H. R. 3961. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to appoint a committee to designate the most appropriate day for National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 221. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies in the conduct of hearings before committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. Res. 222. Resolution to provide for an investigation in open hearings of all circumstances relating to the action of the President in relieving General of the Army Douglas MacArthur of his commands in the Far East; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 3962. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Becker Gutierrez; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3963. A bill for the relief of Kurt Karl Otto Walther; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3964. A bill for the relief of Wladysla Bogusz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3965. A bill for the relief of five sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3966. A bill for the relief of George S. Paschke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3967. A bill for the relief of Harold C. Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 3968. A bill for the relief of Marcella Maria Vankeirsbilck, nee Vanootegem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3969. A bill for the relief of Franco Berardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 3970. A bill for the relief of John (Hans-Christian) von Kotze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 3971. A bill for the relief of Esther Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 3972. A bill for the relief of Ziao Fong Hsia; 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:

266. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 21, expressing regret that General Douglas MacArthur was removed as supreme commander of the Far East, and a further reaffirmation of the resolution adopted at the last national convention of the American Legion calling for the removal of Secretary of State Dean Acheson and also expressing regret that President Truman refused to meet with and have an audience with the national commander of the American Legion, Erle Cocke, following Cocke's world tour which included a visit with troops in Korea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

267. Also, resolution of the Rock County Dental Auxiliary, Rock County, Wis., reaffirming 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.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

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

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

Most merciful God, the fountain of all wisdom and goodness: We thank Thee for the gift of sleep when the tangled web of weary striving and confused thought emerges clarified and straightened by the touch of a new day. In the midst of daily toil and ever-pressing tasks, we lay before Thee the meditations of our hearts, grateful for the noontide pause at this wayside well of peace and prayer.

Bring all our desires and powers, we beseech Thee, into conformity to Thy will. Prepare us for the role committed to our fallible hands in this appalling day, with its vast issues that concern not only our own dear land but all the continents and the islands of the sea. May our individual lives be as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom. We ask it in the name of that One who is the light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 3, 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. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PROPOSED REVISION OF A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 37)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed revision of a supplemental appropriation, involving an increase of $13,000,000, for the Atomic Energy Commission, fiscal year 1951, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

UNITED STATES APPRAISERS' STORES, BALTIMORE—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, Md., on April 23, 1951, relative to improving conditions at the United States Appraisers Stores in Baltimore.

This is a matter of the utmost importance to the well-being of the great port of Baltimore, particularly at this time when traffic is moving through the port in near-record volume.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

S. 841. A bill to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 310); and

S. 1039. A bill to amend the provision of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 relating to the composition of boards for the recommendation of rear admirals of the Navy for continuation on the active list, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 311).

By Mr. STENNIS (for Mr. HUNT), from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1244. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to except the Territory of Alaska from certain restrictions upon the making of Federal contributions, and to amend the provisions thereof relating to the taking of oaths by certain civil defense personnel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 312).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, Friday, May 4, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, or passed, as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1432. A bill for the relief of Stavros S. Niarchos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which was considered and passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 984, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Address on the subject The Great Alliance of Free Men, delivered by Hon. W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President, at the closing banquet of the regional conference sponsored by the American Association for the United Nations, Inc., in Los Angeles, Calif., on April 30, 1951.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Editorial entitled "Secretary Pace's Year," published in the April 7 issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal, regarding the first anniversary of Frank Pace, Jr., as Secretary of the Army.

By Mr. KEM:

Letter from Frank W. Ahrens, published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 29, 1951, discussing the replacement of General MacArthur.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into, the calendar will be called for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, beginning at the beginning. The Secretary will state the first bill on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 32) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile, was announced as first in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 508) to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Educational 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, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Illinois object. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 618) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 673) to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, by request of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska objects. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 41) prohibiting the sale in the District of Columbia of rockfish weighing more than 15 pounds was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 857) for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

APPOINTMENT OF BERNT BALCHEN AS PERMANENT COLONEL IN REGULAR AIR FORCE

The bill (S. 1220) to authorize the appointment of Bernt Balchen as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint Bernt Balchen, AO-426630, United States Air Force Reserve, to the permanent grade of colonel in the Regular Air Force. For the purposes of determining position on promotion list, permanent grade seniority, and eligibility for promotion, the above-named person shall be credited with an amount of service equal to the number of days, months, and years by which his age at the time of his appointment exceeds 25 years and shall be placed on the promotion list immediately below that officer appointed to the permanent grade of colonel on April 2, 1948, who is credited with the same or next greater amount of service.

The service credited to the above-named person at the time of his appointment and his active commissioned service in the Regular Air Force subsequent to his appointment shall be included within the meaning of the term "years' service" as defined in subsection (b) of section 514 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 903; 10 U. S. C. 941b).

EXCHANGE OF WILDLIFE REFUGE LANDS IN MINNESOTA

The bill (S. 467) to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to convey any lands and improvements, or interests therein, of the United States within the Talcot National Wildlife Refuge or the Beltrami Wildlife Management Area to the State of Minnesota in exchange for other lands and improvements, or interests therein, of equal value, which he deems chiefly valuable for migratory bird management purposes.

SEC. 2. Any lands acquired by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to this act, if located within or adjacent to an existing wildlife refuge or reservation, shall immediately become a part of such refuge or reservation and shall be administered under the laws and regulations applicable thereto; and if not so located, may be administered as migratory waterfowl management areas, refuges, reservations, or breeding grounds in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 10, 1934, as amended (60 Stat. 1080), and acts supplementary thereto.

BILL PASSED TO THE FOOT OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 321) to provide that on and after January 1, 1952, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I wonder if we could have an explanation of the bill. If not, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] seems to be in charge of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the bill could go to the foot of the calendar. I am sure an explanation of the bill will be forthcoming during the day.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should be glad to have such course followed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

EXTENSION OF TIME DURING WHICH CLAIM FOR REFUND MAY BE FILED UNDER SECTION 939

The bill (H. R. 2654) to amend section 10 of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECONVEYANCE OF LAND IN MACON COUNTY, ALA, TO TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE

The bill (H. R. 2685) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Tuskegee Institute a tract of land in Macon County, Ala., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN TRUSTS FROM FILING RETURN REQUIRED BY SECTION 153 (B) OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The bill (H. R. 3196) to amend section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 17, 1951, pp. 3943–3944.)

GRANT OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 62) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

CURT EDWARD FRIESE

The bill (S. 1054) for the relief of Curt Edward Friese was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Curt Edward Friese shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DR. FRANCESCO DRAGO

The bill (S. 1092) for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Francesco Drago shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

FRED E. WEBER

The bill (H. R. 576) for the relief of Fred E. Weber was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

R. J. SCHEUERMAN ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 591) for the relief of R. J. Scheuerman, Daniel Fuller, W. Hardesty, and John M. Ward was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAPHET K. ANVIL AND HOWARD A. MONROE

The bill (H. R. 594) for the relief of Japhet K. Anvil and Howard A. Monroe was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ST. PATRICK HOSPITAL AND THE WESTERN MONTANA CLINIC

The bill (H. R. 1141) for the relief of St. Patrick Hospital and the Western Montana Clinic was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN CLARK

The bill (H. R. 1235) for the relief of John Clark was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 8, after the word "unpaid", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of either of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CARL PARKS

The bill (H. R. 1422) for the relief of Carl Parks was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF YOSHIO FUKUNAGA, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 1798) for the relief of the estate of Yoshio Fukunaga, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDIE DEAN GARNER SCOTT

The bill (H. R. 2175) for the relief of Addie Dean Garner Scott was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BERNARD F. ELMERS

The bill (H. R. 2304) for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARCELLE LECOMTE

The bill (H. R. 2714) for the relief of Marcelle Lecomte was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TSUNG HSIEN HSU

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 297) for the relief of Tsung Hsien Hsu which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Tsung Hsien Hsu, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Lt. Richard Corsa, a citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEFAN LENARTOWICZ AND HIS WIFE, IRENE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 360) for the relief of Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the fiscal year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF SIDNEY LOMAX, DECEASED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 536) for the relief of the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Sidney Lomax, deceased, the sum of $5,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Sidney Lomax, who died as a result of injuries received when he was struck by a United States Army truck in Starkville, Miss., on November 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SADAKO KAWAMURA LAWTON

The bill (S. 550) for the relief of Sadako Kawamura Lawton was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, since the Senate bill was reported and placed on the calendar, a companion House bill, House bill 1101 came to the Senate and is also on the Senate Calendar. The House bill is Calendar No. 287. If the matter is to be considered, the House bill should be taken up in lieu of the Senate bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1101) for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 550 is indefinitely postponed.

LUIGI PODESTA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 879) for the relief of Luigi Podesta, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Luigi Podesta shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. A. C. LUPCHO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 645) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REFERENCE OF CLAIM OF AL PARKER TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 656) to confer jurisdiction upon the United District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "notwithstanding any limitation upon the United States district courts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon tort claims against the United States which accrue prior to January 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESTATE OF D. A. MONTGOMERY, DECEASED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 703) for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the word "Code", to insert a colon and *"Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLAIM OF AUF DER HEIDE-ARAGONA, INC., ET AL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2782) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding any lapse of time or any statute of limitations or any defense of laches, jurisdiction be, and the same hereby is, conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and through it the claims of its subcontractors, against the United States arising out of the performance of a contract dated July 25, 1941, with the Veterans' Administration for the construction of a hospital building at Fort Howard, Md., the work on which contract was completed on or about November 19, 1943: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government.

SEC. 2. Such suit may be instituted in the Court of Claims at any time within 4 months from the approval of this act.

SEC. 3. Private Law 643, Eighty-first Congress, approved July 6, 1950, is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLAUDE PIERRE CONNELLY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 291) for the relief of Claude Pierre Connelly, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 4, after the word "laws", to strike out "Claude Pierre" and insert "Claudio Pier", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Claudio Pier Connelly shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Claudio Pier Connelly."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 630) to suspend until December 21, 1952, the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 36) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at a rate of not exceeding 7 cents per mile was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have a request from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CERTAIN CLAIMS OF WILLIAM BERGEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 588) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "injuries", to insert "allegedly", and on page 2, line 7, after the word "Code", to insert a colon and *"Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLEO C. REEVES ET AL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 593) for the relief of Cleo C. Reeves, Floyd L. Murphy, and Fabian P. Durand, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$150" and insert "$123", and in line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$410.10" and insert "$168.10."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. ELEANOR K. SAVIDGE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 849) for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor K. Savidge, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Henry W. Savidge, deceased, of Philadelphia, Pa., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims of said estate against the United States for loss of earnings sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by the said Henry W. Savidge as a result of his having been struck on December 28, 1942, by an Army vehicle in Philadelphia, Pa.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Henry W. Savidge."

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 50) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is hereby amended by striking out "1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "1953."

PRICE DIFFERENTIAL MADE IN GOOD FAITH AS DEFENSE TO CHARGE OF PRICE DISCRIMINATION UNDER ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 719) to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wonder if I may ask the distinguished majority leader a question. He has been very fine about announcing the program in connection with wheat for India, and with respect to the supplemental appropriation bill and other measures. I am wondering if he has in mind when this bill may be set for consideration and debate.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have discussed it with the policy committee, and I assure the Senator that it will come up in due time. I cannot say now just when that will be.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the majority leader kindly withhold his objection until I make an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly, I will withhold the objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. The reason for my request is that I may not be here next week when the bill might come up. I desire at this time to make a brief explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, when we were debating last year on this floor Senate bill 1008, the so-called basing-point bill, there was virtually complete unanimity of agreement, so far as I can recall, on the point that the good-faith meeting of the legal price of a competitor should be a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination under the Robinson-Patman Act.

We disagreed about many things in connection with that bill; but on this one thing I do not remember that we had any disagreement.

Even the members of the Federal Trade Commission, who disagreed rather violently about what the law was, were agreed on what it should be, in this one respect at least. The Department of Justice took the same position. Even those who fought the bill most bitterly stated, here on this floor, one after another, that they recognized that the good-faith absorption of freight, or the quoting and selling at delivered prices, to meet the equally low price of a competitor, and without conspiracy or collusion, was not unlawful and should not be unlawful. Then they proceeded to attack the bill then pending before the Senate—S. 1008—on some other ground. They said it went further than merely confirming the right of a seller to meet in good faith the equally low price of a competitor; and, they said, it was because the bill went further than that, in one respect or another, that they were opposed to it.

Today we have before the Senate a bill which simply proposes to write into unequivocal statutory form what the Supreme Court of the United States has said the law is today. The language of this proposed bill is very short. It is completely clear and completely unambiguous. The bill provides that it shall be a complete defense against a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that he was only meeting in good faith the equally low price of a competitor, provided the seller did not know or have reason to know that the price he was meeting was not a lawful price.

When we brought out S. 1008 last year, we were criticized because we were attempting to amend the language in section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. We were told that if all we wanted to do was what we said we were trying to do, we should not change the language of existing law, but should simply add a new section to the law, stating what we wanted to do.

This year, when we have taken the language of the Supreme Court itself, and adapted it to the legislative purpose, and brought in a bill which does not change the language of existing law but merely adds a single, simple, new section, we are criticized because we are grafting something onto the law and not doing a clean job, and we are told that what we should do is go back and rewrite the existing language of section 2 of the Clayton Act.

According to a letter from former Senator Mead, now Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, three members of that Commission have concurred in a report which asks that this bill be amended. The purpose of the amendment sponsored by this group of three Federal Trade Commissioners is to change the present law, to change the Supreme Court's interpretation of the law, and to provide instead that the law shall be interpreted in the way in which the Federal Trade Commission contended it should have been interpreted, in the very case in which the Supreme Court decided against the Trade Commission's contentions.

At the time the bill was introduced, and before it was in print, the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] made the statement that whenever the Supreme Court handed down a decision unfavorable to big business, an effort was made to change the law; and that whenever the Supreme Court handed down a decision favorable to big business, an effort was made to write that decision into permanent law. The implication, of course, was that the proponents of this bill—or, at least, its sponsors—were serving big business.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, what the bill actually proposes to do is to write into law the decision of the Supreme Court in this case. Is that not true?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. That is all it proposes to.

Mr. President, we are now faced with a situation in which the Federal Trade Commission, having lost its case in court, is asking to have the law changed so that it may win its case in Congress; whereas the proponents of the bill are simply seeking to uphold, and render safe from attack, the law as it now stands, and as the Supreme Court has decided the question.

The Supreme Court of the United States has said that—

> Congress did not seek by the Robinson-Patman Act either to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price cut by a competitor.

The Supreme Court has said, further, that—

> There is, on the other hand, plain language and established practice which permits a seller, through section 2 (b), to retain a customer by realistically meeting in good faith the price offered to that customer, without necessarily changing the seller's price to its other customers.

The highest Court of the land has declared that—

> In a case where a seller sustains the burden of proof placed upon it to establish its defense under section 2 (b), we find no reason to destroy that defense indirectly, merely because it also appears that the beneficiaries of the seller's price reductions may derive a competitive advantage from them or may, in a natural course of events, reduce their own resale prices to their customers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's 5 minutes under the rule has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may complete the statement. It will probably take 2 or 3 minutes more.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Supreme Court has pointed out, very clearly, that if the law is to be so construed that a price discrimination, once established, may be held to be a violation of law if the Federal Trade Commission makes a finding that the discrimination may injure competition, regardless of the fact that the discrimination was only made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor, then the defense would have such little, if any, applicability as to be practically meaningless.

The bill, Mr. President, as I have said, borrows from the language of the Supreme Court itself, in the Standard Oil case. It does not change the doctrine laid down in that case. It does not extend that doctrine, nor contract it. It merely reasserts what the Supreme Court, in the Standard Oil case, has declared the law to be; and writes that reassertion into the permanent statute.

When I introduced the bill, Mr. President, I stated that I did not anticipate much controversy over it, because those of us who had sought enactment of S. 1008 can say, with accuracy, that the decision of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case, and this bill, which would write that decision into permanent law, are exactly in accord with what we said the law was at the time we were pushing for enactment of S. 1008; while, on the other hand, those who opposed the enactment of S. 1008 can say that they held the fort and prevented the enactment of legislation until the Supreme Court had spoken on the question; and they can go along with this bill because it is in complete accord with the Supreme Court's decision.

Perhaps I was overly optimistic, Mr. President, in making that statement; but I still think it is a logical way to look at the matter, and I still cannot see how there can be any substantial controversy over the bill.

Certainly, there can be no reasonable controversy over what the bill does, and therefore the issue is clearly presented, and we should be able to get to a vote in a relatively short time.

The Federal Trade Commission has raised one point which is perhaps worthy of mention. The letter signed by former Senator Mead, now Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, expressed fear that enactment of this bill might in some way shift the burden of proof. Mr. Mead's letter is not very clear about it; but the legal point the letter is attempting to make appears to be this: That when a defense is restricted by an exception clause, it is thereafter sufficient for the person claiming the defense to make a prima facie showing without regard to the exception, after which the adversary must prove the exception in order to defeat the defense.

Of course, that is not the law, and there is no possibility that the proviso in the bill would be construed in that way.

A person claiming a statutory defense has the burden of showing the whole defense. If there is an execption which will void the defense, he must show that he does not come within the exception. To state the proposition another way, the person claiming a statutory defense must establish every essential element of that defense by a preponderance of the evidence, otherwise he has failed to carry the burden of proof.

In connection with the debates last year on Senate bill 1008, I discussed at some length the difference between shifting the burden of proof and shifting the duty of proceeding. I do not think it is necessary to go into that matter again here and now. The important thing is that the burden of proof is on the person claiming a statutory defense to show all the elements of the defense. He must sustain that burden by a preponderance of the evidence, or his claim to the defense will fail. I do not want to argue complex procedural questions, and I do not intend to argue them, because any such argument can only result in befogging the issue now before us. I did feel, however, that I should make this clear and unequivocal statement with respect to the question of shifting the burden of proof. Having made it, I am done with the point; and if anyone of my colleagues wishes to challenge my statement, he can make his own record.

One phony argument which has been used against this bill has been unduly repeated, and I feel I should refer to it briefly.

It has been charged, both directly and by innuendo, that the bill, if enacted, would have an adverse effect on small business, through permitting chain stores to engage in methods of unfair competition with their retail competitors. One critic of the bill has even gone so far, in this direction, as to refer to the bill as a proposal to "legalize the destruction of small business."

Obviously, no such criticism is in any way justified. The bill does not deal in any way with sales at retail. A retailer who cuts the price of an item on his shelves, all the way down to cost, or even below cost, as a loss leader, or otherwise, cannot be said to be guilty of discrimination, because he is offering the same cut price to all his customers, at the same time. It is discrimination at the wholesale or distributing level with which the present law is concerned; and, as has been repeatedly pointed out, the bill now before the Senate does not go beyond what the law is today, as the Supreme Court has interpreted it.

In the report on the bill filed with the Judiciary Committee by the committee on the Clayton Act of the New York State Bar Association's section on antitrust law, there is a paragraph which should be preserved as a part of the legislative history of the bill.

Here is what the committee of the New York State Bar Association said. I shall read it slowly, for there is much meat in it:

> This committee unanimously endorses the objective of the proposed legislation. The Supreme Court * * * has ruled that Congress by the Robinson-Patman Act did not intend to outlaw competition, and the McCarran bill affirms the correctness of that ruling. Congress is subject to strong pressures today from public and private interests seeking protection from competition which hurts. Congress should not retreat from its position that competition is not intended to be painless and that the only alternative to such competitive hurt is a cartel or socialistic economy. Under the Robinson-Patman Act, a business competitor should be entitled to protection against predatory discrimination, but he should not expect to be insured against competition itself.

Mr. President, this bill is a declaration in favor of honorable competition in the field of pricing. There is nothing dishonorable about meeting a competitor's price in order to hold a customer; and the fact that business has the right to do so inevitably redounds to the benefit of the public, regardless of whether the seller absorbs freight charges, or other costs, in order to meet his competition.

I thank the Senate for giving me this opportunity to present my views on the bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief observation on the bill. I wish to thank the Senator from Nevada for the explanation and for the analysis of it. I agree with him that there is no reason, so far as I can see, why the bill should not be passed. I compliment the Senator from Nevada on introducing the bill, on considering it in the Judiciary Committee, and on having it placed on the calendar.

I am most gratified by the remarks of the distinguished majority leader that in due course of time this bill will come before the Senate for consideration. I hope for its speedy passage. It will help very much in the situation in which it is intended to be of assistance. Enactment of the bill is badly needed,

especially for the assistance of the small-business men of the Nation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that I did not attempt to go into an analysis of the bill at this time. The analysis is to be found in the report on the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. Nevertheless, the brief statement the Senator from Nevada has made has given some of the highlights of the bill, of course. I hope every Senator will read the analysis of the bill, so that when it comes before the Senate, its speedy passage will be assured.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

JAN JOSEF WIECKOWSKI AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1229) for the relief of Jan Josef Wieckowski and his wife and daughter, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jan Josef Wieckowski, his wife, Irena, and daughter, Maria, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. OKSANA STEPANOVNA KASENKINA

The bill (H. R. 622) for the relief of Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JANINA WOJCICKA AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 632) for the relief of Janina Wojcicka, Wojciech Andrej Wojcicki and Stanislaw Wojcicki was considered, ordered to a third reading read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF MATTIE MASHAW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 652) for the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,249.45" and insert "$6,244"; and in line 9, after the words "summer of", to strike out "1944" and insert "1942."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. CORAL E. ALLDRITT

The bill (H. R. 664) for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HILDEGARD DETTLING AND JUDITH INGEBORG DETTLING

The bill (H. R. 667) for the relief of Hildegard Dettling and Judith Ingeborg Dettling was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES A. G. MARTINDALE

The bill (H. R. 714) for the relief of James A. G. Martindale was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NICOLETTA AND GUILIA PONTRELLI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 756) for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after the name "Pontrelli", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Nicoletta Pontrelli becoming a public charge."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

FREDERICK EDMOND TOMKINS AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 781) for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN YAN CHI GEE

The bill (H. R. 789) for the relief of John Yan Chi Gee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARGOT KAZERSKI

The bill (H. R. 859) for admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIRST LT. WALTER S. MOE, JR.

The bill (H. R. 887) for the relief of First Lt. Walter S. Moe, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LENA VALSAMIS AND LUCY BALOSA VALSAMIS

The bill (H. R. 889) for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ATHINA MARY ONASSIS

The bill (H. R. 890) for the relief of Athina Mary Onassis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY AND VASSILI DENDRAMIS

The bill (H. R. 891) for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUNTER ARNO THELEMANN

The bill (H. R. 898) for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelemann was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TARO TAKARA

The bill (H. R. 1111) for the relief of Taro Takara was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KIMIKO SHIBUYA

The bill (H. R. 1117) for the relief of Kimiko Shibuya was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHIN YOK KONG

The bill (H. R. 1121) for the relief of Chin Yok Kong was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIO PUCCI AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1150) for the relief of Mario Pucci, Giacomo Favetti; Giuseppe Omati, Vincenzo Andreani, Lambruno Sarzanini, and Alessandro Costa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PIETRO GIANNETTINO

The bill (H. R. 1164) for the relief of Pietro Giannettino was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. CHIA LEN LIU

The bill (H. R. 1263) for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Liu was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACQUELYN SHELTON

The bill (H. R. 1264) for the relief of Jacquelyn Shelton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. FERNAND VAN DEN BRANDEN

The bill (H. R. 1421) for the relief of Dr. Fernand Van Den Branden was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, Dr. Fernand Van Den Branden is a citizen and legal resident of Belgium. On June 30, 1948, the doctor was injured in a crash with a United States Government vehicle near Buchy. The report of the Department of the Army indicates that the fault was solely that of the driver of the Government vehicle and that Dr. Van Den Branden was seriously injured. He is, at the present time, 60 percent disabled, having been 100 percent disabled for quite some time. The sum awarded the doctor has been approved by the Department of the Army as being a sum reasonable and just under the circumstances. The sum amounts to $13,269.82.

This claimant has no remedy under the Federal Tort Claims Act, as the accident occurred outside the United States; and he has no remedy under the Foreign Claims Act, because he was not an inhabitant of France, the place where the accident occurred.

An identical bill was favorably reported from the committee to the Senate

in the Eighty-first Congress, on December 11, 1950.

The committee believes that the claim is fair, just, and equitable and has recommended favorable action.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1421) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT MEETING OF COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a unanimous-consent request and also a brief announcement.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations are now in joint session. Therefore, first, I ask unanimous consent that they may meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR VOTE ON SENATE RESOLUTION 137

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations are very busy at their joint hearing. The Senator from Nebraska has wished to have the Senate vote on his motion to have the Senate consider Senate Resolution 137. Of course, I would not wish to inconvenience the two committees, which now are in session, any more than is absolutely necessary.

Therefore, for the purpose of arranging for a vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to have the Senate consider the resolution, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 1 o'clock, or as soon thereafter as a quorum may be obtained, the Senate shall proceed to vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska that the Senate consider Senate Resolution 137; and that if the motion is agreed to, thereafter, following the completion of the call of the calendar, the resolution be made the unfinished business.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. I also ask, in that connection, that a quorum call be waived.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to agree to the request, but I feel I cannot do so. I wish to present some remarks to the Senate immediately upon the completion of the call of the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. The arrangement I have proposed would not prevent the Senator's doing so. The proposed agreement would simply call for the vote, and nothing more than that; and then the Senator from Nevada could proceed to make his remarks.

Mr. McCARRAN. If that is all that the proposed agreement amounts to, it will be satisfactory.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand the majority leader, the Senate is to take a vote on the motion to consider the resolution, and if the motion is agreed to, the resolution will become the unfinished business, after completion of the calendar call, at which time the distinguished Senator from Nevada could make his remarks. Of course, if the motion is not agreed to, that would be another thing; but if it is agreed to, following the call of the calendar the resolution will become the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

T. L. MORROW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of T. L. Morrow, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. INGEBORG RUTH SATTLER McLAUGHLIN

The bill (H. R. 1438) for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Ruth Sattler McLaughlin was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not want to object to the consideration of this bill, but I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Were both of the preceding bills passed? There was some colloquy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They were passed.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1438) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES R. KEICHER

The bill (H. R. 1451) for the relief of Charles R. Keicher was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELENA ERBEZ

The bill (H. R. 1475) for the relief of Elena Erbez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUISE LEITZINGER AND HER DAUGHTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1722) for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 14, after the words "of the", to strike out "date of their entry into the United States, upon the payment by them of the required visa and head tax" and insert "date of the payment by them of the required visa fees and head taxes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOSE ENCARNACION ORTIZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1823) for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "Upon the enactment of this act" and insert "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LUCIA ADAMOS

The bill (H. R. 2357) for the relief of Lucia Adamos was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONCETTA SANTAGATI GIORDANO

The bill (H. R. 2450) for the relief of Concetta Santagati Giordano was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TERMS OF OFFICE OF REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

The bill (H. R. 3291) to amend subdivision (a) of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be placed at the foot of the calendar, because of the absence of Senators who might be interested in it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

PLACE OF FIRST MEETING OF CREDITORS IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS

The bill (H. R. 3292) to amend subdivision a of section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, I make a similar request as to this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

TERMS OF OFFICE OF REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may revert to the two bills, calendar 266 and 267, House bills 3291 and 3292, which were placed at the foot of the calendar while I was called out of the Senate Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 3291?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill provides that when the term of office of a referee in bankruptcy expires the incumbent referee shall continue to serve until a successor is appointed and qualifies.

Under existing law, referees are appointed for a 6-year term. The statute, however, does not contain a saving clause for the continuance in office. In the instances in which the judges empowered to make the appointment of such referees fail to make such appointment promptly, a lapse occurs in the office.

The bill is proposed by the judicial conference of the United States and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3291) to amend subdivision a of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PLACE OF FIRST MEETING OF CREDITORS IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are two bills of the same tenor. Is there objection to the present consideration of H. R. 3292?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill permits the court to fix the place of the holding of the first meeting of creditors in a bankruptcy proceeding. At present there is an apparent inconsistency between two provisions of the Bankruptcy Act providing the place for the holding of the first meeting. The proposed bill resolves the inconsistency.

The bill bears the approval of the judicial conference of the United States and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 3292?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3292) to amend subdivision a of section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRADY FRANKLIN WELCH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1109) for the relief of Grady Franklin Welch.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I send to the desk an amendment, which I should like to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The secretary will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 10, after the word "Division", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Grady Franklin Welch, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $450, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for attorney's fees paid by him, the said Welch, to his attorney of record in the case of United States against Welch, criminal No. 10,200, District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, Norfolk division: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

FACILITIES FOR ENFORCEMENT OF THE CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS

The bill (S. 24) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," approved June 26, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under the present law the amount of money which may be expended by the Immigration and Naturalization Service or by the Treasury Department for the operation of the Customs Service for any one facility is $5,000. The limit of expenditure for any facility provided for the joint use of the Customs Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service is $10,000.

This bill increases the limit of expenditure for the use of one of these agencies for any one project from $5,000 to $15,000 and increases the limit of expenditure for any one project for the joint use of these two services from $10,000 to $30,000.

It is the information of the committee that the Customs Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service are seriously hampered in the administration of their work because they cannot acquire adequate facilities under the limitations of the present law because of the very substantial appreciation of land and building materials.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 24) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 817), as amended by the act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1091; 19 U. S. C. 68), is further amended by striking from the proviso the figures "$5,000" and "$10,000", and substituting therefor the figures "$15,000" and "$30,000", respectively.

RAFAEL KUBELIK, HIS WIFE LUDNILA KUBELIK, AND THEIR MINOR SON, MARTIN KUBELIK

The bill (S. 275) for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludnila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a husband, wife and minor child, all natives of Czechoslovakia, who entered the United States as visitors in 1950. The husband is the musical director and conductor of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra and the wife is a concert violinist. The husband is a man of positive democratic ideals and principles. The family cannot return to Czechoslovakia for fear of persecution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "wife", to strike out "Ludnila" and insert "Ludmila", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the first available appropriate quota or quotas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik."

RUTH ALICE CRAWSHAW

The bill (S. 652) for the relief of Ruth Alice Crawshaw, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill? As I understand, the Veterans' Administration lodged an objection to the bill as being a preferential bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill provides for the payment of an amount estimated to be $10,000, to the widow of a former Navy enlisted man. The enlisted man served in the Navy from 1909 until the date of his mysterious disappearance at sea in August 1921. At that time, in accordance with Navy regulations, a board of investigation was convened to inquire into the circumstances surrounding his disappearance. That board made a finding, which was subsequently approved by the Secretary of the Navy, that the enlisted man's death was not incurred in line of duty and was the result of his own misconduct. There was no appeal from this decision except by way of an act of Congress.

Thereafter, the widow made application to the Veterans' Administration for a pension based on her hubsband's naval service. The Veterans' Administration was unable to award her a pension because of the decision of the board of investigation previously noted. Moreover, the Veterans' Administration had no authority to reinvestigate the case.

Several prior bills to alleviate the situation were introduced in various Congresses but no action was taken thereon.

Upon the establishment, in 1947, of the board for the correction of naval records, pursuant to authority contained in section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, an application was filed on behalf of the widow seeking correction of this record. That board, after a hearing and investigation in which all interested parties were represented, overturned the finding of the previous board and concluded that "an injustice is found in subject man's record under applicable standards of naval law, administration, and practice," and ordered that his record be corrected to show that his death did occur in the line of duty and not as a result of his own misconduct.

Thereafter, the Veterans' Administration, upon application, commenced paying the widow a pension based on her husband's honorable naval service. However, under applicable law and regulations the payments could not be made retroactive. This bill provides for a lump-sum payment to the widow for the loss of her pension from date of death of her husband to the date the Veterans' Administration commenced payment following the corrective action taken by the board established by Congress.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 642) for the relief of Ruth Alice Crawshaw, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "Administrator of Veterans' Affairs" and insert "Secretary of the Treasury"; in line 4, after the word "pay", to insert "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated"; and on page 2, line 3, after the word "application", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ruth Alice Crawshaw, the widow of Ralph Everett Crawshaw (XC-687874), a sum equal to the amount which would have been payable to her as death compensation for the period beginning on the date of her original application for such benefits and ending on November 4, 1947, on account of the death of the said Ralph Everett Crawshaw in the naval service of the United States, had the award of such compensation been made effective from the date of such original application: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOOK KAT

The bill (H. R. 2068) for the relief of Sook Kat was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS SALARY ACT OF 1947

The bill (S. 945) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1947, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to correct certain inequities in the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1947. It changes existing law in several particulars.

First. It creates a new salary class of "assistants, consultants, and supervisors," with a salary grade below that of principal, but higher than that of teacher. Some personnel in the department were doing work which was above the grade of teacher but below that of principal, and there was no classification for them. This bill would establish such a classification.

Second. It allows the promotion of five librarians and approximately 25 vocational-shop teachers, without the requirement of a master's degree. The reason for this is that the Board has been unable to find or to recruit for such positions personnel who have master's degrees.

Third. It increases the probationary period of service from 1 year to 2 years.

Fourth. It eliminates the requirement that teachers may receive annual increases, after 5 years, only by producing evidence of successful teaching, in the case of a teacher; for outstanding service, in the case of a school officer. The bill would require that the teacher's or officer's work be satisfactory. I understand this will have a good effect on the morale of school teachers.

Fifth. It creates a new position of chief examiner for colored schools. I understand white schools already have a chief examiner.

Sixth. It allows a teacher who on June 30, 1947, held a teaching position requiring a master's degree, or the equivalent of such a degree, but who did not hold such a degree to be continued in his or her position. I understand this affects approximately 260 teachers who have been doing work of higher grade but, because they have no master's degree, would be placed in an inferior position.

I understand all these recommendations meet the approval of the Board of Education, the Board of Commissioners, and the Budget Bureau. The bill is unanimously reported by the members of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 945) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That article II, section 1, of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by inserting before "Class 14—Assistant principals in junior high schools" a new class to read as follows:

"Class 13A—Assistants, consultants, and supervisors: A basic salary of $4,330 per year with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of $5,330 per year is reached."

SEC. 2. The third sentence of section 2 of such act, as amended, is amended (a) by striking therefrom "Except as hereinafter provided in this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "After July 1, 1947"; (b) by striking the colon preceding the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and (c) by striking therefrom the first proviso and so much of the second proviso as reads: "*And provided further, however*, That."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out from the proviso the word "year" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "2 years."

(b) This section shall take effect on the 1st day of July next following the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. Section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out from the first sentence thereof the following: ", except as provided in section 2 of this act."

SEC. 5. Paragraphs (e), (f), (g), (h), (k), (l), (m), (n), (o), (p), and (ab) of section 6 of such act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(e) Teachers in junior high schools, now assigned to salary class 2, group C, shall be

transferred and assigned to salary class 2, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(f) Teachers in junior high schools, now assigned to salary class 2, group D, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 2, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(g) Teachers in senior high schools, now assigned to salary class 3, group A, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 3, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(h) Teachers in senior high schools, now assigned to salary class 3, group B, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 3, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(k) Teachers in vocational or trade schools shall be transferred and assigned as follows:

"(1) Vocational school teachers now assigned to salary class 5, group A, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 5, group A, of the foregoing schedule;

"(2) Vocational school teachers now assigned to salary class 5, group B, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 5, group A, of the foregoing schedule;

"(3) Vocational school teachers now assigned to salary class 5, group C, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 5, group C, of the foregoing schedule; and

"(4) Vocational school teachers now assigned to salary class 5, group D, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 5, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(l) Research assistants shall be transferred and assigned as follows:

"(1) Research assistants now assigned to salary class 6, group A, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 6, group A, of the foregoing schedule;

"(2) Research assistants now assigned to salary class 6, group B, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 6, group A of the foregoing schedule;

"(3) Research assistants now assigned to salary class 6, group C, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 6, group C, of the foregoing schedule; and

"(4) Research assistants now assigned to salary class 6, group D, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 6, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(m) Instructors in the teachers colleges now assigned to salary class 7, group A, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 7, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(n) Instructors in the teachers colleges now assigned to salary class 7, group B, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 7, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(o) Librarians in the teachers colleges now assigned to salary class 8, group A, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 8, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(p) Librarians in the teachers colleges now assigned to salary class 8, group B, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 8, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(ab) Supervisors of penmanship now assigned to salary class 7, group B, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 7, group C, of the foregoing schedule with the title of instructor in the teachers colleges;".

SEC. 6. Section 7 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. On July 1, 1948, and on the first day of each fiscal year thereafter, if his work is satisfactory, every permanent teacher, school officer, or other employee, shall receive an annual increase in salary within his salary class or position as hereinbefore provided without action of the Board of Education. A program of in-service training under regulations to be formulated by the Board of Education shall be established to promote continuous professional growth among the teachers, school officers, and other employees."

SEC. 7. Section 9 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. (a) Every teacher, librarian, research assistant, and instructor in the teachers colleges in the service of the Board of Education on June 30, 1947, shall be transferred and assigned either to group A or to group C in salary classes 1 to 8, inclusive, in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of this act. Every teacher, librarian, research assistant, counselor, and instructor in the teachers colleges appointed on or after July 1, 1947, shall be assigned according to eligibility either to group A or to group C if the salary class to which he is appointed be divided into group A and group C. Every teacher, librarian, research assistant, and counselor transferred and assigned on July 1, 1947, to a group A, or appointed to group A on July 1, 1947, or thereafter shall be promoted to group C on the basis of documentary evidence establishing the attainment of a recognized master's degree: *Provided*, That after June 30, 1948, all promotions to group C shall be made on the first day of the month immediately following the date on which documentary evidence is submitted to the Board of Education establishing to the Board's satisfaction the attainment of a recognized master's degree.

"(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this act to the contrary, the Board of Education is authorized to promote school librarians in the service of the Board of Education on permanent tenure on July 1, 1950, to class 4, group C, without requiring such librarians to have a master's degree and to appoint or promote vocational high school shop teachers to class 5, group C, without requiring such teachers to have a master's degree."

SEC. 8. Section 13 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. There shall be appointed by the Board of Education, on the recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, a chief examiner for the board of examiners for white schools and and a chief examiner for the board of examiners for colored schools. All members of the respective boards of examiners shall serve without additional compensation."

SEC. 9. Appropriations to carry out, after June 30, 1951, the purposes of sections 2, 4, and 5 of this act, and so much of section 7 of this act as relates to subsection (a) of section 9 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended, are authorized. The appropriations for general administration, general supervision and instruction, and vocational education, George-Barden program, under the caption "Public schools" contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1950, approved June 29, 1949, and in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1951, approved July 18, 1950, are hereby made available for carrying out the purposes of such sections of this act for periods prior to July 1, 1951.

SEC. 10. Sections 2, 4, and 5 of this act, and so much of section 7 of this act as relates to subsection (a) of section 9 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended, shall take effect July 1, 1947.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is so near the hour of 1 o'clock that when the next bill is called I should like to have present the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], who is busy at a hearing, and I suggest at this time the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Anderson	Hendrickson	Maybank
Bennett	Hennings	Millikin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bricker	Hill	Moody
Bridges	Hoey	Morse
Butler, Md.	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Ives	Nixon
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Clements	Kefauver	Robertson
Connally	Kem	Russell
Cordon	Kerr	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smathers
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Long	Sparkman
Ferguson	McCarran	Stennis
Flanders	McCarthy	Tobey
Frear	McClellan	Underwood
Fulbright	McFarland	Wherry
Gillette	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Martin	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into today, the Senate will proceed to vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137. The Secretary will state the resolution as amended.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the resolution, to which an amendment has been offered, but

which cannot be acted on until the resolution is considered.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 137) authorizing Senators to attend as observers the joint meetings of the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations on the far-eastern policy.

Mr. McFARLAND. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand the unanimous-consent agreement provides that following the vote, even though the motion be agreed to, the Senate will continue the call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. McFARLAND. Senators who are opposed to taking up the resolution would vote "nay" and those who favor taking it up and displacing the farm labor bill would vote "yea," would they not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there a proposed amendment at the desk which would provide for open hearings?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has submitted an amendment, which was heretofore read for the information of the Senate. It is lying on the table.

Mr. FERGUSON. It provides for open hearings, does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. McCLELLAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I understand that after the disposition of the motion, even if it should be determined that the resolution should be taken up, it would be subject to indefinite debate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be subject to any kind of debate which would be appropriate under the rules.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators who favor the motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution will vote "yea"; those who are opposed will vote "nay." The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

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

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business, and, if present, they would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are necesarily absent, and, if present, they would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] who is necessarily absent is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] who is absent on official business is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] who is necessarily absent is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] who is necessarily absent is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—37

Bennett	Ferguson	Morse
Brewster	Flanders	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Nixon
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Ives	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Cain	Knowland	Tobey
Carlson	Langer	Wherry
Case	Lodge	Wiley
Cordon	McCarran	Williams
Dirksen	McCarthy	Young
Dworshak	Martin	
Ecton	Millikin	

NAYS—41

Anderson	Holland	Monroney
Byrd	Humphrey	Moody
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kefauver	Pastore
Frear	Kerr	Robertson
Fulbright	Kilgore	Russell
Gillette	Long	Smathers
Green	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McFarland	Sparkman
Hennings	McKellar	Stennis
Hill	McMahon	Underwood
Hoey	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken	George	Neely
Benton	Hunt	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Jenner	Taft
Chavez	Lehman	Thye
Duff	Magnuson	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker

So Mr. WHERRY's motion was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the vote just taken, of course, defeats the motion to consider the resolution presented by the Senator from Michigan, which was the vehicle upon which we expected to place an amendment providing for open hearings. Someone has asked me if we expect to renew the motion. I simply desire to say that those of us who believe in open hearings have done our level best to get this matter before the Senate. We have failed. My convictions in favor of open hearings are just as strong as they ever have been; in fact, they are stronger, in view of some of the things we have seen happen. I do not believe in drawing an iron curtain over the hearings, except to withhold such information as might affect detrimentally the national security. I will say we have done our best. We have made three or four attempts. What will happen in the future I do not know. The future will have to take care of itself.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe in reply to what the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has said, that never in the history of this Republic has a hearing been so fully, completely, and accurately presented to the American people, with security matters deleted, as has been the hearing which is in progress at the present time. It is a great triumph for national security and the saving of the lives of American men who are fighting our battles in Korea.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, in support of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee I should like to offer for insertion in the RECORD at this time the column by Mr. Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post of May 1.

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

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN

In view of what appears to be coming in the great inquiry which begins on Thursday we must ask ourselves what is going to happen to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They face the fact that there is now to be published an only somewhat expurgated version of their most secret papers. When they wrote or approved these papers they believed that these papers would not be published—that they would be confidential for themselves, their lawful superiors, and the commanders in the field to whom they issued instructions.

There is no need to guess now about what the publication of these papers is going to prove about the best way to conduct the Korean war. But one does not have to be a prophet to see what the precedent now being set is going to do to the conduct of the United States Government.

We—that is to say the administration and the opposition and everyone else so far as I can see except a few stray dissenters—have accepted the theory that an officer, who disagrees with his orders, may by challenging the integrity of his lawful superiors compel them to open up all their files to the inspection of Congress. According to this theory the congressional investigators are the judges of what shall or shall not be published. What they decide to publish is to be treated as the evidence in a popular debate which is to pass upon the integrity and the competence of the men responsible for the defense of the Nation.

This is the theory which we are about to make into a precedent. It is being done, some say, in the name of the sacred right of the people to know all the facts. They are, I believe, profoundly mistaken. If this theory goes unchallenged, if what is about to be done is accepted as a precedent, as one of the legitimate usages of our constitutional system, the effect will not be to give the people access to the truth. The effect will be to conceal, to disguise, to falsify the truth that is given to the President and to the Congress and to the people.

Once the precedent is set, it will mean that no paper in the files of the Government can be considered truly confidential. Today, the arbiter of what is and of what is not confidential happens to be Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, an able and judicious man. But if Senator RUSSELL can browse around in the papers of the Chiefs of Staff and be the arbiter as to whether they have a right to say that this paper is too secret to be published, then his successors will also be the arbiters.

Senator RUSSELL is a Democrat who will not wish to injure fatally a Democratic administration. But his successor might be one who did wish to do just that, and he might insist, therefore, upon publishing the very documents which Senator RUSSELL has not published. Thus all the Chiefs of Staff, and I might add all other responsible officials, are on notice from here on out that some time or other any document they sign may be published in whole or in part, in its context or out of its context.

What will this do to the Chiefs of Staff? Approximately what it would do to a boy writing to his girl, to a husband writing to his wife, to a businessman writing to his partner, or to Senator TAFT writing to Senator WHERRY, if they felt sure that their letters were going to be published—most probably at the moment when they would cause the maximum embarrassment. Letters written with a knowledge that they may be published will be the kind of letters that are written for publication. They will be phonies in that they will say what will look as well as possible in print. The effect will be to make the formal papers of the Government a false front which does not reveal, which in fact is designed to conceal, the truth. This is already the character of some of the paper work in the Government; it is written with an eye to the headlines which will be used when and if it is published, and what the official really thinks has to be ascertained by calling him on the telephone or asking him to lunch. But this kind of disintegration has not presumably become characteristic as yet of the papers that deal with the issues of life and death, with the military security and the high policy of the United States.

But if this evil precedent is set, that is just what will happen to these papers. They will be written for publication and they will be addressed not to the vital interests of the United States in the long run but to the passions and the prejudices and the ignorance of the moment. The papers will not be worth reading if they are written for publication. In fact they will be worse than useless in that they will not be honest.

Those who think that the right of the people to know can be met by destroying the rules of confidence and publishing anything and everything should ask themselves why they think it right, why they believe it to be part of the very substances of liberty, that some relations shall be privileged and not opened to publicity; the relations of husband and wife, of lawyer and client, of doctor and patient, of priest and his charges. Why do we protect these relationships? Is it not in order to protect our liberties? In Government the relationship between the civil power and the military, between the President and his lawful military advisers, the Joint Chiefs, is as sensitive and as critical as any of the private relations that we protect. On the integrity of the relation between the President and his advisers may depend the life of the Nation. That relation must be destroyed, it will be destroyed, if the privilege of confidence is taken away.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is necessary for the Senator from Oregon to leave the floor in order to attend the hearings of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. I ask unanimous consent at this time to submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to section 504 of Senate bill 984, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and have it printed and lie on the table so that it will be available for being called up on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the call of the calendar will be resumed. The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

AFFIRMATION OF FRIENDSHIP OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FOR ALL THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader if, after the call of the calendar is completed, and the unfinished business, Senate bill 984, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, is resumed, it is the intention to proceed with the consideration of that bill, even late into this evening, or to dispense with the consideration of it today—or what are the plans? Several Senators have asked me what the plans are in respect to that bill.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I will leave that to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, aside from the pending amendment, there may be two or three other amendments, but I do not expect it will take very long to consider them. I should like to conclude the consideration of the bill this afternoon if possible. It has now been before the Senate for 9 days.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, submitted by Mr. MCMAHON, and reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

The first committee amendment was, on page 2, line 2, after the words "That the", to strike out "Members of this."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution which was unanimously reported to the Senate, and which is sponsored by approximately one-fourth of the membership of this body, reaffirming the friendship of the Senate for the peoples of Russia and for the peoples of the lands over which the Kremlin has control, is a vivid testimonial to what is in the minds and hearts of the American people. I call particular attention to the fact that when this concurrent resolution is adopted by the Senate and by the House of Representatives, as I know it will be, it will be transmitted to the President of the United States for transmission to the Kremlin, so that it may be disseminated to the Russian people.

The Soviet Union has tried, and with a good deal of success, to steal the word "peace" and arrogate it to themselves. Unfortunately, never was a greater fraud perpetrated on the people of the world. The concurrent resolution represents a concrete effort which we are making to demonstrate to the peoples of the world that what the American people want and what the Congress wants above everything else is peace. Of course, Mr. President, we mean a peace in the real sense of the word, a peace with honor and with justice. I believe that the message we are now getting under way to the peoples of the Soviet Union may well result in bringing about a better state of relations between them and the Government of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the remaining committee amendments.

The remaining committee amendments were on page 2, line 2, after the word "Congress", to insert "of the United States"; in line 5, after the word "Union", to strike out "by declaring" and insert "and declares"; in line 9, after the word "of", to strike out "America's" and insert "the"; in the same line, after the word "desire", to insert "of the American people"; in line 13, after the word "people", to insert "and their Government"; in line 19, after the word "between", to strike out "them" and insert "the United States Government", and in line 20, after the word "Government", to insert "and invite the peoples of the Soviet Union to cooperate in a spirit of friendship in this endeavor", or as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress of the United States reaffirm the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, and declares—

That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of the desire of the American people to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

That the American people and their Government desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

That, although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to compose the differences standing between the United States Government and the Soviet Government and invite the peoples of the Soviet Union to cooperate in a spirit of friendship in this endeavor; and

That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to acquaint the people of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the Chair). The bill will be passed over.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to present a unanimous-consent agreement at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we not conclude the calendar before that is done?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it will take but a moment or two. It relates to a limitation of debate. Senators are desirous of knowing whether we are going to proceed with the unfinished business, the bill relating to the importation of certain agricultural labor. There are so many Senators engaged in the hearings in the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee that I feel we ought to have a better attendance when the bill is being considered.

In order to expedite consideration of the bill, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 12 o'clock on Monday next, debate on any amendment to the unfinished business, or any motion, including appeals, which may be pending or which may thereafter be proposed to the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, shall be limited to not exceeding 40 minutes, to be equally divided, and controlled, in the case of committee amendments, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], respectively, and, in the case of individual amendment or motions, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], respectively; provided, first, that in the event the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is in favor of any such individual amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] or some Senator designated by him; and second, that no amendment which is not now printed and lying on the table—that is, any amendment that may not already have been submitted—may be submitted by a Senator intended subsequently to be proposed by him and ordered to lie on the table which is not germane to the subject matter of the bill shall be received; ordered further, that debate on the question of the final passage of said bill shall be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the requested unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Is it the intention not to have the Senate vote on any amendments at all this afternoon?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; we would not take them up at all today, if the agreement is reached; we would let the bill and the amendments go over until Monday.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that it is the purpose to have the Senate take a recess until Monday, if the unanimous-consent agreement is entered?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; after the speeches for today are completed and after the call of the calendar is concluded.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware withhold his objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am willing to withhold the objection temporarily.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to invite attention——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall withhold the objection temporarily, but I think I shall have to object.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well; if the Senator from Delaware is going to object——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Arizona. In the proposed agreement is there a provision that one hour or one hour and a half may be allowed to each side for debate on the bill? If so, then I could allot time to any Senator on my side of the aisle who wishes to make a speech at that time.

Mr. McFARLAND. The proposed agreement includes such a provision, namely, that 2 hours be allowed, to be divided equally.

Mr. President, in the previous unanimous-consent request there is a provision which I would include in this one, namely, that either of the Senators in charge of the time may yield any part of the time on the bill for discussion of an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall ask the distinguished majority leader to withhold the unanimous-consent request for a few minutes, so as to enable us to see if we can work it out.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I shall do so.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the majority leader.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we now proceed with the call of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Arizona has yielded to his colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to invite the attention of the majority leader and the minority leader to the fact that the supplemental appropriation bill is on the calendar. If we can dispose today of all the committee amendments which are not controversial—of course there are one or two amendments which are controversial—I think that would expedite the handling of the public business. I suggest that after the completion of the call of the calendar, if the Senate has no further business to transact at that time, the appropriation bill be considered and acted upon to the extent I have indicated, because it is an important measure in the public interest and should be passed as soon as possible.

Mr. McFARLAND. That would expedite the transaction of the business of the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will that mean that that appropriation bill would then displace the agricultural labor bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Temporarily, yes, if that is agreeable; if there is to be no

other business before the Senate this afternoon, I should like to have the agricultural labor bill temporarily laid aside, and have the Senate consider the appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. It would be the Senator's intention to ask unanimous consent to that effect, namely, that the agricultural labor bill be temporarily laid aside. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. Exactly.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to state to the Senator from Arizona that the distinguished Senator from Delaware and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana have made an arrangement which, if accepted as a part of the unanimous-consent agreement, will iron out their problems.

Mr. ELLENDER. The suggestion is to modify the unanimous-consent agreement so as to provide that instead of dividing the time from 12 o'clock, it be divided from 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. And that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be recognized at 12 o'clock.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if there is no objection, and if it is agreeable to the Senator from Oregon, I would say it is unnecessary to control the time on the bill. However, that part of the proposed agreement can be left as it is.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am willing to modify my request to that extent. I regret very much that we have to do so. However, as I have previously said, in working out unanimous-consent agreements, we have to do the best we can.

I feel that if Congress is going to get away from Washington this summer, we must make faster progress. If Senators who wish to make speeches will make them late in the day, after the Senate concludes its business for the day, I shall be perfectly willing to remain and hear their speeches. If we proceed in that way, we shall expedite matters very much.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hate to make objection. I am not trying to get the floor at 12 o'clock on Monday necessarily; but there are many amendments, and the debate on the bill and on the amendments could consume most of the day. That is why I suggested what I did.

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly. Would it be agreeable to the Senator from Delaware that he have the floor at 12 o'clock and that the limitation on debate begin at 2 o'clock or whenever the Senator from Delaware finishes his speech, whichever is earlier?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well; I so modify the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement as modified?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in order that there shall be no mistake, let me state that the proposal now is that the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is to be recognized when the Senate convenes at noon on Monday, and that the time between then and 2 p. m., if the Senator from Delaware wishes to use it, is agreed to be given to him; or, if he does not use all that time, that the limitation on debate begin whenever the Senator from Delaware concludes his speech or at 2 o'clock, whichever is earlier.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has suggested that after we conclude the speeches this afternoon, if it is not then too late, we temporarily lay aside the agricultural labor bill and take up the supplemental appropriations bill, and dispose of the noncontroversial amendments to that bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Some amendments which are to be offered to the bill are to be offered by Members who are not now present.

Mr. McFARLAND. We understand that. The proposal is simply that we dispose of the noncontroversial committee amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I always hesitate a little to agree to such a proposal. I will agree if the majority leader insists. However, the difficulty is to ascertain which amendments are noncontroversial.

I would dislike very much to let an amendment be adopted on the assumption that it was noncontroversial, and then later find that some Senator regarded it as a controversial amendment. So I hate to agree to such a proposal. However, if the majority leader insists, I shall let it go.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask the eminent majority leader whether there will be any voting this afternoon on controversial amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is not anticipated that there will be any voting on controversial amendments this afternoon.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, is this proposal a part of the unanimous-consent agreement which has been under discussion for some time?

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then why do not we dispose of one proposal at a time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement which has previously been stated, together with the modifications which have been stated?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, are we now discussing the unanimous-consent request of the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]?

Mr. McFARLAND. No. I had understood that the unanimous-consent agreement I had proposed had already been agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, it had not been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, as modified, which has been submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]? The Chair hears none, and the proposed agreement as modified is adopted.

The unanimous-consent agreement as reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Monday, May 7, 1951, at the hour of 12 noon, Mr. WILLIAMS be entitled to the floor; that beginning at the hour of 2 o'clock on said day, or at the conclusion of Mr. WILLIAMS' address, if prior to said hour, debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall be limited to not exceeding 40 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, in the case of committee amendments, by Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. WHERRY, respectively, and, in the case of individual amendments or motions, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. ELLENDER, respectively: *Provided*, (1) That in the event Mr. ELLENDER is in favor of any such individual amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by Mr. WHERRY or some Senator designated by him; and (2) that no amendment not heretofore submitted by a Senator, intended to be subsequently proposed by him, and which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, not germane to the subject matter of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That debate on the question of the final passage of the said bill shall be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. WHERRY or some Senator designated by him, respectively: *Provided, however*, That during the consideration of any individual amendment or motion, either of said Senators may yield to the mover of any such amendment or motion, or to one who is opposed thereto, any portion of such time of 1 hour allotted to him under this paragraph as he may desire.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we resume the calling of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY OF COAST GUARD TO INCLUDE THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

The bill (S. 1025) to expand the authority of the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, since the end of the war, the Coast Guard has been maintaining aids to navigation, principally buoys, in the so-called Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, consisting of the Marianas, the Carolines, and the Marshall Islands. Up until now the Coast Guard has been able to maintain those aids to navigation in the Trust Territory even though that area is not specifically mentioned in the statute, by reason of the fact that the islands have been under naval government and thereby meet the requirements of the law.

However, on July 1, 1951, the government of the Trust Territory will be transferred to the Department of the Interior, and it will no longer be under naval government. Hence it is extremely doubtful that the Coast Guard will

have authority to continue to maintain these essential aids to navigation after that date. If the bill is enacted, the authority of the Coast Guard will remain unimpaired after the transfer of the islands to the Interior Department, which, I repeat, will take place on July 1.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Am I correct in understanding that what the Senator is now indicating is to the effect that the Interior Department will have no right or authority whatever which would supersede the authority of the Coast Guard?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Department of the Interior will not perform the function of providing the aids to navigation, and the Coast Guard will be denied the right to exercise the function, so that makes the bill necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 81 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the word "possessions", the phrase "the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,", so that the sentence will read as follows: "Such aids to navigation other than loran stations shall be established and operated only within the United States, its Territories and possessions, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States at places where naval or military bases of the United States are or may be located, and at other places where such aids to navigation have been established prior to June 26, 1948."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

LEASING OF SPACE WITHIN AIRPORTS IN ALASKA

The bill (S. 1183) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this measure?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, under the present law, the Secretary of Commerce is empowered to lease space or property at the airports in Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, for a period not to exceed 10 years. This limitation has made it impossible for the Civil Aeronautics Administration to interest private persons in providing adequate hangar facilities at the two airports. In other words, they cannot make a lease to extend beyond 10 years. The purpose of the bill is to extend the 10-year period and make it possible to have a lease run for 20 years.

The early construction of hangar facilities on the two airports in Alaska is urgent and must be accomplished within the next working season. Since the construction of hangar facilities would require funds in addition to the $17,000,000 already authorized for the airports, the Civil Aeronautics Administrator is unable to provide such facilities, and since the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks are not disposed to sponsor such projects, it is necessary that private persons be interested in constructing the facilities. This bill would encourage that happy consummation. If the Department of Commerce were authorized to grant leases for a period of 20 years, as here proposed, private financing would be attracted. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1183) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," approved May 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 277), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of Commerce is empowered to lease under such conditions as he may deem proper and for such periods as may be desirable (not to exceed 10 years) space or property within or upon the airports for purposes essential or appropriate to the operation of the airports: *Provided*, That real property within or upon the airports may be leased for purposes of erecting structures necessary or incident to the operation of the airports for periods not exceeding 20 years."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

RELIEF OF SUNDRY FORMER STUDENTS OF THE AIR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

The bill (S. 1227) for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. Raymond Pohl, Jr., 505A Magnolia Avenue, Frederick, Md., $83.95: Dan K. Rawlings, 205 Laurel Avenue, Corbin, Ky., $13.10; Harold L. Reed, 201 West Lindell Street, West Frankfort, Ill., $12.20; Marcus A. Sessi, 417 West Pennview Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $8; Robert D. Simmons, 835½ Broadway, New Orleans, La., $23.85; Harry P. Smith, Jr., 2225 Chesapeake Avenue, Hampton, Va., $60.66; Paul E. Smith, 2109 Eoff Street, Wheeling, W. Va., $6.10; Raymond C. Sowko, Glennland Apartments, State College, Pa., $444.40; Clyde C. Spears, 347 Linden Walk, Lexington, Ky., $236.60; Donald E. Spears, 123 West Central Avenue, Belle, W. Va., $212.70; Homer R. Steele, route 1, Fairview, W. Va., $142; John D. Stiles, Wadestown, W. Va., $110.20; George F. Stock, Jr., Hollandale, Miss., $236.95; David A. Stockton, 105 East Seventh Street, box 256, Ritzville, Wash., $179.65; Frank A. Sullivan, 7949 Susquehanna Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $396.80; William K. Sutton, 981 Fincastle Road, Lexington, Ky., $141.25; Floyd Ramsey Tarr, 3729 Marlamont Drive, Weirton, W. Va., $170.05; Hagop H. Terzagian, 217 Myrtle Avenue, Jersey City, N. J., $338.85; Jack Alfred Thalimer, 4518 West Grace Street, Richmond, Va., $226.80; Eugene R. Thomas, 9 South York Street, Wheeling, W. Va., $223.20; Forest G. Thompson, 2201 Frederica Street, Owensboro, Ky., $157.80; Joseph C. Thompson, box 700, O. M. S., Travis AFB, Fairview, Calif., $423.25; Thomas W. Tigertt, box 93, Wilmer, Tex., $583.90; Richard J. Torchia, 630 Dow Avenue, Carnegie, Pa., $229.80; Lee C. Truman, Jr., 2422 Allen Street, Owensboro, Ky., $252.40; Charles B. Upshaw, 394 West Wesley Road NW., Atlanta, Ga., $191; George J. Walters, Jr., 438 South Dallas Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., $435.55; Gilbert Watz, 834 Snyder Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., $366.45; Arthur J. Weinsten, 501 Manheim Street (22-A), Philadelphia, Pa., $200.10; Robert J. Weiss, 111 West Cherryhill Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $239.25; James Bernard Welborn, 442 Cherry Street, Russellville, Ky., $107.55; Earl M. Williams, box 204, Evarts, Ky., $297.50; Edwin J. Williams, Jr., 1832 Chuckatuck Avenue, Petersburg, Va., $505.60; Charles P. Wilson, Jr., route 1, Walkersville, W. Va., $404.16; and Harold W. Wilson, 205½ Fourth Street, Parkersburg, W. Va., $324.20. The payment of said sums shall be in full satisfaction and final settlement of all claims of the above-named claimants against the United States for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property as a result of a fire that occurred on June 28, 1948, in the building in which they were quartered at Langley Air Force Base, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BETTY MINORU KAWACHI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 915) for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Betty Minoru Kawachi, the minor child of Mrs. James J. Leatherman, a citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PHILIP J. HINCKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1113) for the relief of Philip J. Hincks, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$152.40", and insert "$150", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Philip J. Hincks, of Middlebury, Vt., the sum of $150. The payment of such sum shall be in full payment of all claims of the said Philip J. Hincks against the United States for reimbursement of money paid for uniforms which were required during his training as a midshipman at the United States Naval Reserve Midshipman's School, Chicago, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ATHANASIOS ELIAS CHELIOTIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1254) for the relief of Athanasios Elias Cheliotis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Athanasios Elias Cheliotis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2929) to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The bill (S. 677) to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Tennessee give us an explanation of the bill?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this bill would make a good compromise between the points of view with reference to the Marine Corps. Section 2 has been rewritten in such a way as not to give the Commandant of the Marine Corps a vote with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but on matters which pertain to the Marine Corps he would have an opportunity of being heard and of filing supporting memoranda for the consideration of the Secretary of Defense.

It then provides four full strength combat divisions for the Marine Corps. The evidence shows that they are needed, and that this fire power can be obtained through the marines more economically than in any other way. The bill, sponsored by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Armed Services. If there are questions, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as the eminent junior Senator from Tennessee has stated, the bill fixes the floor under the strength of the Marine Corps at four full combat divisions, with four supporting air wings and allied service troops and organizations. It provides, however, that there shall not be more than 400,000 men in the Marine Corps, and thus fixes a ceiling to the Marine Corps. It is anticipated that 4 full divisions will be supplied, with a total of approximately 300,000 men, so the floor is 300,000 men. The ceiling is 400,000.

The compromise on the second section is that instead of the Commandant of the Marine Corps being a full-fledged member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he is to be a consultant member. The bill was introduced by 44 Members of the United States Senate, and was reported unanimously by the Armed Services Committee. I very much hope that it may be passed at this time.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I do not quite understand the amendment which is proposed to the bill. Will the Senator explain it a little more fully?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. In its original form, the bill provided that the Commandant of the Marine Corps was to be a full-fledged member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As amended, he is not to be a full-fledged member, but a consultant member, and when matters affecting the Marine Corps come up, if he disagrees with the decision, he is to be privileged to have direct communication with the Secretary of the Navy and the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Oregon, who has left the floor, has offered an amendment to this bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; that was an amendment proposed to the unfinished business, Senate bill 984, the farm-labor bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 2, line 4, to strike out the word "less" and insert "more", and on page 2, line 5, to strike out section 2 and insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Commandant of the Marine Corps shall be a consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on all problems before the Joint Chiefs of Staff. On matters in which the Marine Corps may be concerned he shall be permitted to be heard and to file a supporting memorandum for consideration by the Secretary of Defense and the President.

So as to make the bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 106 (c) of the National Security Act of 1947 is hereby amended to read as follows: "The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include four full-strength combat divisions, four full-strength air wings, and such other land combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic therein, and the personnel strength of the Regular Marine Corps shall be maintained at not more than four hundred thousand."

SEC. 2. The Commandant of the Marine Corps shall be a consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on all problems before the Joint Chiefs of Staff. On matters in which the Marine Corps may be concerned he shall be permitted to be heard and to file a supporting memorandum for consideration by the Secretary of Defense and the President.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 133) to discharge the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate from the further consideration of S. 656, to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

DIRECTOR OF THE DISTRICT OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

The bill (H. R. 3297) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this measure? Apparently there is no report on it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if an explanation is desired, I may say that I know a little something about the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not think there is a report in print, and I respectfully request that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that there is a report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is a report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I see a report has now come in. It came in late today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada withhold his objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. I withhold my objection.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I, myself, objected to this bill once before, and I spoke to some Senators about it. It has been corrected, insofar as the matter of retirement is concerned. The appointment of one of the members of either the Fire Department or the Metropolitan Police Department as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, as I see it, is necessary at this time, and the bill has been amended to meet all the objections made heretofore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I withdraw my objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3297) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 2, line 22, after the word "greater", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*And provided further*, That should such member, while serving as Director of the Office of Civil Defense for the District of Columbia, elect to retire under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, he may withdraw the retirement funds deposited in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of such act approved September 1, 1916, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

APPLICATION OF DIVIDENDS ON NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE IN PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill is Calendar 198, House bill 321, which went to the foot of the calendar. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 321) to provide on and after January 1, 1952, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill? That is primarily the reason it went to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas, and I shall endeavor to make a brief explanation.

The purpose of the bill is to provide that until and unless the Veterans' Administration has received from an insured a request in writing for payment in cash, any dividend accumulations and unpaid dividends payable after January 1, 1951, shall be applied in payment of premiums becoming due on insurance subsequent to the date of the dividend.

The present law provides that dividends must be paid in cash and may not be used for payment of premiums, except upon a written request of the insured. The bill would substitute automatic application of the dividend as a premium payment for an optional one, unless the Veterans' Administration receives from the insured a request in writing for payment in cash.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 321) to provide that on and after January 1, 1952, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the call of the calendar.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate bill 984.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in its issue of May 2, the Washington Post printed an editorial entitled "Cheap Farm Labor." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, together with a letter dated May 3, 1951, signed by me and addressed to the editor of the Washington Post, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post of May 2, 1951]

CHEAP FARM LABOR

The Senate is now about ready, after 3 days of debate, to come to a vote on Senator ELLENDER's bill for the recruitment and admission to the United States of Mexican agricultural workers. The bill was framed and studied by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry before the recently issued report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor became available. It ignores, or flouts, the most important recommendations of that Commission. Indeed, Senator ELLENDER's bill, if enacted, would serve merely to perpetuate shocking conditions in the agriculture of the Southwest that do grave injury to American and to Mexican farm laborers alike. Senators CHAVEZ, HUMPHREY, and LEHMAN have rendered valuable service in exposing the evils and inadequacies of this legislation. We hope that the amendments they have urged will prevail.

Senator CHAVEZ' action on the measure merits special commendation. Many of the big growers in his home State of New Mexico want to see it enacted without any changes—because they want the Mexican peons who can be brought in under contract to harvest crops and then sent back where they came from. The justification for bringing them in is that an adequate supply of American farm workers is not available. But the fact is, as the President's Commission made clear, that there are plenty of domestic workers available if the growers would only give them decent wages and decent working conditions. The importation of poverty-stricken Mexican peons in years past has operated to drive down farm wages and to reduce a million American farm workers to a state of homeless, rootless migrancy.

The Mexican Government now insists—altogether properly, in our judgment—that certain minimum conditions be met by the growers for the care of contract workers brought in from Mexico. Equivalent conditions—and priority in consideration—should be given to domestic workers. In addition to this, responsibility for determining whether foreign workers are actually needed should be vested directly in the Secretary of Labor and not left to the discretion of State and regional directors of employment security; the latter are simply too susceptible to the pressure of the big growers. And, finally, there ought to be a stringent prohibition against the employment of so-called wetbacks—Mexicans who come into the country illegally. Without such safeguards, the Ellender bill would serve, as Senator CHAVEZ charged, to bring back the things which Lincoln did away with and to bring about peonage in my State and in certain other areas of the United States.

The demand that such safeguards be included in the bill implies no hostility to Mexican immigrants and no desire to keep American growers from obtaining all the labor they need. But the misery of the Mexicans must no longer be exploited to the disadvantage of themselves and of hungry workers on this side of the border.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1951.

Mr. HERBERT ELLISTON,
Editor, the Washington Post,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLISTON: An editorial published in the Washington Post May 2, 1951, charged that the bill, S. 984, recommended for enactment by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, "ignores, or flouts, the most important recommendations of that Commission" (the President's Commission on Migratory Labor). I should like to point out that the committee considered this legislation and ordered it reported to the Senate before the report of the Commission was issued. Therefore, I submit that although the legislation may honestly differ from the conclusions of the President's Commission, it does not ignore or flout that Commission's report.

The only purpose of S. 984 is to enable agricultural producers in this country to continue in a legal manner to import needed farm workers from Mexico where it is economically feasible to do so. The Mexican Government has served notice they intend to terminate the present international agreement under which the program is now operating on June 30, 1951, unless the United States Government is authorized to do the actual recruiting of agricultural workers in Mexico, and will guarantee compliance by employers in this country with the indi-

vidual work contract. S. 984 would, therefore, authorize our Government to carry out its part of the tentative agreement reached with Mexico this year on these modifications. If the bill is not enacted, there will be no legal program for importing Mexican workers after June 30, 1951.

The Commission on Migratory Labor took nearly a year to make its study. I am sure you will agree with me that it would be impossible for a committee in Congress to determine the validity and merit of the recommendations of the Commission and have the Congress enact legislation based on the committee's findings by June 30.

The Commission is properly concerned with the welfare of domestic migratory farm workers in this country. However, the extent to which the Federal Government will pay transportation and subsistence costs, prescribe minimum wages, and guarantee certain standards of working conditions, medical services, and housing is a major question of national policy. Establishing such policy is not the purpose of S. 984.

While it is true the bill as reported provided that the director of State employment service shall certify foreign workers are needed, the bill was amended on the floor of the Senate prior to publication of the editorial to provide that the Secretary of Labor shall make such certification.

Statements have been made during debate on the bill, and I believe the same conclusions have been drawn in the Commission's report, that sufficient domestic labor is available for agricultural employment if proper recruitment efforts were to be made. I should like to outline the requirements of the United States Employment Service before it will certify the unavailability of domestic labor.

First, every employer must file an order with a local employment office requesting domestic labor. The local office searches its files for qualified workers, and if unable to recruit the labor on the basis of its records, resorts to other recruitment devices which commonly include use of the press and radio. When the local office has been unsuccessful in its own jurisdiction, it originates a clearance order which will reach every office in the State, before the effort is extended beyond State lines. Each local office attempts to recruit the needed labor.

If there is no labor supply within the State, the State office of the employment service sends the order to adjoining States, where it goes to local offices thought to have a potential supply of labor. Those local offices recruit labor through the use of their own files, and by other recruitment devices.

Should adjoining States be unable to furnish the labor, the order goes to a regional office of the United States Employment Service, which sends the order to other States which may have a potential supply of labor. If the regional office first receiving the order and adjoining regions cannot locate a source of labor supply, the order is transmitted to the Washington headquarters, who transmit the order to distant States which may have a potential labor supply. When these efforts do not produce the needed workers, then certification is made that Mexican and other foreign workers can be imported. Under such a system, I cannot see how available domestic workers fail to be utilized before foreign workers are imported.

Another major problem now being discussed in relation to this legislation is the illegal immigration of Mexican workers, commonly known as wetbacks. The bill prohibits the recruiting of wetbacks under the program authorized by the legislation, which is a change from the present program. Furthermore, it is evident that if we don't have a legal program for importing Mexican workers, the use of wetbacks will be encouraged.

There are many phases of the wetback problem to be considered in recommending Federal action. I have introduced S. 1391 which would provide severe penalties for the employment of illegal emigrants, a matter that comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. There are still other methods proposed for solving the problem, and I suggest that it would be impossible for Congress to consider all of them and enact this legislation by June 30.

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

REPLACEMENT OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this Nation and a substantial part of the world have been stirred and shaken by what has come to be known as "the MacArthur incident." But the word "incident" is far too narrow. This is a matter of tremendous import. It can do no harm for the Members of this body to pause for a short space and consider where the roots of this matter may lie.

This is not merely a case of an Army officer being relieved of duty. This is not merely a case of a difference of opinion between a military commander and civilian authority. It is much broader and much deeper than that. Nor is this a recent development; it goes back a long way—5 or 6 years at least, back to the policy disagreements preceding and following Japan's surrender.

Opposition to General MacArthur, and efforts to discredit him, to get him out of the way, began at that time.

The first and basic attack on General MacArthur was conceived and launched by the Communist Party.

On June 2, 1945, the National Board of the American Communist Party passed a resolution laying the duty upon all party members—and here I use the words of the Communist Party board's resolution—the duty to work "to curb those who seek American imperialist control in the Far East."

In the discussions on the resolution, both before and after it had been passed, the Communists made it clear that General MacArthur was their target. When I speak of "discussions on the resolution," I make that statement on the basis of testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The Communist leaders did not name General MacArthur in their resolution of June 2, 1945; but they made it clear to each other that General MacArthur was their target; and this was soon made clear to the rank and file of the party. Pursuant to that resolution, the Communists launched a vituperative propaganda attack on General MacArthur; and that attack has continued ever since.

From September 14 to September 17, 1945, James S. Allen, formerly the Comintern agent to the Philippines, writing as a foreign editor of the Daily Worker, presented an amalgamation of slanders purportedly obtained through the Communist Huks in the Philippines. In this scurrilous series General MacArthur was presented as the tool of reactionary elements in Asia.

The basis of all Communist criticism was that General MacArthur was not carrying out a revolution in Japan, but was instead working with existing law-enforcement agencies to keep order and reconstruct the country's economy. On September 19, 1945, the Daily Worker referred to him as "the flamboyant general." On September 22, 1945, the Daily Worker declared General MacArthur to be "unfit for the crucially important assignment of shaping the future of Japan."

The Communists were open in their declaration of hostility, charging that he was suppressing the "democratic elements" — meaning themselves — and making Japan "a bulwark against the Soviet Union and the progressive forces in Asia."

Their targets were the emperor and the Zaibatsu, or big business interests; but in that category they placed everyone who was against a revolution in Japan along the lines which Communists call "progressive."

The Communists were intent on a hard peace for Japan, for the obvious reason that such a peace was calculated to drive the Japanese, in despair, into the Communist fold. The Communists therefore reacted violently against General MacArthur's statement on September 17, 1945, that the occupation policy he was executing was proceeding so smoothly that millions of our men would be able to return home, and billions of dollars saved, by the reduction of the occupation forces to 200,000 men within 6 months. The Communist press commended Dean Acheson when he rebuked MacArthur the next day. The Communist press on September 21, 1945, criticized President Truman for not being as firm with General MacArthur as Mr. Acheson, whose rebuke to "the flamboyant general" they warmly commended.

On October 4, the Daily Worker termed MacArthur's role in Japan as "outmoded" and insisted that the allied council, made up of the United States, Soviet Union, Great Britain, and China, administer Japan. Of course, this showed that the Communists, in endeavoring to discredit MacArthur, were trying to put the Soviet Union in a position to disrupt and paralyze the occupation and bring about the same chaos as in Germany.

With the same purpose the Daily Worker assailed the Emperor as the center and backbone of reaction, linking him up with the industrialists whom they called Fascists, and making out that General MacArthur's policy was to support reactionary forces hostile to America. The truth was, of course, the exact opposite: MacArthur was in fact carrying out a policy to rehabilitate Japan along western democratic lines—this, instead of alienating her people by so-called reforms inspired by the Communists and which would have led to a totalitarian form of government.

On September 4, 1945, as a forerunner to this whole attack on MacArthur, Owen Lattimore gave a press interview in which he assailed the Zaibatsu or industrialists. The Daily Worker on September 5 gave Lattimore wide coverage, emphasizing in large type that part of his speech which warned against suppressing the so-called democratic elements in

Japan. The Communist Party immediately undertook an extensive distribution of Lattimore's attack, using their trade unions and civic groups to give it the widest possible currency.

The Communists never gave up on the idea of destroying MacArthur. They regarded him as the chief obstacle to their success in the Far East. The organs of the Cominform such as the Committee for Lasting Peace for People's Democracy announced not long ago that General MacArthur would one day be tried as a war criminal. And on April 9 last—the very day before his dismissal by the President—the Daily Worker came out with a banner lead line saying that the world was demanding his recall.

Mr. President, it is an unhappy fact that during all this period, General MacArthur was being opposed by officials of our own State Department, on much the same grounds as were being advanced by the Communists.

In order to get the proper background, let us review briefly the situation which existed in the summer of 1945, and what took place thereafter.

In the summer of 1945 Japan's defeat was imminent and the Japanese people, asking only that their Emperor be allowed to remain, were suing for peace.

General MacArthur, prepared for trouble if it should arise, took with him to Japan 25 divisions and thousands of service troops. As it turned out, the Japanese did not resist the occupation, because General MacArthur, though he had been fierce in battle, elected to treat the Japanese in defeat with restraint and with humanity. He rejected the advice of those who would have liked to impose a Morgenthau plan on Japan, and thus drive her people into Stalin's arms by harsh treatment. He made use of the Emperor in bringing the country from war to peace. He used the latter's authority and the veneration in which he is held by the Japanese people to pacify the country and lead it along the path to democracy. He was able to perform miracles of reconstruction and rehabilitation, because he enlisted the zealous cooperation of the people by the wise and restrained use of his dictatorial powers.

He meted out just punishment to all criminals and those who committed atrocities. But although urged by Communist sympathizers, short-sighted liberals, and others blinded by hatred and a list for revenge, to play the Communist game by starving and oppressing the Japanese people, he refused to kick the defeated in the teeth. Instead he gave them hope of working their passage into the free world, and thus encouraged their democratic reorientation. He allowed the Japanese to elect a government of their own, thus teaching them self-government. The occupation of Japan under General MacArthur will go down in history as one of the most successful military occupations in history.

General MacArthur, himself, became a symbol of American justice, mercy, good will, respect for the rights of all mankind, and adherence to the democratic principle of equal justice under law.

Had the advice of General MacArthur's opponents and detractors been followed Japan would today be in grave danger of succumbing to the Communists just as, thanks largely to the misguided policy of our State Department, China did succumb.

In China our identification of "democratic" reform with collaboration with the Communists, and our denial of arms aid and political support to the Nationalist Government unless it would share power with the Communists helped the Communists to power, and led directly to the war in Korea.

How great is the contrast between the success of the Japanese occupation and the fiasco of our China policy. Thanks to General MacArthur our former enemy, Japan, is now our friend. Thanks to the State Department, our former ally, China, is now our bitter enemy.

Thanks to General MacArthur, our occupation of Japan constitutes a unique example of the successful administration of a conquered country. This has been strikingly demonstrated since the outbreak of the Korean war, for General MacArthur was able to send his four occupation divisions to Korea without fear of a Japanese revolt, and with no disorder even resulting from the withdrawal of the bulk of our Armed Forces. It has also been shown by the tremendous ovation given General MacArthur at the time of his precipitate dismissal and recall.

The Japanese people, due largely to the fact that General MacArthur's policies have prevailed, have shown that they are ready to act, if we let them, as a bulwark against the expansion of Communist totalitarian tyranny in the Far East. How disastrous would have been the consequences to our security had the Communists and their sympathizers or dupes been successful in thwarting MacArthur. And we have never been told the full story of how nearly they succeeded. We do know, however, that General MacArthur was harassed and his task rendered far more difficult than it should have been by the outside forces.

I have referred to the fact that if the advice of General MacArthur's opponents and detractors had been followed, Japan would today be in grave danger of succumbing to the Communists. That implies, of course, that there is no such danger today; and I want to qualify that implication. I do not believe there would be any grave danger of Communist successes in Japan if General MacArthur had remained there; but I cannot say what the result may be, now that he has been recalled. The recall itself has been interpreted already, in some quarters, as a "go ahead" signal to the Communists in Japan. Furthermore, we cannot accurately evaluate, for the future, the effect of the day-by-day absence from the scene of the one man available to us whose breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding of the Japanese people, and of the history and problems and philosophies not only of Japan but of all Asia, could be counted upon to avoid even the small mistakes which, under the circumstances, might grow or be magnified into disastrous results.

I do not mean to make any pessimistic predictions with regard to Japan, nor imply any criticism of his successor. It may be that General MacArthur's work has been so well done that Japan will remain safe from communism even in his absence. But the fact remains that many in this country feel, not without reason, that our position in Japan, as in all Asia, is less secure since General MacArthur has returned home.

Mr. President, I have said that attacks by officials of our own State Department paralleled the Communist offensive against General MacArthur, back as early as 1945 in that connection. I have already mentioned Owen Lattimore.

Remember that when General MacArthur estimated, in the summer of 1945, that he would require only 200,000 troops to administer Japan, he based his assessment on the Japanese response to the first expression of his policy which called for moderation and peaceful evolution toward a democratic set-up.

The New York Times of September 20, 1945, carried the following report from Washington:

> The State Department revealed today a decision for social and economic revolution in Japan and emphasized that it would be carried out regardless of what might be said about slashing the American army of occupation.
>
> In a statement, Acting Secretary Dean Acheson said that the United States Government, and not the occupation force under Gen. Douglas MacArthur was determining American policy toward Japan.
>
> It was the second statement that Mr. Acheson had made as a result of General MacArthur's prediction that the occupation army would be cut to 200,000 in 6 months because things were working out so well inside Japan.
>
> Mr. Acheson stated today that this Government's Japanese policy would not be changed and that it would be carried out regardless of cost. His words were: "Whatever it takes to carry this out will be used to carry it out."
>
> Mr. Acheson was understood to speak with the support of the War Department as well as the State Department, but there were doubts whether his implied criticisms of General MacArthur were made with the full backing of President Truman.

Mr. Acheson also said, according to the New York Times, that—

> General MacArthur had issued his occupation estimate without consultation with Washington.

This controversy was clear evidence, at that time, and is no less clear today, that the State Department at the highest level had undertaken a course paralleling that of the Communists in pursuing a hard peace, and was denouncing the general who was resisting such a course. As the case turned out, the general was right and the State Department was wrong.

Our occupation force in a short time after the general's estimate was less than 200,000 troops, and MacArthur's occupation proved to be the most successful in history. By 1946 the occupation forces numbered only 150,000; by 1947 they were reduced to 120,000; and in 1948 they were as low as 84,000 because MacArthur had the courage to resist the pressure put on him by the Communists, and by the State Department.

In September of 1946, General MacArthur issued a warning against the danger of communism in Japan. Im-

mediately afterward the State Department, through the voice of John Carter Vincent, then head of the Department's Far Eastern Division, charged that General MacArthur was—listen to this—instituting an anti-Soviet campaign in violation of State Department directives to use Japan "for building a bridge of friendship to the Soviet Union."

In recent weeks, both the Communist press and officials of our own State Department have been criticizing General MacArthur on the broad ground that his policies, if carried out, would lead to world war III.

As I understand, the heart of General MacArthur's recommendations is that if we let fall the only non-American forces resisting communism in all Asia, namely the army of Chiang Kai-shek, and do not aid its guerrilla activities on the Chinese mainland, then the Communist tide will roll on to our Pacific coast and bring us to the brink, not only of world war III, but of disaster.

In taking the position which has been mine since General MacArthur's recall, the position to which I adhere today, I am not slavishly following the general's views, nor am I carried away by the emotionalism of the present situation. My colleagues, I think, know my record on this question. Last year—before we entered Korea—I had declared, in a public address which was carried over the radio, that:

> We cannot afford to mobilize the forces necessary for a crusade to liberate the Chinese people. We must avoid committing too many of our resources on the continent of Asia. Above all, we must avoid being maneuvered into a position where we look like foreign invaders attempting to subjugate an oriental people. But we cannot allow Russia to make an island civilization of the United States of America.
>
> The United States, therefore, should be ready to get behind whatever forces rise to unify China, and should be resolved to do everything possible to help the redemption of China. In the meantime, we should support the one Chinese leader who is willing and able to get into the fight now—General Chiang Kai-shek.

Senators will recall that back in February of 1949 I introduced a bill to provide aid to the Republic of China. Shortly after that bill was introduced, 49 of my colleagues joined me in a letter to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, pleading for action on that bill, or at least for hearings. Their pleas were ignored.

On July 23, 1949, on the floor of the Senate, I said:

> Events in the Far East have already proved, and are proving daily, that the civil war in China is not a war between Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Tse-tung but a war between democratic forces and world Communism * * * our position in Japan, and in the entire Pacific area, is endangered by this Communist drive. * * * We should immediately give China military aid to help stop the Communist onslaught.

On April 17, 1949, I had said:

> My proposal to aid the Nationalist Government of China is not based on any desire to "do something for China" but is based on the urgent necessity of taking positive action against communism in Asia for the sake of our own enlightened self-interest.

Even earlier—on February 25, 1949—on the floor of the Senate, I said:

> Events in Asia are daily emphasizing the cold, hard truth of the motivating power behind the Chinese Communists. No longer can even the most optimistic believe that the war in China is a mere revolt of an oppressed people. * * *
>
> Secretary Acheson stated to the Congress on March 20, 1947, when it was considering the Greek-Turkish aid program, that such a program was more necessary for Greece than for China at that time because the Greek Government was approaching collapse and it was threatened with defeat by the Communists. Such a time has now come to China. It is no answer to say that it is too late. The state of our future security is in the balance, and we cannot escape our responsibility by thus dismissing the choice with which we are faced.

Continuing—and remember, this was February 25, 1949—I said:

> Flushed with recent victories, the real hand behind the Chinese Communists is making itself known in Asia today. Korea is a powder keg, ready to explode in our face if we are pushed out of China as a force in opposition to communism. Reports already indicate the situation approaches outright war between the southern portion, which we recognize, and the northern or Communist portion, which the Soviets recognize.
>
> Make no mistake, if the Communists are not stopped in China, the next step will be Korea and do not forget that in Korea we still maintain occupation troops and if trouble becomes serious in that country our boys must fight or get out and admit to the world that we are losing our battle for the survival of freedom.

I have recounted these instances so that my colleagues might realize I speak for a principal and from the depths of long conviction; not from any temporary enthusiasm or to serve any personal or political purpose.

Seeing how right General MacArthur proved to be on the question of the method to be followed in administering Japan, and how wrong and how disastrous to us would have been the results if we had followed the recommendations of the State Department, coinciding as they did with the recommendations of the Communist Party, we should give careful consideration to General MacArthur's present advice.

Today the Communists are rejoicing at General MacArthur's dismissal, but in the earlier controversy between the State Department and MacArthur, happily MacArthur prevailed, and he effected a successful occupation of Japan.

Let us hope that the consideration of the episodes to which I have referred may cause us to pause and to heed the advice of General MacArthur when he says that if we give up Formosa and allow the force of Chiang Kai-shek and all the guerrillas and resistance forces in Asia to languish and die, we shall allow the Chinese Communists to consolidate in Asia and overrun the entire Pacific, realizing Stalin's great goal of making that mighty ocean a Red lake. If this happens then indeed we shall be on the brink of world war III; and, what is even more grave, on the brink of our own defeat.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Nevada on the very forceful address he has made. I did not wish to interrupt him in the course of his speech; therefore, I have waited until now to make these remarks.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada for giving us the documentary evidence which he has included in his review of the historic achievements of General MacArthur.

I do not care to detain the Senate, but I desire to say that the Senator might have said for the RECORD, in the course of giving his review of the historical incidents, that in September 1945 the present Secretary of State, who then was Under Secretary of State, directed General MacArthur in regard to certain lines from which he would have to operate from then on, even against his will. At the same time the Under Secretary of State demanded that Russia be given an equal part in a commission government for the islands of Japan. It was because of that fact that when the Senate was confronted with the question of confirming the nomination of Acheson as Under Secretary of State, there developed in the Senate a debate for 2 days on the very matter which has been so forcibly brought to our attention this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

When the vote on the question of confirming the nomination of the then Under Secretary of State was taken—and apparently at that time he had the jurisdiction to say what the policy would be—the nomination was confirmed 69 to 1. That one vote cast in opposition was cast by myself, the junior Senator from Nebraska. For voting in opposition to confirmation of the nomination, I was smeared all over this land. Oh, how the Daily Worker picked on me and has done so ever since. So did a number of other newspapers, saying that my vote on that occasion was an idiotic, unnecessary vote. Yet, Mr. President, it was one of the best votes I have ever cast. I repeat that it was one of the best votes I have ever cast, for it shows of record that at least one Member of the United States Senate had the courage, even though all other Members of the Senate voted in favor of confirmation of the nomination, to vote against it because he believed the nominee was doing his country an injustice. Acheson was then, exactly as the Senator from Nevada has said this afternoon, trying to help the Communists have a part in the government of Japan.

Mr. President, the question of Acheson's confirmation as Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Truman came before the Senate on Tuesday, January 18, 1949. At that time this entire case again was reviewed, and all the arguments on it were made When the vote on the question of confirming his nomination as Secretary of State was concluded, it was found that 83 Senators voted in favor of confirming his nomination and 6 Senators voted against it. Once again the junior Senator from Nebraska cast his vote against the present Secretary of State because in China he had a policy of "let the dust settle"; he had a policy of making enemies out of

our friends; and he was being dominated, if you please, at every turn of the road by influences which have now caused 800,000,000 human beings to be brought into the Russian orbit and more than 12,000,000 square miles of territory to fall under the control of communism.

What is the administration's policy, Mr. President? Who could have done any worse than Dean Acheson has done? I ask you, Mr. President, who could have done any worse than Dean Acheson has done with our foreign policy in China?

Yet he, more than anyone else, I think, has influenced the President of the United States to summarily recall General MacArthur, who has done much for our foreign policy in Asia. In fact, what General MacArthur has done is the only bright spot in all our foreign policy since I have been a Member of the Senate. Yet General MacArthur has been replaced and has been brought back to the United States, even though he has more information and more knowledge of how to operate in the Pacific than does any other living American.

It was a sad day for America, Mr. President, when General MacArthur was summarily recalled by the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, and brought back permanently to the United States.

I wish the RECORD to show that those who have been persecuted and those who have been smeared and those who have had the courage and the fortitude to stand up and speak their convictions, this day are justified. They are justified, not only by the American people, but by the people of Japan and all those whom General MacArthur has helped in administering their government. His administration has helped them on their way back to a point where they can have individual liberty and can assume the dignity of free people.

So I thank the Senator from Nevada very much for the great speech he has made. I appreciate it very much indeed. I only hope his speech will receive so much consideration that the services of this great commander, General MacArthur, will continue to be used in some capacity to help in determining our policies in the Pacific.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India. I request that the amendment, together with an explanation of it, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Without objection, the amendment will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McCARRAN, for himself and other Senators, was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, line 17, strike out all of sections 4, 5, and 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. The assistance authorized by this act shall be made only on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

SEC. 5. In order to carry out the purposes of this act the President is authorized to utilize not in excess of $190,000,000 during the period ending June 30, 1952, of the funds heretofore appropriated by Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

SEC. 6. The credit terms provided for in section 4 shall include repayment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator of Economic Cooperation and the Government of India), or otherwise, materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources; such transfer of materials to include the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite, beryl, raw jute, and cyanite.

The statement by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

We are cautioned daily against emotionalism and hysteria in considering solutions to the problems facing the United States today. This would indeed seem to be good advice. However, I question whether or not it is sincerely given, for we find that when emotionalism and hysteria seem to favor the passage of legislation desired by the administration we are not urged to be cautious in our deliberation. This, of course, brings me to the point on which I wish to speak today: The question of grants or gifts for India. Let me begin by saying first that I am in favor of alleviating hunger, distress, and famine whenever we can, and without respect to persons wherever we can. The natural tendencies of the American people to help distressed people wherever they may be has not become dependent upon political considerations, although we should at all times consider with a certain degree of realism the objects of our charity.

For the past 2 months or so the Congress has received the undeserved abuse of many well-intended, but poorly informed, people with respect to the issue of furnishing grain for India. This abuse, which is so terribly misplaced because of propaganda, should cause the Members of this body concern. Let us make no mistake about it, the situation has not been clearly presented to the American people. The story has been only half told, and I am satisfied that this has been purposeful.

I am not opposed to doing what is right and just with respect to the situation as it confronts us in India. I accept the fact that because of reasons, some of them beyond the control of the Indian Government, there are indeed famine conditions in many parts of India. I will accept the fact also that this country can provide sufficient grain to alleviate some of this famine situation. I will accept the fact that it can be done without depriving our people of necessary food. I must state, however, that this grain is not owned by the Government of the United States. It belongs to private individuals.

I have read in the metropolitan press many letters to the editor, written by persons who have been crying for at least 2 months about the Congress not doing something for the starving people of India. I wonder if these greatly distressed letter-writers have reached into their own pockets in an effort to alleviate these conditions. The grain is available and the means of sending their contribution is available. There are facilities by which any private individual, who is concerned and feels the moral responsibility, may provide to the limit of his ability food for the people of India.

I have also noted that many of the editorial writers of some of our papers have devoted much space to unjustified criticism of Congress. Instead of devoting the time that they have to criticizing the Congress in connection with the proposition that has been presented to the Congress if they had spent an equal amount of time in developing the true facts in respect to this situation, they may not have been quite so critical. In other words, their criticism, I think, is more hysterical than it is logical concern for a solution to the problem.

Let me state again that I do not oppose, and will never oppose, humanitarian help for starving people. Accepting the situation as it is stated with respect to the inadequacy of the Indian food supply, I will support any sound proposition to relieve the situation.

What I am concerned with today is what has been presented to Congress, and the position that the Congress of the United States has been put into in the eyes of the world, even in the eyes of the people in the United States as a result of the clumsy unrealistic handling of this entire situation by our State Department.

The food emergency in India is not new. It has been developing for a period of 9 or 10 months. The Indian Government has appealed to the Government of the United States for its assistance in meeting this famine condition. That is a proper function of the Government. The Indian Government was only discharging its responsibility in approaching the Government of the United States. But from that point is where the crux of the whole intolerable situation lies.

The Indian Government approached the United States with a request for assistance on liberal terms. There is no indication that the Indian Government requested an outright grant, although I will admit that a foreign government would be persuaded to ask for a grant rather than a loan in view of our record of generosity in such requests. The Indian Government, any government, has responsibilities to its people. These responsibilities must be discharged if such governments are to retain the support of their peoples. The failure to adequately discharge such a responsibility must rest with the government charged with that responsibility unless, of course, the responsibility can be successfully shifted or transferred in the eyes of the government's people to some other government.

That is precisely what has happened in this case. With the apparent assistance of our State Department the responsibility of providing food to the Indian people has been successfully shifted from the Indian Government to the Government of the United States, and, in turn, by adroit propaganda to the Congress of the United States.

How has this situation come about? After the Indian Government had made its formal request for economic assistance, our economic bright boys decided that it might be a burden on India to have to buy this wheat, therefore, they set about to provide a means to give the requested assistance. Of course, they had no grain to give, but they did have the power of government to take from the citizens of the United States that which the

citizens of the United States had, unless, of course, the Congress, in its wisdom, should decide otherwise.

So the Congress was presented with a bill to grant the Government of India approximately $200,000,000 to purchase grain. Although the request had come from India in the form of assistance on liberal terms, our State Department presents the issue to Congress and to the people that the only choice we have is an outright gift. Why? Because our economic do-gooders can think only in terms of giving away the United States to everyone anywhere in the world that doesn't have everything that we in the United States possess. It concerns them not that we are carrying a debt burden that has the potential destructiveness equal to that of the sinister power in the Kremlin. So the Congress finds itself presented with a proposition by the executive branch that requires rubber-stamp action or unjustified censure by the people of the country who do not know the facts and are persuaded to judge the case only by the emotional appeal of the professional special interest supporters.

The pending bill provides for the aid on a half grant, half loan basis. Is this a mere concession to force the Congress to act or is it a solution based on the record of India's ability to pay some time in the future? There is no accompanying record to guide the Congress in this determination.

Considering all the factors, I do not see how anyone in his right mind could evaluate the present situation and arrive at a decision to grant any of this aid rather than to provide it on a practical loan basis. The proposed legislation does not provide for a gift to the Indian people. No, quite the contrary. This is a gift of this Government to the Government of India. The people of India must buy the grain from the Indian Government.

When a people establish a government they do it to bring to themselves certain benefits. They give to that government certain assets, and in return that government must use those assets in providing that which is necessary to the sustenance of its people. It is a legitimate objective of government to provide means whereby its people may procure food. No one will question the fact that this responsibility initially belongs to the Government of India.

Before asking or accepting a gift from another government, a gift that in itself is degrading, and let me add here that the Asiatic people have had enough degradation in the past 100 years to last them forever. A government should first assess its own assets to whether or not it can provide the means of payment for food. In this instance, let us look at India's position. She has in gold bullion and short-term dollar assets over $300,000,000.

India—Gold and short-term dollar assets

[Millions of dollars]

1950	Total	Gold	Dollar assets
January	317	247	70
February	317	247	70
March	309	247	62
April	309	247	62
May	307	247	60
June	298	247	51
July	289	247	42
August	298	247	51
September	303	247	56
October	298	247	51
November	305	247	58
December	303	247	56

Source: International Monetary Fund.

She has assets in this country, Government-owned and privately owned by her nationals, which are in excess of $110,000,000.

Estimated assets of India and Indian nationals in the United States

1947:	
Long term	$39,000,000
Short term	65,000,000
Total	104,000,000
As of Dec. 31, 1950:	
Long term	39,000,000
Short term	71,000,000
Total	110,000,000

NOTE.—Source: Office of International Finance, U. S. Treasury Department.

She has little external debt to speak of, in fact, she is a creditor nation. She has sterling balances of approximately $1,750,000,000.

India—Sterling balances

[In billions]

	Rupees [1]	Dollars	Pounds sterling
1945	16.68	3.503	1.251
1946	16.23	3.413	1.219
1947 [2]	15.18	3.188	1.139
1948 [2]	10.25	2.153	.769
1949	8.26	1.735	.619
1950	8.34	1.751	.625

[1] 1 rupee=1½ shillings.

[2] The reduction noted between the years 1947 to 1948 was the result of:

1. India assumed England's pension obligations.
2. India purchased the war stores on hand in India from England.
3. India gave to Pakistan a portion of the pound sterling balances.

India—Status of sterling debt

[In millions]

	UN blocked by year	Free
1947-48	80	[1] 80
1948-49	60	[2] 140
1949-50	100	[1] 100

[1] Unexpended.

[2] Expended.

Source: ECA Division of Statistics and Reports.

Value of United States trade with India

[Millions of dollars]

1950	United States imports from India (f. o. b.)	United States exports to India (f. o. b.)
January	20.3	13.7
February	17.6	18.3
March	22.7	34.5
April	24.2	14.7
May	17.0	28.8
June	20.2	18.0
July	19.3	14.6
August	19.6	11.0
September	27.8	10.1
October	28.8	13.4
November	25.3	18.1
December	76.9	20.3
Total	319.7	215.5

Source: United States customs data, U. S. Department of Commerce.

And finally, her trade position with the United States is favorable; in fact, during the past year of 1950 she earned approximately $104,000,000 more from the United States than she bought in the United States. This means that for every dollar that she had to spend in the United States she earned in the United States almost $2 in return, and this is direct trade balance and does not include earnings from invisibles.

Given this set of facts, and they are facts, how should one evolve a solution to a problem of purchasing additional grain supplies from the United States? If her trade position is not such that she can meet this payment out of current account, then she should explore the possibility of making such payments out of accrued assets. Of course, our economic boys then will say that this cannot be done, because it may interfere with her ability to carry on her present trade and meet all of her current account obligations. Very well, accepting this thesis for the moment, what would be the next step, then?

India is a member of the sterling bloc. Every dollar that she earns goes into the sterling bank; every dollar that she spends must come out of the sterling bank. Therefore, it seems logical that she would go to her banker and, in this case, England, since England—that is, the Bank of England—is the banker to the sterling area. It should be pointed out that India is one of the better dollar earners in the sterling area. Therefore, it would appear that the bank would look with favor upon a request of one of its better customers.

England owes India $1,750,000,000. These credits were accumulated by India during the past war when India was supplying England with many things that England needed. It seems only logical that India should go first to England for some help in financing the import of additional foodstuffs. I do not mean, of course, for the actual food, for England has none, but rather for help involving transfers of credits. This whole matter is merely one of international finance. However, there is no indication in the record that she has done this, although the gold and dollar position of England, at the present time, thanks to the Marshall plan, is very good. In fact, the gold and dollar assets of England today are nearly $4,000,000,000. To allow India to convert 100 million or so from pound sterling to dollars would certainly not interfere seriously with this asset position.

Failing a solution by utilizing such sources of assistance in meeting this problem, then it would seem to be proper to approach the Government of the United States for assistance. However, such a request would not require the United States furnish this assistance on a grant basis, especially since the applicant for aid is in an extremely solvent position with respect to assets.

Although I find no evidence that every effort has been put forth to solve this problem before coming to the United States, the situation, as we are presented with it today, requires some action. This action cannot be justified on the basis of a grant. We can make a loan to India on favorable terms that will not impose a burden in excess of that which India can bear. The Congress of the United States has certain responsibilities to the people of the United States. Those responsibilities must be discharged first. It seems inconceivable to me that we can properly discharge our responsibilities to the people of the United States by giving, through a grant, this aid as is proposed, thereby imposing additional burdens on our weary taxpayers when India can and should shoulder the responsibility for future payment. This assistance can only be justified on a loan basis.

THE DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement regarding the Defense Minerals Administration, whose establishment was authorized by the Defense Production Act,

which I had prepared for presentation to the Senate today.

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

I wish to take only a few minutes of the Senate's time today to bring to the attention of this body a matter which is seriously impeding our country's defense effort. Over 7 months ago the President signed the Defense Production Act, which authorized, among other things, the establishment of the Defense Minerals Administration. The basic purpose behind the creation of this agency was to increase the supply of essential and critical metals and minerals so necessary to our defense effort. This increased supply of essential materials was to be achieved by aiding the domestic mining industry.

The announcement of this plan brought great hope to the mining industry and increased activity was seen immediately. This increased activity was based solely on the supposition that the Government had a concrete plan for aiding the mining industry. I am sorry to say that that supposition has proven to be erroneous, and instead of stimulating the domestic industry, production has been crippled because no definite Government plan or policy has been forthcoming. Without a policy the miners and producers of strategic metals and minerals cannot work.

They have no foundation on which to base their operations.

Early last December I protested the fact that no policy had been established and that the Defense Minerals Administration was surrounded by a mass of red tape and confusion. I was informed at that time that the agency was in the process of organization and would be ready to go as soon as a sufficient and adequate staff had been acquired. Only a few days ago representatives of the Defense Minerals Administration, in testifying before the full Appropriations Committee, stated that the program had been unable to get under way because they had not as yet procured a sufficient staff. It is inconceivable to me that an agency created to take care of an emergency situation has been unable to acquire a staff after 7 months. I know that many men from industry have been called in to help this agency. While some of them are still there marking time, many of them have quit, complaining that their hands were tied, that there was no program or policy, or that they were just wasting their time and the Government's money because no one seemed to know what they were doing or where they were going.

Since the establishment of the defense minerals program, I have received hundreds of letters from mining men and prospectors throughout the country. Every single letter has complained of the inefficiency and inaction of the Defense Minerals Administration. I am sure that other Senators have had the same experience.

I found it hard to believe that an agency established 7 months could have accomplished nothing. I checked and found, from the Defense Minerals Administration's own records, that since their establishment they have received 1,086 applications for all types of aid. The far greatest percentage of these applications asked for a loan or a loan guaranty as authorized. Only one loan application of the hundreds received has been approved, and that one not too long ago. I repeat, only one loan application has been approved after 7 months of operation.

Again, I wish to emphasize that this agency was created to assist in providing the defense program with a domestic supply of essential raw materials. I can assure you that a shortage still exists. If the Senate is going to authorize further appropriations for the Defense Minerals Administration, we should at least have assurance of some sort that the do-nothing policy of this agency which has existed for 7 months cease immediately and a policy of action be substituted forthwith. This country needs strategic metals and minerals for the defense effort. The Defense Minerals Administration has been given a job to do, the time for organization is over; let us now see action. Too much time and money have already been wasted.

CONTROLS ON LIVESTOCK, AND PRICES OF MEAT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement relative to the operations of the Office of Price Stabilization, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

For the past several months, I have been in constant touch with Mr. Eric Johnston and Mr. Michael DiSalle, relative to controls on livestock and prices of meat. I was assured both orally and by letter that there were no roll-backs in the prices of beef even contemplated.

A few days ago the Office of Price Stabilization issued Ceiling Price Regulation 24 imposing ceiling prices on beef sold at wholesale, to become effective May 9, 1951. This has resulted in livestock producers rushing their cattle to market before they are fattened to their best salable weight. This is resulting directly in a loss of meat for the American people. The feeders who produce much of the meat supply are suffering losses. And, as pointed out by the Agriculture Committee of the Senate, the announcement of further roll-backs in beef prices will have the effect of continued early marketing of meat animals, finally resulting in a meat famine in the United States. Imagine that, a meat famine in the United States. There is plenty of meat in the United States. Yet we are liable to have a meat famine because of the stupid, unthinking, deliberate attempts of the Office of Price Controls to regiment everything they can lay their hands on. The Senate Agriculture Committee has presented a resolution to this body, urging that the Ceiling Price Regulation 24 establishing the proposed ceiling prices on beef sold at wholesale be rescinded at once. I am in full accord with this resolution.

The senior Senator from Nebraska has suggested that Congress take a good look at the manner in which the Office of Price Controls has exercised its authority before voting an extension of its life. Title IV of the Defense Production Act expires on June 30.

If the action taken with respect to beef prices is a sample of what to expect from Mr. DiSalle's temple of economic knowledge, then I say title IV of the Defense Production Act is in for an overhauling.

The order issued by Mr. DiSalle with respect to beef prices subjects the meat industry to unfair discrimination which no other industry suffers.

This is not price control—it is confiscation and regimentation. What kind of regimen is this? The definition of regimen as given in Webster's dictionary is "a systematic course of diet." How systematic can we get? Are we to have a group of lofty economists telling us what we can eat, what we can wear, and what kind of leather we are to have on our shoes? A systematic course of diet. It will be so systematic that we will have no meat in our diets at all. Or if we are able to get meat it will be on the black market. Already the prices of meat at the grocery stores are rocketing and they will continue to rocket under the new orders. You know Great Britain has a systematic course of diet. What is the amount of meat a British citizen can buy in any one week? You know as well as I do what that amount is. It is about 8 ounces of meat per week. Is that to happen in the United States? Are we to follow Britain in everything we do?

I cannot think of a better way to force a drastic reduction in the supply of beef for consumers. The beef supply is dependent upon the operations of cattle feeders, and those in the feeding business are in a position quite similar to any manufacturer. They must compute their costs carefully before engaging in feeding operations. They don't purchase cattle for fattening in the feed lot unless they know that they can ultimately resell the livestock at a price sufficient to cover costs. This roll-back is going to mean heavy loss to every cattle feeder who bought livestock during the winter.

Most livestock farmers do not believe in price controls on livestock, but they will accept them in a cooperative spirit if they are convinced that the ceilings are worked out on a fair and equitable basis. But the arbitrary action taken by the Office of Price Stabilization is deliberately designed to thrust a financial loss on them. They are not going to continue feeding operations under these circumstances, and I for one, don't blame them one little iota.

Increased production is the only answer to defense problems facing this country. This is just as true in the meat industry as in anything else.

The livestock industry feels, as do 20 other agricultural organizations which make up the agricultural field, that price controls are a cover-up for inflation. The controls don't get at the source of inflation. They cause fear, indecision, confusion, black markets, and bring about a decrease in production. Controls of this nature have no part in a program to control inflation. I would like to see a program of production, and a fiscal policy on the part of the Government which would involve a pay-as-you-go tax program and control of too easy credit. These are the things which get at the source of inflation. The nebular hypothesis espoused by the brain boys are giving us socialistic lines. They ask "Why is the meat industry so worried about our controls. We have eliminated competition and have fixed it so everybody gets a profit?" American industry has always been based on competition. If we eliminate competition what then?

This is not in line with our American way of thinking. Competition is a good, healthy thing for America, and I, for one, am interested in America—not what people across the seas are thinking. They would like to see socialism in America. I don't. Must we come to the Government for every favor to keep us in business? This is a question which is now constantly on the lips of every manufacturer, every meat packer, every cattle feeder, and every housewife in America today.

The Office of Price Stabilization counters with the statement that, if these controls are not followed to the letter, tighter enforcement will ensue. What does that lead us to? A police type of state, that's what. Finally, it would lead to Government ownership and organization.

You know, there was a roll-back on the price of tallow and hides some time back. This was designed to reduce the price of livestock. The price was rolled back to 30 cents per pound. Now the domestic price is 30 cents, as compared with the world price of 50 cents. We produce about 80 percent of the cattle hides which we consume. We have had to depend on offshore buying for 20 percent of our requirements for the last few years. Since the roll-back to 30 cents in the domestic market, naturally, the world producers are not looking to us for hides. In order to get the other 20 percent of our

requirements, tax money will have to be spent to buy the 50-cent hides which will be sold to domestic tanners at 30 cents a pound. The taxpayer absorbs the difference. Domestic production is further discouraged. Production abroad is subsidized by the very people whose production is being discouraged. Where does it all end?

Therefore, this body should immediately take steps to investigate the operations of the Office of Price Stabilization, as suggested by the Agriculture Committee. If we are to extend the life of this agency—and nothing is more immortal than a Government agency once it has been born—then a full-scale overhauling is in order. The roll-back regulation on beef should definitely be rescinded at once.

AIR SAFETY BOARD—EDITORIALS BY BOB SIBLEY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, one of the most able and well-informed aviation editors in the country is Bob Sibley, of the Boston Traveler.

I hold in my hand two columns written by Mr. Sibley, both containing items concerning the question of an independent air safety board. One of these items appears in Mr. Sibley's column under date of February 28, and carries the subhead "Safety board." The other item appears in Mr. Sibley's column of March 6, and has no subheading, being the leading item in the column.

Because of the great importance of this matter, Mr. President, and the very substantial interest in it by many Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that these two portions of columns by Mr. Sibley may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Traveler of February 28, 1951]

SAFETY BOARD

(By Bob Sibley)

Directors of the Aero Club of New England have gone on record as favoring legislation, pending in Congress, for reestablishment of an independent air safety board. The directors said they found special significance in testimony given before congressional committee hearings by David L. Behncke, president of the Air Line Pilots Association, who asserted the present Safety Bureau is under the thumb of other agencies. Behncke also testified: "Surely an air safety investigating body which is placed in a position of investigating itself cannot hope to do the job as impartially or as effectively as an independent air safety board."

[From the Boston Traveler of March 6, 1951]

SAFETY BUREAU REPORT ON FATAL AIR CRASH LEAVES MUCH UNSAID

(By Bob Sibley)

Those who believe there is need for an independent air safety board to replace the present Safety Bureau of the Civil Aeronautics Board might take a close look at the CAB report on Northwest Airlines' Minneapolis crash of March 7, 1950, recently issued.

The accident took place when the plane hit a flagpole during an attempt to land in blowing snow conditions.

The CAB says that "the probable cause of this accident was the attempt to complete a landing approach by visual means during which time visual reference to the ground was lost."

This is conjecture, neither pilot having survived to contribute any information to support this conclusion.

A completely independent air safety board might have outlined additional possibilities such as:

"The pilots may have been led astray by the CAA's Instrument Landing System, since the flagpole which slashed a wing was 650 feet to the left of the centerline of the runway, and 128 feet below the glide path."

But the CAB report neatly exonerates ILS, by assuming that the pilot was not using this beam-landing device.

An independent air safety board might also have reasoned:

"If the airport had been equipped with ground-controlled-approach radar, the pilots could have been warned of their danger long before they had progressed 650 feet to the left and 128 feet too low."

But the CAB report, willing to guess in some matters but not in others, does not touch on such points. It reminds us of Washington testimony of David L. Behncke, president of the Air Line Pilots Association, who told a congressional committee:

"The present Safety Bureau is under the direct thumb of the rule maker and rate fixer—the Civil Aeronautics Board—and indirectly under the thumb of the rule implementer and enforcers, the Civil Aeronautics Administration."

CENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF THE ICE-CREAM INDUSTRY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding the centennial of the founding of the ice-cream industry.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Even in this fast-moving age, 100 years is a long time. And when an industry has rounded out a century of progress and of service to the Nation, it is a matter worthy of note, and an occasion for congratulations to all concerned.

The ice-cream industry is observing this year the centennial of its founding. I believe a recital of certain facts about its origin and development would be both pertinent and of general interest.

I take pardonable pride in the fact that the first wholesale plant began in the State of Maryland. One hundred years ago, Jacob Fussell, a milk dealer located at 180 Exeter Street in Baltimore found that by contracting with the farmers for their milk he had incurred a problem and an obligation, for in the flush season in 1851 Mr. Fussell found himself with a surplus of milk and cream. His fluid-milk customers could not absorb it. He turned to the old recipes for ice cream and began operating the first wholesale plant in the world.

Actually, ice cream was not a new product. Recipes for it had been known in Europe for hundreds of years before Fussell's first enterprise. The story of ice cream from that day on is really an inspiring story of the development of America. In Europe and the other nations of the world a few small retail manufacturers produced on rare occasions sherbets and ice cream. Actually, these were made by caterers on special order. The cost was high and the distribution was limited to the privileged few but this country, with its technological know-how and mass-production methods and distribution soon made ice cream America's favorite, available to everyone in all walks of life.

Jacob Fussell's business venture spread, and soon he established a wholesale plant in Washington, D. C., in Boston, and later in New York City. The rapid growth of the industry from the turn of the century to now is reflected in the fact that in 1899, 5,000,000 gallons of ice cream were produced. In the last half century, the ice-cream industry has increased its production more than 100 times.

Recognition should be given to the ice cream manufacturers, the specialists and dairy manufacturers, the makers of equipment and machinery, and the many suppliers who have aided in the progress of the industry.

Nor can we overlook the research workers, whose basic studies have uncovered the splendid nutritive value of ice cream and have enabled the ice cream industry to say that "It is not only good, but it is good for you."

During World War II ice cream came into its own when the Interagency Council on Nutrition of the Federal Government classified it in group 4 of the seven basic foods. This important program of good nutrition is still in effect.

Reference has been made to the pleasure the industry has given millions of all ages and all walks of life. Let me also stress its economic importance. Few of us realize that the entire dairy industry is greater than the steel industry. Probably a smaller number know that the products of the ice cream industry now approximate a billion and a half dollars annualy at retail.

While offering employment to thousands, and while helping to raise the dietary levels of the Nation, the ice cream manufacturers have created a great market for the American farmer. This is true not only of the dairy farmer. The ice cream industry uses more than 10,000,000,000 pounds of milk equivalent each year to get their cream and important milk solids. In addition, all the other phases of agriculture, the farmers raising sugar beets and sugarcane, are affected; the fruit and nut growers who furnish the ice cream industry about 200,000,000 pounds of fruit and nuts each year, all feel the impact of this important industry in their market places.

The lesson from Jacob Fussell's operation that the ice cream industry can utilize milk products during the flush season when production is high is still economically sound. Through its operation today, the ice cream industry is known as the balance wheel of the dairy economy for the simple reason that most of its purchases of cream and milk solids is made during the surplus season, thus providing stable markets for the dairy farmer.

EMBARGO ON SHIPMENTS OF WAR MATERIALS TO RED CHINA—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding the imposition of an embargo on shipments of war materials to Red China.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Formal action yesterday by the United States in requesting that all United Nations members at once impose an embargo on shipments of war materials to Red China, is a positive move in the right direction which will have the unanimous support of Members of this body and of loyal Americans.

It is distinctly in line with efforts which have been under way in the Senate, for some 8 months. Such action likewise is thoroughly in accord with the spirit and the text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, which I introduced in this body on February 19. The resolution urged the State Department to exhaust every effort to impress upon the free-nation members of the UN that not only was such trade of strategic materials with our enemies inconsistent with every

concept of allied unity and mutual assistance but that it was indefensible on moral grounds as well.

Some have sought to justify the flow of international trade which has been built up over the years, on the ground that the very lifeblood of the economy of foreign nations is involved. Some difficulty was experienced even here in our own country in alerting and convincing the responsible authorities as to the dangers inherent in policies which permitted enemy countries to obtain highly strategic war materials which they later could use against our own troops and the fighting forces of our allies.

However, as can be clearly shown, the current trade activities between some of the nations allied with us in Western Europe and the common foe in the Far East, do not represent merely a continuation of normal trade activities. Indeed, figures at hand indicate all too clearly that some of the very nations which have been giving support to the United Nations forces in the Korean hostilities, have taken advantage of the situation to capitalize on opportunities to supply badly needed war materials to Red China in amounts far exceeding even the most liberal estimates of what constitutes normal trade.

When trade figures which are in the possession of our Subcommitee on Export Controls and Policies reflect increase of 500 percent and more in the shipments of rubber, for instance; and when increases as high as 2,200 percent are registered with regard to shipments of other strategic materials, conditions have reached the point where it would seem not only desirable, but absolutely vital, that our Government ask on which side of the fight these nations are.

It is incumbent upon us, in justice to our own fighting men who have suffered so horribly from Communist aggression in Korea, to have made plain to the world whether countries who are trading so heavily in materials which were aiding the war against our troops are more interested in combating communism and bringing peace to the world or in fattening their coffers through this diabolical perversion of international trade.

It is shocking that Great Britain has sent such huge supplies of strategic materials and products to Communist areas where it could be assumed that these materials would be used against the nations of the west either in Korea, or in preparation for future aggression elsewhere.

Our Nation must continue to insist that the British Government give official recognition to the damage they have done and are doing by their policy of not only "business as usual" but business on a greatly expanded basis, at the expense of the lives and the interests of their allies and of the United Nations.

SUSPENSION OF APPLICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS RELATING TO EMPLOYMENT OF ATTORNEY BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report an original joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and I request its immediate consideration. It is a unanimous report of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That service or employment of Robert T. Murphy as an attorney on a temporary basis to assist the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284, of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of service, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business:

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination of Arthur L. Jennings be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Oren E. Long, of Hawaii, to be Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 7, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

Ware Adams, of Georgia.
John M. Allison, of Nebraska.
Charles F. Baldwin, of Maryland.
Donald F. Bigelow, of Minnesota.
Sidney H. Browne, of New Jersey.
Charles R. Burrows, of Ohio.
John Davies, Jr., of Virginia.
Owen L. Dawson, of Illinois.
Charles E. Dickerson, Jr., of New York.
Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia.
C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky.
Walton C. Ferris, of Wisconsin.
Andrew B. Foster, of Pennsylvania.
Norris S. Haselton, of New Jersey.
U. Alexis Johnson, of California.
George Lewis Jones, Jr., of Maryland.
Cecil B. Lyon, of New York.
Paul O. Nyhus, of Wisconsin.
Edward Page, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Donald W. Smith, of the District of Columbia.
William P. Snow, of Maine.
Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee.
Francis Bowden Stevens, of New York.
Tyler Thompson, of New York.
William C. Trimble, of Maryland.
Walter N. Walmsley, Jr., of Maryland.
Joe D. Walstrom, of Missouri.
Miss Frances E. Willis, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

William K. Ailshie, of Idaho.
Frederic P. Bartlett, of New York.
Burton Y. Berry, of Indiana.
Clarence E. Birgfeld, of the District of Columbia.
Ralph J. Blake, of Oregon.
Ralph A. Boernstein, of the District of Columbia.
Niles W. Bond, of Massachusetts.
Elmer H. Bourgerie, of Maryland.
Aaron S. Brown, of Michigan.
Robert Y. Brown, of Alabama.
Prescott Childs, of Massachusetts.
Claude Courand, of Texas.
Cabot Coville, of California.
Howard Elting, Jr., of Illinois.
Jerome T. Gaspard, of Virginia.
Eugene A. Gilmore, Jr., of Nebraska.
Bernard Gufler, of Washington.
Edmund A. Gullion, of Kentucky.
Theodore J. Hadraba, of Nebraska.
John J. Haggerty, of Virginia.
John N. Hamlin, of Oregon.
Parker T. Hart, of Massachusetts.
James E. Henderson, of California.
L. Randolph Higgs, of Mississippi.
John A. Hopkins, of Iowa.
Morris N. Hughes, of Illinois.
Fred W. Jandrey, of Wisconsin.
Perry N. Jester, of Virginia.
Howard P. Jones, of New York.
Erwin P. Keeler, of Indiana.
William L. Kilcoin, of the District of Columbia.
Bertel E. Kuniholm, of Massachusetts.
Rufus H. Lane, Jr., of Virginia.
Patrick Mallon, of Ohio.
Gordon H. Mattison, of Ohio.
Edward D. McLaughlin, of Arkansas.
Robert B. Memminger, of South Carolina.
George A. Morgan, of the District of Columbia.
John H. Morgan, of Massachusetts.
Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania.
Robert Newbegin, of Massachusetts.
William C. Ockey, of California.
Marsellis C. Parsons, Jr., of New York.
Troy L. Perkins, of Kentucky.
C. Montagu Pigott, of California.
Paul J. Reveley, of Connecticut.
Arthur R. Ringwalt, of Nebraska.
Andreas G. Ronhovde, of Montana.
Albert W. Scott, of Missouri.
Charles Nelson Spinks, of California.
Robert B. Streeper, of Ohio.
E. Paul Tenney, of Washington.
Charles W. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.
Sheldon Thomas, of New York.
Frederik van den Arend, of North Carolina.
Woodruff Wallner, of New York.
Milton K. Wells, of Oklahoma.
Clifton R. Wharton, of Massachusetts.
Evan M. Wilson, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

William C. Affeld, Jr., of Minnesota.
H. Gardner Ainsworth, of Louisiana.
Edward Anderson, of Florida.
Leonard Lee Bacon, of New York.
N. Spencer Barnes, of California.
James D. Bell, of New Mexico.
Carl Breuer, of New York.
Willard O. Brown, of Texas.
Glen W. Bruner, of Colorado.
John H. Burns, of Oklahoma.
Frank P. Butler, of New Jersey.
Donald B. Calder, of New York.
Turner C. Cameron, Jr., of Alabama.
Robert J. Cavanaugh, of Illinois.
V. Lansing Collins, Jr., of New York
Harry Conover, of New Jersey.
Austin B. Cox, of New York.
Robert C. Creel, of New York.
Glion Curtis, Jr., of Missouri.
Philip M. Davenport, of Maryland.
Joseph L. Dougherty, of Iowa.
Perry Ellis, of California.
Robert B. Elwood, of Iowa.
Frederick E. Farnsworth, of Colorado.
Robert S. Folsom, of Massachusetts.
Paul E. Geier, of Ohio.
Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr., of Illinois.
Richard E. Gnade, of Pennsylvania.
Bartley P. Gordon, of Massachusetts.
Caspar D. Green, of Ohio.
Robert Grinnell, of New York.
Claude H. Hall, Jr., of Maryland.
Wesley C. Haraldson, of Virginia.
Walter W. Hoffmann, of California.
John B. Holt, of Maine.
Richard S. Huestis, of New York.
Hartwell Johnson, of South Carolina.
Sidney K. Lafoon, of Virginia.
Frederick P. Latimer, Jr., of Connecticut.
Raymond G. Leddy, of New York.
F. Ridgway Lineaweaver, of Pennsylvania.
Walter J. Linthicum, of Maryland.
Raymond E. Lisle, of New York.
Ernest de W. Mayer, of New York.
David H. McKillop, of Massachusetts.
John M. McSweeney, of Massachusetts.
John Gordon Mein, of Kentucky.
Robert G. Miner, of Maryland.
H. Gordon Minnigerode, of the District of Columbia.
Charles H. Owsley, of the District of Columbia.
Paul Paddock, of Iowa.
J. Hall Paxton, of Virginia.
Kennett F. Potter, of Missouri.
Henry C. Ramsey, of California.
Halleck L. Rose, of Nebraska.
Edward J. Rowell, of California.
Roy Richard Rubottom, Jr., of Texas.
M. Robert Rutherford, of Montana.
William Langdon Sands, of Florida.
Richard M. Service, of the District of Columbia.
Harold Sims, of Tennessee.
Henry T. Smith, of Georgia.
Henry W. Spielman, of Oklahoma.
Paul J. Sturm, of Connecticut.
Horace G. Torbert, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Murat W. Williams, of Virginia.
David G. Wilson, Jr., of Oregon.
William Witman 2d, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

Robert J. Dorr, of California.
David I. Ferber, of Arizona.
Deane R. Hinton, of Illinois.
Oscar C. Holder, of Louisiana.
Walter C. Isenberg, Jr., of Wisconsin.
Leslie W. Johnson, of Minnesota.
Weldon Litsey, of Wyoming.
Henry L. Pitts, Jr., of New York.
Edward F. Rivinus, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Randolph Roberts, of Virginia.
Robert Rossow, Jr., of Indiana.
Sheldon B. Vance, of Minnesota.
Edward L. Waggoner, of Ohio.
Fred E. Waller, of Michigan.
Meredith Weatherby, of Texas.
Charles H. Whitaker, of Rhode Island.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Robert W. Adams, of Texas.
Robert G. Bailey, of New Jersey.
Milton Barall, of New York.
Taylor G. Belcher, of New York.
Donald C. Bergus, of Indiana.
Robert O. Blake, of California.
Thomas D. Bowie, of Minnesota.
John W. Bowling, of Oklahoma.
Robert A. Brand, of Connecticut.
Howard Brandon, of Georgia.
Gray Bream, of Wyoming.
Clarence T. Breaux, of Louisiana.
William L. Brewster, of Texas.
Lewis D. Brown, of New York.
Miss Lora C. Bryning, of Washington.
Rolland H. Bushner, of Oklah ma.
Wilbur P. Chase, of Ohio.
Keld Christensen, of Iowa.
Charles Philip Clock, of California.
A. John Cope, Jr., of Utah.
Robert F. Corrigan, of Ohio.
Roy T. Davis, Jr., of Maryland.
Alexander J. Davit, of Pennsylvania.
Juan de Zengotita, of Pennsylvania.
Dwight Dickinson, of New Jersey.
Donald P. Downs, of Nevada.
Thomas J. Duffield, Jr., of Massachusetts.
L. Milner Dunn, of Utah.
William J. Ford, of New Hampshire.
Martin F. Herz, of New York.
William P. Hudson, of North Carolina.
Alfred le S. Jenkins, of Georgia.
Joseph J. Jova, of New York.
William C. Lakeland, of New York.
Samuel Owen Lane, of California.
Armistead M. Lee, of Virginia.
Scott Lyon, of Ohio.
George Hubert Maness, of Oklahoma.
Oliver M. Marcy, of Massachusetts.
David E. Mark, of New York.
Edward N. McCully, of Texas.
Thomas W. McElhiney, of Maryland.
Thomas D. McKiernan, of Massachusetts.
Cleveland B. McKnight, of Georgia.
Lee E. Metcalf, of Texas.
Joseph J. Montllor, of New York.
Robert W. Moore, of Iowa.
Andrew E. Olson, of Washington.
Clinton L. Olson, of California.
W. Paul O'Neill, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Alexander L. Peaslee, of Ohio.
Norman K. Pratt, of Pennsylvania.
Lubert O. Sanderhoff, of California.
Rufus Z. Smith, of Illinois.
Herbert D. Spivack, of New York.
Wells Stabler, of the District of Columbia.
Charles G. Stefan, of California.
Gerald Stryker, of Connecticut.
John H. Stutesman, Jr., of New Jersey.
John L. Topping, of New York.
Temple Wanamaker, of Washington.
H. André Weismann, of New York.
Jackson W. Wilson, of Texas.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

Theo C. Adams, of Texas.
Thomas W. Ainsworth, of New Hampshire.
Willard Allan, of Colorado.
Arthur B. Allen, of the District of Columbia.
James F. Amory, of Virginia.
John C. Amott, of New Jersey.
Alfred L. Atherton, Jr., of Massachusetts.
John Campbell Ausland, of Pennsylvania.
Philip Axelrod, of Delaware.
Robert A. Aylward, of Massachusetts.
William M. Bates, of Missouri.
Robert M. Berry, of Massachusetts.
Slator C. Blackiston, Jr., of North Carolina.
James J. Blake, of New York.
Vincent R. Boening, of Michigan.
Howard L. Boorman, of California.
William D. Brewer, of Connecticut.
Robert C. Brewster, of Nebraska.
William B. Buffum, of New York.
Miss Patricia M. Byrne, of Ohio.
Stuart B. Campbell, Jr., of Virginia.
William C. Canup, of Michigan.
Frank E. Cash Jr., of Minnesota.
Ralph G. Clark, of New York.
S. Wilson Clark, of California.
Stephen A. Comiskey, of Colorado.
Thomas J. Corcoran, of New York.
Henry L. Coster, of California.
Richard H. Courtenaye, of California.
William D. Craig, of California.
David C. Cuthell, of Connecticut.
Philip M. Dale, Jr., of New York.
Nathaniel Davis, of New Jersey.
Robert D. Davis, of Oklahoma.
John M. Dennis, of Pennsylvania.
Frank J. Devine, of New York.
John B. Dexter, of Maryland.
William B. Dunn, of Texas.
Samuel D. Eaton, of New York.
Hermann F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania.
Richard A. Ericson, Jr., of Minnesota.
Richard T. Ewing, of Maryland.
John M. Farrior, of North Carolina.
John W. Fisher, of Montana.
Wayne W. Fisher, of Iowa.
Benjamin A. Fleck, of Pennsylvania.
Robert C. Foulon, of Illinois.
A. Eugene Frank, of Illinois.
James A. Garvey, of California.
John N. Gatch, Jr., of Ohio.
Scott George, of Kentucky.
Howard C. Goldsmith, of California.
Herbert Gordon, of New York.
John G. Gossett, of Oklahoma.
Philip C. Habib, of California.
Philip E. Haring, of Pennsylvania.
Gregory Henderson, of Massachusetts.
Robert S. Henderson, of New Jersey.
Converse Hettinger, of Wisconsin.
John H. Holdridge, of California.
Walter P. Houk, of California.
Paul R. Hughes, of California.
Vernon V. Hukee, of Minnesota.
Edward C. Ingraham, Jr., of New York.
Richard G. Johnson, of New York.
Howard D. Jones, of Oklahoma.
Ralph A. Jones, of Pennsylvania.
Harold G. Josif, of Ohio.
Abbott Judd, of Rhode Island.
Warren A. Kelsey, of Massachusetts.
Jack T. Kilgore, of Indiana.
Richard H. Lamb, of Washington.
James F. Leonard, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Edward T. Long, of Illinois.
Matthew J. Looram, Jr., of New York.
Roye L. Lowry, of Washington.
John E. MacDonald, of New Hampshi
Robert J. MacQuaid, of Pennsylvania.
Frank E. Maestrone, of Connecticut.
Francis N. Magliozzi, of Massachusetts.
Philip W. Manhard, of California.
Eugene V. McAuliffe, of Massachusett
Richard M. McCarthy, of Iowa.
Glenn R. McCarty, Jr., of Iowa.
Stephen H. McClintic, of Maryland.
James H. McFarland, Jr., of Michigan.
Joseph F. McFarland, of New Jersey.
John B. McGrath, of Rhode Island.
Ralph J. McGuire, of the District of Columbia.
Paul M. Miller, of Maryland.
Robert E. Moberly, of Idaho.
James D. Moffett, of Minnesota.
Thomas H. Murfin, of Washington.
John L. Murphy, of Oklahoma.
William Nesselhof, Jr., of Missouri.
Cleo A. Noel, Jr., of Missouri.
Richard B. Parker, of Kansas.
John M. Perry, of Massachusetts.
Chris G. Petrow, of Massachusetts.
Robert M. Phillips, of California.
Paul O. Proehl, of Illinois.
Ernest E. Ramsaur, Jr., of California.
John B. Root, of New York.
Robert W. Ross, of California.
James R. Ruchti, of Wisconsin.
Samuel O. Ruff, of North Carolina.
John A. Sabini, of the District of Columbia.
Mrs. Corey B. Sanderson, of Idaho.
Dwight E. Scarbrough, of Minnesota.
Robert Simpson, of New York.
Michel F. Smith, of Texas.

Karl E. Sommerlatte, of Florida.
C. Melvin Sonne, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
G. Alonzo Stanford, of Michigan.
Kenedon P. Steins, of Pennsylvania.
Harrison M. Symmes, Jr., of North Carolina.
Herbert B. Thompson, of California.
John M. Thompson, Jr., of Florida.
Edward J. Thrasher, of New York.
Edward J. Trost, of New York.
Gordon C. Tullock, of Illinois.
Francis T. Underhill, Jr., of New Jersey.
Viron P. Vaky, of Texas.
Philip H. Valdes, of New York.
George S. Vest, of Virginia.
Theodore A. Wahl, of New York.
John Patrick Walsh, of Illinois.
Milton C. Walstrom, of Hawaii.
Herbert E. Weiner, of New York.
Arthur D. Weininger, of New York.
William H. Witt, of South Carolina.
Chalmers B. Wood, of the District of Columbia.
Robert C. Wysong, of Indiana.
Elmer E. Yelton, of Virginia.
John B. Young, of New Jersey.
Robert W. Zimmermann, of Minnesota.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Joe Barnes Harrison, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia, vice Henry O. Camp, deceased.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

I nominate the following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 1, 1951, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Thomas Elwood Aaron
David Manker Abshire
Bruce Allen Ackerson
Albert Bayliss Akers
Joseph Albenda
Herbert Hugh Albritton
Richard Crawford Allen
Don Charles Anker
Eric Ferdinand Antila
Carl Franklin Arnold
Floy Lauren Ashley
Edward Breed Atkeson
Ralph Lee Auer
Bruce Barton Bailey
Merton Juel Bangerter
Ransom Edward Barber
William Chauncey Barott
James Thomas Barron
Philip Charles Barth, Jr.
Harold Anthony Barton
Frank Myer Bashore
Robert Edmond Bauers
Peter Anthony Beczkiewicz
Aaron David Bernstein
David Anderson Betts
George Anthony Bicher, Jr.
James Donald Bick
David Leroy Bills
Elmer Havens Birdseye
James Gowen Boatner
John Joseph Bohan, Jr.
John McGee Bohen
William James Bradley, Jr.
Richard Clay Breakiron
James Sereno Brett
Patrick Matthew Brian
Norman James Brown
Charles Edwin Bryant
Richard Joseph Buck
John Wendell Buckstead
John Robertson Byers
Charles Draper William Canham II
Gerald Joseph Carlson
David Alliene Carroll
David Giles Carter
Lewis Marquardt Casbon
Robert William Chapman
Theodore John Charney
James Alden Check
Joseph William Clarke II
Ryburn Glover Clay, Jr.
Joseph Gordon Clemons, Jr.
Roland Eugene Cooper
Sanders Ashford Cortner, Jr.
Albert Crescenzo Costanzo
Paul Allin Coughlin
John Hartley Cousins
Jimmie Stewart Cox
Francis Washington Craig
Lawrence Pope Crocker
William Edward Crouch, Jr.
Charles Arthur Crowe
J. Godfrey Crowe
Philip Archinard Cuny
John David Daigh
Michael McQuatters Davis
Richard Backer Dawson
Allen Matthew Robert Dean
Anthony Joseph Delano
Frederick Lockwood Denman
William Lawrence Depew
Thomas Barnett DeRamus, Jr.
John Thomas Derrick
Otto Carl Doerflinger, Jr.
John Joseph Dorton
Laurance Condon Dosh
Juan Francisco Doval
Lee Edward Duke
Norman Eugene Dunlap
William Carl Edler
Bruce Erland Elmblad
Alan Clare Esser
Henry Cotheal Evans, Jr.
Charles Boal Ewing, Jr.
Joseph Lewis Fant III
William Dwight Farrington
George Charles Filchak
Robert Elliot Fitch
Robert William Flanagan
Joseph Vincent Fleming
John Daniel Foldberg
Redmond Vincent Forrester, Jr.
Peter John Foss
John Bernard Foster
Thomas George Foster III
Alan Arthur Frick
Hugh Stephen Galligan
George Henry Gardes
John Hillman Gardiner
Rodney Bruce Gilbertson
Charles Rolland Gildart, Jr.
William Leneas Givens II
George Massie Gividen, Jr.
Chandler Goodnow
John Alexander Graham III
Seldon Bain Graham, Jr.
Clinton Edwin Granger, Jr.
John Walter Granicher
Myles Standish Grant
Theodore William Griesinger, Jr.
William Everitt Grugin
James Talbot Guyer
Philip Haines Gwynn
Frank Edmund Hamilton
Eben Nathaniel Handy, Jr.
George Davis Hardesty, Jr.
George Lawrence Harman
Richard Lee Harris
Barry McKnight Harriss
Thomas Ure Harrold
Edward Patrick Hartnett III
Thomas Hubert Hastings
John Phillip Haumersen
John Vaughn Hemmler, Jr.
John Allen Hemphill
Kenneth Guynn Herring
Roy Jacob Herte, Jr.
John Peter Hill
Paul Richard Hilty, Jr.
John Hinton, Jr.
Jonathan Lane Holman, Jr.
John Ferguson Hook
John Randolph Hook
Thomas Bernard Horgan
Robert Arthur Howes
Joseph Wood Hutchinson, Jr.
Robert Allison Hyatt
Jerry Shannon Ingram
Frederick French Irving
Robert Michael Isaac
Thomas Zadock James
Guy Earlscort Jester, Jr.
Dean DeLaine Johnson
Harlan Warren Johnson
Kermit Douglas Johnson
Maynard Benjamin Johnson
Robert Lloyd Johnson
Russell Leroy Johnson
Walter Henry Johnson
Lincoln Griffin Jones
Norman Dean Jorstad
Donald Joseph Kasun
James Addison Keeley
Earl Loyd Keesling
Lawrence Michael Kelly
James Richard Kintz
Walter Albert Klein
Charles Leland Knapp
Albert Ray Knight, Jr.
Joseph William Knittle, Jr.
Michael Kovalsky
Marvin Joseph Krupinsky
Joseph Delta Lafleur, Jr.
Donald James Leehey, Jr.
John Joseph Leffler
William Lyman Lemnitzer
John Broadus Lewis
Alan Arthur Lichtenberg
Robert Bruce Lins
Harry Warner Lombard
William Charles Louisell, Jr.
Joseph Albert Luger
Edward Page Lukert, Jr.
Samuel Ayer Lutterloh
Patrick Hugh Lynch
Robert Eulass Macklin
William Andrew Malouche
Edward Murphy Markham III
Jack Wayne Martin
Louis Brooks Martin
Robert Lee Massenburg
Edward Eli Matney
Glenn Edward McChristian
Richard Carlyle McClure
Neil Oliver McCray
Lynn Maynard McCrum
Richard Rougier McCullough
James William McDonald
Robert Heyburn McIlwain
Charles Crawford McIntosh
Charles Brannon McLean, Jr.
Richard Philip McLean
George Allen Meighen
Edward Charles Meyer
Louis Guy Michael, Jr.
Rex Douglas Michel
Ronald Hugh Milam
Robert William Milburn
Fred Richard Miller
Stuart Livingston Miller
Walter Bernard Miller, Jr.
Wayne Dickson Miller
Lawrence Lester Mintz
John Little Moffat
William Sidney Monsos
Newton Bedford Morgan, Jr.
John Joseph Moroney, Jr.
Edward John Mueller, Jr.
Dean Duane Mulder
Frank Ager Mullens
Daniel James Myers
Edwin Thompson Nance, Jr.
Paul Eugene Niedringhaus, Jr.
Cecil Ward Nist, Jr.
Donald James Norton
John Bernard Norvell
Thomas Christian Odderstol, Jr.
Desmond O'Keefe, Jr.
Robert Orlikoff
George William Orton
Henry Charles Otten
Garland Logan Owens
William Gladstone Owens, Jr.
Everette Sanford Parkins
Norton Lacy Parks
Hugh Heflin Pattillo
Robert James Pazderka
Donald Dean Peifer
Ernest Dishman Peixotto
Edouard Albert Peloquin
Karl William Peltz

Elmer Dean Pendleton, Jr.
Richard Arney Perry
Edward Compston Peter II
Charles Davis Phillips
James Holden Phillips, Jr.
James Richard Pitts
Robert Allan Prehn
George Peter Psihas
Charles Cowdry Pursley
Robert Allen Rachek
Joseph Wyndham Rawlings
Philip Neill Reed
George McKinley Reid, Jr.
Andrew Cunningham Remson, Jr.
Joseph Peter Rice
William Rowland Richardson
Kenneth Volkert Riley, Jr.
Delmar Lawrence Ring
George Gardner Ritter
Ronald Arthur Roberge
Lew Sidney Robinson
Roscoe Robinson, Jr.
Frederick Gore Rockwell, Jr.
James Mitchell Rockwell.
Ronald Joe Rogers
John Lawton Ross
Herbert Roth, Jr.
Christian Foltz Rupp III
Walter Brown Russell, Jr.
Richard Louis Ryan
Derrick William Samuelson
Raymond Francis Sargent, Jr.
Freddie Gene Sartin
Charles Joseph Satuloff
S. Arthur Scalise
Max Burton Scheider
George Peter Scheuerlein
William Ferdinand Scheumann, Jr.
William Wallace Schooley, Jr.
Joseph Francis Schuman
Donald Ray Schwartz
Richard Alfred Schwarz
John Eugene Schweizer
Stanley Stuart Scott
James Roe Semmens
Leonard Paul Shapiro
Daniel Gorman Sharp
Donald Thomas Sheridan
Stan Roger Sheridan
Francis Joseph Sheriff
Aaron Sherman
John Early Shillingburg
Michael John Simpson, Jr.
Robert Ingalls Simpson, Jr.
Guerdon Sterling Sines
Joseph Lee Sites
Donald Lovett Smith
Gorman Curtis Smith
Joseph St. Clair Smith
Howard Wayne Snyder
Melvin Claude Snyder, Jr.
Robert William Snyder
William Spence, Jr.
John Jay Stahl, Jr.
George Willis Stannard
Howard Merritt Steele, Jr.
Walter Richard Steidl
Wallace Chace Steiger, Jr.
Floyd Gilbert Stephenson
Francis Adelbert St. Mary
William Kenneth Stockdale
Louis John Storck
Thomas Anthony Stumm
Paul Dilwyn Summers, Jr.
Richard Anthony Szymczyk
Duane Ray Tague
John May Tatum, Jr.
Roland Dean Tausch
Malcom Brandt Tennant
Edgar Cornell Thomas, Jr.
William Neal Thomas
Dudley Thompson
Peter Louis Thorsen
Raymond Lawrence Toole, Jr.
Lowell Emmett Torseth
William Edward Vandenberg
Edwin Van Keuren, Jr.
Donald Augustus Van Matre
Frank Paul Vellella
Herman Joseph Vetort
Gustave Villaret III
Robert DeWitt Vincent
Robert Hartness Volk
Douglas Frederick Wainer
Francis Joseph Waldman, Jr.
Charles Jenkins Walker
Charles Nathan Wallens
Russell Fleming Walthour
Thomas Joseph Wanko, Jr.
John Duke Ward
Daniel Hurlburt Wardrop
John Richard Wasson
Robert Earl Welch
Richard Marshall Wells
Alexander Mulqueen Weyand
Howard Cameron Williams
Edward Martin Willis
Franklin Loeb Wilson
Francis Edward Winfield
Francis Lally Winner
Thomas Roger Woodley
William Brooks Woodson
Robert George Yerks
Edward Lauriston Zuver
Bernard Zwerling

I nominate the following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 1, 1951, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualifications:

Kie Oldham Doty
William Frederick Lackman, Jr.
James Myrick Lowerre
William Fulton Magill III
Edward Allen Partain
Walter Carper Phillips, Jr.
Bruce Harry Robertson

I nominate the following-named individual for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 2, 1951, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong., subject to graduation from the United States Naval Academy and subsequent discharge therefrom:

Robert Adam Renneman

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

PARAGRAPH 1. 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. Except as otherwise indicated, all officers have been found physically qualified for promotion. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. Those indicated by the symbol (*) are subject both to physical and professional examinations required by law due to circumstances which have prevented such examinations (Clarence LeR. Anderson, missing in action, and Alexander M. Boysen, prisoner of war).

To be lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Alan Beresford Todd, O42088.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps

×Robert Scurry Anderson, O22268.
×Joe Morris Blumberg, O29332.
×Clarence Raymond Brown, O24320.
Oliver Russell Buesing, O41775.
Leo Joseph Butler, O22267.
Richard Ray Cameron, O21717.
Joseph Thomas Caples, O21034.
Alonzo Bee Christie, Jr., O21723.
Martin Andrew Compton, O21038.
Robert McAllister Davis, O21454.
Herbert Downing Edger, O21452.
×Fred James Fielding, O21460.
Harold Winfield Glascock, Jr., O30854.
Frank Whitton Govern, O21031.
×Edwin Wayne Hakala, O21456.
Robert Sexton Higdon, O21459.
Tyron Ehrhart Huber, O56808.
×Forrest Edgar Hull, O21045.
Arthur Thomas Jones, O21678.
William Theodore Lane, O21714.
Homan Elfred Leech, O21679.
×Doss Owen Lynn, O21722.
Jackson Franklin Morehead, O21449.
×Myles Patton Moursund, O22269.
Leon Joseph Numainville, O21002.
×Thomas Earl Patton, Jr., O21674.
Edwin Joseph Pulaski, O41779.
×Francis Wilson Regnier, O22699.
Richard Wampler Satterthwaite, O51176.
×Charles Daniel Shields, O41776.
Philip Jack Smith, O21719.
Julius John Snyder, O21036.
Walter Dudley Spearman, O30848.
Frank Gordon Stephens, O21044.
×Alfred Pembroke Thom 3d, O21032.
Oscar Elliott Ursin, O21687.
×Henry Clay Vedder, O20999.
×John Henry Voegtly, O21450.
Edwin Sharp Wallace, O30859.
×Oswald Massena Weaver, O30861.
John James Young, O51172.

To be majors, Medical Corps

James Archibald Bell, O26452.
Joseph Reese Blair, O52007.
Alfred Sjouke Blauw, O26962.
×John James Brennan, O31150.
Donald Campbell, O31122.
William Wallace Cox, O43178.
William Ward Currence, O26446.
Jon Price Evans, O52010.
Raymond Joseph Getz, O26450.
Christian Gronbeck, Jr., O26470.
Milton Henry Hollander, O31102.
Charles John Hornisher, O26461.
Harry Aloysius Horstman, Jr., O26459.
Robert Samuel Jordan, Jr., O26460.
Avery Parsons King, O26449.
George Fairless Lull, Jr., O31114.
Frank Wisner Lynn, O26448.
Jules John McNerney, O26453.
Richard Francis Mulholland, O31124.
×Joseph John Nannarello, O56843.
Watson Edward Neiman, O31072.
×John Francis Pfeffer, O26468.
×Raoul Constantine Psaki, Jr., O26467.
×Harold Elton Ratcliffe, O56840.
×Frank Bradway Rogers, O26466.
Richard Coffman Shrum, O26447.
Arnot Crawford Sine, O41364.
Nathaniel Roscoe Spencer, O26944.
John Worthington Sumner, Jr., O31133.
John Henry Tenery, O43172.
Urban Linus Throm 2d, O26465.
John Keay Wallace 2d, O31131.
×Maurice Burton Winstead, O43163.

To be captains, Medical Corps

William Arved Abele, O57912.
Arthur Walker Adams, O58047.
Joseph Allison, O58105.
×Ellsworth Chapman Alvord, Jr., O58207.
*Clarence LeRoy Anderson, O61069.
Saul Baer Appel, O58113.
×Benjamin Lester Archer, O59576.
Clifton Wallace Arrington, O58032.
Alexander Woodson Ashford, O61183.
Marshall Beale Atkinson, O58208.
×Frank Herbert Austin, O57904.
Robert Evanston Baird, O58087.
Robert Hershey Baker, O58098.
Davis Aloysius Baltz, O58106.
Harry Banoff, O58027.
George Randolph Barnes, Jr., O57999.
Marcus Richard Beck, O60043.
William Robert Beisel, O59560.
James Carroll Bell, O58111.
James Seymour Berger, O58080.
Stephen Joseph Berte, O60132.
Robert Harold Bickford, O57996.
Frederick Charles Biehusen, O58038.
Edward Otto Bierman, O58045.
Leland Merle Bitner, O59570.
Richard Kekuni Blaisdell, O59710.
Hu Al Blake, O58708.
Alan Irving Blumberg, O58054.
Heath Douglas Bourdon, O60764.
John George Boutselis, O58030.
*Alexander Marius Boysen, O59612.
Carl Otto Brackebusch, O59561.

William Roy Breg, Jr., O58003.
Anthony Leonard Brittis, O60042.
Arnold Jason Brody, O58099.
Donald George William Brooking, O59601.
×David Phillips Buchanan, O59563.
Charles Edward Buck, O58007.
×Edward Louis Buescher, O60050.
Charles Edwin Butterworth, Jr., O59617.
John Mostier Cahill, O58067.
Harold George Carstensen, O60061.
Irvin Walters Cavedo, Jr., O59557.
Gerald Aiken Champlin, O60046.
×Bruce Frederick Chandler, O59613.
John Frederick Christianson, O62914.
Norman Jensen Cole, O58028.
Richard King Cole, Jr., O59599.
Warren James Collins, O59564.
Joseph Vincent Conroy, Jr., O59707.
William John Conroy, O59614.
Morton Charles Creditor, O58050.
William Francis Crepps, O59629.
Charles Brandon Crow, Jr., O58037.
John Bankhead Crow, O59623.
Arthur Jackson Crumbley, Jr., O58004.
Hugh Paul Curtis, O58048.
×Arthur Newton Dadirrian, O59708.
Paul Worthen Dale, O58044.
Crowell Turner Daniel, Jr., O59693.
Roswell George Daniels, O60058.
Albert James Davis, Jr., O59556.
William Jesse Dean, O59606.
Frank Ross De Luca, O58066.
Stephen Henri Deschamps, O57913.
Robert Lind Devine, O57903.
Arthur Calvin Dietrick, O59578.
John Hammill Draheim, O60034.
Richard Howard DuPree, O60759.
John Emery Egdahl, O61948.
James Paul Elkins, O58059.
Franklin Harold Epstein, O58062.
×Robert Andrew Etherington, O59583.
Paige Bill Follo, O58086.
Richard Myron Fox, O58043.
John William Frye, O58083.
Robert Dale Gamble, O59694.
Donald Hall Giesler, O58093.
Gordon Earl Gifford, O59546.
Robert Grout Gildersleeve, O58031.
Joseph Lang Girardeau, O59637.
Donald Henry Glew, Jr., O59550.
Norman Goldstein, O58104.
Arthur Goldwyn, O58063.
Clifford Peter Goplerud, O59700.
John Newton Gordon, O59695.
Fay Burton Graves, O57558.
Stuart Graves, Jr., O58068.
Leon David Graybill, O59567.
Lloyd Jefferson Gregory, Jr., O58100.
Paul Frederick Guerin, O57954.
Ben David Hall, O58065.
×Robert Joseph Hall, O59628.
William Henry Hall, O60133.
George Belgrove Hamilton, O60143.
James Francis Hammill, O59543.
Charles Walcott Hanford, O58096.
Walter White Hannah, O58053.
Joseph Lawrence Hannon, O59553.
Frederick Lee Harcourt, O61945.
William Henry Harper, Jr., O60130.
Ira Barnett Harrison, O59603.
Russell Connell Harrison, O61081.
Moses McCoy Hartman, 59705.
Charles Leroy Hedberg, O59566.
Armand Elkin Hendee, O59596.
×Thomas Love Hendrix, O58206.
Donald Lavern Howie, O60756.
Robert Franklin Hufner, O58110.
David James Hughes, O58005.
×Robert Davidson Hume, Jr., O61067.
Samuel Wynne Hunter, O58085.
Harry Frederick Hurd, O59587.
Robert Wheary Irvin, Jr., O59555.
×William Harry Isham, O59610.
Lawrence Monroe Jackson, Jr., O59443.
Herbert Jerome Jacobs, O59686.
×Park Chalmers Jeans, Jr., O59600.
Francis Wheatley Jeffords, O57910.
Robert Travis Jensen, O60761.
Winston Charles Jesseman, O60060.
Kenneth Eugene Johnson, O57748.
Lester Dean Johnson, Jr., O58060.
Merlin Hubert Johnson, O58092.
×Richard Greene Johnson, O58253.
Edward Harold Johnston, O59536.
Blackburn Smith Joslin, O58041.
×Albert Jacob Kanter, O59575.
John Stephen Kelly, O57997.
Cecil Harry Kimball, O59593.
Donald Everett King, O58768.
Robert Reese Koefoot, O58000.
Charles Haden Lasley, O57998.
Joseph Anthony Latteri, O61949.
James Maitland Lauderdale, O59552.
John Kline Leach, O58088.
×Evan Larson Lewis, O58205.
Arthur Fulton Lincoln, O60033.
William Paul Lochte, O58769.
Charles Leo Lynch, O57911.
Donald Ray Lyon, O59634.
Richard Edward McGovern, O59573.
John Rockwell McLelland, O57741.
×Campbell Arthur McNicol, O58052.
James Wallace Mankin, O58089.
Robert Anthony Markelz, O58069.
Roscoe Edward Mason, O59618.
×William Charles Matousek, O59579.
Carter Lee Meadows, O59632.
Charles Hymerick Meeks, O58108.
John Jacob Meyerdierks, O58039.
Joe Elias Mitchell, O57958.
John Arthur Moncrief, O59697.
Charles Allan Moore, O59584.
×Charles Herbert Moore, O59701.
William Alexander Moore, O57415.
×Robert William Moseley, O59559.
Thomas Henry Moseley, O59554.
Robert Harlan Moser, O59597.
Arthur Anthony Murray, O59590.
Joseph Raymond Newton, O58064.
Robert Floyd Newton, O58095.
John Allen Norman, O57957.
Edward Taylor O'Dell, O57960.
×Richard Eugene Ogborn, O58209.
John William O'Grady, O57908.
Lawrence Joseph Oot, O59598.
Edwin Lowell Overholt, O60030.
Kenneth Norwood Owens, O59586.
×John Harold Painter, O59551.
John Majure Palmer, O58029.
Paul William Palmer, O60097.
Charles Council Parker, O60055.
Alois Peczenik, O61181.
Francis James Peisel, O59621.
Vol Keeney Philips, O59709.
William Greeley Phippen, O59581.
Charles Calvin Pixley, O57841.
Donald G. Pocock, O59622.
Raymond Ernest Ponath, O57071.
Warren Ellsworth Porter, O58046.
James Richard Prest, Jr., O59565.
×Walter Stauffer Price, O61182.
×Robert Walter Puckett, O57749.
Gordon Keith Pyles, O59585.
Robert Keith Rawers, O59547.
Wallace James Redner, Jr., O58767.
×Robert Ward Regan, O59574.
Eric Reiss, O62915.
Robert George Richards, O60054.
Roberto Carlos Rodriguez, O59706.
Harold Rosegay, O58766.
×Joel Leonard Roth, O60139.
Samuel Morris Rothermel, O59588.
Joseph August Roy, O58090.
William David Sanderson, O59620.
James Howard Sands, O58112.
×William John Sayer, O60031.
William Renold Schillhammer, Jr., O63453.
×Lionel Abbott Schwartz, O57955.
John Edwin Scott, O59568.
Wilson Radcliff Scott, O57070.
Lee Sherwood Serfas, O61184.
John Hays Sharp, O59619.
×Jacques Lawrence Sherman, Jr., O59541.
Robert Leonard Sherman, O60062.
Alvin Sholk, O59630.
Paul Eugene Sieber, O58707.
Robert Andrew Simenson, O58101.
Fred Harshman Slager, O60069.
Charles Burnett Smith, O58042.
Robert Warren Spaulding, O58033.
Harry Franklin Sproat, O57416.
Lee Arnold Steele, O59582.
Robert John Steinborg, O59635.
Donald James Summerson, O60747.
Frank Louis Swift, O59542.
Yiwen Yves Tang, O58026.
Arthur Abbott Terrill, O59594.
×Paul Erhard Teschan, O59604.
×Miles Evered Thomas, O58107.
Ralph Gomer Thomas, O58084.
Willis Herbert Thornburg, O58097.
David Michael Tormey, O59609.
William Waters Tucker, O58051.
×Jasper Leon Van Avery, Jr., O59703.
Francis Leonard Van Veen, O57739.
Molloy George Veal, Jr., O59569.
Richard Aloysius Walsh, O61187.
Richard Alpheus Ward, O60070.
David Wesley Wardell, O59602.
Donald Riegel Watkins, O57907.
Richard Elvin Weeks, O60066.
William Holmes Weingarten, O59605.
Herschel James Wells, O57956.
×Dick Davis Wetzel, O58091.
Glenn Richard Weygandt, O58094.
David Craig White, O60763.
William Herman Whitmore, Jr., O59558.
Fred Crump Williams, O57906.
Dean Flewellyn Winn, Jr., O57959.
×Walter McIlhaney Wolfe, O57740.
William Henry Wright, O59580.
Vladimir Antonovich Yaholkovsky, O57905.

To be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps

Hugh Davis Avary, O30838.
William Preston Barnes, Jr., O21048.
Clare Thomas Budge, O21050.
Ernest Joseph Fedor, O38657.
John Eugene Finnegan, O20971.
Thomas James Hagen, O20967.
Onas Lee Johns, O29323.
Thayne Foster McManis, O21047.
Maurice Alexander Meador, O30835.
James Shira Pegg, O20966.
Charles Kenneth Reger, O20962.
William Brooks Simms, O20968.

To be major, dental corps

Perry Wilson Bascom, O25171.
James Blake Bunnell, Jr., O31074.
John Lloyd Campbell, O38863.
×Fred James Farrar, O56838.
John Edward Jordan, O38859.
Herbert Bonell Laffitte, O43150.
Norbert Steve Lang, O31062.
Raymond Aloysius Mahr, O43157.
Edmund Severn Olsen, Jr., O31071
Clare William Sauser, O26444.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Dale Carl Bowers, O57751.
Walter Zimri Brown, O57752.
Robert Duncan Buchanan, O57842.
×Sebastian Joseph Campagna, O57845.
Raymond Charles Clark, O61072.
Robert Joseph Fanning, O57572.
Ralph Warren Flinchbaugh, O61071.
Paul Mertins Cowan, O57914.
Frederick Albert Helig, O58115.
Kenneth William Hughes, O57846.
Carter Hamilton Lewis, Jr., O57915.
Roderick Latimer Lister, O57753.
Richard John Maloney, O57574.
Jack Douglas Pigford, O57843.
Harry Charles Robertson, O60746.

To be lieutenant colonel, Veterinary Corps

×Richard George Yule, O18948.

PAR. 2. The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Charles Thomas Burch, O63060.
Charles Augustus Hagman, Jr., O63291.
Louis William Kranyak, O063296.
Douglas Alexander Mollison, O62213.
Gene Dale Moore, O63280.
Charles Glen Noice, Jr., O63303.
Malcolm Kaye Rhine, O63306.
James William Ryan, O63070.

Walter Thayer Ride, Jr., O63290.
Joseph Dominick Spinelli, O63488.
James Edwin Stacy, O63285.
Comfort Kent Starr, O63292.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Oren E. Long, of Hawaii, to be Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-gracious God, our Father, may this moment of worship inspire us with a more filial trust in Thee and a more fraternal attitude toward all mankind.

Grant that we may be lovers of righteousness, walking humbly before Thee and seeking earnestly to do Thy will more perfectly.

In the sphere of human relationships may we always act like Christian brothers and neighbors, manifesting the spirit of good will and encouragement and extending the hand of helpfulness to all who are bearing heavy burdens.

Daily we are bringing unto Thee the difficult problems of our own country and the desperate needs of a world torn asunder and riven by the storms of hatred and war.

We pray that our President, our Speaker, and all who legislate in the affairs of government may be endowed with wisdom and courage as they strive to find the way to a just and an enduring peace.

In Christ's name we penitently offer our petition. Amen.

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

VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on yesterday, he did on today, May 4, 1951, sign the following enrolled bill:

S. 271. An act to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 49]

Abbitt	Granahan	Miller, N. Y.
Anfuso	Granger	Morano
Armstrong	Green	Morrison
Bakewell	Gregory	Murphy
Baring	Halleck	Murray, Tenn.
Barrett	Harrison, Va.	Murray, Wis.
Bramblett	Hébert	Nelson
Brooks	Heffernan	Patman
Buckley	Heller	Philbin
Byrne, N. Y.	Herlong	Powell
Case	Hinshaw	Price
Celler	Hoffman, Ill.	Reams
Chatham	Holifield	Redden
Chelf	Irving	Ribicoff
Chudoff	Jackson, Wash.	Roosevelt
Cole, N. Y.	James	Sasscer
Combs	Javits	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Curtis, Mo.	Kearney	Sieminski
Dawson	Kee	Taylor
DeGraffenried	Kelly, N. Y.	Vail
Dingell	Kersten, Wis.	Vinson
Dollinger	Kirwan	Watts
Doyle	Klein	Whitaker
Elston	Kluczynski	Widnall
Fine	Latham	Wood, Idaho
Fugate	McGuire	Woodruff
Gavin	McKinnon	
Gillette	Mansfield	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 42) which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3880, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] had 20 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] had 51 minutes remaining.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, as one of the freshman members of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices it has been a privilege to serve through the past months under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], than whom there could be no finer or more able chairman, and to have the benefit of the guidance and assistance of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], ranking member on my own side of the committee, and to associate with the other members of this very able subcommittee.

During the hours of general debate, Mr. Chairman, there were brought out before this House many of the details of this rather complicated bill involving thirty-five-odd independent agencies of the Government. I should like to call the attention of the Committee to a few of the comparatively minor points which at the same time are rather significant as indicating the problems we are up against and showing the membership and the people how far we have gone along the line of Government expenditures and what our real problems are.

If you study the thirty-five-odd departments with which our committee has been dealing during these months of intensive hearings, you will find some significant facts. For instance, you will find that the requests authorized by the Bureau of the Budget for the item of travel alone in these 35 departments total some $16,600,000. Incidentally, that amount of money would build 27 B-29's or 83 Patton tanks. You will find that the combined requests approved by the Bureau of the Budget for these 35 departments for communication expense—telegraph and telephone—totaled some $8,300,000 plus. That money for telephone and telegraph charges and for communications would have constructed 14 B-29's or 41 Patton tanks.

The combined request for printing and binding of these departments, many of them comparatively small regulatory bureaus of the Government, total over $5,000,000, which would construct 9 B-29's or 26 Patton tanks. I merely mention these facts to show how these comparatively trivial items mount as you go through the long list.

It is interesting to note also that almost every one of these bureaus and departments is expending a good deal of energy and a great deal of money in the matter of research and fact finding, and almost without exception they come in and suggest that this research and fact finding must be redoubled because of the war effort; that it is necessary to have at the disposal of the military and other branches of the Government, including special war-emergency agencies, all of their data. The Tariff Commission, for instance, is engaged in a vast campaign of fact finding and research. The Federal Power Commission insists on more money in order that it may make more research and place at the disposal of the Government agencies more information regarding power, and so on down the line through almost every one of these agencies, and so these charges pile up.

Mr. Chairman, a further instance—much was said about housing here yesterday. In connection with the Federal Housing Administration you will find that the sum of over one and a half million dollars, comparatively small perhaps,