so that the public, the citizens of this great land, are gravely and greatly concerned. If, in the event the investigation comes to an end, the public is going to wonder if it is sought to conceal anything.

We heard last Sunday evening, or the other evening, reference made to the fact that there were Senators involved. We heard that statement made over the network of a national radio hook-up. The public, listening to the radio hook-up, is imagining that someone in the United States Senate and some Members of Congress are involved. Unless the investigation continues, so that all letters to the RFC and all pressures which were brought upon the RFC are brought to light, the public, and more especially the youth of America, are going to feel that this body, the greatest legislative body in the world, is under suspicion. For that reason, I was not politically minded when I said I hoped the Senator would proceed with the investigation.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for yielding to me.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the charge of politics has been made in this case. The discussion of the last hour and one-half was brought about apparently by a speech I made yesterday in the Senate, advocating the abolition of the RFC. I have not changed my mind about that matter for the past 3 years. My conclusion that the RFC and all Government direct lending ought to be abolished is not a sudden conclusion to which I have come as a result of this investigation or any of its revelations.

Mr. President, there is some partisan politics in this matter. I seem to be the only one who has not been excused from it; but if this is politics, it is good politics, and I accept full responsibility for my part in it.

However, there is partisan politics in it, also, as evidenced by the discussion of a few minutes ago in what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] said. I took the following off the news ticker, at 1:15 p. m., a minute or two after he said it:

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois) said today that the Senate RFC subcommittee leaned over backward to protect Republicans who might have been accused of currying favor to obtain Government loans for business firms.

That is the first reflection, Mr. President, that has been made upon the integrity of the chairman of this subcommittee and the investigation which has been carried on; and it is unfair. It is not true. At no time did the chairman of the subcommittee try to protect any Republicans, and he should not have. If he had, I would have been the first to object to it.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator from Ohio think that the Senator from Illinois ought to be called and challenged to furnish the names of those who he said were being protected, in view of that statement? I ask that question. He certainly should, I think.

Mr. BRICKER. Certainly he should. In view of the interpretation which be placed upon it, which would amount to a reflection on the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], on whom I have made no reflection in any way, for all I have done is to approve what he has done, I think the Senator from Illinois should be asked to enlighten us on that matter.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. As a member of the committee, I wish to say that the able Senator from Illinois made the statement he made, knowing it would go out on the ticker and be published in every newspaper in the United States; and when he made the statement, he knew there was no truth in it, because there is no truth in it. If there is any truth in it, then he has indicted the able Senator from Arkansas, whom he praised so highly before, because if the able Senator from Arkansas was a party to protecting the Republicans in this investigation, then the Senator from Arkansas ought to be exposed. The fact is that he was not responsible for it, because there was no such information; and I dislike it very, very much.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to remark that the entire Illinois senatorial delegation is on the Banking and Currency Committee, and I should like to have the Senator designate which Senator from Illinois is referred to.

Mr. BRICKER. I am glad to do so, for I named him—PAUL H. DOUGLAS. I read that into the RECORD as it came over the ticker, and I think that is perfectly clear.

If there is any assumption that I was referring to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I wish to dissipate that immediately.

Mr. President, reference has been made to party policy on this side of the aisle. Yesterday when I made the speech, I did not know that my party had taken any policy position at all. I did not know of it until after my speech was concluded; and then information was brought to me on the floor of the Senate, and I made it a part of the RECORD.

The charge has been made that the Republicans are desirous of continuing this investigation so that they may take partisan advantage of it. Mr. President, the only charge of partisan politics, aside from the reference the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has made in the Senate, the report of which has gone out over the ticker, was made by the President of the United States, when

he said that the report of the subcommittee was asinine. If it had not been for that statement by the President, I doubt that we would have had the revelations which have recently been made in regard to the RFC. The only good which could come from such a remark by the President of the United States is that the truth has finally been told.

The Senator from Arkansas objects to the speech I made yesterday. He says that in that speech I criticized him and his subcommittee. Mr. President, I said then, and I repeat, that because of the work done by the Senator from Arkansas and his subcommittee, the truth has been told. I gave him credit for that yesterday.

However, I say that the record of this matter cannot be concluded until Bill Boyle and Don Dawson come before the subcommittee and reveal the facts of their association with the RFC. That may be partisan politics, but it is honest government. Time and time again their names come into all the sordid revelations about Rosenbaum and the fur coat and Merl Young and the others. Mr. President, if they are men who should be in the Government of the United States, they should be willing and anxious to come before the subcommittee and tell what they know about this matter and reveal the whole truth, so that the people of the United States will not look upon this investigation as a partisan investigation, but will look upon it as an honest investigation, as it has been. They should look upon it as their investigation, and not follow the President of the United States when he referred to the report as asinine.

Mr. President, I did not term the subcommittee a "whitewash committee." It has done an excellent job. It has revealed the truth. I have had a very small part in its work, and I wish to commend the other members of the subcommittee for the part they have played. The American people today would not know of the sordid transactions which occurred if it had not been for the fine work done by the Senator from Arkansas and his subcommittee.

The Senator from Arkansas said he felt that I was unfair when I said that a smoke screen is being thrown up by those who wish to defend the RFC and the Democratic National Committee and those who have been unfairly and illegally using the RFC for their own private profit; and the Senator from Arkansas said that we should adopt the President's reorganization plan in regard to the RFC. Of course, if we did that, then the President could say, "We have cleaned up the mess."

Mr. President, I wish to say that would be the wrong way for us to legislate; that would be a back-handed process of legislating, and I will never vote again for a reorganization plan of that kind.

If I were going to support a reorganization of the RFC, I would vote for the bill of the Senator from Arkansas.

However, I think the RFC should be abolished. If it is abolished, I will certainly vote for the Senator's bill, rather than vote for any reorganization plan of the President, which might be in-

terpreted by the country, and actually would be, as a whitewash of all that has been revealed by the work which has been done so well by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and his subcommittee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Arkansas leaves the floor—and I know he is anxious to get away—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say that the charge of partisan politics certainly is out of order in respect to this particular investigation, at least, as well as to some others.

Yesterday on the floor of the Senate, when the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] was speaking, when he was near the conclusion of his speech I asked him what he felt about continuing the investigation. He replied that he felt that the investigation should be continued.

I had a short colloquy with the Senator. I did so because I am a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and happen to be the ranking minority member of the committee; hence I help in framing the recommendations of the committee as to appropriations for investigations.

I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas that not only once, but several times, I have said to him that I thought he had rendered outstanding service in the investigation being conducted by his subcommittee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has spoken to me about the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to read from yesterday's RECORD, prior to this outburst today and the charges of the Senator from Illinois that the subcommittee had leaned over backward to cover up some activities of Republicans. This is what I said yesterday, when the Senator from Ohio made one of the most forceful addresses we have heard on the floor of the Senate for many, many months. I said, regarding the question of continuing the subcommittee's investigation:

Let me say that when that question arose in the Rules and Administration Committee, of which I am a minority member, I asked the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] whether he was going to request funds with which to continue the investigation. He said that was all he expected to do then.

In other words, to wind up the affairs of the committee.

I read further:

I said to him that I thought he was doing a good job, and that I, for one, would be glad to vote for any more funds that he might need in order to continue the investigation.

So far as I am concerned, I want the subcommittee to continue the investigation and to do all the investigating that is needed, and I shall be glad to vote for all the appropriations which may be needed in order to see that that job is completed.

It might be a little premature. I do not know all that the committee has done, but from the speeches made and the things we have read in the press, I wanted my position to be plain and clear, namely, that I thought the chairman had done an excellent job, and that I ap-

proved the appropriations. I told him then, and I tell him now, as I said yesterday, before this question ever came up, I felt that if they needed to continue the investigation, I, for one, would be glad to vote for the appropriation, and there was not one thing said in the Rules and Administration Committee meeting—and I certainly did not say it yesterday—charging any partisan politics in this matter at all.

After all, Mr. President, the Republicans cannot be charged with inciting this, and that is what has been done here today.

I should merely like to call attention to the fact, as shown by the RECORD of January 25, that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], a Democrat, opposed the resolution which was reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], a Democrat, requesting funds for these investigations. Mr. President, the Democrats are in power today, as they were in 1950, and as they were 10 years ago. I shall read what the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] said, as shown by the RECORD of January 25. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman, had asked unanimous consent to continue these investigations, and had requested approval of the funds. I quote from page 659:

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have just pointed out to the distinguished Senator, in the past 10 years the amounts spent for these purposes have increased enormously.

The Senator was referring to money spent for investigations such as the investigation of the RFC, the crime investigation, and all the other investigations which are now being made, for which resolutions have been submitted by the chairmen of the different committees, which committees are controlled by the majority. Continuing, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] said:

Today we are spending 10 times more for these purposes than we spent 10 years ago.

Last year it amounted to nearly \$2,000,000. Now, this is a Democrat, complaining of these investigations; but the investigations were being requested by the Democrats themselves.

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

Mr. WHERRY. In a moment.

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

Mr. WHERRY. In a moment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nebraska wish to ask me a question?

Mr. WHERRY. No. I merely wanted the Senator to remain on the floor, so that I could read to him what I said in the RECORD yesterday, before this blow-up occurred today, when the charge of politics was made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I want to say for the RECORD is that, when I first went before the Senate Committee on Rules

and Administration, the Senator from Nebraska was very cooperative.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Nebraska has always endeavored to be cooperative.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not recall that I brought the Senator from Nebraska into this conversation at all, in any way whatever. He has always been cooperative with me, not only in regard to this but in regard to other matters. My sister is one of the Senator's constituents.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct—and I am interested in seeing that good care is taken of the Senator's sister in Nebraska. [Laughter.]

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to ask the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say I shall be delighted to have the senior Senator from Indiana ask me a question. I regret that I was not on the floor when the Senator asked a question earlier, and I hastened to the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. The question I want to ask is based on an Associated Press dispatch, issued at 1:13 p. m. today, which reads:

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois), said today that the Senate RFC subcommittee leaned over backward to protect Republicans who might have been accused of currying favor by obtaining Government loans for business firms.

Mr. President, the question I want to ask the able Senator is, Will he name the Republicans? Will he tell the world who they are?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say I think that this report is somewhat inexact. I should like to see the stenographic copy of my statement. It was not my intention to say that we had leaned over backward to cover up for anyone. I did say—it was my intention to say, and I believe the RECORD will show—that we did not pursue certain lines of inquiry which, if carried out, might have reflected upon certain prominent Republicans, and that we were very careful not to do that, lest we be charged with unjustly smearing leaders in the Republican Party and people active in the Republican Party.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD be read as to exactly what the able senior Senator from Illinois said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for that purpose, provided I do not thereby lose the floor. I wish to finish my remarks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Indiana wish to address a further question to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. I am now rising to make a point of order, and to ask that the RECORD be read, that we may know exactly what the able Senator from Illinois said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD has been sent for and, when it arrives, it will be read. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since the RECORD is being sent for, I should like to ask that the RECORD be read, wherein the Senator from Indiana stated that the Senator from Illinois made the statement knowing it was not true—which I think is a violation of the rules of the Senate. If we are going to go back to the RECORD, I think we ought to have the whole RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think we ought to have that, also.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator make that request?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for the purpose of the request of the Senator from Illinois that the RECORD be read—that is, the RECORD which will show the observations made by the Senator from Indiana relative to the statement of the Senator from Illinois, to the effect that he made this statement, knowing it was untrue, or words to that effect.

Mr. President, while we are getting the RECORD, I should like to finish, if I may. I am not particularly anxious to remain on the floor, but the charge was made, as I understood—and it was a general charge—that the Republicans were inciting these investigations. Naturally that charge runs to the leadership and to everyone else. I am saying to the distinguished Senator and to other Members of the Senate that these investigations have been initiated by the majority, and this year it took 10 times as much money as it took 10 years ago, to make such investigations. Mr. President think of that. I am for them. I think they are necessary. I want the world to know that, and I am going to continue to vote for funds for this purpose, because I think they are needed in order to make investigations of this kind. I do not know what the situation will be in another 2 years, but, if the percentage continues to rise as it has in the past, we shall not be prepared to make adequate appropriations to get the job done which needs to be done. So I am for the appropriations. I am against appropriations for needless investigations, but in this particular instance I am for them. I think the Kefauver committee to investigate crime in interstate commerce ought to continue, if Senators want to know the truth, and yet there has been an effort to discontinue it.

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

Mr. WHERRY. In a moment I will yield. I think there are other committees which ought to be conducting investigations. Recently a charge was made on the Senate floor by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and by his colleague [Mr. STENNIS], two of the finest men I know, men whose integrity is above question, about dealing out patronage jobs, selling such jobs in Mississippi and in other States. That is a matter which ought to be investigated.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I can think of many things which might be investigated, and let me say, as one who is economically minded, even more so, I think, than the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, that I am going along with appropriations for such investigations. Furthermore, I am going to give credit to whoever does the investigating, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the one big issue in the United States today is to eliminate immorality from Government, and if it is found in any Federal agencies, it ought to be revealed and eliminated. The Senate of the United States ought to lead the way. I care not who may conduct the investigations or whence he comes, or what his party may be. If he has the courage to undertake the work and do a real job of investigating, I intend to support him, and I shall vote to appropriate the necessary money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to inquire whether the record of my remarks has been obtained?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I am not going to yield for that purpose. It would be necessary for me to yield for a point of order, and I am not going to yield for any purpose now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the Senator wanted to find out what I said.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to have that information, I may say to the Senator, when I finish my remarks. I realize, of course, that perhaps the Senator does not care to listen to them, but I wish to make them, anyway.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am always delighted to listen to a speech by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has raised this point, and we are going to finish it now.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, let us get the RECORD, so that we may know what was said.

Mr. WHERRY. I am going to do that in my own time.

Mr. President, not long ago I was in a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, not the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the members of the committee were concerned about putting a ceiling on the amount of money appropriated for the contingent fund, because they did not want some of the investigations continued. I shall not repeat what was said, because I do not care to violate any confidence, but I say to the Members of the Senate that I am one who is now, as I have been all the time, in favor of getting rid of immorality, favoritism, and paternalism in government. If we need investigating, let us investigate, and let us keep on appropriating, let us keep on putting men in charge of the investigations like the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who has done a wonderful job. Let us back him up, and clean up this thing,

and bring everything out in the light so that there will be no dispute.

I was shocked when I heard the Senator from Illinois say—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask that the statement be read?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask that the statement be read.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield. I have read the statement. I do not care how the Senator interprets it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely want to have it read.

Mr. WHERRY. It does not make any difference to me. I heard what the Senator said.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let us hear it read.

Mr. WHERRY. Have I the floor, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is anyone out of order it is the Senator from Illinois, walking up and down the aisles. He should go to his seat and remain there. That is what the rules require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend until order can be obtained in the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the Senate may be in order, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The Senate must be in order. Senators will resume their seats.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. Not yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have concluded my remarks, but I yield to the Senator from Indiana, who can read the record in his statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For what purpose does the Senator from Illinois rise?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to ask that the record of my remarks, as officially transcribed, be read to the Senate—

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that we may know what the remarks are, and not merely what other people say they are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is not in order. The Senator from Nebraska has yielded to the Senator from Indiana for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to ask the able Senator from Nebraska whether he knows that the senior Senator from Illinois made the following statement on this floor this morning, according to the Associated Press, which word has now gone to every newspaper in the United States which subscribes to the Associated Press:

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS (Democrat, of Illinois) said today that the Senate RFC subcommittee leaned over backward to pro-

tect Republicans who might have been accused of currying favor to obtain Government loans for business firms.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. CAPEHART. Just a moment. I should also like to ask whether the able Senator from Nebraska knows whether or not, as the Associated Press reported, the senior Senator from Illinois made this statement, which has now gone out over the AP wire:

DOUGLAS took the floor to laud FULBRIGHT's devotion to duty and to state that he pulled no punches, he shielded no one. Then he took after the Republicans.

In other words, the question is whether the able Senator from Illinois, after praising the Senator from Arkansas and lauding his devotion to duty, saying that he "pulled no punches; he shielded no one," then later in his remarks said, according to the Associated Press—and we shall in a moment read exactly what he said—"that the Senate RFC subcommittee leaned over backward to protect Republicans who might have been accused of currying favor to obtain Government loans for business firms."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask the Senator from Illinois to name the Republicans, to bring forth the record and tell about whom he was talking when he said that the committee leaned over backward to protect someone.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is not in order. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois to read the record.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. I ask that the record of my statement be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the record.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I also ask that the statement of the Senator from Indiana be read.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, but I want the Senator to ask me to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed with the record.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. About a year ago I was appointed as a member of the Reconstruction Finance Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I have been fairly intimately connected with that investigation, and have been able to follow it in detail, to take a minor part in its conduct, and to work very closely with the chairman, the Senator from Arkansas.

In my opinion the Senator from Arkansas has set an example of energy, honesty, and complete fidelity to duty. He has given up virtually every other interest which he has had. He has spent days and nights, yes, months, at this work. He has directed a staff of assistants. He has pulled no punches whatsoever. He has shielded no one. If

there had been any thought of considering the purely political effects of the investigation, there are many witnesses who have been summoned who would not have been summoned, and a great many cases which have been investigated which would not have been investigated. The Senator from Arkansas has been completely impartial and, as a matter of fact, has leaned over backward in his desire to be fair.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to complete my statement, if I may.

We have had in our possession information as to facts about certain loans which might have affected adversely the opposing political party. Had there been any desire to smear, the chairman of the subcommittee would have brought those loans out into the open. He did not do so. He leaned over backward, as a matter of fact, to protect the members of the opposition party who might have been accused, justly or unjustly, of trying to get favoritism in RFC loans, and he was unsparing in the effort which he made to see that anyone who was guilty of unethical conduct, whatever his connection, should be put on the stand and interrogated.

Mr. President, I am aware that the RECORD is technically correct about the Senator from Arkansas, but I wish to add a word from my heart. He has been an incorruptible and honest investigator, and I do not want to have even an imputation made about his character.

I was very happy yesterday morning when I read an article in the Baltimore Sun, which is an extremely reputable paper, and I should like to read into the RECORD at this point in my remarks, if I may, certain comments which John W. Owens, who wrote the article, made about the Fulbright inquiry. The article, under the headline, "The Fulbright inquiry sets example," reads as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair what has been read covers what was requested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I have not had time to examine the record. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has corrected the record in any way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I have not seen the record.

Mr. WHERRY. Did any of the Senator's clerks or did his administrative assistant correct the record?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Some corrections have been made on the transcript. That is why I propounded the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am informed that my administrative assistant has not made any changes in the record.

Mr. WHERRY. Has anyone from the Senator's office made any?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No one from my office has made any.

Mr. WHERRY. There are some corrections on the transcript.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Corrections are made by the Official Reporters.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may we ascertain whether the corrections were made by the Official Reporters?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the point is that the official report of what

the Senator from Illinois said, as it has been read on the floor, corresponds with what the Associated Press sent out to the world. What is the argument about?

Mr. WHERRY. I would say that anyone who interpreted the remarks of the Senator from Illinois in the way they have been interpreted by the press was justified in making such interpretation of the statement made on the floor by the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator's remarks do not need interpretation. The press has reported exactly what he said.

Mr. WHERRY. I very much think so.

Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to reread the passage which has been so much questioned, and to ask whether there is the slightest touch of impropriety in what I said. I read from the official record:

We have had in our possession information as to facts about certain loans which might have affected adversely the opposing political party.

I ask Senators to listen to this part:

Had there been any desire to smear, the chairman of the subcommittee would have brought those loans out into the open. He did not do so. He leaned over backward, as a matter of fact, to protect the members of the opposition party who might have been accused, justly or unjustly, of trying to get favoritism in RFC loans, and he was unsparing in the effort which he made to see that anyone who was guilty of unethical conduct, whatever his connection, should be put on the stand and interrogated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not intend to hold the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the Senator from Nebraska had yielded.

Mr. WHERRY. I had yielded to the Senator from Illinois. I should like to yield the floor, if the Senator wishes to make a speech.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the Senator had yielded.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I yield to the Senator. He may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the Senator had already done so.

Mr. WHERRY. No. I still have the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor. He has yielded to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, has the Senator yielded permanently, or is he going to snatch his gift back at any moment?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to do it any way the Senator wants me to do it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would be happier if the Senator were not an Indian-giver.

Mr. WHERRY. If I finish my remarks and sit down the Senator from Illinois will not have to worry about my snatching anything back. I wish to say that certainly the press reports, as they have been read on the floor, indict Republi-

cans with the implication that they have been "covered up" by the committee. There is no doubt about the fact that the report to that effect has gone out all over the United States. The statement says that the opposition party might have been indicted. "Might have been indicted," Mr. President. That statement certainly goes a long way toward indicting members of the Republican Party for questionable deals with the RFC.

I think the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Indiana is in order. If there are any Members on this side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle who might be drawn into this investigation, they ought to be drawn into it. The investigation ought to continue, and it ought to wipe the slate clean, no matter who is involved. That is the way I feel about it. The Senator from Illinois, who I think came as close to violating the personal rule of the Senate as anyone could without doing it, should bend over backward to make the RECORD clear that he is not accusing Republican Senators. He owes it to the ethics and integrity of Senators of the United States to do so.

I wish again to thank the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], able statesman that he is, in whom I have the utmost confidence, for one of the finest addresses that has ever been made on the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. It has been called to my attention that the press release—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska yields only for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from Nebraska know that the press release, which I said was an Associated Press release, was actually a United Press release?

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for making the correction for me.

Before yielding the floor, I wish to say again that I compliment the Senator from Arkansas for the very fine work he has done. In line with the statements which have been made today from this side of the aisle I hope he will continue the job to its completion. I believe it goes even further than merely recommending legislation. With the innuendoes and interpretations which have gone out over the press wires today, I think it behooves the committee to clear up any implied indictment of the Republican leadership, or of any member of the opposition who has not been drawn into the investigation. I think if the committee has any information that Republican members are involved they should be asked to testify before the committee, along with other persons, to see if anyone in the legislative branch has been guilty of favoritism, paternalism, or anything else, in the granting of loans by the RFC. I want to say to the junior Senator from Arkansas that the junior Senator from

Nebraska intended no partisanship in the statement he made.

If it had not been for the general charge with respect to the Republican leadership I would not have taken the floor.

I feel it is absolutely necessary that immorality be driven out of all Government agencies, as it should be driven from any other place, and I hope the investigation will be continued. I shall be glad to vote for additional appropriations of money for the subcommittee, so that it may continue its work and finish with its investigations of the charges and indictments which have been made, not only before the committee, but in the press.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire whether the Senator from Nebraska has really yielded the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is that question addressed to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was addressed to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we are making a mountain out of a molehill. I read from the official record:

He—

The chairman—

leaned over backwards, as a matter of fact, to protect the members of the opposition party who might have been accused, justly or unjustly.

Mr. President, I stand on that statement. I am proud that my colleague from Arkansas is a man who gives a proper break to the opposition. Such practice is not always observed in the game of politics. Frequently the procedure is to smear one's opponent and to cover up for oneself.

The Senator from Arkansas has not covered up for anyone. Certain lines of inquiry might have been pursued, which might have subjected some of the leading members of the opposition party to severe criticism, and a politically minded chairman would have done it. However, the chairman of the committee is not that type of politically minded Senator. He has been trying to see that justice was done.

I do not like to make charges on the floor of the Senate. I do not like to attack people on the floor of the Senate. I do not think that in the 2 years I have been a Member of the Senate I have ever said an unkind word about any other Senator. I do not intend to do so. Since the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Nebraska have been pressing me about certain cases I may say that I have been extremely dubious about the loan of \$18,500,000 which was made to the company of which Mr. Guy George Gabrielson is now president. The company which got the loan of \$18,500,000 is owned by a group of oil companies whose assets in the aggregate probably run close to a billion dollars. They had ample resources to finance the developments of the company of which Mr. Gabrielson is now president, without running to the RFC for funds. However, they did go to the RFC for funds. Had the chair-

man of the committee and the Democratic members of the committee been politically minded, it would not have been too difficult to put this case over a barrel.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question to the eminently fair-minded Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. If the investigations of the committee indicated that there was available or could be made available any evidence indicating undue influence or illegal practices with reference to that particular loan, was it not the duty of the committee to look into it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say that I do not think we have unearthed any illegal practices. We have detected improprieties. That is what we have been pursuing.

In view of limits imposed by the size of our staff and the time available for this investigation, the number of cases we could choose to investigate was of necessity, limited. We tried to shy away from the investigation of any case with respect to which we might be accused of being politically biased. So we did not push the Carthage Hydrocol case as completely as we otherwise would, had we had more time or resources. May I say that even with the necessary time and resources, had we had a politically minded chairman or a politically minded committee, we might have concentrated our efforts on this case, but we chose to pass it over.

In any case, I believe that the major oil companies which owned Carthage Hydrocol should not have gone to the RFC for a loan.

In this connection, I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I wish to give him more credit than he has apparently given to me. I want to say that in the hearings of our subcommittee it was the Senator from Indiana who carried out the most rigorous cross-examination with respect to this loan, and who expressed himself against it. I pay tribute to the Senator from Indiana because he did that.

But it is also true that the chairman of the committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, did not trot forward the Carthage Hydrocol case, with Mr. George Gabrielson as a central figure, for investigation. That is all I said.

It is an extraordinary situation—

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I should like to finish my sentence.

It is an extraordinary situation when the chairman of the committee, who pushes an investigation with complete fidelity, is criticized because he leans over backward—or because I say he leans over backward—in the desire to be fair.

I remind the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] that we should thank God that there are still people in the United States who follow those tactics, even though the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Indiana may not believe it.

Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will yield to either one of these Heavenly Twins. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have a question to propound to the Senator from Illinois. In one breath, the Senator says, as reported in the press:

DOUGLAS took the floor to laud FULBRIGHT's devotion to duty and to state that he pulled no punches; he shielded no one. Then he took after Republicans.

I read further from the press ticker sheet:

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS said today that the Senate RFC subcommittee leaned over backwards to protect Republicans who might have been accused of currying favor to obtain Government loans for business.

The able Senator talked completely around the bush, as he is now doing. The question I am putting to him is this: Who were the Republicans whom the Senator from Arkansas leaned over backward to cover up? If the Senator wants to put this debate on the basis of "all holy," let us put it on that basis. Let us quit intimating that some Members on the Republican side were shielded, because the Senator knows that they were not.

A moment ago the able chairman of the committee—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator from Indiana completed his question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I want the Senator from Illinois to name the Republicans with respect to whom the chairman of the committee leaned over backward, because the Senator intimated that there were such. The statement has gone out to the world this afternoon that there were such Republicans. Let us name them. I challenge the Senator to name them. I challenge him to call a meeting of the committee tomorrow and name those about whom he is talking, because the Senator was speaking in the plural. He was not merely talking about the so-called Gabrielson case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Indiana has, upon occasion, reminded me that my past occupation was that of a teacher. I am very proud of that occupation. One of the many good lessons one learns from that occupation is to consult sources and not to depend exclusively on secondary evidence such as press reports which, however, accurate they may be in the main, are sometimes defective in individual instances.

What I said was that the chairman of the subcommittee "leaned over backward, as a matter of fact, to protect the members of the opposition party who might have been accused, justly or unjustly, of trying to get favoritism in RFC loans."

There is nothing wrong with that statement. It is exactly what a scrupulous and honorable man would do; and I am surprised that there should be any

criticism of me for making that statement.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator just quoted his own words. He said "members." That means more than one. I challenge the Senator to name the members. He evidently has someone in mind, or he would not have made the statement. Tell the Senate and tell the world who the Republicans are with respect to whom the able Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Illinois leaned over backward to protect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is always a certain advantage in a general statement which is true without arousing personal passions by mentioning individuals. We all know that.

I may say that in addition to the Carthage Hydrocol loan, I have been extremely critical of the Texmass loan, a loan of something more than \$10,000,000. A large portion of this loan was used, not to develop oil properties—and I do not believe that any of it should have been used to develop the oil properties in question—but was used to help bail out three groups, namely, the John Hancock Life Insurance Co. of Boston, the Massachusetts Mutual Co., and a group of Boston investors organized into a peculiar kind of investment group, whose names read like a list of the bluebloods of Boston. I do not believe that very many Democrats could be found in that list. In fact, it reads to me like a list of members of the most exclusive Boston clubs.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me finish. The percentage of Democrats in that group is very small. We did not direct our investigation at the Boston end of the Texmass affair. We directed our investigation at the Texas end of the Texmass affair.

I may say that the term "Texmass" is an abbreviation of "Texas" and "Massachusetts," indicating the combination of Texas oil and brains, the Massachusetts money.

We concentrated the investigation at the Texas end, which happens to be the Democratic end. If the Senator from Nebraska or the Senator from Indiana wants to have the investigation directed at the Massachusetts end, I think the Senator from Arkansas is willing to oblige him. If that matter is gone into, I think the situation will be shown to be extraordinary.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I finish?

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I am going to finish my statement.

I think it will be extraordinary to find men who are opposed to any Government participation in business or any Government participation in financing, coming down here to Washington, not with a tin cup, but with a bushel basket, and having large amounts of money poured into it in order that there may be relief for the wealthy Bostonians who

live on Beacon Hill, vote the Republican ticket, and damn the Democrats every time they have a chance.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I see my good friend, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in the Chamber. I do not include him in that list. He is one of the finest Members of the Senate. I hope he will not take offense at my statement.

May I say to him that I was drawn into this by inadvertence. I did not want to discuss the Boston connection, but these two experts in psychological warfare got me into it.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question. Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First let me yield to my good friend the Senator from Massachusetts, who, I hasten to say, is not on this list, and has nothing whatsoever to do with the transaction. He is one of the finest Members of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I am glad to have this opportunity to say that I have no connection whatever with the activities of which the Senator speaks. I know nothing whatever about their merits. I hope the situation will be investigated, let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is exactly what I would expect the Senator from Massachusetts to say. It is in keeping with his whole character.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. Are we to understand that the Republicans about whom the Senator was talking were the John Hancock Life Insurance Co., the Massachusetts Mutual Co., and certain blue bloods from Boston? What other Republicans were involved?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I have furnished a sufficient field of inquiry for the talents of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from Illinois made the charge that Republicans were covered up in the investigation by the able Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. CAPEHART. That is a serious charge.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Wait a minute.

Mr. CAPEHART. I demand that the Senator prove it. I demand that the committee meet tomorrow, and that the Senator prove his statement, because so far as I am concerned, if he does not prove it, it is an untruth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate and of the Senator from Indiana to the fact that the words "to cover up" did not appear in any portion of my remarks. This is a wholly gratuitous insertion which someone—and I think perhaps the Senator from Indiana may have been an innocent victim—made in his version of what I said. The record does not

show any use of the verb "to cover up." It does show as follows:

He leaned over backwards, as a matter of fact, to protect the Members of the opposition party who might have been accused, justly or unjustly, of trying to get favoritism in RFC loans.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I decline to yield.

We are in an extraordinary position. When we are unfair we are attacked, and when we lean over backwards, in an effort to be fair, we are attacked as being unfair.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield to the "dart thrower" from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I would rather speak as one of the heavenly twins, if the Senator does not mind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say to my friend from Nebraska that he grew up in Nebraska and there saw the Comanches circle and close in on the trains of prairie wagons and thus he became accustomed to the method of closing in on a man by shouting at him?

Mr. WHERRY. Shouting?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought I used a very modulated voice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. In a very modulated voice, I would suggest that we get down to facts. Instead of making speeches, let us get down to what has been asked by the Senator from Indiana. Is it not a fact that even on the Senator's own testimony he used the word "break" in his remarks, and that he referred to his giving a break to the opposition?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was a colloquialism.

Mr. WHERRY. All right. If the Senator will permit me: What was the break? All I am interested in is: What did the Senator do to cover up or give a break?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not "cover up."

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute. The Senator wants to be fair to the "heavenly twin."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator this question. If the Senator says it was not to cover up what was the break the Senator gave the Republicans?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may have an opportunity to give certain illustrations?

Mr. WHERRY. I think the Senator from Illinois ought to answer the question, and I will tell why I think he should. I believe he is a fair-minded man, at least he says he wants to be, with his colloquial expressions. I think if a "break" is given to a person, that it is just the same as covering up for a person.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. What I want to know, and what the Senator from Indiana wants to know is: Who got the "break"?

Who are the committee "covering up"? Who are they, whether they are Republicans or Democrats? We are entitled to know who they are. A serious charge has been made. I am not throwing any darts. I may not be expressing myself in the best of "heavenly" language, but I am speaking in the old Midwestern fashion. I want to know who is being "covered up" or what is being done for any person.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In order to keep the RECORD straight I will say I have never used the words "cover up."

I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator used the words "to protect." Now, who is being protected?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The Senator from Indiana is out of order. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the floor temporarily to the Senator from Arkansas to present some illustrations of this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to the inquiry of the Senator from Nebraska about "giving a break." First I should like to preface it by saying that I think the report of the committee may have dealt with some distinctions that have been perhaps too subtle for some people quite to follow. We made distinctions between improper and illegal conduct.

I think in the statement made by the Senator from Illinois there are perhaps some nuances of meaning that are difficult to follow. He was not saying and he did not mean to say "cover up" in the language used.

The Senator from Nebraska refers to "a break." I will give one illustration of a break which I think is a legitimate illustration of that very thing, with regard to the Gabrielson matter. This is the actual truth of that matter. When we came to the hearing on the question of the Carthage-Hydrocol loan the staff had briefed the chairman, and I think some of the other members. This was done last summer. I knew from the information supplied me by the staff—Mr. Herz in particular—that Mr. Gabrielson was a prominent member in that organization. I think he was president of it or its attorney. We were not at that time concerned about undue influence. I disapproved of the loan on the ground already stated by the Senator from Illinois. But I consider it a break that I did not lead off with Mr. Gabrielson; that I permitted the Senator from Indiana, a Republican member, and I think the only Republican member present, to develop it himself. I permitted him to develop the fact that Mr. Gabrielson was there, and he was given every opportunity to express his indignation at the participation in RFC lending by such an organization. I consider that a break.

We could have headlined the matter; I could have taken over as chairman and made it appear as if all the Republicans were greatly surprised and chagrined.

I consider that a legitimate break, because we were not seeking to make a partisan hearing out of it. That is an illustration of what I call a "break." We were not covering up anything. I think it was a break to permit a Republican minority member to take advantage of that situation, and it reflected credit on him. I think it reflected credit on the subcommittee.

Mr. WHERRY. So long as the Senator from Arkansas addressed his remarks to me, I should like to ask him, outside of the Gabrielson incident, which he denies—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What does the Senator mean "denies"?

Mr. WHERRY. That he had anything to do with this loan.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He does not deny that. We never accused him of using undue influence.

Mr. WHERRY. But outside of this man Gabrielson, does the Senator have any Republicans in mind to whom the committee gave a break or covered up, or whatever language the Senator may wish to use?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We did not cover up for anybody.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not consider that a cover up for anybody. I stated that a moment ago.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator name them?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I do not consider that we covered up for any Republican.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator name anyone to whom a break was given?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I think it was a break to the Senator from Indiana, and the whole Republican membership of the subcommittee.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean the committee covered up something?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall refer to the Texmass case; before I mention that, I will say I do not think the Senator understands what either the Senator from Illinois or I have in mind when I say we did not take full advantage of all the possibilities involved in the hearing. There is a misapprehension here respecting the use of the words. I think all the Senator from Illinois intended to say was that the committee had not undertaken to make political capital out of these hearings. That is about all it comes to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Here is the press release—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are not responsible for the press release. We will deal with the record as the reporter made it.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the Senator a question. The press release states that—

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, said today that the Senate RFC subcommittee leaned backward to protect Republicans who might have been accused of currying favor to obtain Government loans for business firms.

If the Senator is asked this question: Is that statement true; what would he say about it? That question will be asked the Senator by the press. Would the Senator say that it is true?

I will read it again, because I want to emphasize it:

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, said today that the Senate RFC subcommittee leaned over backward to protect Republicans who might have been accused of currying favor to obtain Government loans for business firms.

Will the Senator say that statement is true? Will the Senator say it is untrue? As to this statement will the Senator say it is true or untrue?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I would say it is not a correct representation of what the Senator from Illinois said.

Mr. WHERRY. No; but the Senator is fair-minded. What would the Senator say about this statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would say that it is not true.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator says that it is not true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Wait a minute. There are two points I am trying to make. The first is that it is not in accord with the full statement of the Senator from Illinois. In the second place, I think it is subject to an erroneous inference because it does not carry the words "justly or unjustly" which were used by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator think it is true?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is subject to misrepresentation by reasonable men.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it true, I ask the Senator. It is either true or not true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would say that it was not said on the floor of the Senate. In that sense it is certainly not true. I think the Senator or, if the Senator prefers the term, "heavenly twin," made a mountain out of a molehill.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not at this moment.

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

Mr. WHERRY. A mountain has been made out of a molehill by the Senator from Illinois in charging a "cover-up" for Republicans.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no. If the Senator made any charge it was that I did the covering up, and I know the Senator had no intention of saying that I covered up anybody. What he was intending to say and trying to emphasize was that this hearing had been conducted in an eminently fair manner, without an attempt to take political advantage of the position of the minority. That is certainly all he was trying to do.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator answer the question of the Senator from Nebraska. It is a very simple question, phrased in very simple language.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator say that that statement as carried over the press, was true or untrue? Answer it "Yes" or "No." [Laughter.] The Senator is very fair-minded.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. WHERRY. No. Very well. It is not true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out that the statement printed in the press was not the precise statement that was made on the floor.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois now has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to make a brief statement, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question, not for a statement.

Mr. CAPEHART. My question is—and I address my question to the able Senator from Illinois—is it not a fact that the chairman of the subcommittee and the committee itself, did a fair, impartial job; that they did not cover up anybody or try to protect anybody; that they have done an honest job right up to this very minute, and that at no time did they in any way try to defend or try to protect or cover up anybody? Is that not the history of the committee and its chairman?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since I am a member of the subcommittee, and the Senator from Indiana has just paid tribute to the committee, and therefore has paid tribute to me—and I now want to thank him for his generosity. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President—

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I did not hear the answer to the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is unbecoming for anyone to pin flowers upon himself, but since it has been done, I will say I think it is true. The chairman of the committee, the members of the committee, including the members on the Democratic side, have been eminently fair in this matter. I thank the Senator from Indiana very much.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have not had years of experience in training boys in the University of Chicago, so I simply do not understand the reference to colloquialisms and "heavenly twins" and so on. I apologize by reason of not having had that experience.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Indiana does very well. There is no need to apologize. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAPEHART. What I want to ask the Senator from Illinois is this: Did he read the dispatch which was sent out by the United Press, the UP, knowing that

it would be published in all the newspapers, or many of them, in the United States; and was the chairman not justified in calling the matter to the attention of the Senator from Illinois in order that he might correct the record himself?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would have preferred it if the Senator from Indiana had first consulted the actual text of the record to find out what I actually said, and if he had then talked to me, we could have made a joint statement indicating that the press report was not precisely in conformity with the full official record.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Illinois left the floor, and returned only a few minutes ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had gone to lunch, for I did not realize that these fireworks had started. Hereafter I shall keep a sandwich in the cloakroom. [Laughter.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Actually, if there is any reflection arising out of the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, I should think it would be on the chairman of the subcommittee for having countenanced any "covering up."

Mr. DOUGLAS. But I did not say that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know the Senator did not, and I know he did not intend his remarks to be interpreted in that way. So I do not see what the Senator from Indiana was so excited about.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then what did the Senator from Illinois intend by the statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He intended to emphasize the fact that the committee had been impartial and fair in the way it conducted its investigations. That is all he intended.

Mr. CAPEHART. No; he intended that what actually did happen would happen, namely, that the statement that Republicans had been covered up, would be sent all over the world. I will stand on that statement until the Senator from Illinois says it is not what he intended.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was going to do that. Mr. President, I protest having the Senator from Indiana read that intent into my statement and action. That was not my purpose in any way. My sole purpose was to defend the integrity of the chairman and the subcommittee, which, although not directly attacked, had been somewhat blurred by imputation. That was my sole purpose. I now wish to assure the Senator from Indiana that was my purpose, my sole purpose, and nothing but my purpose.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take my seat until I give my friends on the other side of the aisle an opportunity to ask questions.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator from Illinois brought into the debate a loan made to Carthage Hydrocol, Inc. Does the Senator know whether, when that loan was made, Mr. Gabrielson was

chairman or president of Carthage Hydrocol, Inc., or whether he was chairman of the Republican National Committee?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my understanding that at the time when the loan was made, he was neither president nor chairman of the Republican National Committee. I think that is true—at least at the time of the first of the three loans. There were two subsequent loans.

Mr. WELKER. Was he at any time, when any of the three loans were made, president of Carthage Hydrocol, Inc.?

Mr. DOUGLAS. When Mr. Gunderson, a former member of the RFC, was queried on this loan, he replied—hearings, page 441—"Mr. Gabrielson was originally the attorney." Later he became the president. I regret that I do not follow the affairs of the Republican Party as closely as I should for I do not know when he became Chairman of that party.

Mr. WELKER. Perhaps I can acquaint the Senator with the facts in that matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask when Mr. Gabrielson became Chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. Gabrielson became Chairman of the Republican National Committee on the fourth day of August 1949.

I say to the Senator from Illinois, for his information, that the last installment of the loan to Carthage Hydrocol, Inc., was made on April 25, 1949.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was very careful to keep Mr. Gabrielson's name out of this matter, until the questioning began.

Mr. WELKER. But the Senator from Illinois did name Mr. Gabrielson, did he not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I said I thought the loan to the Carthage Hydrocol Company, of which Mr. Gabrielson became president and before that the attorney, should not have been made, and that the subsequent loans should not have been made.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. WELKER. Is the Senator from Illinois familiar with the subcommittee hearings under date of July 10, 1950, on page 440, when a former RFC director, Mr. Harvey Gunderson, testified as follows:

I had never talked to Mr. Gabrielson, and I know of no one in the RFC who had ever talked with him, until after the loan was made, at which time he was elected president of the company.

In that connection, Mr. Gabrielson has issued a statement from which I read the following:

Mr. Gunderson's testimony further makes it clear that the loan was negotiated by Mr. P. C. (Dobie) Keith, an outstanding chemical engineer, through Mr. Jesse Jones, former Federal loan administrator. I have been Mr. Keith's attorney for many years.

Because of its value to national defense and the development of natural resources, the loan was endorsed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Is the Senator from Illinois familiar with that testimony?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, in a general way. Let me say that the attention of the press was called to that testimony at the time. We never have charged Mr. Gabrielson with doing anything wrong.

What I did point out was that we did not push the investigation of this loan. If this line of investigation had been carried out further, it would have shown, I think, that the loan should not have been made, and by imputation, such an investigation might have reflected on Mr. Gabrielson, who subsequently became chairman of the Republican National Committee.

My point is that we have been scrupulous in trying to protect Mr. Gabrielson, but now apparently we are being attacked because we are trying to be scrupulous.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further, and then I shall be through.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I am sure the Senator from Illinois realizes that I am not attacking him. I am confused, as the Senator from Illinois is.

Let me ask why the Senator from Illinois mentioned the name of Mr. Gabrielson and why the Senator from Illinois used the words that he was "giving a break to some Republicans," if there were no malintent on the part of Mr. Gabrielson or on the part of any other Republican the Senator can name?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to the Senator from Idaho that I did not want to bring Mr. Gabrielson's name into this matter. It was under very severe pressure from the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that I even mentioned the name of the company. The RECORD of today's debate will, I am sure, make this quite clear.

I do think that if there had been a disposition on the part of the chairman of the subcommittee or the subcommittee itself to probe the Carthage Hydrocol loan rather severely, it could have been shown that this was a loan which should not have been made in the public interest, but that the financing should have come from the huge oil companies which owned Carthage Hydrocol. On the other hand, the subcommittee could have attacked the company for getting large hand-outs from the RFC. But we scrupulously tied our hands behind our backs on this matter.

Mr. WELKER. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I appreciate the fact that neither the Republican nor the Democratic Party—no political party—has a monopoly on honesty. I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois and to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is my close personal friend, that I appreciate the Senator's reference. However, as a freshman Member of this body, I say we should not let this investigation cease now. On the contrary, let us go to the bottom of all this matter, and let us be accurate when we accuse anyone of engaging in fraud by the misuse of the money of the American people.

I say to the Senator that even if all the chips fall on this side of the aisle,

he will be doing a great thing for the people of the United States if he proves his case and proves any malfeasance, either on the part of the Republican Party or on the part of the Democratic Party.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think that in the heat of the debate, the Senator from Idaho put words into my mouth and thoughts into my mind which I did not utter or which were not in my head. I have not charged any Republican with malfeasance. I merely said that there were certain loans which, if the committee had thoroughly investigated them, might by imputation have reflected upon the Republican Party, but that we were careful not to go into those loans, lest we be accused of unfairness and political partisanship.

If the Senator from Idaho will read the RECORD tomorrow, when all of us are in a calmer mood, I think he will see that those have been not only my words but my intentions.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. WELKER. I am certainly not angry. I heard the Senator from Illinois bring the name of Mr. Gabrielson into this debate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did so under questioning from the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WELKER. Naturally the Senator would want me to do what I could to keep the RECORD straight. If Mr. Gabrielson was not even connected with the Corporation at that time, we certainly should defend him on that basis.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly; and I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. President, if there are no further questions, I yield the floor.

Mr. WELKER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with the matter which has been under discussion, a statement issued by Mr. Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee.

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

STATEMENT BY GUY GEORGE GABRIELSON,
CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL
COMMITTEE

Let Representative HAYS clean up his own party, and his own national committee, before he tries to talk about something which he knows nothing about. His statement on the House floor today was an unmitigated lie.

The hearings of the Fulbright subcommittee show that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan to Carthage Hydrocol, Inc., was negotiated before I became president of Carthage, and before I became chairman of the Republican National Committee.

The printed hearings of the subcommittee show, on page 440, that under questioning of Senator FULBRIGHT on July 10, 1950, a former RFC Director, Mr. Harvey Gunderson, testified as follows:

"I had never talked to Mr. Gabrielson, and I know of no one in the RFC who had ever talked with him, until after the loan was made, at which time he was elected president of the company."

Mr. Gunderson's testimony further makes it clear that the loan was negotiated by Mr.

P. C. (Dobie) Keith, an outstanding chemical engineer, through Mr. Jesse Jones, former Federal loan administrator. I have been Mr. Keith's attorney for many years.

Because of its value to national defense and the development of natural resources, the loan was endorsed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior.

The record shows that I have no financial interest in Carthage Hydrocol, and that the only compensation I have received has been for my services as president and counsel.

The last installment of the loan to Carthage Hydrocol was made April 25, 1949. I became chairman of the Republican National Committee August 4, 1949. These facts are all a matter of record, and were available to Congressman HAYS.

"I can only conclude that this deliberate smear is an attempt to divert attention from the rascality rampant in Washington under the administration of the political party to which Mr. HAYS is affiliated. And no amount of misrepresentation or mud-throwing will deter me from continuing to urge that we turn these rascals out in 1952."

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to one matter. Earlier I spoke about investigations. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we have now spent almost 3 hours of valuable time in talking about an investigation. But we have now before us for consideration a bill which was introduced by eight distinguished Democratic Senators and six distinguished Republican Senators, if I can still count, after listening to the colloquy which has occurred here on the floor of the Senate. Apparently, at least 16 Members of this body regard that legislation as being important, deserving of consideration and action. I merely wish to reiterate that the time has come when we should spend more time on legislation if we are to do what is expected of us. I say that in all kindness.

One investigating committee alone has spent a quarter of a million dollars upon an investigation within the last year, which is a considerable sum of money for one committee to spend.

We have before us a bill which involves health. The Senators who have sponsored the bill thought it was important to the health of the country. I see the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] on the floor. He is one of the co-authors of this bill.

I hope this body will not resolve itself into a group of policemen to such an extent that some will suggest we should wear uniforms. On the contrary, I hope that we can get down to the serious consideration of proposed legislation, and can spend a little time in legislating. I say that in the utmost friendliness and sincerity.

ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH
OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference seven bills and to submit a concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk.

All these measures are intended to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. There are approximately 10 or 11 other bills which also will be introduced by other Senators in this connection. A number of other Senators have joined with me in sponsoring these bills. I shall not take the time to read their names or to insert them into the RECORD, for they will appear on the bills when printed.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that I am introducing these measures by request. With many of them I am in general agreement as to their objectives. However, in introducing or submitting these measures, and in the other bills which will be introduced by other Members to carry into effect the recommendations of the Hoover Commission—and I believe that these measures cover all the recommendations of the Hoover Commission—we reserve the right to amend the bills, eliminate from them provisions which may be objectionable, or, if they cannot be revised sufficiently, to oppose them outright.

Our purpose in introducing all these bills is to get before the Congress all the proposals of the Hoover Commission, in order that the Congress may have an opportunity to study them, to the end that there may be enacted into law all the recommendations which are found to be advisable, which have merit, and which we think would carry out the general objectives of bringing about greater efficiency and economy in government.

Mr. President, I ask that the bills be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills and concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. DUFF, Mr. BENTON, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 1134. A bill to establish principles and policies to govern generally the management of the executive branch of the Government in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 1135. A bill to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1136. A bill to place in the Administration of General Services responsibility for coordination of certain miscellaneous activities in the District of Columbia in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1137. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. BENTON):

S. 1138. A bill creating a Veterans' Insurance Corporation in the Veterans' Administration to exercise all of the functions with respect to Government life insurance and national service life insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1139. A bill making certain changes in laws applicable to regulatory agencies of the Government so as to effectuate the recommendations regarding regulatory agencies made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. BENTON):

S. 1140. A bill to establish and to consolidate certain hospital, medical, and public health functions of the Government in a Department of Health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) submitted by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. IVES, Mr. LODGE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. DIRKSEN), was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of State is requested to submit to the Congress within 90 days after the adoption of this resolution a plan for amalgamation of the personnel of the permanent State Department established in Washington and the personnel of the Foreign Service into a single foreign affairs career service, administered separately from the general civil service, and obligated to serve at home or overseas, as recommended by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in line with the statements just made by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the chairman of the committee, I am sending to the desk seven reorganization bills for appropriate reference. These bills were drafted by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. They are a part of the program just outlined by the Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and are designed to carry out through legislative enactment the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission which have not yet been approved by Congress.

I am glad to cooperate in this non-partisan approach to assure the full consideration of all the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission. At the same time, I, as the Senator from Arkansas has stated, am doing so under the reservation that I do not wholly approve in advance of every provision contained in these bills, and reserve the right to offer perfecting amendments, or should the facts developed in committee so warrant, to oppose certain parts of this program, even including some of the bills I am sponsoring.

The main objective in this coordinated effort by 20 Senators is to insure that all recommendations of the Hoover Commission not yet fully activated will be given consideration by the appropriate committees of Congress. It has been estimated that 50 percent of the approximately 300 recommendations made by the Hoover Commission have already been activated. While I realize that the remaining 50 percent are those which have met the most opposition, I nevertheless am glad to associate myself in this effort to assure such consideration, and will do whatever I can, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to have consideration given those provisions carrying out the recommendations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. IVES, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1141. A bill to expand the activities of the Department of Commerce in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 1142. A bill to expand the activities of the Department of Labor in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 1143. A bill to effectuate recommendations relating to the Department of the Interior of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1144. A bill to provide for the creation of a Board of Analysis for Engineering and Architectural Projects and Drainage Area Advisory Commissions, in accordance with recommendations of the Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. BENTON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1145. A bill to establish a Department of Social Security and Education in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. THYE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1146. A bill to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LODGE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1147. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Displaced Persons Commission and the War Claims Commission to the Department of State, in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and several of my colleagues, whose names appear on the bills, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills, which are in effect companion bills to the ones just offered by the Senator from Arkansas, and which are intended to put the recommendations of the Hoover Commission before the Senate for action. The bills I am introducing provide for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, the making of certain changes in the law applicable to the Post Office Department, and so on.

As the Senator from Arkansas has said, in introducing these bills we do not say they are perfect in every way. We reserve the right to support amendments and to offer amendments, and in some cases, even to oppose the bill itself, if it later appears that it is unadvisable to enact it. However, it appears to us that all the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, based upon about 18 months' work by the Commission, under the direction of the Congress, should be submitted to the Congress for action, one way or another. So I am glad to join with the Senator from Arkansas and other Senators in seeing to it that all these proposals are placed before the Senate for appropriate reference and action by this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LODGE, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. IVES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1148. A bill making various changes in laws applicable to the Post Office Department in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LODGE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. IVES):

S. 1149. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to send to the desk a bill, and ask for its appropriate reference. The bill is sponsored by several of my colleagues and myself. It is a bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of the Treasury, in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

This, Mr. President, is one of the several bills referred to by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I wish to join in furtherance of the spirit which they have shown, the spirit of having presented to the Congress all proposals of the Hoover Commission, for consideration by the several committees. I recognize that on many of these bills there will be differences of opinion, and I, too, along with my colleagues reserve the right, despite cosponsorship and sponsorship of proposed legislation, either to vote to amend, to alter, or even to oppose these measures in committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received, out of order, and appropriately referred.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1150. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of the Treasury in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the reorganization of the Veterans' Administration.

This bill would provide for the reorganization of the Veterans' Administration in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. This is one of the 19 bills which, with a concurrent resolution, are being introduced in the Senate today to implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

I have joined in the sponsorship of each of these 20 measures. I have done so in the full realization that some of the measures may prove controversial and that full study of each by the ap-

propriate committees of the Senate is essential. I may even say that I would place the bill I have just introduced in the category of those measures which are controversial and which will require fullest study.

My purpose in joining in the blanket sponsorship of each of these measures is to demonstrate my wholehearted support for the Hoover Commission and my personal determination that its objectives shall be accomplished. In order that its objectives may be accomplished it is necessary that its recommendations which require legislative implementation be laid before the Congress.

Congress, in its wisdom and in the light of all the facts which its committees will now be charged with developing, may wish to revise some of these recommendations. That is only as it should be. Like other Senators who have sponsored some of these measures, I reserve to myself the right to amend any of these proposals or even to vote against them as the full facts are developed in Congress.

But before any of that Congressional screening of these proposals is possible it is necessary that they be placed before the Congress. It is therefore a very important thing that we are doing today in carrying forward the objectives of the Hoover Commission, and I am personally gratified to be able to participate.

I do this as a public service because of the official distinguished character of the Hoover Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1151) to provide for the reorganization of the Veterans' Administration in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have listened to the statement of the Senator from Michigan with regard to the bills which have been introduced and designed to cover the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I should like to add my name to various of these bills, with the same understanding and the same support that the Senator from Michigan has so well expressed. I hope the Senate may take action upon many of them.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I was called to the telephone. I should like to say merely a word or two in connection with the bills introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and other Senators to effectuate the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

I am glad to join with a large and distinguished bipartisan group of my colleagues in helping to bring before the Senate bills embodying the remaining half of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for Federal efficiency and economy. It is, of course, particu-

larly fitting that this largest single program of reorganization legislation ever presented to the Congress should be introduced on March 15—the deadline for our income-tax payments.

I would like to make it clear that I am not giving my unqualified personal support to all of these bills or their specific provisions. No legislative program of such magnitude can be considered to be incapable of improvement after committee hearings and study. I therefore reserve the right to support amendments or even to oppose some of these measures outright. The important and essential objective is to make sure that each of these proposals receives the most careful consideration and study during the present session of Congress. Never before has the need for economy and efficiency in the Federal Government been as great.

Some of these measures will be referred to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, or the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on both of which I serve. Because I desire to give these bills the most objective consideration possible in committee, I have not formally sponsored any of this group. I shall, of course, give all of the remaining bills my most sympathetic and careful study, and I am cosponsoring eight which deal with subjects with which I am relatively familiar. This includes measures dealing with the following:

General management of the executive branch.

Office of General Services—supply activities.

Separation of subsidy from compensation paid to airlines for carrying the mail.

Department of Agriculture.

Department of Commerce.

Regulatory commissions.

Creation of an impartial board of analysis for engineering and architectural projects.

Overseas administration; Federal-State relations; Federal research.

CONDUCT OF THE WAR IN KOREA AS AFFECTED BY THE THIRTY-EIGHTH PARALLEL—INTERVIEW WITH GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a very significant statement was printed today in the Washington News. It was an interview given by Douglas MacArthur, with Hugh Baillie, president of the United Press. It is a relatively short statement, and I should like to read it to the Senate, after which I should like to offer some very brief comments upon it. The article reads:

(By Hugh Baillie, president of the United Press)

NEW YORK, March 15.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur said today UN troops must continue their war of maneuver in Korea because there are no natural defenses near the thirty-eighth parallel to hold against the Chinese Communists.

The number of UN troops it would take to hold the parallel, General MacArthur said, would be sufficient to drive the Chinese Communists back across the Yalu River boundary with Manchuria and to hold the line there.

The supreme commander told me in response to a single question I asked him by cable:

"How many troops would be required to hold the thirty-eighth parallel inviolate?"

General MacArthur's reply is quoted as follows:

As I have on several occasions pointed out, the conditions under which we are conducting military operations in Korea do not favor in engaging in positional warfare on any line across the peninsula.

Specifically with reference to the thirty-eighth parallel, there are no natural defense features anywhere near its immediate proximity.

The terrain is such that to establish a conventional defense system in reasonable depth would require such a sizable force that if we had it, and could logistically maintain it, we would be able to drive the Chinese Communists back across the Yalu, hold that river as our future main line of defense, and proceed to the accomplishment of our mission in the unification of Korea.

Under the realities existing, however, we can and will, unless the situation is radically altered, continue our campaign of maneuver as the best means to neutralize the military disadvantage under which we fight and keep the enemy engaged where it best serves our own military purposes.

Such a point of engagement will of necessity be a fluctuating variable, dependent upon the shifting relative strengths of the forces committed and will constantly move up or down.

The problem involved requires much more fundamental decisions than are within my authority or responsibility to make as the military commander—decisions which must not ignore the heavy cost in Allied blood which a protracted and indecisive campaign would entail.

That is the end of the article and the end of the quotation from General MacArthur's reply. At this time, Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that one of the handicaps under which the United Nations forces have been operating in Korea has been the strict limitation that they must not proceed, for either tactical or reconnaissance purposes, north of the Yalu River. When I was in Korea last year responsible military, naval, and air officials indicated to me they did not believe that in the entire history of our country we had forced our military commanders to operate under such severe restrictions, which in fact endanger the whole strategic concept of the war in that area of the world.

Secondly, Mr. President, what concerns me is that I think General MacArthur has very clearly, not only in this statement, but in a prior one, pointed out that with the forces at his disposal, in view of the aspect of the Korean fighting which had developed with the movement of hundreds of thousands of Chinese Communists into Korea, the whole situation in that area has changed. Following the Inchon landings, when the back of the North Korean resistance was broken, the United Nations forces proceeded under their directives, and not in violation of them, to move toward the Yalu River line. It was in October that the Chinese Communists began to cross the Yalu River in force and to make their full weight felt in the Korean operation. In view of this aspect of the situation there were not sufficient forces at

the disposal of General MacArthur to continue to carry out the original UN directive, which was the unification of the entire country of Korea.

From a military point of view we must depend upon the judgment of our military commanders. General MacArthur has very clearly pointed out that he does not, under present circumstances, have sufficient forces either to go to the Yalu River, or, indeed, to hold a particular line, be it at the thirty-eighth parallel, the thirty-ninth parallel, or any other fixed position. I think it is one thing for us realistically to face that problem, but it is an entirely different situation for either the United Nations or for our Government to tie the hands of the commander a second time and tell him that he may not tactically cross the thirty-eighth parallel.

I have been in that area of Korea, and it is quite possible that 15 miles, 30 miles, or 50 miles north of the thirty-eighth parallel there may be a far better defense position than at the parallel itself. I think even more important than that is the fact that once we acknowledge that we will not cross the thirty-eighth parallel we give de facto recognition to the Communist regime of North Korea all over again. We would do so after considerable blood has been shed by United Nations forces, of which most are United States forces and forces of our ally, the Republic of Korea. If we do that, it is my judgment that we can never bring about a stabilized condition in Korea. In my opinion, Korea cannot exist as an independent entity if divided at the thirty-eighth parallel.

The Republic of Korea, which came into being under the auspices of the United Nations and under the auspices of the United States, contains about 30,000,000 people south of the thirty-eighth parallel. However, most of its industrial strength and most of its hydroelectric power is located north of the thirty-eighth parallel. It would be very difficult for the country economically to exist divided at that unnatural line.

More important than that, Mr. President, if the United Nations or the United States acknowledges again the de facto control of North Korea by the Communists, we shall be constantly faced with the same type of threat which finally resulted in the attack on the 25th day of June of last year. The Communist forces in Korea would rebuild their forces. They would get equipment from the Chinese Communists. They would get equipment from the Soviet Union. When we had withdrawn the United Nations forces, or a large part of them, and when we felt that peace had come to that troubled area of the world, they would be prepared to embark once again in an aggression against the Republic of Korea.

Mr. President, I think we must constantly keep in mind that by this kind of de facto recognition of the Communist regime, the North Korean aggressor would go completely unpunished. Furthermore, it would free the Chinese Communists to move against the island of Formosa or against Indochina. In my

judgment, we would make a very great mistake if for a temporary armed truce in Korea we were to free the Chinese Communists so that they could move their equipment and the forces which they now have in Korea south again, in order to move against Indochina, Siam, and Burma. If they did not move in that direction, they would be free to move against the island of Formosa. Practically all of our responsible commanders have stated that the loss of Formosa to unfriendly hands—and Communists would be unfriendly—would menace the entire American defense position which runs from Japan through Okinawa to the Philippines.

There has been much discussion at Lake Success. All of us hope that peace can be brought to this troubled world, both in the Far East and in Europe. However, I submit it must not be a peace at any price. It must be a peace with honor. The American people should be frankly told on just what basis we or the United Nations are prepared to negotiate a peace in Korea. Certainly everyone would welcome a cessation of hostilities in that area of the world. The Chinese Communists have it in their hands to bring hostilities to an end. They can do it by withdrawing their aggressor forces to a point north of the Yalu River. There is not a single member of the United Nations who has now or has had at any time any intention of moving troops of the United Nations beyond the Yalu River into Manchuria.

If the Communists want an honorable peace they can secure it by taking the Chinese aggressor forces out of Korea. If we should permit a status quo to develop, in which the North Korean Communists could replace their forces and equipment north of the thirty-eighth parallel, and leave them free to move into other sections of the world, we would be buying a very short peace, on the basis of a far eastern Munich. I doubt that a peace bought under such circumstances would last the year that the Munich peace settlement lasted.

Mr. President, we should be informed by the Government of the United States and by the United Nations whether or not any move is now being made in the United Nations whereby a dickering would be undertaken with the Chinese Communist aggressor, and hope held out to him that if he ceases his operations at the thirty-eighth parallel, we will welcome him into the United Nations. We are entitled to have that information. The Senate of the United States by unanimous vote expressed its conviction that the Chinese Communists should not be admitted to the United Nations. Is that a part of a deal which is now being made?

Mr. President, we should be informed as to whether or not there is a possibility that part of the bait being held out is the surrender of the island of Formosa into the hands of the Chinese Communists. Is that a part of a deal which would be considered? If not, the American Government and the United Nations should frankly say so. Eight million free human beings are involved on the island of Formosa. More than 600,000 non-Communist troops are involved on the island of Formosa. That is a larger non-

Communist force than exists in all the other nations of Asia put together.

I think it is time now for the Government of the United States to begin to disclose to the American people just what help we propose to give to the Republic of China, now on Formosa. All the reports coming from inside China indicate that there is great unrest, that the farmers are unhappy about the seizures of their grain, that businessmen have been destroyed, and that workers are out of work. There is great unrest south of the Yangtze River. Yet at a time when the Chinese Communist forces are in contest with the United Nations forces in Korea, when we have an opportunity to bring to our side of the picture literally millions of Chinese guerrillas who are non-Communists, this Government still imposes a blockade which prevents the Republic of China from equipping the non-Communist forces on the mainland of China. I think it is time for us realistically to face this issue.

On two different occasions the Congress of the United States has provided appropriations—\$75,000,000 in the first arms-implementation bill, and \$75,000,000 in the second arms-implementation bill—for the aid of the Republic of China and the area in the immediate vicinity. Yet I say on my responsibility as a United States Senator that a relatively inconsequential amount of aid has been given to the Republic of China to date out of either of those appropriations.

Mr. President, the typhoon weather has about passed in the Straits of Formosa. Within the period of the next 30 to 60 days it would be possible, if they determined to make an amphibious assault on Formosa, for the Chinese Communists to begin their operations. In view of the notice which has been served on the Government of the United States by its responsible commanders, that the loss of Formosa would be detrimental to the security of this country, I hope that we are not again to be faced with the situation of too little and too late. The time when arms and equipment should have been sent to the Republic of China and the non-Communists on Formosa has been during the period of the past several months. If we continue to delay we may find that the assault has started, that the equipment is not there, and that it will again be said, "We are very sorry, but we started too late."

PUBLIC-HEALTH ASSISTANCE TO STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 445) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and their subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public-health units, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the pending bill, Senate bill 445, is entitled a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and their subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public-health units, and for other purposes.

The bill was originally introduced in the Eightieth Congress by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachu-

setts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. Today he is one of the cosponsors of the pending bill. In fact, the bill is now under the cosponsorship of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the late Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Chapman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Alabama.

A similar bill was reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the last Congress, and it was passed by the Senate unanimously. Unfortunately it did not receive action in the House. The bill is before the Senate today after having been carefully considered by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, composed of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Alabama. The subcommittee spent many hours—yes; many weeks—in going over the bill with a fine-tooth comb in an endeavor to draft the best legislation to meet any need which the subcommittee felt compelling, and with respect to which the full committee concurred.

The local public-health unit is perhaps best summarized in a very brief statement before the committee by Surgeon General Scheele, of the United States Public Health Service. I quote General Scheele:

The local health unit is a team of trained public-health workers employed by the community to protect and promote the health of all the people; to guard every family against communicable diseases and insanitary conditions; and to cooperate with the local physicians, dentists, and hospitals for better health throughout the community.

The success of the team depends upon effective leadership and upon the continuity of its efforts. A local health unit—in the modern sense—is directed by a medical health officer, a physician, who is employed full time on that job. His staff always includes public-health nurses and sanitation personnel. It may also include laboratory technicians, health educators, public-health dentists and dental hygienists, nutritionists, medical social workers, and so on.

Some of the basic duties of a local health unit are familiar to all of us. The local health unit is the official organization through which a community protects its water, milk, and food supplies; maintains sanitary conditions in the schools, restaurants, hotels, factories, swimming pools, and food-handling establishments. It collects and analyzes community-health statistics as a basis for planned improvement of the health of the public, and it stimulates citizen participation in community-health programs. The unit is responsible for communicable-disease control, including promotion of programs for immunization against such diseases as smallpox, diphtheria, and whooping cough. It provides many laboratory services for local physicians, either in its own

facilities or through the public-health laboratory of the State. It is responsible for tuberculosis control and venereal-disease control, for maternal- and child-health services—indeed, for any other special program which the State and the community wish to operate on a community-wide basis for the benefit of the people.

The local public-health unit in any area or community where it exists, as the definition of Surgeon General Scheele so well indicates, is a basic permanent organization upon which the particular community depends for the control of communicable diseases and for over-all protection of the health of the people. It is obvious that the development of basic public-health services is a national concern requiring national action. It is an indisputable fact that disease has no respect for the political boundaries of State and local subdivisions. No one State or locality anywhere can expect to be safe from preventable diseases until all States are sufficiently covered by up-to-date, adequate, full-time public-health units.

This is the situation, whether we are concerned with the health emergencies of peace or with the possible catastrophes of war. That fact was recognized by the Hoover Commission in a declaration to which I call attention. The Hoover Commission declared itself strongly in favor of a bill such as the bill now pending before the Senate. I read from page 132 of the Hoover Commission report of January 1949 on public welfare. The report states:

The extension of full-time, well-organized local health units throughout the rural areas is fundamental, and there is little question in the minds of those familiar with the development of such units that some Federal subsidy is necessary to stimulate their extension, to provide the entire population with basic health services.

Today there are more than 1,300 counties, containing approximately 40,000,000 people, who are without full-time public-health services. Moreover, of the 1,734 counties covered by full-time local health services, only 769 meet the minimum approved standards as to the number of public-health physicians. Only 148 meet the standards for the number of public-health nurses; and only 956 meet the standards for sanitary personnel. It is therefore apparent that a very large number of the full-time local health organizations now operating require expansion in staff and activities to assure even minimum standards of operation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Is it not a fact that what we are trying to do by the bill is to extend throughout the country the excellent types of public-health services which have been tried and proved in various sections of the country?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. What we seek to do is to extend the health services which have proved of such great benefit in certain sections and certain counties. The

Senator from New Jersey is one of the authors of the bill. He labored long in the subcommittee to bring forth the best possible bill. He well knows that the bill does not take the Federal Government into any new field. We are not going into any activity or program in which we are not now engaged. All the bill does is to augment and strengthen the program in which the Federal Government is now engaged, by endeavoring to bring the same local public-health services to more counties and communities throughout the country.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator yield to me for one more question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Is it not the whole purpose of the local public-health unit to work in the field of preventive medicine, which is so much needed in order to take care of people in the most effective way?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. Since he raised the question I shall read from testimony given before the subcommittee. The bill is limited entirely to the field of preventive medicine, to keep our people from becoming sick, to keep them from becoming diseased, to protect their health. I think it is generally conceded that there is no greater authority on the subject of health, and particularly the health of the people as a whole, which is dealt with in the field of public health, as we know it, than Dr. Haven Emerson, of the National Advisory Committee on Local Health Units of the State of New York. He is also a member of the Board of Health of the City of New York. He made a significant statement before the subcommittee, which I am sure the Senator will recall. I read from page 84 of the hearings of the subcommittee:

In fact, I believe a widely held professional opinion is to the effect that when the logical, practical, and Nation-wide effects of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act and of the bill S. 522 before you here—

He was speaking of the bill then under consideration. The bill now before the Senate is Senate bill 445. I continue to read—

If enacted into law, are thoughtfully observed over a decade, there will be a diminution in the clamor for elaborate, costly, and revolutionary proposals for medical care and ultimately a cessation of demand for any kind of compulsory federally controlled system of sickness insurance.

In other words, as the Senator from New Jersey has said, the bill not only deals with preventive medicine, but in the opinion of Dr. Emerson and of other distinguished authorities on health in this country, the very passage of the bill will do much to remove many of the demands now being made for some form of curative medicine that many persons do not favor at this time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator has just answered the question I was going to ask him. The question is whether this bill and the excellent hospital bill of which the Senator from

Alabama was one of the authors, the Hill-Burton bill, together, do not lay the foundation for meeting health needs, including the needs in the field of preventive medicine the Senator mentioned; and will not the result be that there will be a decrease in the demands the Senator speaks of for some kind of new-fangled plan of socialized medicine, or something of that sort.

Mr. HILL. That is exactly the opinion of Dr. Emerson and of others.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The distinguished Senator from Alabama has already stated that the bill does not provide for the undertaking of any new activities on a Federal level. Is it not a fact that really what the bill would do is to bring together under one coordinated plan the activities of the States and their local health units?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. The bill follows the pattern set by the Hospital Construction and Survey Act in that it provides that each State shall make plans for public-health activities at the State level and at the level of public-health units. What the bill does is to provide assistance for carrying forward these State plans just as we have provided assistance for carrying forward State plans under the Hospital Construction and Survey Act.

Mr. President, I think one of the best summarizations of the services of some of the local public-health units was given to the subcommittee by Dr. Vlado A. Getting, commissioner of public health of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, who in testifying as the representative for the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, stated that local health units are responsible for providing or seeking adequate provision for the following basic public-health services for the citizens they serve:

1. Vital statistics: People need and can obtain copies or certified copies of birth and death certificates which are frequently necessary for entrance to school, for obtaining work, for entering the Armed Forces, or for collecting insurance, for settling estates, etc.

2. The control and prevention of the communicable diseases, including the acute communicable diseases, the venereal diseases, tuberculosis, malaria, hookworm, etc., and protection against those diseases for which protective measures have been found effective.

3. Environmental sanitation: The people have a right to expect an adequate, safe, potable water supply, an adequate, clean, safely pasteurized milk supply, the supervision of foods and food handling, including instruction in personal hygiene and the hygiene of food handling, a safe method of excreta disposal, the health aspects of housing, the control and supervision of swimming pools and bathing areas, insect and rodent control, proper sanitation of schools, a program of accident prevention, and a cooperative effort with industry to assure the health protection of workers.

4. Laboratory services providing aids to the diagnosis of disease and the examination of water, milk, and other foods.

5. The protection of maternal and child health should be provided through the prenatal, parturient and postnatal periods and

the infant, preschool and school age. Adequate hospital, medical, and nursing services should be locally available and if not available, they should be actively sought by the local health unit.

6. Control and prevention of chronic diseases: The development of educational and diagnostic programs for the prevention, arrest, amelioration, and cure of chronic diseases and their complication.

7. Health education: The people have the right to expect their health department to be a source of authentic information on generally accepted procedures for health protection and the maintenance of optimal health.

Mr. President, it is evident that these functions of local public-health service units are of fundamental importance in peacetime. But the danger that confronts us, the shadow that is this hour cast over us, the uncertainty as to what may come to our country, makes these units, and their installation and their augmentation and their strengthening all the more important, because the functions and duties of these units would be vastly increased and would be immensely more important in the event of a catastrophe, an attack, or the bombing of one of our cities or communities.

Under our civil-defense plan we find the following provisions with reference to this question:

The civil-defense health service should plan and train in peacetime against emergencies in time of war. * * * The health service should be an extension of existing services rather than a separately administered organization which inevitably would duplicate the work of, and compete with, existing health agencies.

I emphasize that statement, Mr. President. We are going to have this health protection under our civil-defense program, and unless we are wise enough to pass a bill such as that now pending under which existing agencies, the United States Public Health Service and the local public-health units which we now have will be used, we will find that we will be forced to set up, under the defense program, duplicating agencies which will make for conflict of authority, and no doubt result in waste and uneconomic operation.

The civil-defense-program provision continues:

The local health officer should be in charge of the local civil-defense health service.

In other words, Mr. President, if we are to have a civil-defense program in the United States for the protection of our people, it is necessary to have the local health officer in charge of these defense services—not tomorrow or next year or 5 years or 10 years hence, but now.

The provision continues:

The health officer may find it necessary to deputize sufficient persons in the professional and technical fields to supplement his permanent staff in order to direct the various activities for which he is responsible during an emergency.

In other words, he needs not only to be on hand himself, but to be able to proceed to have an organization set up to meet an emergency.

In that connection, Mr. President, there came to each of us, a day or two ago, a bulletin published by the Civil

Defense Administration. The bulletin is entitled "Here Is What You Should Know About Biological Warfare." On page 19 of the bulletin there appears a corroboration of what I have just been saying. I quote now from the bulletin:

The health-service divisions of our local civil-defense organizations, working with our peacetime health-safety systems, will form the backbone of our community defenses against biological warfare.

The same thing might be said about any radioactivity warfare or any atomic-bomb warfare.

I read further from the bulletin:

Health officers, veterinarians, and plant specialists already are being instructed in biological-warfare defense. Their job will be to spot the attack, pin it down, and stamp it out.

So, Mr. President, we need these health officers now, and that is one of the main purposes of this bill.

It has long been apparent that if we lack local public-health units, the control of special fields of disease cannot be adequately developed. Undoubtedly today there is a great waste of money and effort and there is inefficient operation because of the lack of the local health units which we should have in our struggle to promote the control of cancer, mental disease, heart disease, infantile paralysis, tuberculosis, and syphilis.

In that connection I should like to read briefly from the testimony of Dr. James E. Perkins, managing director of the National Tuberculosis Association. Dr. Perkins testified before the subcommittee, as follows:

The National Tuberculosis Association has long held the opinion that effective tuberculosis control can be achieved only if there are adequately staffed and adequately financed full-time local health services.

Mr. President, in this country there are thousands of persons who today are suffering from tuberculosis, and there are other thousands who are dying from tuberculosis. Yet we know that tuberculosis can be controlled and can be prevented. However, as Dr. Perkins says, if we are to do the job, if we are to wipe out the disease of tuberculosis, as we can and as we should, we must have these local public-health units.

I read further from the testimony of Dr. Perkins:

We know enough about tuberculosis today to rid our Nation of this disease if there were local health officers and public nurses in the field to follow up each case and assure treatment.

The chief field of our association—

In other words, the chief field of the National Tuberculosis Association—is educational. But education falls down if there are no X-ray machines and other facilities, if there are not enough people in the local health agencies to actually do the work.

Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to reiterate—because I said it in my answer to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey—that this bill deals with the field of preventive medicine, and not at all with the field of curative medicine.

I have averted to the fact that in this bill we would follow the principle of

matching and of using the State plans. Each State would have its own plan; and the Federal Government would simply come up to the State line and would give to each State the assistance it needs to carry out its plan. The Federal aid would be given on a matching basis and on the basis of three factors which would be used in determining how much would go to any particular State: The factor of the need as shown by the per capita income; the factor of population; and the factor of the special health needs in any particular State.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to state to the Senator from Alabama, who has mentioned the local health units, that I remember that when I was a very small boy a Dr. Henry Boswell came to my home town, a very small town in Mississippi, on a privately endowed 60-month-period local health investigation. Many persons were affected with tuberculosis, and the local doctors could do little about it. In the health work in that local community Dr. Boswell received the inspiration of leaving a tubercular sanitarium. Under his fine leadership the State later established a fine institution, and he now has a national reputation. His record of service in that institution has continued for more than 40 years, during which he has done remarkable work. It all goes back, as the Senator has said, to the local health units.

I am encouraged that the Senator from Alabama has a plan whereby the local health units will find cases of disease, and will find them in time. The great man I have mentioned, Dr. Henry Boswell, began that work in 1910; and his original inspiration has been developed by him into a lifetime of service which can be extended to all the people.

Mr. HILL. I wish to thank my friend, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, for his contribution and for the example he has cited in regard to the work which can be done.

Mr. President, what we seek to do by means of this bill is to carry on such work throughout the United States, for the benefit of all our people.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I believe he had to go to the telephone, and I am not sure he was on the floor at the time when I stated that he was the original author of this bill, having introduced it in the Congress. I am delighted to yield now to my distinguished friend, who has such great interest in this bill, and who understands so fully the compelling need for its enactment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank my colleague from Alabama. I think this is the third bill on this subject on which he and I have joined.

I should like to ask this question: Has the Senator already stated the cost, or does he intend to state it?

Mr. HILL. I was coming to that point immediately. I was about to say that I asked the Bureau of the Budget to give me an estimate of the cost of this

bill, if it should be enacted into law. The estimate was between \$15,000,000 and \$20,000,000.

I may say that so far as cost is concerned, there are to be several checks on it. In the first place, as the bill provides, the funds provided must be matched by the State or the local subdivision. In other words, if the State or the local subdivision does not provide its share of the funds, then of course no Federal funds will be used in the particular State or local subdivision.

In the second place, there is a limitation of \$1.50 per person, in an area served by a local unit, for Federal expenditure in one particular year. That, of course, leads me to the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is such an able Member, the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator knows that appropriations are very carefully considered by that committee. Many times we do not appropriate the full amount we might appropriate, as authorized by law. I have in mind particularly the Federal funds for vocational education. Senators will recall that today under the vocational education law there is an authorization of appropriations to the extent of a little more than \$29,000,000, yet the Congress has never seen fit to appropriate more than \$19,000,000. There is today an authorization under the Hospital Construction Survey Act, of \$150,000,000. This year, as the distinguished Senator, chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which handles that particular appropriation, well knows, the Congress appropriated only \$85,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that the public-health commissions of the various States are strongly behind this bill? In other words, do they not believe that it is not a deprivation of their powers in any way or a usurpation of their powers by the Federal Government, but a definite extension of their fields in the respective States, which will be under their jurisdiction, with suitable plans, to be approved by the Federal Government?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely correct. I know of no group, I know of no organization, which more strongly advocates the passage of this bill than the public health officials of the several States. They know full well their need of the assistance which this bill would provide.

I had adverted earlier to the fact that their spokesman before the committee was the distinguished commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Dr. Gettling, and I quoted rather extensively from his summation of the purposes of and needs for this proposed legislation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I may ask one more question, I did not hear the Senator attempt to say—and I am glad he did not—that this bill was specifically in aid of our defense program at the present time. We cannot justify it on that ground, but we can justify it on the ground that it will make a larger number

of young boys healthy and fine physical specimens, and enable them to be more useful in the service of their country than they can be at the present time.

Mr. HILL. I can justify it certainly on the ground to which the Senator has adverted, in connection with the general strength of American men and women, who must be the supporters of the Nation and maintain it in time of emergency and of attack.

But I may say to my distinguished friend that I think our civil defense program also justifies this bill. Earlier I adverted to a provision in the civil defense program which emphasizes this thought. I read from that provision:

The civil defense health services should plan and train in peacetime against emergencies in time of war. . . . The health service should be an extension of existing services rather than a separately administered organization which inevitably would duplicate the work of, and compete with, existing health agencies. The local health officer should be in charge of the local civil defense health service.

What we do in this bill ties in directly with our civil defense program, and, in fact, does the work far better and in a much more economical way than would be possible under that program, if we were to set up separate health services and activities.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation?

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

Mr. HILL. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts, after which I shall yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not a fair statement that those of us who, in this difficult time, when we must concentrate on the defense program, do not want to start new programs, need not be worried about voting for this bill, for the reason that it is an extension of an existing health program, and is not the creation of something new? It is rather designed to make the present program more practical and more helpful in a larger number of areas than is now possible.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely correct. This is not the starting of a new program. It is not putting the Federal Government into a field in which it is not today operating. It is merely the augmentation and strengthening of an existing program, to which the Federal Government has long been a party.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. While my own State of New York will not, of course, by the provisions of this bill, profit as much as will certain other States, largely because of the formula set forth in the bill, nevertheless I am sure that the people of New York are willing to share their good fortune with other States of the Union and are willing to bear their fair share.

I have seen how cooperation between the larger units of Government and the local units works in practice. During the years when I was Governor of my State,

we brought into much greater effectiveness the coordination between the State and local units. The State, of course, had concerned itself with health problems for a great many years, and there were certain local units which were operating; but, during the years from 1928 to the present time, we have coordinated those efforts, and it has been of the utmost profit to the people of the State and of the local communities. It has not only immediately raised health standards in communities, but it has made their people conscious of Federal therapeutic practices, conscious of the advantage of diagnosis in the early stages, and many other things of that sort.

I believe that this measure, particularly in view of the fact that it does not provide any new standards, but simply leads to a coordination, so that all the States can avail themselves of the provisions of the bill and thereby make it possible to develop health standards and health activities in their localities, is of the utmost importance to the people of the State and of the country.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his very fine statement in behalf of the bill. I am sure we all recognize that no Member of this body speaks with greater authority on this subject, or has had a more intimate insight and knowledge of the purposes of this bill and of the results which will come from its operation, than our distinguished friend, who served with such distinction as the Governor of our great Empire State of New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this bill really is sponsored by the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the mothers and fathers whose children are in school. They know what the bill means. They know what it means to have a Public Health doctor or a Public Health nurse available to make an inspection of the school, to make sure that their children are carrying on their work, not only in a happy environment but in one which is sanitary and healthful. Therefore, the main sponsor of this bill is the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, with its 6,000,000 members throughout the 48 States.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps the Senator has covered this point, but I did not hear him do so. There is today a great shortage of doctors. If this bill becomes law and is administered in a practical, thoughtful, and efficient way, it will help to alleviate the situation created by a shortage in the supply of doctors, will it not?

Mr. HILL. It certainly will. Insofar as it reduces sickness and prevents disease, there will be a smaller demand for doctors, and, therefore, we shall help meet what is now an acute shortage of doctors.

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

Mr. HILL. I shall yield in a moment. I was going to call attention to a few of

the many organizations that are supporting this bill. If there is any organization which is against the bill, I do not know of it. As we know, the American Medical Association does not favor all the health bills introduced in the Congress, but it is on record as favoring the objectives of this bill. The association might not have written it exactly as we did. They might desire certain changes here and there, but they favor the objectives of the bill, and they are not seeking to prevent its passage by the Senate. The fact of the matter is that their representative, Dr. James R. Miller, a member of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association, testifying before the committee, on May 10, 1949, stated:

We, the American Medical Association, have long believed that the existence of effective and properly operated public-health units is basic to the maintenance and improvement to the health of our people. Recognition of this conviction was reflected in action taken by the association as early as 1883 when a report was made at our annual meeting for that year covering a survey conducted to ascertain what States and counties had at that time health departments.

In 1942 the house of delegates of the AMA adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the trustees of the American Medical Association be urged to use all appropriate resources and influences of the association to the end that, at the earliest possible date, complete coverage of the Nation's areas and population by local, county, district, or regional full-time modern health services be achieved.

On January 22, 1951, not long ago, there was a joint meeting of the legislative committee and the executive committee of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association. As I say, if they were writing the bill, they might not write it exactly line for line as reported by the subcommittee and, later, by the full committee; but they are not opposing the bill. They favor the objectives of the bill.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that one of the possibilities under the proposed legislation is the improvement of the program, for example, of industrial accident prevention?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely correct. That is one of the objectives of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It has relationship particularly in a period of high productivity, such as incident in this period to our defense program, not only to the everyday problems of the American society, but, in particular, to the emergency and to the defense program which is now under way.

There is one other point about the bill in which I was interested, and which I wanted to call to the Senator's attention, for any comment he might care to make. This bill, as has been stated, is an amendment to other public-health legislation.

Mr. HILL. It is an amendment to the basic Public Health Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand from the hearings and the testimony that the

bill will provide a sort of minimum basic program throughout the country.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are great areas which are, we might say, blind spots, in the sense that they do not have any kind of public local health service.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. There is no question that there are many areas which do not have any services at all, and there are also many areas which have very inadequate services.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One other observation I should like to make is that, from my understanding of the bill, it would not necessarily mean a great increase in personnel on Government payrolls. I think we ought to make note of that fact. Actually, people who are presently employed will merely take on new jobs, new functions, and new services. Of course, there will be some increases, where there is no personnel at all.

Mr. HILL. There will be some increase, I may say to the Senator, but not any large increase. As a matter of fact, the medical personnel presently available is so limited as to make it difficult to have any very great increase in such personnel.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But, as the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out a moment ago, this proposed legislation, if passed by the two Houses, signed by the President, and placed in effect, will have the effect in various communities of relieving some of the problems caused by the lack of surgeons, doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The better our Public Health Service, which is preventive medicine in a sense, the less need for curative medicine. Surely, this is a time when the preventive aspects of the medical field should be emphasized.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. I know the study and thought he has given to the subject, and the many contributions which he has made.

Mr. President, I hope we can pass the bill this afternoon. I conclude my remarks by naming a few of the organizations which appeared before the committee urging the passage of the bill. I have already adverted to the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. I mention now the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, the American Hospital Association, the National Tuberculosis Association, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, the National Society for the Prevention of Blindness, the American Social Hygiene Association, the National Health Council, the American Public Health Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the American Art Association, the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, the YMCA International Council, and the National Grange.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. The State of Kansas has had most efficient cooperation from the Bureau of Public Health. We have a State board of health, and also local

units. I appreciate the fact that we do not have a local unit in every county of the State. One reason for it is that it would be impossible to get the nurses, who are usually the ones who fill the local health unit administrative positions. Has the committee given any thought to getting additional nurses or health directors?

Mr. HILL. There is a bill on the calendar, Senate bill 337, which the committee has reported, the purpose of which is to help train more doctors, nurses, and medical technicians.

Mr. CARLSON. That is one of the problems we have been confronted with in the Middle West. My State has taken steps to work out a program which would greatly increase the capacity of the State medical school at Kansas University. We have established clinical schools to develop a program of health. It has been one of our problems, and I am glad to hear the statement of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator. As a former distinguished governor of his State he is familiar with the problem and knows the need for meeting it. I appreciate particularly his calling attention to the need for additional nurses. I hope the Senator will find time to look at the bill to which I have referred. It is on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 16, line 19.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there is another committee amendment. It is on page 16, line 21, to strike out "1950," and to insert in lieu thereof "1951."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That amendment has not been reported by the committee. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 16, line 19.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, 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	Green	Maybank
Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Benton	Hennings	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Neely
Byrd	Holland	Nixon
Cain	Humphrey	O'Connor
Capehart	Ives	Pastore
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kem	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Smathers
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Lodge	Stennis
Dworshak	McCarran	Taft
Eaton	McCarthy	Thye
Ellender	McClellan	Watkins
Ferguson	McFarland	Welker
Flanders	McKellar	Wherry
Frear	McMahon	Wiley
Fulbright	Magnuson	Williams
George	Malone	
Gillette	Martin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I feel a little apologetic for raising my voice at this hour of the afternoon on so simple an issue as Federal economy. I feel,

however, that it must be done. I realize that an appeal for economy is old-fashioned. I know it is not nearly so dramatic as to talk about troops to Europe or the rascality of the RFC, but I feel we are faced by an economic issue, and that someone has to address himself to it. So the junior Senator from Illinois undertakes that humble task, because there is involved a little more than meets the eye.

My very good and eloquent friend from Alabama [Mr. HILL] said a little while ago that he called up the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the bill now under consideration and that he was advised that the cost would be \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000. I do not dispute that figure. For aught I know, it may be correct. But I know what the testimony showed as to the bill, and I think the Senate ought to know about it.

I read from the testimony given on the bill on May 10 and 11, 1949, when the bill was pending in the Eighty-first Congress. There were no hearings on it in the Eighty-second Congress. This testimony will be found on page 45 of the hearings. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] was addressing a question to Dr. Scheele, as follows:

So with \$80,000,000 of Federal money, you would have \$160,000,000 of State and local money, or a total of \$240,000,000.

That referred to \$160,000,000 out of State and local treasuries, which, as we know, have no money except as they siphon it out of the pockets of the taxpayers. The Federal Government has no money except as it borrows or it obtains it from the taxpayers. So the bill will, when it is finally translated into action in the corners of the country, cost John Q. Taxpayer \$240,000,000 a year.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the fact that the American Public Health Association and many other associations have endorsed the bill, or at least they have not opposed it. Endorsements and sponsorships can be secured for anything that calls for a give-away program. I remember some years ago when the former mayor of Chicago was assassinated in Florida. Somebody, as a canard prepared some kind of a resolution or petition whose purpose was to provide a medal or an award to the assassin, and secured 300 or 400 signatures. No one ever bothered to ask what was in it.

The people back home do not know what is in this proposed legislation. It is so easy for those who professionally and officially represent various groups to call us off the floor, and in the gilt and gold ornate reception room talk to us about such bills as this. But I think the time has come for John Q. Taxpayer to have a voice, because if he discovers that it is going to be costly, he will, in the light of what has happened to our economy, certainly want his publicly elected representatives to stand up and be counted when we appropriate money from the Public Treasury.

There is here evidently more involved than in so many loan cases. But oh, how difficult it is to get a respectable hearing, as a matter of fact, to ascertain what is involved. So at this late

hour in the afternoon, I feel the necessity for saying something for the taxpayers of the country, and for what is involved in the proposal before the Senate.

I say to my friend the Senator from Alabama that I have not the slightest doubt that the bill, if enacted, will be of good service. I have no doubt that people will like it when it is put into effect. They always do. I remember what the distinguished former Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, said to me when I was a young Representative years ago. He put his arm around my shoulder at the Mayflower Hotel when we were talking about subsidies from the Federal Treasury and said, "My boy, you will find that at first the people will rather demur at the idea. Later on they will expect it, and finally they will demand it."

Mr. President, there is being set in motion now a program to reach into every county in the United States of America, and even that will not be the end. My good friend the Senator from Alabama read from the testimony of Dr. Emerson a statement which indicated that if the proposed legislation were enacted it would minimize the pressure of the whole controversial question of socialized medicine.

In my considered judgment, it will not do anything of the kind. It will augment the pressure, for in proportion as people learn to get more and more free things from the Federal and State treasuries, it will break down their resistance; and if they think someone else is going to pay the bill, they will be on hand with their requests.

So we are initiating a program which, according to the testimony in the Eighty-first Congress, finally will take \$240,000,000 a year out of the pockets of the taxpayers, either through the instrumentalities of the States or through the instrumentality of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, today people are alert to the question of economy. Someone identified with a small-business organization telephoned my office yesterday and said, "How much of your mail addresses itself to economy?" We made a little sampling. My mail now runs approximately 1,500 or sometimes 2,000 first-class letters a day. One-third of the mail identifies itself with the issue of economy and taxation and spending, and there is a reason for it.

This is a red letter day in the calendar; today is the 15th day of March 1951. I see in the newspapers pictures of great queues of people gathering at the offices of the collectors of internal revenue. What for? To make their peace with Uncle Sam; and, Mr. President, making peace with the tax gatherers today is a far more costly proceeding than it ever was before. If we impose upon the people of this country the taxes contemplated in the President's message, there is going to be more and more demurring, and the people will wonder what kind of stewards we are.

So we have to think a little bit not only about the desirability of these programs—of course, nearly everything that

presents itself is desirable—but about the cost, as well, particularly in a period of emergency.

Is there anything of an emergency nature about this measure, Mr. President? First of all, standards will have to be set up in connection with the program called for by this measure. The standards will have to be approved by the Surgeon General, and subsequently the money will be disbursed. It is entirely likely that the tension and the emergency could pass away before this bill could be expressed in the form of effective action in the remote corners of the country, certainly, and very likely in a good many other corners of the country, as well. There is no showing that this is an emergency bill; at least, I have not seen such a showing. But it is so felicitous and it is so easy today to tie everything into the defense picture.

In the first place, I do not like the fantastic language of this bill. There is something fascinating about legislative language, Mr. President. I can get the biggest thrill out of it, and then I wonder what its implications are. I wonder whether we have sufficient time in a busy day to spell out all the facets of the language in the bills which come here for our attention.

Let us examine this bill for a moment. We find that, in the beginning, it says:

The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

Mr. President, that is one of those wonderful phrases. It is like the phrase that appears in every appropriation bill with which I am familiar. I used to sit back and chuckle a little bit in the Appropriations Committee because at a time when I knew we were busted, when I knew we had a deficit, and when I knew that in order to obtain money, our Government had to borrow, we were still sitting there and having to work with an appropriation bill which said:

There is hereby appropriated out of the Treasury from funds not otherwise appropriated—

And that was said at a time when there were no funds actually in the Treasury, as we would have found if we had cast a balance sheet and had paid the bills.

So in this bill we find one of those happy phrases.

What does the Congress find and declare in this measure, Mr. President? No wonder the courts today say there is no such thing as legislative intent. Great lawyer that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is—and I have great respect for him—I doubt if he could determine the legislative intent in this instance. I must say that I am fascinated by some of the court decisions and some of the interpretations the law school professors make, for in them we find the statement that "legislative intent" is a fiction; and so it is held that it is for the Court to say what was in the mind of Congress. It is no wonder, Mr. President, that the courts do that today, because I myself sometimes wonder what the legislative intent is.

But in this bill we, as a solemn, deliberative body, begin by saying:

The Congress—

And that includes every one of us collectively and severally—

hereby finds and declares that—

(1) adequate protection of the Nation's health is essential to the security and well-being of our country and cannot be achieved unless public health services are available in every locality through adequately staffed and properly equipped local public health units.

Mr. President, I shall not quarrel with the objective. I only say that I grew up in a small town, and did not know what a public health officer was. I came through the measles, diphtheria, and all the contagious diseases to which childish flesh is heir. I am not quarreling with the objective; but it seems to me that is very extravagant language to use—when it is said in the bill that the security and well-being of our country cannot be achieved otherwise.

Then in the bill the Congress further declares:

(2) at present more than 40,000,000 persons in the United States live in areas not served by local public health units, and less than 10,000,000 persons live in areas served by units which meet minimum public health standards.

Mr. President, that may be, and it may be desirable to achieve that objective.

Then we find the following statement in the bill:

(b) It is therefore the policy of the Congress, and the purpose of this act, in the promotion of the general welfare and in the interest of national security—

That is what this bill says. However, there is no showing that this program will get started while the tensions continue upon us. It may take quite a long time before the program provided by this bill can begin before we can tool up and set up the instrumentalities for which provision is made, particularly in the remote corners of the country.

So, Mr. President, the achievement of all these glorious and fine objectives "to assist the States through the measures provided for in this act in developing and maintaining local public-health units," and so forth, is going to be realized from now on.

So it is proposed that we set in motion a program which will be something more than what my distinguished friend the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] said when he said, "This is coordination."

I say to my friend this is an expansion; and if we are going to expand every desirable thing that has been authorized, I do not know where we are going to get the money.

Let me admonish my colleagues—and certainly I do not do so in a captious or patronizing spirit, for I feel very humble about it, but I cherish a sense of alarm about the solvency of our country at a time like this—let all of us be aware of the fever, as it were, the inflationary fires, as it were. I ask my colleagues to examine their mail and see what it shows.

Today I had to send to the OPS to get a better statement than I could contrive about the prices which are going up notwithstanding a great galaxy of people

who have issued a variety of directives. Prices are going up. Why? First, because there is goodness knows how much money in the country today, and there will be more money in proportion as we spend on Federal programs and enhance the flexibility of bank credit and make it possible for people to spend more and more. We are not going to put any cap sheaf on it by means of controls, for controls are only a secondary remedy. Mind you, Mr. President, when we impose controls and at the same time continue to shovel coal into the fire pot under the boiler, the result will be that we will blow up the boiler before we get through. That is what I sense with a feeling of alarm about what is going on in the country today. We do not serve our country, of course, by adding to the expenditures.

When I submitted myself to the electorate last year, and sensed a great wave of reaction—as I am sure was the experience of all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who also submitted themselves to the electorate last year—I thought that surely there was a great feeling of alarm in the country. It is apparent among the humble people who now are preparing their tax returns, and who find that, with a modest income of \$2,000, they may have to pay Uncle Sam as much as \$400 out of that modest stipend before they can get "off the hook."

Mr. President, are we going to improve that situation or ameliorate the inflationary fever by authorizing more and more expenditures and by pouring more and more money into the economic bloodstream of the country? I doubt it very much.

It is rather singular to me to note the vitality of bills which have in them a lot of "give away." The Members of the Senate will remember that this bill came before the Senate Monday afternoon. I rose at that time and objected; I thought that if no one else would object, I would object; and I did. I made a few observations of sorts, bearing generally upon this theme. That was on Monday, and this is Thursday afternoon. However, like the cat with nine lives, the bill is back upon this floor now. I did not anticipate that it would be here this afternoon, and I had scant opportunity to go back and refresh myself on the testimony and on the hearings regarding this matter. However, whenever there is free money for the States, whenever there is a hand-out and a give-away, such bills have an astonishing amount of vitality. How quickly they come back.

Mr. President, we are familiar with the purposes of the bill. I shall not weary the Senate at this hour in the afternoon by describing them in detail. The bill calls for the setting up of health units in the respective communities. However, I believe I shall allude to one item which came up in connection with an inquiry made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I do not know whether I understood him correctly, but I understood him to say that one of the purposes of the bill is to stimulate or improve the program of industrial-accident prevention.

Is that a correct statement of what the Senator from Minnesota said?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In response to that, I can say only that on page 6 of the bill, where it defines the types of services which shall be considered public health services, the bill recites:

The diagnosis and prevention of disease, the control of communicable disease, health education, demonstrations, sanitation, vital statistics—

And this is a good one—

the training of personnel for State and local public health work, and other aspects of preventive medicine, but shall not include medical, dental, or nursing care except in the diagnosis or prevention of disease or the control of communicable disease or the promotion, establishment, or maintenance of industrial accident prevention programs.

Is the junior Senator from Illinois in error, or is the Senator from Minnesota in error, and is the error concurred in—if it is error—by the Senator from Alabama? I am only interested in having the Senate adequately and properly advised as to what is in this bill. What will it do? How much will it cost? Who will pay the bill? What will it do to the solvency and the economy of the United States?

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota was merely referring to the preventive medical care aspects of this bill. There are two types of medicine—preventive medicine and curative medicine. He felt that this bill, as it applied to the local jurisdictions of government, in the local public health work, would do much to aid the industrial economy, particularly in the case of industrial plants, by combatting industrial disease and industrial accidents, and by the kind of work which can be done by the local public health officer. I think the point which the Senator from Illinois has in mind is, that there are other measures before the Congress, outlining a broad program of industrial-accident prevention. Those measures are to be acted upon separately. This bill does not authorize a full-scale industrial-accident-prevention program, but certainly it does not in any way prevent local public health officers from caring for the health and welfare of people who may work in industrial plants.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may have misinterpreted and completely misunderstood my friend from Minnesota, and certainly I would do him no injustice or injury in that respect; but I got the clear and distinct impression that this bill was designed to stimulate accident-prevention programs; and there is a specific exception in the bill.

I may say to the Senate that if it should vote down this bill—and it should vote it down in this period of strain upon the finances of the Government, when no representation as to its emergent character has been made which in my judgment is persuasive—such action would not preclude the Government from rendering services of the kind proposed. In the Seventy-eighth Congress we passed Public Law 410. I was there

when it was passed. In section 314 of that bill provision is made for grants and services to States. It contains the language, "To enable the Surgeon General to assist, through grants," and so forth, a varied line of services, in an amount not to exceed \$20,000,000. That power is in existence today; it can be exercised; and in my judgment it is equal to nearly every emergency situation which can arise. But is this body now, without adequate debate, in my judgment, going to authorize an expenditure which will place a burden of \$80,000,000 on the Federal Treasury and \$160,000,000 on the local treasuries, before we get through?

Something was said to the effect that the enactment of this bill would not greatly expand personnel. Mr. President, I can only say to my senatorial colleagues, I wonder what the money is to be used for? Obviously, there are going to be some facilities. Obviously there are going to be some appliances. Obviously there is going to be the need of light, heat, and power. Obviously, we are going to have to locate the personnel somewhere. Obviously there are going to be paper clips, rubber bands, some waste paper, paper tabs, and that sort of thing. But in essence, very much of the money will be devoted to personal services and to traveling expenses from one area to another, and this will be done at a time when the emergency agencies of the Federal Government are increasing in number by leaps and bounds.

Where do we finally stop? I ask it in all humility. Consider the \$17,500,000,000 budget. It does not tell the whole story. I know about the unliquidated authorizations, which are always made in prior years, for which money must be appropriated. That is one of the artful dodges in the appropriations procedure. We pass an authorization bill, which it is said will cost only \$3,000,000 for the blueprints in the first year. The next year it will be \$10,000,000; the next year, \$50,000,000; the next year, \$100,000,000. That is the way those things climb. So, in addition to what the eyes see, there are unliquidated authorizations for which there will be requests for appropriations; and there will be added supplementary and deficiency appropriation bills, and all the rest of the things that come along.

The President wants \$97,500,000 for the Voice of America. My good friend from Connecticut [Mr. Benton] and I, over the years, when he was at the other end of the Avenue, used to confer. He would come, gracious, kindly, gentle, able gentleman that he is, to visit with me at length regarding the Voice of America. We used to have little group meetings to see what might be done about it, in order to carry the story of America on the air lanes into the innermost recesses of the Soviet Union, in the hope that some day contrition and a chastened heart might ease the tension of the world. It was a modest program then. I think the initial request was for \$10,000,000. Now there is a request for \$97,500,000. My, how Topsy has grown.

There comes a deficiency bill for \$1,400,000,000 for a variety of purposes. We are nowhere near June 30, when the fiscal year comes to an end, and I have an idea, if I can correctly interpret the charitable impulses and the generous instincts of the gentleman who is the boss of the Budget Bureau—I am referring to the President—that we have not seen the last of the supplemental deficiency appropriation bills which will be sent to the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. No; there will be a good many more, and it will be interesting to see what the total summaries of the budget figure will be when, at long last, we wind up our labors, some time late on the night of June 30, perhaps pushing back the clock, and the busy clerks in the Appropriations Committees draw the line and find out what an aggregate burden has been placed upon the people of America. Are they not entitled to the greatest diligence and devotion upon the part of their elected representatives in both bodies, in the hope that wherever we can we should save some money, that wherever we can we shall keep the inflationary forces to a minimum; and that wherever possible, when we resolve between the indispensable and the things that are desirable, we shall be on the side only of those things which are imperative, in the hope that the taxpayers may get a break?

Mr. President, I could suggest programs *gaioire*, programs which are very desirable; but is its desirability the only criterion for a program in an hour of emergency? Unless all signs fail, there will be tremendous amounts estimated and requested for all security and defense purposes.

I know how easy it is to say, "Oh, it is only \$20,000,000," or "it is only \$80,000,000," or "it is only \$240,000,000 a year that will be taken out of the pockets of the taxpayer." But where will it finally stop? I do not know. An old man once taught me what a million is. He said, "Look at your watch, and watch the second hand. You can see it every second, every minute, every day, every night, every week, every month, every year—and in 3 years it would go around 1,000,000 times." How much is that in terms of dollars? I do not know.

Frankly, I have been engaged in the business of working in the field of appropriations for a good many years, and I have now no adequate, finite concept of \$1,000,000 or \$1,600,000,000; and I doubt whether even the members of the Budget Bureau have. I am confident that the President of the United States has no adequate concept of \$1,000,000,000, because he would not use the term so easily, and he would not, with such felicity, send us these estimates, in the face of the kind of budget which confronts us at the present time.

To summarize, Mr. President, I do not believe a case has been shown. There is at the present time no emergency quality about this bill. It is going to take a while to carry out the program. It is desirable, but it is not absolutely imperative. It is going to add to the bigness of Government; and, goodness knows, it is big enough in its civil dimensions to-

day. I have forgotten how many civilian employees the Government has, but I saw the last estimate, I think, by my friend the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], who, by the way, has rendered a great service to the country by keeping the people advised about the proportions of the Federal payroll. I suppose, however, that, as of now, the civilian complement must be about 2,200,000. That is a large number of people. This bill is going to add to it. Do we have to do it now, desirable as it is, and add to bigness, when there has been no justification and no showing that this bill comes in an emergency category?

Mr. LANGER rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did my friend wish me to yield?

Mr. LANGER. I want the floor when the Senator gets through.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I desire to refer to one other thing. My friend may comfortably repose in his easy chair for a few moments, for it will take about 10 minutes.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator, but I fear that someone else might get the floor. I want to answer my distinguished friend from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite all right.

I make this point with respect to this bill. It is said this is probably going to serve as a damper upon the pressures, with which we have become familiar, to socialize the healing arts. My own notion is that this bill is going to energize those pressures. As I think of socialism, I think in terms of control. It is unnecessary to socialize a country by taking it over and making it the property of the Federal Government. That is done through the instrumentality of control. Laski, the great exponent and interpreter of socialism in Great Britain, demonstrates that fact very forcibly in a book which came from the press not long ago. Mr. President, control is the back door. Where are the controls in this bill? Simply this. Standards are set up and, it is said to the States, "You comply, or you will get no money. If you comply, you will get money." So each State can become a mendicant and say, "We will do what you want us to do, in the hope that under this formula we shall receive a grant-in-aid for this purpose."

Mr. President, we are building up this pyramid of control. The bill is nothing more than one of the rocks in the structure. It is on that basis, I say, we are going to energize the pressure force and then we shall have to deal with the demand or proposal to socialize the healing arts of the country.

I do not want to appear captious about it. I see the problem as best I can. I see it particularly from the standpoint, I say to my good friend from North Dakota, of economy. Oh, yes; I know all about the conditions that prevail. I understand them. I also understand the desirability of economy. At long last all Senators, on both sides of the aisle, will have to deal with the fundamental question of how much we can spend, notwithstanding the credit of the country, notwithstanding the fact that we have a greater industrial plant today than we

ever had before, notwithstanding the fact that we have generated a national income which comes close to two hundred and seventy-five and perhaps three hundred billion dollars a year. I understand the bill. I also understand the demands which are being made today by the humble people who carry the dinner bucket to the factory, whom the tax load is beginning to squeeze.

People who carry their dinner buckets into the factories are beginning to write about it. They are becoming conscious of the fact that every dollar that is taken out of their pockets by the tax collector is one dollar they cannot spend for themselves as they will, where they will, how they will, without dictation from the State and Federal Governments.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator think that it would be better for the Senate on this problem, as on similar problems, to postpone action until we have enacted a tax bill, so that we may see how much we shall have to increase taxes in order to pay for our existing programs?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it would be a sensible thing to do. Mr. President, I am not insensible to the fact that there will not be money available for this program. However, we have the problem of planning the budget. After all, there are only one of two things we can do. Of course, if we could find the open sesame we could perhaps get ourselves out of the present difficulty. We must either find the taxes, or diminish spending by the Federal Government. In my judgment it is just as simple and just as orthodox as that. The program may be desirable, but in an hour of emergency, when it looks as if such a heavy burden is going to be imposed on our people, the least we can do is exercise some caution and defer it until we can see whether or not we are going to make ends meet, or whether we are going to use vast quantities of red ink to foot up the budget totals at the end of the next fiscal year. By that I mean the fiscal year of 1952.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois referred to the alternative of using vast quantities of red ink. That means nothing more than devaluing the American dollar still more, does it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct, and it is a matter that certainly ought to give us some concern today. The first thing I want to allude to in that connection is that there seems to be a rather interesting flight of gold from the country. I admit that I am not a monetary expert. I remember that my good friend, Representative Findley Gray, of Indiana, who was a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, started to make a speech on the floor of the House by saying, "Mr. Speaker, there are 13 monetary experts in the United States, and I am not one of them." So he proceeded to give a money speech. He was talking about gold. I am not a

monetary expert. However, reports indicate that there is a flight of gold from the country. Some people who are trying to get a little money out of the International Bank are willing to take it in currency other than American dollars. What does that mean? Is the American dollar beginning to get a little soft, compared with other currencies? If it is, I do not think we have to look very far for the reason. Therefore I have become concerned about the solvency of the country, because it affects everyone, young and old, rich and poor, rural and urban, in all the corners of the earth.

I simply say today with respect to this bill that there is a little more to it than meets the eye. My friend from Alabama said that now it will cost \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000. The whole story is that when the program is articulated it will be \$80,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury, and \$160,000,000 out of local treasuries, or a \$240,000,000 burden on the taxpayers of America, in addition to the burdens they already carry.

Mr. President, before I yield the floor I should like to say to my very good friend from North Dakota that while we were visiting together a little while ago he said, "Well, if you are going to throw it to the east and west and spend it for people everywhere, let's spend a little on our own people." I recognize the logic of his position. However, I have a better answer. I think we had better start to cut down on the aid programs to everyone under the sun. Such programs only add to the danger with which America is confronted at the present time. Long before anyone in this body or anyone in the other body was saying very much about the Marshall plan my distinguished colleague from Illinois and I were on a platform at Quincy, Ill., and I said, "I think the time has come now to put the knife in, and put it in deep."

I shall be as charitable as I know how to be. I shall be as equitable and as decent as I know how to be. I shall be all that to my own people, and then I shall try to keep faith with them by saying, "Since we deny it to you, we will deny it to others also."

I am not in favor of cutting on roads, for example, and saying to the American people, "You must embrace the gospel of austerity. You must sacrifice." I do not think we can say it with good grace, when we are lolling around in the sunshine in sport shirts. Under such circumstances it is rather funny to say to people they must be austere and must make sacrifices. First let us do a little sacrificing and practice a little austerity in government. Let us first meet the challenge of austerity. One way to do it by making sure that we do not spend and authorize over our heads, and thus jeopardize the fiscal integrity and solvency of this country.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say. It is a very simple story. Economy is old-fashioned. It reminds me of the sweet young mother who called the doctor to come and attend her baby. Finally the doctor said, "Well, my dear, just give the baby some castor oil."

She was a rather arty person, and she said, "Doctor, castor oil is so old-fashioned."

The kindly doctor said, "I know, my dear, but babies are old-fashioned things, too."

Mr. President, economy is an old-fashioned thing. It savors of horse and buggy days. I am only too glad, however, to say a few kind words in behalf of economy, for in economy, in frugality, and in the thrift of our Government I think we shall ultimately find ourselves and our salvation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am very much surprised by my distinguished friend from Illinois. I am surprised to hear him make the argument he has made. For 4 years I was president of the board of health of my State. I met with members of the board of health from other States, among them the great State of Illinois. I do not know whether my distinguished friend is familiar with the fact that it was the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago which in my opinion did the finest job of stamping out communicable diseases of any State and certainly of any city in the entire United States.

He talks about economy. Today in Chicago they are tearing down three solid blocks of buildings. Why? To build the Cook County Hospital. They have appropriated \$80,000,000 for the work. The State of Illinois is a rich State. It has an enormous income.

I want to take my friend to some counties, such as Sioux County in North Dakota, where there is not even a doctor. The county is so poor that in ordinary times not even one doctor will locate there. Does the Senator think that health education is not needed there? If hog cholera breaks out in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, or North Dakota, they will rush out hog specialists and veterinarians to stamp out hog cholera. Bangs disease comes along and they send for the best experts from all over the country. They even get the experts from Brazil, as they did a short time ago. It seems that we think more in this country of preventive medicine for the hogs than we do of human beings, especially little children.

I remember when we had before the Senate the loan to England of \$3,750,000,000. Senators who were on the floor may remember that I offered a substitute. It was voted down. It dealt with good roads and schoolhouses. Former Senator Lucas of Illinois was the majority leader. When I offered an amendment providing for a urinalysis to be made of every man, woman, and child in the country who desired it, he ridiculed the idea, not knowing that the Rockefeller Foundation for 25 years had been advocating that very thing.

Mr. President, a short time ago in the city of Washington we had a free heart clinic. A little while later we had a free chest clinic. A little later we had a free diabetes clinic. That shows that the doctors and nurses of the country are cooperating in every possible way.

Consider for a moment diabetes. This is the first time that we have ever had a National Diabetes Week. What happened? The doctors who were in authority estimated that there were in the United States 800,000 diabetics. What did the result of the clinics show? It

showed that we had more than 2,000,000. Diabetes Week resulted in the discovery of 1,200,000 people who did not know they had diabetes until after Diabetes Week. If we had had the health education provided for in this bill, what would have happened? If we had followed the recommendation of the Rockefeller Foundation, it would have meant that every man, woman, or child who desired to send in a sample of urine would have had a free analysis made. The result would have been that for the trifling sum of 2½ cents three diseases could have been detected. By spending \$2.50 the doctors could detect 23 diseases.

Why should not a man or a woman, or a family living 40 or 50 miles out in the country, in a county which has no doctor, or in a county where sometimes for weeks the people do not get their mail, have the right to send specimens in to some county health authority, partly supported by the United States Government? As I remember the statistics, in the last war 688,000 boys were turned down because they could not pass the health tests provided for the Army, the Navy, and other forces.

Mr. President, it can be readily seen that for the trifling sum of 2½ cents, as the Rockefeller Foundation says, three diseases can be detected by analysis. By spending \$2.50 they can detect 23 diseases. Is not that more important than appropriating money for the control of Bang's disease or hog cholera?

So I say to my friend from Illinois, for whom I have the greatest admiration, that there is nothing new about this proposal. It is said that the situation is not emergent. There has been an emergency for scores of years in this country. Hundreds of thousands of people are lying in their graves because they did not have a urinalysis. I remember trying a case at Carson, N. Dak. The foreman of the jury weighed about 220 pounds. He was an outstanding farmer of that community. Two months later he died in diabetic coma. He never knew that he had diabetes.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, I would say to my friend from North Dakota that we have any number of such statutes on the books today, notably one we enacted in the Seventy-eighth Congress, Public Law 410, which authorizes the Surgeon General to train health personnel and to conduct demonstrations, with authority to spend to the extent of \$20,000,000. We have a variety of services under the Social Security Act. States participate in a great deal of this kind of activity. Must the entire load be on the Federal Government? Must we build up a bureaucracy at a time when there is an emergent situation on the outside?

The thing is as long as it is broad. The Senator will not get much of an argument from me. I have not passed on the desirability or undesirability of these things. I do not measure them in comparative terms, as against Bang's disease and the other diseases, because when all is said and done, if in connection with the agricultural program we do not control such things as Bang's

disease, contagious abortion, and tuberculosis in cattle, and integrate such controls into the health program, obviously we might as well forget about trying to maintain the health of the Nation. We cannot pour tubercular milk into a country or feed the people with animals which are diseased and accomplish anything in the field of public health. But we have kept these programs within bounds, as a matter of fact. During a time of emergency, there is always the question of keeping a program within bounds.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend. I suppose he, like every other Member of this body, has received letters from young men in his State pleading for an opportunity to get into a school of medicine. At North Dakota University only 28 doctors a year can be educated. Citizens have come forward and said, "If you will take my boy into medical school, I will gladly help the University of North Dakota with a contribution toward an endowment fund."

In my office today there are at least 10 appeals from boys—not all North Dakota boys; some are from New York and some are from other States—who are endeavoring to get into medical school. If my distinguished friend from Illinois can find a place where those 10 boys can get into medical school, I wish he would name the school.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad that my friend from North Dakota asked me about that. I have listened to a great deal of this discussion. On Monday I objected to a bill to provide subsidies to schools, up to \$500, particularly schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. At long last the Federal Government, through the back door, is going to get its hands upon the secondary institutions.

This is a question which has never been answered. It is said, "We will provide the buildings. Just get the money and you can get the students." What I want to know is, where is it proposed to get the professors of physiology, histology, surgery, anatomy, and all the rest? A professor is not made overnight. Certainly we are not going to "sic" an amateur professor onto a group of medical students, and subsequently turn them out at standards well below the traditional standards of America.

Mr. LANGER. It is evident that my distinguished friend has not even read the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not in this bill.

Mr. LANGER. It is in the bill, on page 7, line 3.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This bill does not provide for schooling.

Mr. LANGER. The bill, if enacted, would "set forth a program for establishing and maintaining adequate State public health services, including programs in mental health."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Manifestly we cannot establish such services without doctors. We must have doctors, and we must have nurses.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to have my friend from North Dakota show me a line in the bill which calls for the education of doctors.

Mr. LANGER. Of course the distinguished Senator knows that the bill does not mention doctors, and for a very good reason. If it mentioned a doctor, my friend would be here screaming, "Socialized medicine!" However, I call attention to the very words which the Senator himself read a few moments ago, on page 6, line 17, showing that this money would be used for health education.

The doctors estimated that there were 800,000 diabetics. During Diabetes Week it was discovered that there were 1,200,000 more. I say that that is one step toward health education. If we had had such a service 20 years ago, thousands of people would not be lying under the sod now.

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

Mr. LANGER. Just a moment, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Some of the very finest work along this line has been done by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. They have gone into State after State. I suggest to my distinguished friend that he consult Jim Farley, who has had a great deal to do with that kind of work, as head of the Order of Elks. In his own State of Illinois the Senator can go to the head of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, which has a committee working on this identical problem. He will receive an education which will stand him in good stead. I can assure him that he will find, by looking up past records, that there have been cases of little children 10 or 11 years old with ossified bones, whose entire bodies could be lifted by taking hold of one arm. Such cases were discovered by the Elks in going over the country. This work is all voluntary. The Shriners have done a magnificent job. It has been voluntary, but the work has not been integrated, as it would be under the terms of this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I ask the Senator a personal question? Is he a member of the Elks?

Mr. LANGER. It happens that I am; but perhaps not of the same order as that to which the Senator from Illinois belongs. I happen to be an honorary member of the colored Elks. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have been a member of the Protective and Benevolent Order of Elks for a good many years, and I think I am entirely familiar with the programs they carry on in the field of health and medical aid to crippled children. But I want to keep the record straight, Mr. President. There is not a line in the bill providing for the education of a medical student. If my friend can find any, I am willing to eat that page of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the bill does provide for health education, and in my opinion nothing can be more important than such education, for which I fought at the time the British loan bill, against which I voted, was under consideration. I may say to my friend from Illinois that at the very time he may have supported the Marshall plan, if he supported it while he was a Member of Congress, I was speaking against it and voting against it, and I have been against it all the time. I have not voted for a single dollar to be paid out of the United States Treasury to any foreign country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will shake hands with my friend from North Dakota, because I voted against the British loan also. I took the Marshall plan on faith. I accepted the extravagant averments which were made at the time, but I am not going to do it again. I am going to vote with my eyes open.

Mr. LANGER. I am glad to hear the Senator say that he will keep his eyes open in connection with any further proposals under the Marshall plan, and I hope he will keep his eyes open when he comes to vote on the pending bill.

KOREA

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes to address himself to the question of Korea and to make a reasonable suggestion about that blood-drenched and sad situation.

On November 28, 1950, in speaking for many Americans who cannot speak on this floor for themselves, I spoke to the Senate about Korea and about Gen. Douglas MacArthur. What I said can be found in volume 96, part 12, pages 15939, 15940, and 15941 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On that occasion I probably consumed about 15 minutes of the Senate's time. Because I shall now speak on the same subject and for identical reasons I shall detain the Senate but a very few minutes.

In recent weeks the Senate of the United States has been deeply and seriously preoccupied with the manpower bill and with the so-called great debate which revolves around the monumental question of whether American forces shall be committed in peacetime to an international army and whether the policy decision involved shall be made by the Executive, or by the Congress, or by both branches of the Government working in concert with each other. In grappling with both of these complicated issues the Senate has been endeavoring to work out the best possible security system for America.

The Senate has already taken affirmative action on the manpower bill. We can therefore forget this question for the time being. The troops to Europe issue has not reached the floor of the Senate. In my opinion we can safely defer action on that question in favor of working for victory and peace in Korea. As matters stand in Korea today we are headed neither for victory nor for peace.

On November 28 Gen. Douglas MacArthur accused Communist China of hurl-

ing more than 200,000 troops against the collapsing allied line in Korea "in an entirely new war." He said China's full-scale intervention posed issues beyond his authority and asked the United Nations what they wanted to do about it.

General MacArthur made this declaration 3½ months ago. He placed the need for affirmative policy action squarely in the laps of the United Nations. That was 3½ months ago. What, I must ask, has the United Nations done in the last 3½ months?

Have they given to General MacArthur the authority to destroy the enemy wherever he may find them? Have they demanded greater personnel and equipment contributions from those many nations which resolved in June of 1950 to stop the aggressor? The United Nations have done no such thing. Have they recognized that the Chinese Communists are currently endeavoring to build up and prepare for a large-scale spring offensive? Because of what the United Nations has not done in the last 3½ months I have no reason to believe that the United Nations is endeavoring to satisfy the requirements which any large-scale offensive by the enemy will force upon our armies in the field.

General MacArthur advised America and the United Nations 3½ months ago that victory on the battlefield could never be reached unless the United Nations provided him with greater personnel strength and with the authority to destroy the enemy's ability to destroy us.

After advising all of us of what must be done if we ever expect to reach a decision on the battlefield General MacArthur returned to his work of doing a magnificent job with the limited forces at his command. After the Chinese Communists in November created an entirely new war our allied forces suffered one reverse after another. Before the impetus of that November offensive could be stopped and contained our forces were driven back to the vicinity of the beachheads we had occupied last June. In recent weeks our side has been successful in a tactical sense. We have taken the initiative from the enemy and have regained a portion of the territory we were driven from in the early days of the winter. We are now again approaching the thirty-eighth parallel from the south. During the course of every recent day enemy losses have been far greater than our own. Within the limits of a totally impossible situation the United Nations forces are doing well.

On Wednesday, March 7, General MacArthur was moved again to speak of the future. He said in language we can all understand that this accordian war of ours can go on practically forever without reaching a decision. He said that every foot of the progress we make in these days of our success on the battlefield is a move in the direction of encountering the same catastrophe which overwhelmed our forces last November. He said that we had been successful in the southern part of Korea because we had room in which to maneuver; because the enemy was working on an overextended supply line; and, because our air power had scores and scores of targets at

which to strike. General MacArthur told us that as we move forward we shorten the enemy's supply lines, we restrict our freedom of movement, and we reduce the number of targets and objectives at which our air power can strike.

Mr. President, what is there for the Senate to do about Korea? Is there anything we can do to be of assistance to General MacArthur and to every man under his command? One of two things I can think of doing is to go on sending General MacArthur replacements for those young men who are being killed and wounded and captured every day. Since the day the war began, and without reference to the gallant efforts and losses made and suffered by the South Koreans, America has contributed 90 percent of the fighting forces and suffered 90 percent of the casualties. As matters stand we not only can, but we must order more and more brave and talented young Americans to take the places in Korea of those who have not got anything more to give. This prospect has as its only reward a full measure of grief and sorrow for every American.

General MacArthur has done everything he can do. He told us 3½ months ago what he needed to reach a military decision. This has been denied him. In the future General MacArthur can only tell us what he has twice stated before. As of this minute General MacArthur is as tragic a figure as is to be found in all history. He is required 7 days out of every week to send his men forth to die without offering to those who fight the prospect of eventual victory. No less tragic figure than General MacArthur is every human being under his command. For them there is little ahead but frustration and futility.

Mr. President, it has been time for a long time to reach an understanding with the United Nations. General MacArthur has tried and failed to secure this understanding. We in Congress may fail but we ought to determine to try to reach that understanding.

On February 1 the General Assembly of the United Nations created a Sanctions Committee and condemned Peiping for aggression in Korea. It is to this Sanctions Committee that we in America must probably look for action. Ernest A. Gross is our American representative on the Sanctions Committee. What does Mr. Gross have in mind for our future?

Under a Lake Success date line of March 7, the New York Times referred to Mr. Gross. It quoted him as saying that within a few days the United States will present to the Sanctions Committee some of its own ideas for steps that could be taken against the aggressor.

The Times article went on to say this:

The plan to consider new efforts to increase contributions of United Nations members to the international army in Korea, Mr. Gross declared, was made before General MacArthur's warning today of an indefinite stalemate.

So far, 13 members of the United Nations—

Thirteen members of the fifty-odd who signed a resolution and pledged them-

selves to stop the aggressor back in June of 1950—

have sent military units ranging from 50 men to 22,000 to fight alongside United States and Republic of Korea forces. Several countries have indicated they would step up their aid, but diplomats here—

Referring to Lake Success—

predicted that there would be no great rush of new assistance as the result of General MacArthur's warning or of any decision of the sanctions committee.

Selim Sarper of Turkey, which has sent 5,500 men to Korea and has seen her troops suffer heavy casualties, said today that members of the United Nations certainly "ought" to contribute more. The trouble, he indicated, is that many members of the United Nations have security interests and commitments in other parts of the world and cannot see their way clear to releasing more men for Korea.

Mr. President, let me interpolate to say this about Turkey: What Turkey has done in Korea ought to make a score of nations I could name totally ashamed of themselves. Turkey had less reason to participate in the war in Korea than a score of nations I could mention. Turkey sits right on the boundary of Russia. Turkey had a right to say, "Our national interest is here. Our fear of the Soviet is supreme. We are not, nor have we been permitted to become, a member of the Atlantic Pact, and therefore we have no deep-seated obligation to the nations which are fighting in Korea."

Mr. President, Turkey said no such thing. Turkey has sent to Korea some of the finest fighting men this world has ever known. If every nation among the 53 nations which in June 1950 signed the resolution calling for the stopping of the aggressor had done what Turkey has done, the war already would be over. At least, there is sound reason to support this contention.

Let me suggest at this point, and I think I am correct as to this, that if today there was in the Western World any tangible and real unity which was reflected in a unified "ball team" and major contribution from all the free nations to the United Nations effort in Korea, that unity would be more effective than any atom bomb which could be dropped upon the Kremlin. We are having our monumental and inexcusable troubles in Korea because we do not have enough Turks, or because we do not have enough allies who are motivated by the understanding and the courage and the willingness to participate that the Turks have so clearly demonstrated by their actions and their blood and their sacrifices. One does not need to be an American to get excited over the Turks. All one has to be is a human being.

Let me say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is a very thoughtful member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and who thinks as deeply on this subject as I do and as almost every other Senator does, that if we had in Korea tonight contributions equal to those made by Turkey, from some of our Atlantic Pact friends—and I hold all of them in high regard—there would be no necessity for a Member of the United States Senate to say that unless policy decisions are

soon arrived at, we shall be fighting in a field of such frustration that from now on nothing can happen but the slaughtering of additional Americans. Mr. President, I enjoy having this brief chance to speak a word of appreciation of the very gallant Turks who rose in the face of an aggressor on their own boundaries, and went off to work and fight in Korea for the United Nations and for freedom everywhere.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the wonderful contribution which has been made by the Turks, and I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if he agrees with me that unless the other nations who are members of the United Nations do not immediately move to impose sanctions provided for under the Charter against the aggressors who are defying the United Nations, the very future of the United Nations will be in grave jeopardy.

Mr. CAIN. I agree with the Senator from New Jersey, and in this connection I repeat what some of us have been saying for a long time—that unless a way is found for us to obtain more help from the other Members of the United Nations, from the rest of the free world, not only is the United Nations' effort in Korea likely to be meaningless, but it is likely that freedom will be in jeopardy everywhere on the face of the earth.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator, and I join him in that statement.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am glad to have this opportunity to associate myself with the views of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

I now continue reading from the article in the New York Times:

United Nations delegates for the most part saw almost no chance—

The Senator from New Jersey will be interested in this, in relation to what he has just said—

of the organization's agreeing to what they considered an implied request in the MacArthur statement—authorization to attack the source of the enemy's supplies in Korea.

Mr. Gross said the United States delegation had no instructions now to try to extend the scope of General MacArthur's authority to include action outside Korea. The General Assembly resolution of February 1, setting up the sanctions committee and condemning Peiping for aggression in Korea, he added, did not imply permission to carry the war to Chinese territory.

The United States delegate shied away from further comment on General MacArthur's statement except to say that the United Nations commander was not making recommendations but giving an analysis. Any recommendations from the Unified Command to the United Nations, he declared, would be made by the United States Government itself.

That is the end of the quotation from the New York Times.

Mr. President, permit me to repeat the last sentence of the New York Times story which credits to Mr. Gross the declaration that any recommendations from the Unified Command to the United Na-

tions would be made by the United States Government. In that sentence, for the first time in a long time I see some hope. Now we are told that it is up to the Government of the United States to make recommendations to the United Nations. I had not been aware of that before, so far as General MacArthur was concerned. I suppose I am naive in these matters; I am inclined to take too much for granted. I had assumed, from the time when Gen. Douglas MacArthur became Supreme Commander, that when he made a declaration, an observation or some recommendations, he did so in his role of Supreme Commander of an international army to the United Nations in Lake Success. However, Mr. Gross, our official United States delegate to the Sanctions Committee, says that is not the case. He says that any recommendations to the United Nations affecting Gen. Douglas MacArthur must come through the United States Government.

Mr. President, if it is up to our Government to make recommendations to the United Nations, we might all join together to see that recommendations are considered and submitted to the United Nations without delay.

Gen. Dwight Eisenhower has been named as the supreme commander for an international army in Europe. Before he undertook his duties, he went to Europe to evaluate the European situation. He wanted to determine the character of contributions to be made to the international army by every Atlantic Pact nation. He wanted to determine what America's contribution to that international army ought to be. After his inspection trip he returned to America to discuss his findings and his recommendations with the administration and with the Congress and with the American people. Although the Congress has as yet taken no positive action, it has been and is, through the appropriate committees of the Congress, giving serious consideration to General Eisenhower's report.

The only difference between General Eisenhower and General MacArthur is that the former has been charged with a grave responsibility for endeavoring to prepare Western Europe against war, while General MacArthur is charged with the even graver responsibility for winning the war in which he and his men are engaged. If it was proper—as I believed it was—to require General Eisenhower to talk with the Congress about the future before steps were taken to meet the future, it is just as proper, and the need is much more pressing, for General MacArthur to talk with the Congress, the administration, and the American people about the present and the steps which must be taken now to secure victory in Korea.

If General MacArthur will come to us and tell us what he needs, I am satisfied that the Congress can prevail upon the administration to submit to the United Nations, and to press for action on them, the recommendations for what General MacArthur needs to meet his requirements.

General MacArthur is the commander of a United Nations army, but he is an

American, as are most of the men in his army. General MacArthur knows what these men need to give them the best chance to live. We owe it to these men to give them every opportunity for survival. Let us get together with Gen. Douglas MacArthur and work as a team for the best way out of the prevailing situation, which is completely intolerable.

Mr. President, I have been sitting along with other Senators, for weeks, on the troops-to-Europe question. Nearly every witness maintains that America must provide forces to the Atlantic Pact army, in order that the morale of Europe may be improved and then maintained. I think there is something to be said in support of this contention, but I am totally and completely unimpressed by it, for as long as we continue to be engaged in a war in Korea, which is not going anywhere I want the nations in Europe to work and fight, first, with the United States of America and with the South Koreans, in Korea, before the United States makes additional sacrifices to stimulate Europe's morale for the future.

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

Mr. CAIN. I shall certainly yield in a moment. Until we reach a decision in Korea, no living man can foresee what the future holds for any of us in Europe or elsewhere. I am now pleased to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, what the distinguished Senator is saying is that morale building is really a two-way street, and that the people of the United States of America would like to see the countries of the North Atlantic Pact furnish their fair share of troops in Korea and start fighting there, if they want the morale of the United States to be built up to help them in their countries. Is that not correct?

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator has stated his own position clearly and well; and that position, in part, is my own. I feel that we should settle one thing at a time. I am absolutely convinced that what the Kremlin most fears is unity among free people. That unity is being tested, and it has failed dismally, and this sad fact has been true in Korea for the last 8 months. It is not a case of being bold—I think it but common sense to suggest that we ought to build the unity, about which we talk so much with reference to the future of Europe, in the cross fires of murder and slaughter and bloodshed in Korea; and if we can survive that test, then we shall have much less concern for the future of Europe and other parts of the world.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. Let me add this; I am anticipating the springtime. The weather is getting better here. We cannot forget what happened last winter, when, as the result of our successes in going north in Korea, we put ourselves under the floodgates of the Communists, and, when the floodgates were opened, we found ourselves driven back to the south and those bridgeheads we first fought from last June. I think I have said it somewhere in this statement, but I want to say again that every inch of

progress that is made in Korea by Gen. Matthew Ridgway, the Eighth Army commander, who is Gen. Douglas MacArthur's field commander, is an inch in the direction of another catastrophe. The answer to that catastrophe does not lie on the field of battle, but at Lake Success. If the United Nations at Lake Success permits our unified forces to go up to the Yalu River again without at the same time providing Douglas MacArthur with authority to protect himself and his men, our American and allied friends will face only the annihilation to which they exposed themselves, and which in part they suffered, last November.

That brings me back to my contention that freedom is being held in the balance and in jeopardy in Korea, and all I am asking is that those in Western Europe for whom we have done so much, will stand up now with everything they have at their command, to put out the fire which they said last June should be extinguished by everyone at the earliest possible moment. No one has ever heard the junior Senator from Washington say he was opposed to contributing four ground divisions to General Eisenhower's Atlantic Pact army abroad. I do not think that happens to be the question. They can have four divisions, and if they need them, so far as I am concerned, they can have more; but no divisions, by way of contrast to Korea, are needed anywhere today throughout this world, except in Korea. I think we had better get them there, and get them soon.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator has aroused a very interesting line of thought. If we send divisions into Europe, and the Korean matter is still unresolved, there is a possibility that hordes of Chinese Reds or Manchurians may fall upon our troops in Korea. What then? What would be the situation?

Mr. CAIN. The situation would be but a continuation, though I think a more serious one, of the one which involved the United Nations forces in Korea last November. We only saved ourselves at that time by the skin of our teeth, and because the enemy had to overextend their supply line, and because they did not have any air power.

Mr. GEORGE. But they may have air power.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. If there is an intent and purpose on the part of Russia to move aggressively in Western Europe, she certainly might provide air power and submarine power in order to keep up the fight in Korea.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct. I think the question is deserving of our best thought, I may say to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, and I am pleased to have him suggest that there is some substance in this chain of thought which I am trying to express.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course, like other Americans, I am hoping the Korean affair will be resolved, but it has not been to date; and so long as it is unresolved, we might be deliberately walking into a fight on two opposite sides of the globe.

Mr. CAIN. We are faced with many seemingly insoluble questions in these days. I do not know what is going to happen to Europe, because that lies in the future. I know what has happened and what is happening in Korea. No one will begrudge me this particular comment. The man who is Gen. Douglas MacArthur's field commander, Matthew Bunker Ridgway, is the officer whom I was so highly privileged to have served in a minor capacity for approximately 3 years during the late war. That is to say, I read the newspapers more closely than many other Americans, because so many of my close friends are in Korea. In the late war, General Ridgway had a general staff, which had a chief of staff and five assistant chiefs of staff on it. I was one of those in that lesser category. I saw the mother of one of those staff officers recently here in Washington. She stated that she had but recently heard from her son, Col. Day Searles. His father was well known to Senators who have been here for some years—Major General Searles. General Ridgway, Day Searles writes to his mother, has surrounding him now, with few exceptions, all of the men who did anything and everything we could to serve him when he was corps commander of the only airborne infantry corps in the United States Army during World War II. I sometimes wish in these days that I was not now one of those exceptions. But the point involved is that, as I have read the papers within the past several days, our people are moving rapidly forward, and they cannot find the enemy. I read a statement which was quoted somewhere today, giving credit to General Ridgway, who is highly intelligent, as well as being a brave-hearted human being, in which he said to his forward units, "Be careful not to extend yourselves too rapidly." All he meant was that, as the enemy retreats, for reasons which do not seem to be apparent, one logical assumption is that the purpose is to draw us in, that they are sucking us northward, because they know, on the basis of the present tactical situation, that all they have to do is to entice us across the thirty-eighth parallel and get us up under the Yalu River, and then let those floodgates go, and a few thousand more Americans, together with some brave Frenchmen and Turks and other people, will die, too. So General MacArthur has twice asked the United Nations, "What do you want to do about Korea? Do you want to permit me to fight, or do you not? Just tell me what you want. But until you do, because my life has been devoted to the military, I shall carry out the UN orders, and I shall keep on going forward as best I can, meanwhile losing Americans and other allied troops." There is no way to win a decisive victory in the absence of having the weapons with which to wage total war, in days such as the present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and of the Senator's being a very active member of the Armed

Services Committee, I should like to ask him, "Where will the troops come from to take care of the Korean situation, and also become a part of the international army in Western Europe? Where are they to come from?"

Mr. CAIN. I can give the Senator a factual answer to the question. We are going to have, in due time, a military strength in this country, as the Senator well knows, of approximately 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 men. When those men have been trained in their respective branches, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, there will be among the ground forces in this country more than a score of what we assume will be battle-worthy divisions. From that score or more divisions the four divisions in prospect for Europe can be safely sent. Others from that score or more can be sent off to Korea. The point that I am making is that the war in Korea did not start out nor should it have been permitted to become so largely an American operation. It is an operation of the free nations of the world.

My contention is that we ought to give consideration now, not to troops for Europe, but to troops from Europe to Korea. Therein, I think, lies the best answer—and there may be other answers that I do not know—to the future peace of the world. If we are driven out of Korea, or if we win the war in Korea without having had a full contribution by all of the many nations that signed the aggressor resolution in 1950, we shall not have convinced the Kremlin that the free world means business. I am willing to agree that under conditions I do not foresee that we might win the war somehow in Korea. But beware. As an American, I will deny that America out of its own resources can win a dozen Koreas. If this Korean fire is put out, the fire of aggression may spring up somewhere else. Unless free people everywhere are determined immediately to spring up and quench the fire, freedom is headed in the direction of liquidation. That is why we need in Korea today the very best in men, resources, and leadership which every free nation has at its command.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Congress of the United States finally determines to send four divisions or six divisions into an international army in Europe and the situation in Korea does not improve, and there is an attack in Alaska, where will we get the troops?

Mr. CAIN. The more trouble we have in more places at the same time the more difficult it is to get a sufficient number of troops to handle such given situations.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not likely that it would happen? The Senator is a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. CAIN. No, sir; I would not say it is likely. I would say it is possible.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; I accept the correction.

Mr. CAIN. We are trying to be as objective in our thinking as it is hu-

manly possible to be, because we are dealing with large and difficult subjects.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator believe that if we should assign these troops to a European army and trouble should come in Alaska we would have a right to take the troops from Western Europe and send them to Alaska after they have once been consigned to an international army in Europe?

Mr. CAIN. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. WHERRY. It is not a bad question.

Mr. CAIN. No. I shall study it over the week end.

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

Mr. CAIN. I may say to my good friend from Massachusetts that I have only two more paragraphs to read in my prepared address, which I thought were very important at the time I wrote them, because I believed in them. I still and will continue to believe in them. I think there is justification for giving consideration to the recommendation I mentioned at the outset. I would urge the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief, to bring Douglas MacArthur back to us, so that we might have a better chance to understand where we are going, which not a single person in this room or in our country understands tonight; so that we might better understand what General MacArthur needs and so that we might agree together on a course of action which would achieve our objectives.

Mr. President, if we in the Senate and if America needs any great compelling reason for seeking a Korean solution at the earliest possible minute it is simply this: When Gen. Douglas MacArthur first uttered his words of wisdom and warning on November 20, 1950, American casualties totaled 31,028. On the occasion when Gen. Douglas MacArthur uttered those same words of warning and wisdom on March 7, 1951, American casualties totaled 52,448. A little earlier in the afternoon I got the latest casualty list, as of March 14, yesterday, the year being 1951. The total now is 54,648.

Between those two warnings of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, which every Senator had a chance to listen to and think about and act on, as had Mr. Gross, Secretary of State Acheson, and the President of the United States, wherever he may be tonight, 21,420 Americans were killed, wounded, or reported as being missing in action. Mr. President, our dead, our wounded, our men missing in battle have spoken tragically and eloquently. It is for me and everyone else to do their best to speak for them in their absence on the floor of the Senate. When shall we give heed to the casualty lists? When shall we face reality, as every man in Korea has to face reality, whether he wishes to do so or not? When will we as a Nation seek a solution to the contradictions, the obstacles, and the frustrations which engulf our fighting men and our Nation and freedom everywhere today?

TWO-TERM LIMITATION—NEVADA THIRTY-SIXTH STATE TO RATIFY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it was especially fitting that the State of Nevada should put the twenty-second amendment into the United States Constitution. This amendment, limiting the President to two terms, carries out the intent of the founding fathers; and Nevada, the last frontier State, has the honor of being the State to return the United States to the fundamental principles of a truly representative form of government.

The people of the great State of Nevada are the last people who would submit to a totalitarian rule, which is bound to come from an unlimited tenure in the White House. Nevadans believe in freedom of the individual, and freedom disappears under totalitarianism.

Nevada was the thirty-sixth State to be admitted to the Union, on October 31, 1864. It is well for it to be the thirty-sixth and deciding State to ratify this important amendment. But beyond that, the people of Nevada stand for those wholesome American traits of freedom of enterprise which unfortunately have been discouraged by the socialistic and totalitarian rule which started with the first violation of the two-term-limit tradition.

All of our present troubles stem from that violation. It is going to take this country many years to recover from the harm done. The twenty-second amendment is of course the right start.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point press dispatches dealing with the ratification of the constitutional amendment.

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

[From the Reno Evening Gazette of March 1, 1951]

MALONE PLEASED AS AMENDMENT IS RATIFIED

Speaking of the twenty-second amendment, ratified by the vote of the Nevada legislature Monday, Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, said in Washington today that it was especially fitting that the State of Nevada, the thirty-sixth State to be admitted to the Union, should be the thirty-sixth and deciding State to ratify this amendment.

"This amendment," the Nevada Senator said, "carries out the intent of our founding fathers, and Nevada has the honor of being the State to return the United States to the fundamental principles of a truly representative form of government."

Continuing, Senator MALONE said: "The people of Nevada are the last people who should submit to totalitarian rule, which is bound to come from an unlimited tenure in the White House. Nevadans believe in freedom of the individual, and freedom disappears under totalitarianism."

"Nevada people stand for those wholesome American traits of freedom and enterprise which unfortunately have been discouraged by the socialistic and totalitarian rule which started with the first violation of the two-term-limit tradition."

"All of our present troubles start from this violation. It is going to take this country many years to recover from the harm done. The twenty-second amendment is the right start."

"Several of our Presidents have observed that any President, after being in office for

8 years, could perpetuate himself in power indefinitely, through the political machine built by hundreds and thousands of Presidential appointments and favors. These Presidents, recognizing the great danger to the country in this very thing, chose to observe the precedent set by George Washington. The tradition was tossed out the window when the Communists and Socialists who had taken over in Washington influenced Roosevelt to seek a third and then a fourth term."

[From the Nevada State Journal of February 28, 1951]

MALONE PRAISES ACTION AT CARSON

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE in Washington yesterday praised the action of his home State legislature in becoming the thirty-sixth legislature to ratify the two-term amendment.

He said in a statement that "Nevada, the last frontier State, has the honor of being the State to return the United States to the fundamental principles of a truly representative form of government."

He added that "totalitarian rule . . . is bound to come from an unlimited tenure in the White House."

"Nevada people," he said, "stand for those wholesome American traits of freedom and enterprise which unfortunately have been discouraged by the socialistic and totalitarian rule which started with the first violation of the two-term limit tradition."

MALONE said that President Roosevelt was influenced to seek a third and fourth term by the "Communists and Socialists who had taken over in Washington."

[From the Nevada State Journal of February 27, 1951]

NEVADA VOTE CHANGES CONSTITUTION OF UNITED STATES—SILVER STATE BECOMES THIRTY-SIXTH TO RATIFY LAW LIMITING PRESIDENTIAL TERMS

(By Robert Bennyhoff)

CARSON CITY, February 26.—Nevada, the thirty-sixth State to be admitted to the Union, today became the thirty-sixth State to ratify the constitutional amendment limiting Presidents to two terms.

At 4:30 p. m., the Nevada senate voted 16 to 1 to pass the resolution ratifying the twenty-second amendment. Earlier in the day, the assembly adopted the same resolution by a vote of 29 to 12, including nine Democrats.

Governor Charles Russell, a Republican who took office January 1, said he would immediately notify Wayne Grover, Chief Archivist of the United States, that Nevada had become the thirty-sixth State to ratify the twenty-second amendment, putting it in effect.

WAITED 3 HOURS

The Nevada Senate had waited for more than 3 hours for word from Utah, which only a few minutes earlier had become the thirty-fifth State to ratify the amendment.

Lt. Gov. Cliff Jones, of Las Vegas, presiding officer of the senate, telephoned the president of the Utah Senate early in the afternoon and was told the measure was to be voted on shortly. Jones was told the State of Utah would be happy to let Nevada become the thirty-sixth ratifying State.

The senate then recessed and when informed by United Press of the Utah ratification by a vote of 14 to 8, went immediately into session.

Five minutes later, the senate voted 16 to 1 to approve the amendment limiting the presidents to two terms in office.

Until the last day or so, ratification of the twenty-second amendment had been regarded by many Nevada lawmakers as part of a State political issue. The Democrats, who hold a slim majority in the assembly, at one

time caucused and pledged all party members to vote against ratification.

However, after an appeal from the floor by Don Crawford, a Democratic rancher, that "this matter is too vital for partisan politics," the Democrats held another caucus today and released the pledges.

Nine Democrats joined 20 Republicans in approving ratification and the measure was sent to the senate.

SENATE ACTS SWIFTLY

The upper chamber, where Republicans hold a 11-to-6 majority, acted swiftly and without debate.

John E. Robbins, Elko Democrat and dean of the senate, moved that the ratification measure be made an emergency measure and that all legislative rules be suspended.

"There seems to have been some stigma of partisan politics connected with this measure," Robbins said. "To me, there is no politics involved."

"As a Democrat active in party affairs in the State of Nevada for more than 40 years, I would like to remove the stigma of politics by urging adoption of this measure."

A. V. Tallman, a Winnemucca rancher and majority leader in the senate, said Republicans were very pleased with Robbins' attitude and described the impending passage of the bill as "momentous."

The ratification was approved by a margin of 16 to 1 on the roll call minutes later. The single dissenting vote was cast by Harry Wiley, an Esmeralda mining man, who said he was opposed to the twenty-second amendment on principle.

In the assembly the roll call was as follows:

For ratification: Blum, Boak, Buol, Byers, Capurro, Carville, Chapman, Coulthard, Crawford, Fairchild, Folsom, Francovich, Frazier, Hawes, Hendel, Humphrey, Jepson, Keough, Leavitt, McElroy, Ogee, Primeaux, Ramsey, Rowntree, Slatery, Turner, Walters, Warner, and Whitacre.

Against ratification: Anderson, Barr, Bastian, Christensen, Englestead, Hawkins, Houssels, McCuiston, Melody, Olson, Smith, and Swackhamer.

Not voting: Higgins.

Absent: Seever.

TRUMAN GETS LAST SHOT AT THREE TERMS—AMENDMENT DOES NOT AFFECT PRESENT INCUMBENT

WASHINGTON, February 26.—Final adoption of the twenty-second amendment through action of the Nevada Legislature left President Truman today as the last man who can aspire to more than two terms in the Nation's biggest job.

But if he has the desire—and can get the votes—he can legally match the record of Franklin D. Roosevelt, only man in American political history to break the two-term tradition.

The new constitutional amendment originated with the Republicans, to whom Mr. Roosevelt handed four successive beatings, but had Democratic help in the final drive that put it over.

The twenty-second amendment declares that hereafter no person can be elected to more than two full terms as President of the United States.

It also says that any person who serves more than two years of a predecessor's unexpired term, as did Mr. Truman, can run only once in his own right.

Mr. Truman is specifically exempted, however. The limitation does not apply to him because he was in the job when the proposition was submitted to the States for their approval.

Even though he served more than 3 years of Roosevelt's fourth term, and was elected on his own in 1948, Mr. Truman can run again in 1952 if he desires. He could keep on running as long as he lives.

Some politicians believe, though, that ratification presents an ethical obstacle to his seeking another term on the basis that it reflects widespread feeling that more than eight years is too long for any man.

If Mr. Truman should run, and be elected, in 1952 it would give him almost 12 full years in the job. Mr. Roosevelt had served three full terms and two months and 23 days of his fourth when he died.

It was Mr. Roosevelt's breaking of the two-term tradition which prompted Republican sponsorship of the new amendment to the Constitution.

The Republicans moved in fast when they got control of the Eightieth Congress in 1947 after so many Roosevelt-dominated years out of power.

[From the New York Journal-American of February 28, 1951]

DEMOCRATS AND GOP HAIL BAN ON THIRD TERM

(By Kent Hunter)

WASHINGTON, February 28.—Republicans and Democrats in both House and Senate today hailed ratification of the twenty-second amendment, limiting the presidency to two terms, as "the people's recapture of the Americanism of George Washington."

Senator MALONE (Republican, Nevada), whose State was the thirty-sixth to ratify and so put the amendment automatically into the Constitution, said on the Senate floor:

"This amendment carries out the intent of the founding fathers. Nevada, the last frontier State, has the honor of providing the final ratification to bring back the fundamental principles of truly representative government."

Guy Gabrielson, Republican National Committee chairman, said:

"Nevada's action ends the myth of the indispensable man. Roosevelt broke the precedent on the ground that he was needed to carry on the war. We will not be in a war in 1952 unless Truman gets us into it."

Representative MASON (Republican, Illinois) told the House:

"If this amendment had been passed 20 years ago we would not have sent a sick President to Yalta to barter away America's future. We would not have permitted communism to infiltrate our National Government. We would not have had to stage the Berlin airlift, face a crippling national debt, be in actual war in Korea and facing war in Europe, or be tied down at home by controls and the other trappings of socialism."

Representative RANKIN (Democrat, Mississippi) declared:

"The plea that any man is indispensable in America is silly. America is strong because America always developed strong men to lead us, without setting up a royal political family or permitting delusions of grandeur to nurture the ego of any man."

[From the Elmira (N. Y.) Star-Gazette of February 27, 1951]

TWO-TERM PRESIDENTIAL LIMIT BECOMES LAW; RATIFIED BY THIRTY-SIXTH STATE

WASHINGTON.—From now on, no President of the United States—except for Harry Truman—may be elected to more than two terms.

And under the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution, which for all practical purposes became law last night, no man or woman may serve more than 10 years in the White House.

The amendment, while limiting future Presidents to two elective terms, allows a person who has served 2 years or less of an unexpired term to be elected twice on his own.

As President at the time the amendment was approved by the Republican-controlled

Eightieth Congress, Mr. Truman was specifically exempted.

Thus he would be permitted to run for a second full term in 1952 even though his White House tenure would then fall within the ban set out in the new amendment. He has not said whether he will run.

Utah and Nevada Legislatures acted in quick succession last night to approve the amendment. Nevada completed action at 7:30 p. m. (eastern standard time), becoming the thirty-sixth State to ratify the amendment.

The Constitution requires that amendments to it be ratified by three-fourths of the States—or 36 at present—to become law. A two-thirds majority in Congress is required to submit amendments to the States.

The new amendment could be repealed by the same procedure, of course, just as the eighteenth (prohibition) amendment was repealed by the twenty-first. It was ratified December 5, 1933.

Nevada legislators had stood by to grab for their State the honor of being the thirty-sixth State to ratify the new amendment. Minutes after learning that Utah had approved, Nevada Senators voted 16 to 1 for ratification. The assembly had approved earlier 29 to 12.

At least two other States were also near ratification votes—Minnesota and Maryland. The Minnesota Legislature had suspended the rules to schedule a vote this afternoon in the hope of becoming the thirty-sixth and deciding State to act.

The amendment has been before the States since March 1947.

After an initial spurt of ratification votes, interest in the proposal apparently lagged and only 24 States had acted favorably by the start of this year.

Then came another rush, bringing approval by legislatures of a dozen States within the past few weeks.

The amendment when proposed was generally regarded as a rebuke to the late President Franklin Roosevelt, who won four terms in the White House. He thus broke a two-term precedent set by George Washington, who declined to run for a third term.

James A. Farley, who split with Mr. Roosevelt over the third term, said he was gratified that the amendment had been ratified. In a statement issued in New York, Farley recalled he had been the subject of rather harsh criticism when he opposed the third term.

New York State ratified the amendment in 1948, the nineteenth State to take such action.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of February 27, 1951]

TWO-TERM LIMIT MADE LAW BY THIRTY-SIXTH STATE O. K.

CARSON CITY, NEV., February 26.—Nevada today became the thirty-sixth and last needed to ratify the twenty-second amendment to the United States Constitution limiting the President to two terms.

The amendment now automatically becomes part of the Constitution.

The Nevada Senate acted on the proposal 16 to 1, minutes after learning that the Utah Senate had done likewise to make that State the thirty-fifth to approve the amendment.

United States Presidents by custom have served but two terms, with the exception of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Democrat, who was elected four times.

The new amendment does not affect President Truman. He still may seek another term since the Eightieth Congress, which originally proposed the amendment, excepted the Presidential office holder at that time—Truman.

The proposal cleared the Nevada Assembly 29 to 12 early in the afternoon despite a Democratic majority.

The Senate withheld action through the afternoon until it was advised about 4:30 p. m. (Pacific standard time) (7:30 p. m. eastern standard time) of the Utah Senate action.

The final action of this State followed within 10 minutes.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 27, 1951]

UNITED STATES VOTES TWO-TERM LIMIT ON PRESIDENCY—NEVADA THIRTY-SIXTH STATE TO ACT; H. T. EXEMPT

CARSON CITY, NEV., February 26.—Nevada, the thirty-sixth State in the Union, today became the thirty-sixth and last State needed to ratify the twenty-second amendment to the United States Constitution limiting the President to two terms.

The amendment now automatically becomes part of the Constitution.

The Nevada Senate acted on the proposal 16-1, minutes after learning that the Utah senate had done likewise to make that State the thirty-fifth to approve the amendment.

United States Presidents by custom have served but two terms, with the exception of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was elected four times.

The new amendment does not affect President Truman. He still may seek another term since the Eightieth Congress, which originally proposed the amendment, excepted the Presidential officeholder at that time—Mr. Truman.

The proposal cleared the Nevada Assembly 29-12 early in the afternoon despite a Democratic majority.

The senate withheld action through the afternoon until it was advised of the Utah Senate action.

The final action of this State followed within 10 minutes.

MARYLAND HOUSE ADDS VOICE TO RATIFICATION CHORUS

ANNAPOLIS, Md., February 26.—The house of delegates voted 84-27 tonight to ratify the constitutional amendment limiting the President to two terms in the White House.

However, the question had become academic less than two hours before, when Nevada's endorsement made it a part of the Constitution.

The amendment now goes to the State senate.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 27, 1951]

HARRY TRUMAN CAN RUN AGAIN AND AGAIN IF HE IGNORES SPIRIT OF NEW LAW

Final adoption of the twenty-second amendment left President Truman yesterday as the last man who can aspire to more than two terms in the Nation's biggest job.

But if he has the desire—and can get the votes—he can legally match the record of Franklin D. Roosevelt, only man in American political history to break the two-term tradition.

The new constitutional amendment originated with the Republicans, to whom Mr. Roosevelt handed four successive beatings, but they had Democratic help in the final drive that put it over.

The twenty-second amendment declares that hereafter no person can be elected to more than two full terms as President of the United States.

It also says that any person who serves more than 2 years of a predecessor's unexpired term, as did Mr. Truman, can run only once in his own right.

Mr. Truman is specifically exempted, however. The limitation does not apply to him because he was in the job when the proposition was submitted to the States for their approval.

Even though he served more than 3 years of Roosevelt's fourth term, and was elected

on his own in 1948, Mr. Truman can run again in 1952 if he desires. He could keep on running as long as he lives.

Some politicians believe, though, that ratification presents an ethical obstacle to his seeking another term on the basis that it reflects widespread feeling that more than 8 years is too long for any man.

If Mr. Truman should run, and be elected, in 1952 it would give him almost 12 full years in the job. Mr. Roosevelt had served three full terms and 2 months and 23 days of his fourth when he died.

It was Mr. Roosevelt's breaking of the two-term tradition which prompted Republican sponsorship of the new amendment to the Constitution.

The Republicans moved in fast when they got control of the Eightieth Congress in 1947 after so many Roosevelt-dominated years out of power.

The proposition was sponsored by Representative Michener, Republican, of Michigan, who then was chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and since has retired from Congress. It sped through the House and Senate as one of the first major measures approved that session.

On March 26, 1947, it was submitted to the States for their ratification.

The Republicans had some help, particularly from anti-Roosevelt Southern Democrats, in pushing it through Congress.

Some anti-Roosevelt and anti-Truman sentiment also was credited with giving ratification a lift in some of the southern legislatures.

For example, among the 12 States which ratified the amendment this year were Arkansas, New Mexico, Georgia, Tennessee, Texas, and North Carolina.

Other ratifications this year were voted by Indiana, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, and finally, Nevada.

The 12 ratifications this year which put the amendment over the top were exceeded only by 1947, when the issue was first presented. There were 18 ratifications in the first few months. Then it slowed down. There were 3 in 1948, 2 in 1949, and only 1, Louisiana, in 1950.

When Congress submitted the amendment in 1947, the States had 7 years to decide—until March 26, 1954.

TEXT OF AMENDMENT

Here is the text of the twenty-second amendment:

"No person shall be elected to the Office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of the President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term."

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 27, 1951]

PRESIDENTS SUCCEEDING TRUMAN LIMITED TO 10 YEARS IN OFFICE—AMENDMENT FOR TWO ELECTION TERMS RATIFIED AS UTAH AND NEVADA TAKE QUICK ACTION

From now on no President of the United States—except for Harry Truman—may be elected to more than two terms.

Under the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution, which for all practical purposes became law last night, no man or woman may serve more than 10 years in the White House.

The amendment, while limiting future Presidents to two elective terms, allows a

person who has served 2 years or less of an unexpired term to be elected twice on his own.

As President at the time the amendment was approved by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress, Mr. Truman was specifically exempted.

Thus he would be permitted to run for a second full term in 1952 even though his White House tenure would then fall within the ban set out in the new amendment. He has not said whether he will run.

Utah and Nevada Legislatures acted in quick succession last night to approve the amendment. Nevada completed action at 7:30 p. m., becoming the thirty-sixth State to ratify the amendment.

The Constitution requires that amendments be ratified by three-fourths of the States—36 at present—to become law. A two-thirds majority in Congress is required to submit amendments to the States.

Nevada legislators had stood by to grab for their State the honor of being the thirty-sixth State to ratify the new amendment. Minutes after learning that Utah had approved, Nevada Senators voted 16 to 1 for ratification. The Assembly had approved earlier, 29 to 12.

At least two other States also were near ratification votes—Maryland and Minnesota. The Maryland House approved the amendment by an 84-to-27 vote yesterday, leaving the Senate to act. The Minnesota Legislature had suspended the rules to schedule a vote this afternoon in the hope of becoming the thirty-sixth and deciding State to act.

The amendment has been before the States since March 1947.

After an initial spurt of ratification votes, interest in the proposal apparently lagged and only 24 States had acted favorably by the start of this year.

RUSH IN RECENT WEEKS

Then came another rush, bringing approval by legislatures of a dozen States within the past few weeks.

When it submitted the amendment to the States, Congress provided that to be effective it had to be ratified by the required number within 7 years, or before March 26, 1954.

The amendment when proposed was generally regarded as a rebuke to the late President Franklin Roosevelt, who won four terms in the White House. He thus broke a two-term precedent set by George Washington, who declined to run for a third term.

James A. Farley, who split with Mr. Roosevelt over the third term, said he was gratified that the amendment had been ratified.

In a statement issued in New York Mr. Farley recalled he had been the subject of rather harsh criticism when he opposed the third term.

"I held this view because it was my inner conviction that the Presidency should be limited to two terms and that it was so intended by the founding fathers although they did not put it into law," Mr. Farley said.

FEW FORMALITIES REMAIN

He supported Mr. Roosevelt in 1932 and 1936 and then resigned as Democratic National Committee chairman. Mr. Farley also served as Postmaster General in the Roosevelt Cabinet in the early New Deal years.

Actually a few formalities still remain to be carried out.

After the ratification documents are signed in the final States to act, State officials must notify the Federal Government in the person of General Services Administrator Jess Larson, who has supervision over the archives.

He will then formally proclaim the amendment as a portion of the Nation's basic law.

The 36 States which ratified the amendment, by years, were:

1947: Maine, Michigan, Iowa, Kansas, New Hampshire, Oregon, Illinois, Delaware, Ver-

mont, California, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Ohio, Colorado, Pennsylvania, Nebraska, Missouri, Connecticut.

1948: New York, Virginia, Mississippi.

1949: North Dakota, South Dakota.

1950: Louisiana.

1951: Indiana, Montana, Idaho, New Mexico, Wyoming, Arkansas, Georgia, Tennessee, Texas, North Carolina, Utah, Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, several of our Presidents have observed that any President, after being in office 8 years, could perpetuate himself in power indefinitely, through the political machine built up by hundreds and thousands of Presidential appointments and favors. These Presidents, recognizing the great danger to the country in such a situation, chose to observe the precedent set by George Washington. The tradition was tossed out the window when the Communists and Socialists who had taken over in Washington influenced Roosevelt to seek a third, then a fourth, term.

Mr. President, I desire now to address myself to another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

LABOR AND SMALL BUSINESS VERSUS FREE TRADE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the workingmen, the small businesses, and industrial enterprises of America are being destroyed through the State Department's one economic world program advanced under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended.

To prevent the completion of this program through the adoption of the trade treaties currently being completed at Torquay, England, lowering the tariffs and import fees on a "free trade" basis, the President's authority to enter into such agreements should be terminated forthwith.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the so-called reciprocal trade act, which expires on June 12, 1951, should in no event be extended, because it would continue in jeopardy the jobs and investments of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have several press dispatches printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 15, 1951]

MALONE LASHES AT PLAN TO EXTEND RECIPROCAL TRADE

A bill to permit Congress to recover its constitutional authority over regulation of foreign trade through imposition of tariff and import fees was introduced in the Senate yesterday by Senator MALONE, Republican, of Nevada.

The Senator charged the State Department is moving the United States into an economic one-world by selling out American workers and investors under international trade schemes.

HEARINGS ON EXTENSION

MALONE called for an end to the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 on June 30. The Senate Finance Committee is holding hearings on extension of the act.

Although the committee is expected to support a State Department request for extension, the possibility of a filibuster hung over the Senate.

Senators from industrial States are considering an effort to talk the program to

death. These include Senators WELKER, Republican, of Idaho; CAIN, Republican, of Washington; KEM, Republican, of Missouri; JENNER, Republican, of Indiana; MARTIN, Republican, of Pennsylvania; BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska; and CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana.

CHEAP LABOR IS CITED

The administration program is to be attacked on the ground that it will lower the living standards of American workers by permitting foreign nations to divide up world markets and flood this country with products of cheap labor.

"If the State Department has its way, import fees will be reduced to a point where American industry cannot survive," MALONE told the Senate committee.

"American wages will come down to compete with the low wages in foreign countries. Our American system will be discredited and the Communists here and abroad will have achieved their goal.

"Extension vitally affects every man, woman, and child in America, but the public does not know what is about to happen to them because the one-economic-worlders are putting through the final phase of the free-trade program under cover of war.

HELD UP BY THE WAR

Ironically, our economy is held up now only by the war emergency and deficit financing. Many people do not understand the tariff question, but they understand things to eat, things to wear. These would be taken away from them and their standard of living leveled downward by the economic-one-worlders.

"When the present lowering of import fees passes a rapidly approaching point, our American wage standard and high standard of living will come to a violent and untimely end. There is no need for political one world if our State Department gets us into an economic one world."

SLAVE LABOR PRODUCTS NOTED

MALONE charged the administration is now desperately striving to hide the plight of workers hit by importation of the products of slave labor abroad. He named the textile, watch, hat, shoe, and other industries.

"Despite all this," he said, "the State Department boys are now making a reckless division of our markets with the low-wage nations of the world, selecting the industries that are to be permitted to survive a while longer and those to be sacrificed to build up sweatshops in Europe and Asia, discrediting American enterprise, and advancing the socialistic one-economic-world philosophy."

[From Nevada State Labor News of March 8, 1951]

MALONE CLAIMS TRADE ACT AIMED AT LABOR

"A shotgun is leveled at the head of every working man and woman of my State of Nevada," Senator GEORGE W. MALONE said today, "and when it goes off it will be too late to wonder what happened."

The Nevada Senator made this statement in his testimony this morning before the Senate Finance Committee in opposition to H. R. 1612, a bill to extend the Trade Agreements Act of 1934.

Senator MALONE said: "It is the shotgun of free trade in the nervous hands of an inept State Department. Some people call it 'reciprocal trade' as a catch phrase, while there is nothing reciprocal about it.

"If the State Department has its way, import fees will be reduced to the point where American industry cannot survive, American wages will come down to compete with the low wages in foreign countries, our American system will be discredited, and the Communists, here and abroad, will have achieved their goal.

"Extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, removing the floor from under wages and

investments, vitally affects every man, woman, and child in America, but the public does not know what is about to happen to them because the one-economic-worlders are putting through the final phase of the free-trade program under cover of war. Ironically, our economy is held up now only by means of the war emergency and deficit financing."

[From the Reno Evening Gazette of March 1, 1951]

FLEXIBLE IMPORT BILL INTRODUCED

Senator MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, long an outspoken opponent of the administration's reciprocal trade agreements program, has introduced a bill to replace it with a system of flexible import fees.

Under his measure, which he previously has advocated, this country's tariff rates would be adjusted to wage and living standards in other nations.

MALONE told the Senate his bill would establish an American market for the goods of every nation in the world on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

[From the Pioche Record of March 1, 1951]

MALONE INTRODUCES IMPORT FEES BILL

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Senator GEORGE MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, today introduced in the Senate a bill providing for flexible import fees to take the place of the Trade Agreements Act, which expires in June of this year.

[From the Humboldt Star of March 1, 1951]

MALONE PROPOSES FEES ON IMPORTS

WASHINGTON, February 28.—Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, has introduced a bill to provide import fees to take the place of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which expires in June this year.

MALONE said the reciprocal trade program committed "crimes against the workers and investors of America."

[From the Elko Free Press of February 28, 1951]

MALONE INTRODUCES IMPORT FEE BILL

WASHINGTON, February 28.—Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, has introduced a bill to provide import fees to take the place of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which expires in June this year.

MALONE said the reciprocal trade program committed "crimes against the workers and investors of America."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Senate bill 1122, now before the Committee on Finance, would forthwith terminate the President's authority to continue the administration's free-trade program through further trade agreements under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Senate bill 1040, also before the Committee on Finance, would broaden and make available the escape clause following the expiration of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Senate bill 981, referred to the Committee on Finance, would amend the flexible-import-fee section, section 330, of the 1930 Tariff Act, turn the long-experienced Tariff Commission into a foreign-trade authority, since it more nearly represents the job to be done, and establish markets for foreign nations' goods on the principle of fair and reasonable competition.

To prevent the continuing transfer of American jobs and investments to foreign soil under the One-Economic-World program of the State Department, Congress should recover its constitutional

responsibility to regulate foreign commerce through allowing the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire on June 12, 1951, and stop this vicious and unwarranted attack upon the national economic structure.

PUBLIC HEALTH ASSISTANCE TO STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 445) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and their subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum may be withdrawn and that the order for the call of the roll may be rescinded.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that beginning tomorrow at 12 o'clock, debate on the pending bill shall be limited to 1½ hours, to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents, with only germane amendments to be offered; and that at the end of said period of 1½ hours, debate on each amendment shall be limited to 10 minutes to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not wish in any way to interfere with the attempt of the majority leader to obtain a limitation on debate—let me say that, as I understand, the proposed limitation is not in regard to the final vote on the bill, but is in regard to debate on the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I further understand that it is proposed that beginning at 12 o'clock, debate on the bill shall proceed until 1:30.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And that as to any amendments which may be offered—

Mr. McFARLAND. Any amendments which may be offered must be germane. No amendment which is not germane may be offered, under the unanimous-consent proposal. It is also proposed that, as to any amendments which are offered, debate on them shall be limited to 10 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator be willing to propose that the limitation be 10 minutes to each side on each amendment, rather than 5 minutes to each side?

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought that 5 minutes to each side on each amendment would be sufficient; but I shall propose that the limitation be 10 minutes to each side on each amendment, if the Senator from Nebraska wishes to have that arrangement made.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me make sure that I am not mistaken in my understanding of the unanimous-consent proposal. I understand that the proposal is that the debate be limited to one hour

and one-half—which would be until 1:30 tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to have the limitation provide for only 1 hour of debate on the bill itself, if that would be agreeable.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the majority leader propose that the debate on the bill continue until 2 o'clock, because there are several Senators whom we should like to have here for the debate.

Mr. McFARLAND. The debate on the amendments will take until 2 o'clock, under the proposal I have made.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the unanimous-consent proposal include a provision in regard to motions which may be made?

Mr. McFARLAND. I now include in the proposal a provision that motions be placed in the same category with amendments which may be offered.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall agree to this: that we limit debate on the bill to the period between 12 o'clock and 2 o'clock, and thereafter allow 20 minutes on each amendment or on each motion—so the debate will not be protracted—and that the final vote be taken thereafter.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish very much to make sure that sufficient time is provided for another matter. It has been announced that tomorrow we would take up the resolution dealing with the question of sending troops to Europe, and that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] would make his address on that subject. So I should like to make sure that we complete action on the pending bill in sufficient time to permit that to be done. Therefore, I would not wish to have the vote on this measure taken at a late hour tomorrow.

Would the Senator be willing to have 1 hour and 40 minutes allowed for debate on the bill? Thereafter, the debate on one amendment would take up until 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Suppose we make it 2 o'clock, and that will give any Member an opportunity thereafter to speak on the amendments, with 10 minutes to be allowed for the debate on each amendment—5 minutes to each side; and we can limit debate on motions in the same way.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, let me say that the proposal is that the debate on the bill shall be limited to 2 hours.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. With 1 hour of the time to be in charge of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the other hour to be in charge of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRksen]; and that debate on any amendments or motions which may be offered shall be limited to 10 minutes each, with that time to be divided equally between the Senator offering the motion or the amendment and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. WHERRY. That is all right.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose the debate ends before 2 o'clock. Under the proposal, will it be possible for a vote to be taken at 1:30 or at 1 o'clock?

Mr. WHERRY. No; that is the very reason why I wish to have the proposal provide for debate on the bill until 2 o'clock, because I know there are several Senators who wish to be present, and to whom we shall have to get word.

The proposal as now framed will provide sufficient time, so that no Senator could complain that he did not have an opportunity to get in on the quorum call.

The unanimous-consent agreement relates, not to the vote on the bill, but to a limitation on debate on the bill and on amendments or motions which may be offered thereto.

I wish to tell the majority leader that I think the agreement is a good thing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has already announced that the agreement has been entered.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is there no assurance that the vote will be taken immediately after 2 o'clock?

Mr. McFARLAND. The vote would have to come after the period of time provided in the agreement as the limitation on debate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. In other words, at the conclusion of debate on the bill and on the amendments or motions, we shall have a vote, and shall not simply be sitting around here. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be the duty of the Chair to put the question, after debate has been concluded under the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that a limitation on debate is better than a limitation in regard to the time for voting, because in the case of the former, there is a better attendance of Senators on the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not understand who was to control the time.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is to control the time for the proponents and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for the opponents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, March 16, 1951, between the hours of 12 o'clock noon and 2 p. m., debate on the bill (S. 445) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and their subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public-health units, and for other purposes, be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the said bill, and controlled, respectively, by Mr. HILL and Mr. DIRKSEN: *Provided*, That debate on any amendment or motion proposed or made after said hour of 2 p. m. shall be limited to not exceeding 10 minutes, to be equally divided between the proposer thereof and Mr. HILL: *Provided further*, That

no amendment shall be received that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill.

PEANUT MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2615, known as the peanut bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2615) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the object of the request?

Mr. McFARLAND. The object of it is to satisfy the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be perfectly agreeable, if the majority leader will ask unanimous consent to make House bill 2615 the order of business as soon as the pending bill shall have been disposed of.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I cannot do that.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator contemplate there is to be debate on the peanut bill?

Mr. HOEY. No; there is unanimous agreement on the part of everyone.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply regret that I shall have to object to the unanimous-consent request. I should like to comply with the wishes of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, who is always most fair.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. This is the situation: This bill was unanimously reported from the Committee on Agriculture; it is recommended by the people of all the peanut producing States; it is recommended by the Farm Bureau Federation, and there has been no objection from any source that I know of. If it would precipitate extended discussion, I would not ask for its consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. I should very much appreciate it if the distinguished majority leader would ask unanimous consent that, after the pending bill is disposed of, the peanut bill be considered. I should then be willing to agree to it.

Mr. McFARLAND. No, I cannot do that, unless the distinguished Senator from Texas is not ready to proceed with his bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not see how the majority leader can request a limitation of debate on one measure, and then ask unanimous consent for the consideration of some other measure.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will yield, let me state the situation which confronts Virginia, North Carolina, and other peanut-producing States. The planting season is approaching.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Time is of the essence, and we do not think there will be any objection to this bill. We have no desire to debate it, and we are hoping

that we may pass it by unanimous consent. If we cannot—

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot see how the Senator can be sure there will be no objection, even though there be unanimous consent. We had a long controversy about peanuts. The Senator is thinking in terms of the producers. We must think a little of the salters, also, and of the peanut manufacturing industry. In the case of some of our large industries, peanuts are almost blocked out of the market.

Mr. ROBERTSON. This bill will protect the salters and manufacturers, because there is a shortage of the edible peanuts they handle. They want this bill, because it will give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to allot acreage for edible peanuts equal to the present demand. We have been importing peanuts from China and other countries.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Notwithstanding the acreage extension, a price is made which puts our people out of business.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It does not affect them in the least.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot agree to the request, and shall have to object.

Mr. McFARLAND. If there is to be objection, there is no need of discussing the matter further.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Why does not the Senator from North Carolina work on this matter until tomorrow noon, and then, if the differences can be ironed out, perhaps no one will object to the bill and it can be passed without consuming much time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Arizona that an adjournment would require a morning hour.

Mr. McFARLAND. The time is divided, anyway, so it would make no difference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona to adjourn.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Chair puts the question—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to inquire whether that does not conflict with the division of time, under the limitation of debate agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that, under the circumstances, the unanimous-consent agreement having been entered into, it would take effect immediately at 12 noon, whether there be an adjournment or a recess.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is my reason for moving to adjourn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona insist upon the motion to adjourn?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, Mr. President; I insist upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 16, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 15, 1951:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Chauncey F. Tramutolo, of California, to be United States attorney for the northern district of California, vice Frank J. Hennessy, term expired.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Major James Kenneth Gaynor, ~~XXXX~~
United States Army.

Major Samuel Mason Hogan, ~~XXXXXX~~
United States Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be colonels

Joseph Daniel Alexander, ~~XXXX~~
Robert Campbell Aloe, ~~XXXXXX~~
Kenneth Charles Barnes, ~~XXXXXX~~
Raymond Earle Bell, ~~XXXXXX~~
Earl Clarence Bergquist, ~~XXXXXX~~
Joy Roosevelt Bogue, ~~XXXXXX~~
Leon Augustus Brock, ~~XXXXXX~~
Lawton Butler, ~~XXXXXX~~
Max Nathaniel Clon, ~~XXXXXX~~
Robert Emmett Coffey, ~~XXXXXX~~
Joseph Lawrence Dark, ~~XXXXXX~~
Barney Avant Daughtry, ~~XXXXXX~~
Calvin Arthur Loy Dickey, ~~XXXXXX~~
Paul Alfred Disney, ~~XXXXXX~~
John William Donnell, ~~XXXX~~
X Ralph Edwin Doty, ~~XXXXXX~~
George Arthur Duerr, ~~XXXXXX~~
Richard Ford Ebbs, ~~XXX~~
X William Elwood Ela, ~~XXXXXX~~
Maxwell Emerson, ~~XXXXXX~~
Hugh Everett, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
Charles Boal Ewing, ~~XXXXXX~~
Joseph George Felber, ~~XXXXXX~~
Samuel Wallace Fisk, ~~XXX~~
Floyd Sebastain Fix, ~~XXXXXX~~
Nelson Irving Fooks, ~~XXXXXX~~
Louis Howard Foote, ~~XXXXXX~~
Delbert Bliss Freeman, ~~XXXXXX~~
Philip DeWitt Ginder, ~~XXXXXX~~
George Alphonsus Gould, ~~XXXXXX~~
Carl Sherman Graybeal, ~~XXXXXX~~
Jack Henry Griffith, ~~XXXXXX~~
Woodson Finch Hocker, ~~XXXXXX~~
John Joseph Holst, ~~XXXXXX~~
George Millen Jarvis 3d, ~~XXXXXX~~
Vernon Raymond Johnson, ~~XXXXXX~~
X Howell Hopson Jordan, ~~XXXXXX~~
John Prame Kaylor, ~~XXXXXX~~
Rosewell Howard King, ~~XXXX~~
Earl Frederick Klinck, ~~XXXXXX~~
X Walter Armin Linn, ~~XXXXXX~~
Carl Elliott Lundquist, ~~XXXXXX~~
Jack Darremore Mage, ~~XXXX~~
John Philip Maher, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
George Christian Masters, ~~XXXXXX~~
X Willis Small Matthews, ~~XXXXXX~~

X Chen Clovis McBride, ~~XXXXXX~~
Harry Ellery McKinney, ~~XXXXXX~~
Glenn Stephens Meader, ~~XXXXXX~~
Guy Stanley Meloy, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
Martin Joseph Morin, ~~XXXXXX~~
Christian Gotthard Nelson, ~~XXXXXX~~
Rudolph Waldemar Nuss, ~~XXXXXX~~
William Victor Owen, ~~XXXXXX~~
Forest Sheldon Rittgers, ~~XXXXXX~~
Littleton Adams Roberts, ~~XXXXXX~~
James Hill Robinson, ~~XXXXXX~~
Andrew William Roth, ~~XXXXXX~~
Arthur Roth, ~~XXXXXX~~
Bradford Torrey Schantz, ~~XXXXXX~~
Antulio Segarra, ~~XXXX~~
Leland Burdette Shaw, ~~XXXXXX~~
Warren Stokes Shelor, ~~XXX~~
X Robert Frederick Sink, ~~XXXXXX~~
Terence John Smith, ~~XXXXXX~~
Sidney Stanley Sogard, ~~XXXXXX~~
Edward Frederick Stanford-Blunden, ~~XXXXXX~~

Raymund Gregory Stanton, ~~XXXXXX~~
X Richard Don Stevens, ~~XXXXXX~~
Frederick Streicher, ~~XXXXXX~~
Orin B. Sykes, ~~XXXXXX~~
James Edmond Tarrant, ~~XXXXXX~~
Fulton G. Thompson, ~~XXXXXX~~
Fred Leroy Thorpe, ~~XXXXXX~~
Roy Clifton Ulmer, ~~XXXXXX~~
Charles Somerville Ware, ~~XXXXXX~~
Roland Stuart Watts, ~~XXXXXX~~
Elmer Matthew Webb, ~~XXXXXX~~
Stuart Marvin Welsh, ~~XXXXXX~~
Willard White, ~~XXXXXX~~
Benjamin Whitehouse, ~~XXXXXX~~
X Calvin Louis Whittle, ~~XXXXXX~~
Cyril Edward Williams, ~~XXXXXX~~
Joy Thomas Wrean, ~~XXXXXX~~
Lowell Allen Yost, ~~XXXXXX~~
Norman Edgar Youngblood, ~~XXXXXX~~
Ralph Wise Zwicker, ~~XXXXXX~~

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels

Ambelton Mangles Ahrens, ~~XXXXXX~~
James Ernest Akans, ~~XXXXXX~~
David Charles Alexander, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
Chester Fuller Allen, ~~XXXXXX~~
Leonard Amoroso, ~~XXXXXX~~
Chester Harley Anderson, ~~XXXXXX~~
Townsend Canfield Anderson, ~~XXXXXX~~
Luther Ruebush Andrews, ~~XXXXXX~~
Harry Auspitz, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
Elverson Earl Baker, ~~XXXXXX~~
Samuel Edward Baker, ~~XXXXXX~~
Robert Seney Ballagh, ~~XXXXXX~~
Curtis Moultry Banks, ~~XXXXXX~~
Troy Alton Barker, ~~XXXXXX~~
George William Barry, ~~XXXXXX~~
George Quincy Bass, ~~XXXXXX~~
William Howard Bates, ~~XXXXXX~~
Edwin Le Page Beauchamp, ~~XXXXXX~~
Vancel Ritson Beck, ~~XXXXXX~~
Paul Ernest Bellamy, ~~XXXXXX~~
Thomas William Bender, ~~XXXXXX~~
Ernest August Benser, ~~XXXXXX~~
John Alvin Bergmann, ~~XXXXXX~~
Louis Benjamin Besbeck, ~~XXXXXX~~
Arthur Terry Bill, ~~XXXXXX~~
William Henry Billings, ~~XXXXXX~~
Arnold David Blair, ~~XXXXXX~~
Robert Kelly Blair, ~~XXXXXX~~
Francis Richard Blankenship, ~~XXXXXX~~
Eugene Victor Blaser, ~~XXXXXX~~
Joseph Stanley Bochnowski, ~~XXXXXX~~
Angelo Domenic Bollero, ~~XXXXXX~~
Cecil Hamilton Bolton, ~~XXXXXX~~
Mervin C. Bowers, ~~XXXXXX~~
John Edward Boyce, ~~XXXXXX~~
Lawrence Lewis Boyd, ~~XXXXXX~~
John Martin Bradley, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
James Orsen Branch, ~~XXXXXX~~
James Dudley Clark Breckenridge, ~~XXXXXX~~
William Arthur Briggs, ~~XXXXXX~~
Courtland Forrest Brittain, ~~XXXXXX~~
William Thomas Brogan, ~~XXXXXX~~
Harry Elmer Brown, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
Maskell Edward Brown, ~~XXXXXX~~
Elbridge Leroy Brubaker, ~~XXXXXX~~
John Chester Bucher, ~~XXXXXX~~
Oscar Charles Buser, ~~XXXXXX~~
Howard Cooper Bush, ~~XXXXXX~~
James Jenkins Butler, ~~XXXXXX~~
Paul Patrick Byrne, ~~XXXXXX~~
William M. Campbell, ~~XXXXXX~~
James Cantey, ~~XXXXXX~~
Eugene Jackson Carson, ~~XXXXXX~~
James Willard Caughron, ~~XXXXXX~~
Fitzhugh Horton Chandler, ~~XXXXXX~~
Rubert Daniel Chapman, ~~XXXXXX~~
Werlen Franklin Cheney, ~~XXXXXX~~
Lee Dake Chilson, ~~XXXXXX~~
Luigi Francis Claps, ~~XXXXXX~~
Harold Frederick Clark, ~~XXXXXX~~
Rhoman Edward Clem, ~~XXXXXX~~
John Rodgers Clifton, ~~XXXXXX~~
Glenn Leonard Clinebell, ~~XXXXXX~~
Henry Michael Clisson, ~~XXXXXX~~
George Wayne Coffman, Jr., ~~XXX~~
Hubert Paul Coleman, ~~XXXX~~
James Chapman Coleman, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
John Joseph Connors, ~~XXXXXX~~
Dave John Cook, ~~XXXXXX~~
Harold Llewellyn Corey, ~~XXXXXX~~
Gordon Douglas Cornell, ~~XXXXXX~~
Harper Brown Cowles, ~~XXXXXX~~
Stuart Meredith Cox, ~~XXXXXX~~
Weldon William Cox, ~~XXXXXX~~
Jack Oliver Cromwell, ~~XXXXXX~~
Eual Wister Culbertson, ~~XXXXXX~~
Frank John Culley, ~~XXXXXX~~
Edwin Paul Curtin, ~~XXXXXX~~
Raymond Edward Deehler, ~~XXXXXX~~
John Rambo Dale, ~~XXXXXX~~
Hartley Fuller Dame, ~~XXXXXX~~
Raymond Wesley Darrah, ~~XXXXXX~~
John Hamilton Davin, ~~XXXXXX~~
John Frank Day, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
Edwin Augustus Deagle, ~~XXXXXX~~
Nelson Isaac Decker, ~~XXXXXX~~
James Terry DeJarnette, ~~XXXXXX~~
James Donald DeMarr, ~~XXXXXX~~
Carl Noble DeVaney, ~~XXXXXX~~
James Harold Dicks, ~~XXXXXX~~
Forrest Vinyard Diehl, ~~XXXXXX~~
James Reid Dorman, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
Robert Earl Dorsey, ~~XXXXXX~~
Jay Wesley Doverspike, ~~XXXXXX~~
Donald George Dow, ~~XXXXXX~~
Paul Alton Dresser, ~~XXXXXX~~
Gilbert Proctor Dubia, ~~XXXXXX~~
Samuel Hardy Duerson, ~~XXXXXX~~
William Perl Dunn, ~~XXXXXX~~
John Irving Haumerson Eales, ~~XXXX~~
Gail Addison Eaton, ~~XXXXXX~~
Theodore Hadrick Ebert, ~~XXXXXX~~
Leonard Earle Echois, ~~XXXXXX~~
Thomas Wadsworth Eddington, ~~XXXXXX~~
William Henry Edwards, ~~XXXXXX~~
Gustaf Adolph Engstrom, ~~XXXXXX~~
Jack Martin Ernst, ~~XXX~~
Albert B. Evans, ~~XXXXXX~~
William James Evans, ~~XXXXXX~~
Walter Ray Ewing, ~~XXXXXX~~
Charles Albert Fanning, ~~XXXXXX~~
William Byron Feindel, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
Joe Le Roy Fincher, ~~XXXXXX~~
Edward Daniel Fitzgerald, ~~XXXXXX~~
Lewis LeVerl Flamm, ~~XXXXXX~~
Walter Andrew Fleckenstein, ~~XXXXXX~~
Merwin Bishop Forbes, ~~XXXXXX~~
Forrest Hall Forcum, ~~XXXXXX~~
John Mitchell Franklin, ~~XXXXXX~~
Lloyd Ralston Fredendall, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
John Edward Frick, ~~XXXXXX~~
Blair Aloysius Froehle, ~~XXXXXX~~
Wilton George Gaefe, ~~XXXXXX~~
James Ansel Gaston, ~~XXXXXX~~
John David George, ~~XXXXXX~~
Michael Peter Georges, ~~XXXXXX~~
Leon David Gladding, ~~XXXXXX~~
George Robert Glen, ~~XXXXXX~~
Jay Theodore Glen, ~~XXXXXX~~
Hugo George Goetz, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
Oscar Glenn Goodhand, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~
Mason French Goodloe, ~~XXXXXX~~

Edwin William Grenelle, [REDACTED]
 William Theodore Grenier, [REDACTED]
 Ralph James Griffin, [REDACTED]
 Manfred Jacques Haas, [REDACTED]
 Harold Hatch Haines, [REDACTED]
 James Arthur Hamilton, [REDACTED]
 Vernon Hammonds, [REDACTED]
 Wayne Hardman, [REDACTED]
 James Edward Harper, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Elmer Harvey Harrelson, [REDACTED]
 Kenneth Grant Harrison, [REDACTED]
 Harry Louis Hart, [REDACTED]
 Ira Winfield Hart, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Gordon Harton, [REDACTED]
 Robert Hawley Hayden, [REDACTED]
 George Heck, [REDACTED]
 Neil Frederick Hein, [REDACTED]
 William Perry Henderson, [REDACTED]
 Harlan William Hendrick, [REDACTED]
 Clarence Philip Hendricks, [REDACTED]
 Buie Hess, [REDACTED]
 Elmer Robinson Higgins, [REDACTED]
 Roger Elsbree Higgins, [REDACTED]
 Donald Stock Himes, [REDACTED]
 Daniel Light Hine, [REDACTED]
 Clifford Cecil Hines, [REDACTED]
 Robert Edwin Hisle, [REDACTED]
 Adrian Leonard Hoebeke, [REDACTED]
 Ervin Daniel Karl Hoehne, [REDACTED]
 Stuart Sheets Hoff, [REDACTED]
 Leo Vincent Holly, [REDACTED]
 Lund Foster Hood, [REDACTED]
 John Presley Horton, [REDACTED]
 Russell Hawkins Horton, [REDACTED]
 William Clifton Howell, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Frank Richards Hubbard, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Donald Kenneth Hughes, [REDACTED]
 Robert Ervin Huneycutt, [REDACTED]
 Lewis Andrew Hunt, [REDACTED]
 Richard Martin Hurst, [REDACTED]
 Asbury Haines Jackson, [REDACTED]
 William Freebairn Jackson, [REDACTED]
 George William James, [REDACTED]
 Arthur Blanchard Jeffery, [REDACTED]
 John Jay Jewett, [REDACTED]
 Albert Morse Johnson, [REDACTED]
 Bertram Howard Johnson, [REDACTED]
 Bruce Holley Johnson, [REDACTED]
 Leonard Marshall Johnson, [REDACTED]
 Milton LaFayette Johnson, [REDACTED]
 Raymond Lee Johnson, [REDACTED]
 William Griffith Johnson, [REDACTED]
 Argyle Phillips Jones, [REDACTED]
 Edmund Hawley Jones, [REDACTED]
 Edward Murthas Jones, [REDACTED]
 Thornton Eugene Jones, [REDACTED]
 Charles Edward Kabrich, [REDACTED]
 Harry Donald Kamy, [REDACTED]
 Charles Raymond Keasey, [REDACTED]
 Gerald Cornelius Kelleher, [REDACTED]
 Frederick Thomas Kent, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Truman Harry Kern, [REDACTED]
 Lewis Henry Keyes, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Tallant Kilday, [REDACTED]
 Stewart Hood Knowlton, [REDACTED]
 John Frederick Kuster, [REDACTED]
 Joe Calvin Lambert, [REDACTED]
 Danna Lee Lane, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Marvin Larnier, [REDACTED]
 John Kershaw Lee, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Royal Leonard Leidy, [REDACTED]
 Beverly Matthews Leigh, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Donald Lester Lewis, [REDACTED]
 George Glover Lewis, [REDACTED]
 Donald Dominic Limoncelli, [REDACTED]
 John Boynton Lininger, [REDACTED]
 Lafar Lipscomb, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William Aubrey Locke, [REDACTED]
 Edwin Ripley Lodge, [REDACTED]
 Homer Edwin Long, [REDACTED]
 Terrance Marshall Longacre, [REDACTED]
 Emil Albert Lucke, [REDACTED]
 Regis Whitlo Luke, [REDACTED]
 Raymond Cad Luna, [REDACTED]
 Daniel David Mack, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Donald MacGlashan MacWillie, [REDACTED]
 Edward Reeves Maddox, [REDACTED]
 Oscar Jackson Magee, [REDACTED]
 Edward Joseph Maguire, [REDACTED]
 Pasquale Pietro Maiorano, [REDACTED]
 Lloyd Lale Malen, [REDACTED]
 Charles Frank Mallalieu, [REDACTED]

John Schaeffer Mansfield, [REDACTED]
 Harrison Moore Markley, [REDACTED]
 Lewis Tabor Martin, [REDACTED]
 John Thomas Massingale, [REDACTED]
 Don Snowden Mathews, [REDACTED]
 David Arnold Mathewson, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert John McBride, [REDACTED]
 Ernest Edward McClish, [REDACTED]
 William Harold McCreary, [REDACTED]
 William John McDonald, [REDACTED]
 Alexander Thomas McElroy, [REDACTED]
 Arvine Walter McElroy, [REDACTED]
 John Patrick McGovern, [REDACTED]
 Glenn Joseph McGowan, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Martin McGrall, [REDACTED]
 Donald Anthony McGuire, [REDACTED]
 James Bernard McNaalley, [REDACTED]
 Adam Watts Meetze, [REDACTED]
 Merle Leroy Mennie, [REDACTED]
 Anthony Gaul Merritt, [REDACTED]
 Lyndon William Merry, [REDACTED]
 Joshua Robert Messersmith, [REDACTED]
 Arthur Ernst Messner, [REDACTED]
 James Franklin Metcalf, [REDACTED]
 Arles Henry Miller, [REDACTED]
 Eugene Edward Miller, [REDACTED]
 James Roy Miller, [REDACTED]
 Leland Veeder Miller, [REDACTED]
 Charles Arthur Minot, [REDACTED]
 Willard Winfield Mize, [REDACTED]
 Clewis Clayton Moffett, [REDACTED]
 Elmore Patrick Moore, [REDACTED]
 Lowrey Robert Moore, [REDACTED]
 Charlie Emmett Ashburn Morgan, [REDACTED]
 Seaborn Hawes Mosely, [REDACTED]
 Robert McFarland Mouk, [REDACTED]
 George Francis Moynahan, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Carroll Conrad Mullen, [REDACTED]
 Jack Reeves Murphy, [REDACTED]
 William John Murphy, [REDACTED]
 Roy Alexander Murray, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Shelly Prusher Myers, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James Richard Nagel, [REDACTED]
 Samuel Snelson, Neill, [REDACTED]
 Herbert Lincoln Nelson, [REDACTED]
 Ralph Earle Nelson, [REDACTED]
 Erman Milford Newman, [REDACTED]
 Glenn E. Nida, [REDACTED]
 Clifton Frank Nooncaster, [REDACTED]
 George Edward Norton, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James Doyle Nutt, [REDACTED]
 Curtiss Welt Oakes, [REDACTED]
 Lennart Yngve Ohlsson, [REDACTED]
 Harleee Royall O'Neal, [REDACTED]
 Larr James O'Neil, [REDACTED]
 John Thomas O'Neill, [REDACTED]
 Guy Anthony Orsino, [REDACTED]
 Raymond Leo Orton, [REDACTED]
 Eric Robert Osborne, [REDACTED]
 Hugh Painter Osborne, [REDACTED]
 Dallas Buford Pack, [REDACTED]
 Brookman Renninger Painter, [REDACTED]
 George Edward Painter, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Richardson Palmerlee, [REDACTED]
 Ernest Courtland Parks, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert Clayton Parry, [REDACTED]
 Franklin Riley Patterson, [REDACTED]
 Harold John Pearson, [REDACTED]
 Edward Francis Penat, [REDACTED]
 Gines Perez, [REDACTED]
 John Lewis Peyton, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Forrest Phillips, [REDACTED]
 Stanley Walden Phillips, [REDACTED]
 Benjamin Henry Pochyla, [REDACTED]
 Leon Oscar Pond, [REDACTED]
 John Paul Powhida, [REDACTED]
 Warren Karl Pratt, [REDACTED]
 Lee Huse Pray, [REDACTED]
 Walter Johnston Preston, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William Jennings Pritchard, [REDACTED]
 Daniel Aubrey Ranney, [REDACTED]
 Sam James Raser, [REDACTED]
 Theodore August Rathje, [REDACTED]
 Robert Wilkinson Rayburn, [REDACTED]
 Albert Leonard Reed, [REDACTED]
 David Glenn Rees, [REDACTED]
 Edward Louis Rehmman, [REDACTED]
 Harold Russell Reifsnnyder, [REDACTED]
 Vernon William Rice, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Marshall Richardson, [REDACTED]
 Walter Roy Ridlehuber, [REDACTED]
 John Raymond Riley, [REDACTED]

Cornelius James Rinker, [REDACTED]
 Donald Peter Ringue, [REDACTED]
 Stanley Oliver Rishoi, [REDACTED]
 Emanuel Martin Robertson, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Bradley Roelofs, [REDACTED]
 Robert Louis Roper, [REDACTED]
 Clarence Edwin Routh, [REDACTED]
 Charles Fredrick Ryan, [REDACTED]
 John Louis Ryan, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Victor Morgan Ryan, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Anthony Sabatelli, [REDACTED]
 John Shaw Sabine, [REDACTED]
 Ralph Saenz, [REDACTED]
 Donald Angus Sanders, [REDACTED]
 Ramon Antonio Sandin, [REDACTED]
 David Gustive Schep, [REDACTED]
 John Andrew Seitz, [REDACTED]
 Raymond Wiltse Sellers, [REDACTED]
 Merle John Senn, [REDACTED]
 Willard Renwick Seymour, [REDACTED]
 Millard Shaw, [REDACTED]
 Walter Arthur Shaw, [REDACTED]
 Burdwell Hoyt Shipe, [REDACTED]
 John James Shoemaker, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Anthony Sivigny, [REDACTED]
 Halbert Jennings Slagle, [REDACTED]
 Stanley Woodard Smiley, [REDACTED]
 Dana Emerson Smith, [REDACTED]
 James Bradley Smith, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Victor Smith, [REDACTED]
 Merwin Howard Smith, [REDACTED]
 William Anderson Smith, [REDACTED]
 Yenne Earl Snider, [REDACTED]
 James Porter Snooks, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Marvin Henry Snyder, [REDACTED]
 Edward Joseph Soares, [REDACTED]
 Otto Frederick Sonneman, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William Russell Spillman, [REDACTED]
 Russell Gilbert Spinney, [REDACTED]
 James Marshall Sprake, [REDACTED]
 Monas Nathan Squires, [REDACTED]
 Albert Tyra Stafford, [REDACTED]
 Charles Abner Stanley, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Edward Stannah, [REDACTED]
 Henry John Stark, [REDACTED]
 Alfred Ludman Stevens, [REDACTED]
 Stanley Llewellyn Stewart, [REDACTED]
 Henry Marx Stiebel, [REDACTED]
 Frank Laron Street, [REDACTED]
 James Patterson Streetman, [REDACTED]
 George Taft Stump, [REDACTED]
 Duff Walker Sudduth, [REDACTED]
 John Joseph Sullivan, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert Nelson Swartz, [REDACTED]
 Robert Watson Sylvester, [REDACTED]
 Glenn Roy Taylor, [REDACTED]
 Richard Stacius Tennant, [REDACTED]
 Evert Spencer Thomas, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William Ralph Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Richard Bohrer Thrift, [REDACTED]
 Martin George Tieman, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Marvin Leroy Tjostem, [REDACTED]
 Harry Edmund Trail, [REDACTED]
 Merrill LeRoy Tribe, [REDACTED]
 James Robert Troth, [REDACTED]
 James Richard Truden, [REDACTED]
 Gerald Franklin True, [REDACTED]
 John Ralph Turner, [REDACTED]
 Vincent Usera, [REDACTED]
 Bruce Hudson Vall, [REDACTED]
 William Harry Van Dine, [REDACTED]
 Constantine Vardas, [REDACTED]
 Lewis Gabriel Villere, [REDACTED]
 Osmyn Arsene Vining, [REDACTED]
 Henry von Kolnitz, [REDACTED]
 John George Wagner, [REDACTED]
 Kurt Ladislaus Walitschek, [REDACTED]
 Ivan Orville Walt, [REDACTED]
 Frederick George Ward, [REDACTED]
 William Albert Warner, [REDACTED]
 Carl Augustus Weaver, [REDACTED]
 Robert Lee Webb, [REDACTED]
 Clark Webber, [REDACTED]
 Arthur Augustus Weinland, [REDACTED]
 Leonard Edward Wellendorf, [REDACTED]
 Edward Langley White, [REDACTED]
 James Russell Whitehead, [REDACTED]
 Ray William Whitson, [REDACTED]
 George Lewis Willey, [REDACTED]
 Byron Edward Williams, [REDACTED]
 John Andrew Williams, [REDACTED]
 William Howard Willoughby, [REDACTED]

Charles Augustus Wingo, [REDACTED]
 Bernard Wobeking, [REDACTED]
 Donald Jackson Woolley, [REDACTED]
 Clari M. Worthy, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Ralph Yancey, [REDACTED]
 Harold Ralph Yeager, [REDACTED]
 Harvey James Yost, [REDACTED]
 Charlie Lemon Young, [REDACTED]
 Stanley Archer Young, [REDACTED]
 Gus Spiece Zinnecker, [REDACTED]

To be majors

Norman Duncan Aboosh, [REDACTED]
 George Edward Albert, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Logsdon Albert, [REDACTED]
 Tyrus Raymond Ambron, [REDACTED]
 Burton Staley Andrews, [REDACTED]
 Edward Berri Armstrong, [REDACTED]
 Frank Melvin Arthur, [REDACTED]
 Wallace Austin, [REDACTED]
 Clarence Fred Ax, [REDACTED]
 John Claude Bartholet, [REDACTED]
 Charles Prindle Bartow, [REDACTED]
 Robert Sharp Bary, [REDACTED]
 Fountain Fox Beattie, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Kenneth Eugene BeLieu, [REDACTED]
 Ralph George BeOn, [REDACTED]
 Robert Joseph Bird, [REDACTED]
 Daniel Nestor Black, [REDACTED]
 George Warren Black, [REDACTED]
 John Hustler Blair 3d, [REDACTED]
 Allan Louis Bogardus, [REDACTED]
 Cornell Dent Booth, [REDACTED]
 Charles Bless Boswell, [REDACTED]
 Pierre Donald Boy, [REDACTED]
 Stuart Frederick Brady, [REDACTED]
 Patrick James Brennan, [REDACTED]
 Benjamine Marvin Brothers, [REDACTED]
 Richard Kinnicutt Brown, [REDACTED]
 Shannon Delos Brown, [REDACTED]
 Paul Egbert Bruehl, [REDACTED]
 Albert Victor Bruni, [REDACTED]
 Stockton Donald Bruns, [REDACTED]
 Darrell H. Burnett, [REDACTED]
 Sterling Champ Bush, [REDACTED]
 Robert Ellis Butts, [REDACTED]
 William Hendric Byrd, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Charles Thomas Campbell, [REDACTED]
 Jack Young Canon, [REDACTED]
 George Watson Carter, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Charles Carroll Case, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Charles Wilbur Casey, [REDACTED]
 Andrew Cella, [REDACTED]
 Francis Alonzo Chamblin, [REDACTED]
 Andrew Roy Cheek, [REDACTED]
 Charles Vinyard Christianson, [REDACTED]
 James Paul Clark, [REDACTED]
 George Challen Clowes, [REDACTED]
 Martin Holmes Colley, [REDACTED]
 Sidney Loyd Cone, [REDACTED]
 Sherman Dell Cosgrove, [REDACTED]
 Frederic Morris Cramer, [REDACTED]
 Alfred Holder Crawford, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lucian Capers Croft, [REDACTED]
 Samuel Mathew Cromwell, [REDACTED]
 Robert Lee Crouch, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Albert Willits Crowell, [REDACTED]
 Ernest Craig Dameron, [REDACTED]
 Glen Ercil Daugherty, [REDACTED]
 Henry Emil Davidson, Jr., [REDACTED]
 John Henry Donaldson, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Maxim James Dowd, [REDACTED]
 Donald Ephraim Downard, [REDACTED]
 Leland Rodman Drake, [REDACTED]
 Leonard Drazen, [REDACTED]
 Edward Francis Dudley, [REDACTED]
 Chesley Folsom Durgin, [REDACTED]
 Kenneth Elmer Eckland, [REDACTED]
 Eric Ray Edgerton, [REDACTED]
 Dale Laverne Etka, [REDACTED]
 Lynn Dillon Fargo, [REDACTED]
 James Edward Feliz, [REDACTED]
 Paul Edward Fives, [REDACTED]
 Elmer Wellington Fox, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Erwin Clarence Frederickson, [REDACTED]
 Clayton Thomas Fry, [REDACTED]
 Edward Alexander Galt, [REDACTED]
 Dale Martin Garvey, [REDACTED]
 Robert Dean George, [REDACTED]
 Charles Howard Gibbs, [REDACTED]
 Michael Paul Gierlak, [REDACTED]
 William David Gnaul, [REDACTED]

Barney Golden, [REDACTED]
 William Van Nostrand Grace, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Aloysius Graham, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Daniel Griswold Grandin, [REDACTED]
 Orlando Lee Greening, [REDACTED]
 Harry Atkinson Greer, [REDACTED]
 Edgar Theodore Guenther, [REDACTED]
 Thorvald Jorgen Guerdrum, [REDACTED]
 Walter Joseph Haberer, Jr., [REDACTED]
 McLean Hampton, [REDACTED]
 Robert David Hand, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Eldon Hanks, [REDACTED]
 Eliwood Frederick Hanson, [REDACTED]
 Burrell Curry Hassett, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Henry Clement Hatchell, [REDACTED]
 John Joseph Hayes, [REDACTED]
 Curtis Everett Heaton, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Miller Helsler, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James Thomas Hennessey, [REDACTED]
 Mahlon D. Hickman, [REDACTED]
 William Thomas Hillis, [REDACTED]
 Homer Clair Hinckley, [REDACTED]
 Carroll Broadus Hodges, [REDACTED]
 Julian Louis Hogan, [REDACTED]
 Charles Henderson Hollis, [REDACTED]
 William Webster Holmes, [REDACTED]
 Arthur Emil Holt, [REDACTED]
 Werner Holtz, [REDACTED]
 Isaac Hoppenstein, [REDACTED]
 Harry Douglas Hoskins, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hottenel James Huff, [REDACTED]
 William McCaw Hughes, [REDACTED]
 George Harry Huppert, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Fred Raymond Huston, [REDACTED]
 Richard Kenneth Hutson, [REDACTED]
 William Henry Innes, [REDACTED]
 Robert James Jackson, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Jerome Sydney Jefferts, [REDACTED]
 Paul Richard Jeffrey, [REDACTED]
 Park Trammell Jenkins, [REDACTED]
 James Monroe Johnson, [REDACTED]
 Gordon Cowley Jones, [REDACTED]
 George Juskallan, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Gabriel Katlin, [REDACTED]
 Fred William Kellner, [REDACTED]
 Harold Leon Kelly, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Ralph Robert Kenigson, [REDACTED]
 Justus Crawford Kennedy, [REDACTED]
 Carl Vivian Kiling, [REDACTED]
 Darce Ronald Knight, [REDACTED]
 Henry Simon Kostanski, [REDACTED]
 Eugene Claire Kreighbaum, [REDACTED]
 Charles John Kronke, Jr., [REDACTED]
 John Charles Kulp, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Gerald August Lake, [REDACTED]
 William Sylvanus La Mee 3d, [REDACTED]
 Douglas Harvey Lane, [REDACTED]
 Charles Ellis Lawrence, [REDACTED]
 Gerald Preston Lerner, [REDACTED]
 Elias Frederic Liakos, [REDACTED]
 Francis Stone Livermore, [REDACTED]
 Jorge Jose Lluy, [REDACTED]
 Floyd Kenneth Long, [REDACTED]
 James Bradfoot Lyle, [REDACTED]
 Myron McClure, [REDACTED]
 George McCutchen, [REDACTED]
 Walter Ben McKenzie, [REDACTED]
 John Kenneth McWilliams, [REDACTED]
 John Edward MacDonaldough, [REDACTED]
 Howard William Martens, [REDACTED]
 Talbert Iredell Martin, [REDACTED]
 Arlo Willis Mitchell, [REDACTED]
 Paul Hugh Mize, [REDACTED]
 Robert Everett Moore, [REDACTED]
 Emil Lawrence Moshelm, [REDACTED]
 John Cummings Motter, [REDACTED]
 William David Mouchet, [REDACTED]
 Glen Avery Mounsey, [REDACTED]
 John Michael Mullen, [REDACTED]
 Perry Arthur Munro, [REDACTED]
 Bertram Isaac Nash, [REDACTED]
 Morris John Naudts, [REDACTED]
 Lloyd Stanley Nelson, [REDACTED]
 Howard Ellis Nestlerode, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert Stanton Niccolis, [REDACTED]
 Samuel Heywood Oakley, [REDACTED]
 Francis William O'Brien, [REDACTED]
 Hugh Rowe O'Farrell, [REDACTED]
 Lewis Boice O'Hara, [REDACTED]
 Robert John Cleland Osborne, [REDACTED]
 Bill Woodrow Paden, [REDACTED]

Anthony Emil Papa, [REDACTED]
 Norman Cordrey Pardue, [REDACTED]
 William Gray Patterson, [REDACTED]
 Thurston Tyler Paul, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Leslie Maurice Payne, [REDACTED]
 Earl George Peacock, [REDACTED]
 James Leland Pence, [REDACTED]
 Fred Emerson Perry, [REDACTED]
 William Robert Pershall, [REDACTED]
 Martin Charles Pertl, [REDACTED]
 Clifton Allen Peters, [REDACTED]
 George Henry Pierre, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Roy Frederick Pille, [REDACTED]
 David Burnett Price, [REDACTED]
 Richard Thomas Pullen, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hugh Francis Queenin, [REDACTED]
 Bruce Warner Reagan, [REDACTED]
 Charles Lee Redman, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Arthur Watkin Reese, [REDACTED]
 William Francis Register, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Maurice James Reynolds, [REDACTED]
 Dan Earl Riggs, [REDACTED]
 Charles Edward Roman, [REDACTED]
 Eric Armand Rundquist, [REDACTED]
 Hugh Middleton Rutledge, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Samuel Ryan, [REDACTED]
 Reuben Nathan Salada, [REDACTED]
 Robert Keith Saxe, [REDACTED]
 Herman Albert Schmidt, [REDACTED]
 William Patrick Scholl, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James Franklin Schoonover, [REDACTED]
 Emmett Gilliam Scott, [REDACTED]
 John Bennett Scott, [REDACTED]
 Eugene Thomas Seaburn, [REDACTED]
 Earl Irving Seekins, [REDACTED]
 Lachlan MacLean Sinclair, [REDACTED]
 Charles Spencer Skillman, [REDACTED]
 Harry Anthony Slad, [REDACTED]
 Byron Saul Smith, [REDACTED]
 Francis James Smith, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Richard Secord Smith, [REDACTED]
 Edward Morris Solomon, [REDACTED]
 James Thomas Specht, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Charles Lee Stahler, [REDACTED]
 William Alfred Stanford, [REDACTED]
 Paul Raymond Steckla, [REDACTED]
 Robert Emmett Sullivan, [REDACTED]
 Daniel Henry Sweet, [REDACTED]
 Gordon Ulysses Tapper, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Salvador Francis Taranto, [REDACTED]
 Nicholas Lee Tate, [REDACTED]
 Carl Bernard Tenhagen, [REDACTED]
 Robert Middleton Thompson, [REDACTED]
 Warren Atticus Thrasher, [REDACTED]
 John Walker Tomlin, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Ian Frederick Turner, [REDACTED]
 Roman Irodian Ullans, [REDACTED]
 Robert Ellis Vandenberg, [REDACTED]
 Herman Heinrich Von Benge, [REDACTED]
 Arthur Dalton von Rohr, [REDACTED]
 Jack Kenneth Walker, [REDACTED]
 Kenneth William Wallace, [REDACTED]
 Lawrence Ray Ware, [REDACTED]
 David Woodrow Way, [REDACTED]
 Jack Lawrence Weigand, [REDACTED]
 Walter Wilbur Wendt, [REDACTED]
 William Hugh Wikoff, [REDACTED]
 Leslie Ray Wilcox, [REDACTED]
 Robert Charles Williams, [REDACTED]
 Franklin Leon Wilson, [REDACTED]
 Harold Glen Wilson, [REDACTED]
 Lawrence Mervyn Wilson, [REDACTED]
 Carl George Witte, [REDACTED]
 Vincent Michael Witter, [REDACTED]
 William Lunsford Wyatt, [REDACTED]
 John White Yow, [REDACTED]
 Richard Francis Zeoli, [REDACTED]

To be captains

Edwin Carl Adams, [REDACTED]
 Robert Howard Allan, [REDACTED]
 Edward Paul Anderson, [REDACTED]
 Robert Louis Andreoli, [REDACTED]
 James Leander Atkins, [REDACTED]
 Robert George Benckart, Jr., [REDACTED]
 John Samuel Benner, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert William Betchtel, [REDACTED]
 Eugene Holt Bishop, [REDACTED]
 Wayne Austin Blair, [REDACTED]
 Stewart Penfold Blake, [REDACTED]
 Frame John Bowers, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Ben William Bradley, [REDACTED]

William Holman Brandenburg, [REDACTED]
 Gustav Joseph Braun, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William Henry Brinnon, [REDACTED]
 Richard Howerton Brownley, [REDACTED]
 Robert Leonard Bryan, [REDACTED]
 Robert Hazlett Bullard, [REDACTED]
 Frederick Richards Burnet, [REDACTED]
 Robert Charles Canham, [REDACTED]
 James Edward Carson, [REDACTED]
 June Crawford Caton, [REDACTED]
 John Joy Christensen, [REDACTED]
 Robert Lee Cody, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Arthur Cook, [REDACTED]
 Edwin Worton Levering Curll, [REDACTED]
 Laurence LeRoy Dantzer, [REDACTED]
 Howard Nelson Darling, [REDACTED]
 William Andrus Davis, [REDACTED]
 Daniel DeYoung, [REDACTED]
 Edward Michael Dooley, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Francis Dougherty, [REDACTED]
 Dean Alexander Doyal, [REDACTED]
 Carl Ray Duncan, [REDACTED]
 Leo Elzear Dupont, [REDACTED]
 Lawrence Jack Evans, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Charles Robert Fish, [REDACTED]
 Edward Thomas Flash, [REDACTED]
 John William Gephart, [REDACTED]
 William Frederick Graves, [REDACTED]
 Richard Edwin Guthrie, [REDACTED]
 Herbert Raymond Haar, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William Charles Hacker, [REDACTED]
 Harry Barnell Hardy, [REDACTED]
 John William Harrop, [REDACTED]
 William Joseph Heaser, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William Warren Henderson, 3d, [REDACTED]
 John Quint Henlon, [REDACTED]
 Merle Lee Hite, [REDACTED]
 Milton Samuel Hochmuth, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Henry Hoy, [REDACTED]
 Orville Roy Hughes, [REDACTED]
 David Boyd Humphrey, [REDACTED]
 Dean Edward Hutter, [REDACTED]
 Charles Grimes Ives, [REDACTED]
 Warren Harding Jepson, [REDACTED]
 Clyde Alden Joslyn, [REDACTED]
 Hermann Eugene Kessler, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Richard Koczak, [REDACTED]
 Henry Richard Lema, [REDACTED]
 Robert Walston LeMay, Jr., [REDACTED]
 C. J. LeVan, [REDACTED]
 Roger Carl Loving, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Argyle Lowe, [REDACTED]
 John Gerard Lownds, [REDACTED]
 Billy Murray McCormac, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Joseph McDonald, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Joseph McDonald, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Chester M. McKeen, Jr., [REDACTED]
 David Ray McNaught, [REDACTED]
 Ralph Eugene Main, [REDACTED]
 William Clarence Malkemes, [REDACTED]
 Daniel Valentine Matto, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert George Metz, [REDACTED]
 Charles Ernest Miles, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Dewey Franklin Louis Moser, [REDACTED]
 Felix Ray Moss, [REDACTED]
 William Francis Mullen, [REDACTED]
 Antonio Victor Munera, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Paul Marion Nance, [REDACTED]
 James Vincent O'Brien, [REDACTED]
 Gregory L. Olney, [REDACTED]
 Lloyd Allen Osborne, [REDACTED]
 Burton Fisher Parker, [REDACTED]
 Leonard Farrel Parks, [REDACTED]
 John Arthur Pedlar, [REDACTED]
 Eugene Miles Perry, Jr., [REDACTED]
 J. Coulson Phillips, [REDACTED]
 Gene Meredith Powell, [REDACTED]
 James Francis Powers, [REDACTED]
 Walter Edward Rafert, [REDACTED]
 William Francis Rapson, [REDACTED]
 John Edson Roach, [REDACTED]
 Max Malcolm Rule, [REDACTED]
 Charles McCall Shadle, [REDACTED]
 Benjamin Stump Silver, [REDACTED]
 George Lane Simpson, Jr., [REDACTED]
 George Townsend Singley, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Harry Charles Slawson, [REDACTED]
 Glen Woodard Smith, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Jeffrey Greenwood Smith, [REDACTED]
 Ray Hosley Smith, [REDACTED]
 Judson Cauthen Spence, Sr., [REDACTED]

Cyril Branston Spicer, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lester Owen Styve, [REDACTED]
 Roy Morris Taylor, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Thomas Elton Terry, [REDACTED]
 Jay Parsons Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Edmund Grover Thompson, [REDACTED]
 Alan Ross Toffler, [REDACTED]
 Oscar Chapman Torbett, [REDACTED]
 Jack LeMaster Treadwell, [REDACTED]
 Robert Ebb Trigg, [REDACTED]
 William Francis Usher, [REDACTED]
 Dean Van Lydegraf, [REDACTED]
 Wendell Wood Vance, [REDACTED]
 Charles Page Wallen 5th, [REDACTED]
 Howard Walter Weinberger, [REDACTED]
 Cecil Ward White, [REDACTED]
 Bruce McKay Whitesides, [REDACTED]
 Richard Keith Williams, [REDACTED]
 Richard Albert Wise, [REDACTED]
 Erik Faddersboll Yde, [REDACTED]

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Herber Carlton Leney, [REDACTED]

To be majors

Virgil Maurice McElroy, [REDACTED]
 Rodham Carroll Routledge, [REDACTED]

To be captains

William Avery Bland Addison, [REDACTED]
 Farrell Baldwin Anderson, [REDACTED]
 Francis Howard Anderson, [REDACTED]
 Victor Don Baughman, [REDACTED]
 Richard Reeve Baxter, [REDACTED]
 Earl McGinnis Bradley, [REDACTED]
 Henry Bertram Cabell, [REDACTED]
 Clement Egan Carney, [REDACTED]
 Fred Albert Chalupsky, [REDACTED]
 Daniel Joseph Costello, [REDACTED]
 Manley Everett Davis, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Richard Joseph Deegan, [REDACTED]
 Leslie Earl Dixon, [REDACTED]
 Dean Russell Dort, [REDACTED]
 George Charles Eblen, [REDACTED]
 Robert Bernard Ellert, [REDACTED]
 John Spencer Folawn, [REDACTED]
 William O. Gilbreath, [REDACTED]
 Bruce Nicolson Gillaspay, [REDACTED]
 Clarence Emory Goodman, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lawrence Patrick Hansen, [REDACTED]
 Edward William Haughey, [REDACTED]
 Dugald Walker Hudson, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Monahan Kelly, [REDACTED]
 Winchester Kelso, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Paul John Kovar, [REDACTED]
 William Walter Kramer, [REDACTED]
 Marvin Gerald Krieger, [REDACTED]
 Robert Martin Lathrop, [REDACTED]
 Charles William Levy, [REDACTED]
 Samuel S. Lionel, [REDACTED]
 John Austin Macomber, [REDACTED]
 Donald Lawrence Manes, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Nicholas Michael Margetis, [REDACTED]
 Herbert Meeting, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Carl Grady Moore, [REDACTED]
 Henry John Olk, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Donald Sylvester O'Neill, [REDACTED]
 Leonard Petkoff, [REDACTED]
 Arthur David Porcella, [REDACTED]
 Donald Vergne Potter, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Prentiss Ramsay, [REDACTED]
 Houston Chapman Reynolds, [REDACTED]
 Abraham Richard Richstein, [REDACTED]
 Merle Cox Rideout, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Harry Jefferson Salisbury, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Thomas Marquis Sterling, [REDACTED]
 James Spaulding Talbot, [REDACTED]
 Clayton Briggs Tasker, [REDACTED]
 William Charles Vinet, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert Kean Weaver, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Maslin Wells, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lawrence Harvey Williams, [REDACTED]
 Carl Emil Winkler, [REDACTED]
 John Francis Wolf, [REDACTED]
 Willard Wellman Young, [REDACTED]

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examina-

tion required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

X George Townley Price, [REDACTED]
 X Marion Woolever Scothorn, [REDACTED]
 X Mervyn Benson Starnes, [REDACTED]

To be major

Conley Gordon Isenberg, [REDACTED]

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. 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.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Ralph W. Bunn, [REDACTED]
 Rex Pendry Clayton, [REDACTED]
 Harvey Winsor Coddington, [REDACTED]
 Gunnar Harald Hage, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Raymond Jones, [REDACTED]
 Raymond John Karpen, [REDACTED]
 Ludwig Roland Kuhn, [REDACTED]
 Richard Henry Orth, [REDACTED]
 Reginald Roderick Quarton, [REDACTED]
 Henry Dale Roth, [REDACTED]
 Leslie Grant Tennes, [REDACTED]

To be majors

Herman Schnor Andersen, [REDACTED]
 Edward Joseph Anderson, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hampton Lee Antley, [REDACTED]
 Paul Franklin Austin, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Ellsworth Baker, [REDACTED]
 Jerome Nicholas Brandt, [REDACTED]
 George Bradley Curtis, [REDACTED]
 Rudolph Paul Czaja, [REDACTED]
 James Owen Darling, [REDACTED]
 Chester Hoag Davis, [REDACTED]
 William Emory Gott, [REDACTED]
 George Arthur Gruver, [REDACTED]
 Jose Miguel Homs, [REDACTED]
 Jack Houser, [REDACTED]
 Willard Wallace James, [REDACTED]
 Hubert Silas Kirksey, [REDACTED]
 Ralph George LeMoon, [REDACTED]
 Ivan Luther Nedds, [REDACTED]
 Arion Bernard Nibbelink, [REDACTED]
 Vernon Stell Oettinger, [REDACTED]
 William Adolphus Rawlins, [REDACTED]
 Robert Ryer 3d, [REDACTED]
 Mario Ernest Smith, [REDACTED]
 Joseph Nicholas Stable, [REDACTED]
 Fred Worley Sweet, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Victor Bunch Taylor, [REDACTED]
 Howard Francis Vire, [REDACTED]

To be captains

Sydney Milton Bunson, [REDACTED]
 Stanley Edgar Butler, [REDACTED]
 Lynn Ross Cheezum, [REDACTED]
 Carroll Eugene Clutter, [REDACTED]
 Wade Hampton Dexter, [REDACTED]
 Norman Clarence Holladay, [REDACTED]
 Ovid Lee Knight, [REDACTED]
 Charles Albert Layman, [REDACTED]
 John William Wiscarson, [REDACTED]

CHAPLAINS

To be lieutenant colonels

X Stephen Henry Stolz, [REDACTED]
 X Albert Ambrose Knier, [REDACTED]

To be majors

X George Anthony Lehman, [REDACTED]
 Francis Leon Sampson, [REDACTED]
 X Alexander Jefferson Turner, [REDACTED]

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, as amended by section 3, Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, approved May 16, 1950. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Elizabeth Georgia Mixson, XXXX
 Ada Miriam Simpson, XXXX
 Genevieve Marian Smith, XXXX
 Welma Grace Wiehe, XXXX
 Theresa Anne Wilson, XXXX
 Kathryn Grace Witter, XXXX

To be majors

Helen Mae Abramaska, XXXX
 Carrie Elizabeth Barrett, XXXX
 Irene Caroline Blochberger, XXXX
 Elizabeth Louise Breitung, XXXX
 Mary Katherine Cuppy, XXXX
 Eileen Fitzgerald, XXXX
 Kathryn Dollason Hannigan, XXXX
 Margaret Harper, XXXX
 Lucy Evelyn Jacobson, XXXX
 Georgia Elizabeth Lessley, XXXX
 Elizabeth Ella Mettler, XXXX
 Helen Elizabeth Miller, XXXX
 Laura M. Mosley, XXXX
 Dorothy Jane Odell, XXXX
 Bertha Estelle Pollard, XXXX
 Miriam Claire Schaupp, XXXX
 Vera Fern Shaw, XXXX
 Hazel Irene Snowden, XXXX
 Dorothy A. Tessen, XXXX
 Nora M. Tobin, XXXX

To be captains

Imogene Anderson, XXXX
 Dorothy Evelyn Baltzo, XXXX
 Phyllis Doris Barsh, XXXX
 Goldie Leonia Bodson, XXXX
 Edith Josephine Bonnet, XXXX
 Nelle Bradshaw, XXXX
 Mary Norma Brandon, XXXX
 Glenna Mae Briley, XXXX
 Ann Catherine Browning, XXXX
 Edna Marie Browning, XXXX
 Roberta Broyles, XXXX
 Catharine Aline Burgmeier, XXXX
 Ruth Bustraan, XXXX
 Lacadia Mary Clarke, XXXX
 Marie Cole, XXXX
 Mildred Pierce Coleman, XXXX
 Kathleen Marie Dean, XXXX
 Glenice Hilda Dearborn, XXXX
 Helen Juanita Donnelly, XXXX
 Barbara Elizabeth Earle, XXXX
 Claudia Lou Fore, XXXX
 Willie Clay Gilliam, XXXX
 Dale Arrie Hawkins, XXXX
 Barbara Mae Hogan, XXXX
 Jane Montgomery Irving, XXXX
 Helen Claire Jansen, XXXX
 Mary Elizabeth Keefe, XXXX
 Thelma Jeannette Kiltz, XXXX
 Jean Barbara Koziol, XXXX
 Orva Ruth Kunkel, XXXX
 Grace Josephine Mach, XXXX
 Mary Magdalene Matlavage, XXXX
 Annie Belle Maynard, XXXX
 Helen Anna McCloskey, XXXX
 Margaret Lucille McDow, XXXX
 Agnes McMahon, XXXX
 Hazel Moore Meeks, XXXX
 Catherine Alice Merat, XXXX
 Pattie Gibbs Morris, XXXX
 Emma Eleanor Ozuna, XXXX
 Susie Winifred Page, XXXX
 Mary Ann Petrick, XXXX
 Martha Anne Puckett, XXXX
 Carolyn Bergeron Rahm, XXXX
 Helen Joan Rakita, XXXX
 Lucille Leona Resler, XXXX
 Elizabeth Catherine Richard, XXXX
 Bernadine Mary Rosenbaum, XXXX
 Grace Lucille Sears, XXXX
 Frieda Seidman, XXXX
 Jacqueline Blackmer Sharpe, XXXX
 Lilamae Smith, XXXX
 Ruth Elizabeth Smith, XXXX
 Virginia Louise Smith, XXXX
 Agatha Bertha Spaeth, XXXX
 Sylvia Mildred Stiven, XXXX
 Faye Rita Sullivan, XXXX
 Sara Allen Tapp, XXXX
 Bernadine Rosenbaum Temple, XXXX
 Virginia Maxine Tolar, XXXX

Bernice Eulalia Tyo, XXXX
 Johanna Helen White, XXXX
 Jeraldine York, XXXX
 Thelma Mary Zeller, XXXX

WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be major

Helen Rita Sheehan, XXXX

To be captains

Mildred Jane Anderson, XXXX
 Myrtle May Bates, XXXX
 Marcel Binning, XXXX
 Anna Theresa DeNegri, XXXX
 Jean Marguerite Hawkins, XXXX
 Fuchsia Lucille Johnson, XXXX
 Mary Lipscomb, XXXX
 Althea LaRaut Luttrell, XXXX
 Leila Frances Miller, XXXX
 Inez Moffitt, XXXX
 Elizabeth Marie Nachod, XXXX
 Jennie Farnsworth Quam, XXXX
 Margaret Eileen Radke, XXXX
 Mada Steele, XXXX
 Annabel Watkins, XXXX

To be first lieutenant

Lottie Vera Blanton, XXXX

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. 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 first lieutenants

Marvin Luther Adams, XXXX
 John David Allis, XXXX
 Albert Mellen Avery, Jr., XXXX
 Richard Absalom Bailey, XXXX
 William Edward Bartholdt, XXXX
 Peter Ben Bennett, XXXX
 Bent Egon Berner, XXXX
 William Archie Blackburn, XXXX
 Karl Heinz Borcheller, XXXX
 Robert Eugene Bundy, XXXX
 Gerald Clayton Burch, XXXX
 Martin Joseph Burke, Jr., XXXX
 Sherman Kennedy Burke, XXXX
 Hugh Walton Bush, Jr., XXXX
 Raymond Lee Call, XXXX
 Herbert Truman Casey, Jr., XXXX
 X Herbert Jefferson W. Childress, Jr., XXXX
 Frank William Clayton, XXXX
 X Archie Ernest Conn, Jr., XXXX
 Roger Atkinson Corrington, XXXX
 Kenneth Lemuel Cowan, XXXX
 Floyd Greig Craft, XXXX
 William Holmer Crane, XXXX
 John Dewhurst Cunningham, XXXX
 Galen Laverne Curry, XXXX
 David Nicholas Dalton, XXXX
 Ralph Joseph Davis, XXXX
 X Leonard Pete Dileanis, XXXX
 Bernard Joseph Dolan, Jr., XXXX
 Richard Edward Donahue, XXXX
 Harry Anthony Dragotta, XXXX
 Warren Stewart Ducote, XXXX
 James Robert Duncan, XXXX
 Eugene Charles Egg, XXXX
 Robert Lee Ely, Jr., XXXX
 Rudolph Anthony Fallon, XXXX
 Walter Carl Franzen, XXXX
 Benedict Louis Freund, XXXX
 Joseph Mitchell Gay, Jr., XXXX
 Joseph Grezaff, XXXX
 James Alexander Grimsley, Jr., XXXX
 Roy Arthur Hagen, XXXX
 John Davis Hale, Jr., XXXX
 Walter R. Harrison, Jr., XXXX
 John Edward Jessup, Jr., XXXX
 Philip Everett Karl, Jr., XXXX
 Pierre Patrick Kirby, XXXX
 John Henry Klein, Jr., XXXX
 Kenneth Mortner Kone, XXXX
 Frederick Charles Krause, XXXX
 Joseph Henry London, XXXX
 Frank Phillip Lovett, Jr., XXXX
 James Robert Lukens, XXXX
 Donald LeClear Lynes, XXXX

Merritt Porter Martin, XXXX
 Frank Alfred Merigold, XXXX
 X Walter Paul Meyer, XXXX
 Henry Donald Mitman, XXXX
 Russell Eugene Moore, XXXX
 William Lade Mundie, XXXX
 Dorward Weston Ogden, Jr., XXXX
 Tillman Clinton Oliver, XXXX
 Brian Boru O'Neill, XXXX
 Jack Grover Penick, XXXX
 Richard Arnold Perkins, Jr., XXXX
 Hobert Henry Porter, XXXX
 Jacob Ancile Randolph, Jr., XXXX
 John William Reynolds, XXXX
 X Howard Fred Robinson, XXXX
 Charles Girard Ross, XXXX
 Wadie Jerome Rountree, XXXX
 Jay Vincent Russell, Jr., XXXX
 Craig Carleton Scott, XXXX
 Dwain Lewis Scott, XXXX
 Robert Wharton Shidler, XXXX
 Milton Max Silverstein, XXXX
 Martin John Slominski, XXXX
 Charles David Smith, Jr., XXXX
 Homer Duggins Smith, Jr., XXXX
 Richard Tarlton Smock, XXXX
 Americo W. Spigarelli, XXXX
 Roderick Alexander Stamey, Jr., XXXX
 Charles Beman Stevenson, XXXX
 Virgil Mansel Stone, XXXX
 Leslie J. Swope, XXXX
 John Kefauver Tate, XXXX
 Wesley Elmer Thomas, XXXX
 Hiram Speed Tye, XXXX
 Joseph Raymond Ulatoski, XXXX
 Perry Wilson Wales, XXXX
 Fred Mallett Walker, Jr., XXXX
 Homer Lee Walker, XXXX
 Donald Christopher Wells, XXXX
 William Monitor Whitesel, XXXX
 Charles Burton Wild, Jr., XXXX
 William Vernon Young, XXXX

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 15, 1951:

POSTMASTER

Norbert F. Kalkowski to be postmaster at Ashton in the State of Nebraska.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 Rev. Bruce Hays Price, D. D., LL. D., First Baptist Church, Newport News, Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and merciful God, in the spirit of gratitude we praise Thee for the material blessings Thou hast showered upon this, our great Nation. But more than this, we praise Thee for the spiritual blessings we have received, and the freedom we enjoy in this "land of the free and the home of the brave."

We pray that our people may be bound together by cords of love through an understanding and an appreciation of each other. And may we always place the welfare of all our citizens above party, creed, and race. Guard our country from enemies abroad, and from those at home who would sell their birthright for a "mess of pottage." Our Heavenly Father, let Thy protecting arm be around those who defend us in our armed services. Give comfort to our homes in which the family circles have been broken during these anxious days.

Most Holy One, bless all those who are in places of leadership and authority among us. May they look to Thee in