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 powers, and to provide 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. 321. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a study which is a part of the investigation of the removal of 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. MARLEN:
H. R. 3962. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Becker Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:
H. R. 3963. A bill for the relief of Kurt Karl Otto Waltzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURRIS:
H. R. 3964. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Bogus; 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. MICHNO:
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 Vanek and Jan Vanek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELEY:
H. R. 3969. A bill for the relief of Franco Bernardi; 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. WALDIE (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 Ziio Fong Hsi; 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 renunciation 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, Eric Cocks, following his appearance before which included a visit with troops in Korea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S E N A T E
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 weariness 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 and thanksgiving which will fill our time and minds as we prepare for the role committed to our care, that we may bring all our desires and powers, we beseech Thee, into conformity to Thy will. In our weakness we are 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 previous day, 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 BILLS WERE ORDERED TO BE CALLED UP FOR CONSIDERATION:

PROPOSED REVISION OF A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT OF 1951, AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE TRANSFER TO THE VERTMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ADDISON COUNTY, VT., FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES.

BILLS SIGNED AND ENROLLED

SENATE BILL NO. 271.

By unanimous consent, the following bills were enrolled:

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949—AMENDMENTS

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

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, 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 Page's Year," published in the April 7 issue of the Army-Navy-Air Association for the United Nations, Inc., as follows:

By Mr. KEM:

THE CALENDAR

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

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 72) 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 specially equipped 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. 308) 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. 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.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of 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 will be passed 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. HENDRICKSON. 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.

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.

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.

APPOINTMENT OF BERNT BALCHEN AS PERMANENT COLONEL IN REGULAR AIR FORCE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill (S. 1220) to authorize the appointment of Bernt Balchen as permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force, was announced as next in order. The bill was 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 Talkeetna National Wildlife Refuge, to 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. 938), 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. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill 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 899

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. 2885) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Tuskegee Institute a tract of land in Macon County, Ala., was amended.

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.

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. 1564) 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 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. FRANCISCO DRAGO

The bill (S. 1682) for the relief of Dr. Francisco 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. Francisco 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, et al., 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 bill was 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. 369) 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 Estate, the sum of $5,000, as compensation 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 1161 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. 1181) 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. 643) 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 "or" 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 OP CLAIM OF AL PARKER TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States 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 to appear as a party 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 Auff 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 expiration of any statute of limitations or any defense of laches, jurisdiction of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Auff 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.

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.

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Claude 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 amendment was made so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Claude 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. Schoeppe. 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 a mile was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

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. 893) 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 an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "$123," and in line 7, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$410.10" and insert "$418.10."

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 $1,000, 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 assigned 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."
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 exception 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 the defense 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 of 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, if I have not done enough 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 which might injure their small competitors. One critic of the bill has gone so far, in this direction, as to refer to the bill as a proposal to "legalize the destruction of small business."

Of course, no such criticism is in any way justified. The bill does not deal in any way with sales at retail. A retailer who holds the price on his goods 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 lowest price in town, at the same time. It is discrimination at the wholesale or distributing level with which the present law is concerned; and, in any event, it is too late, and 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 by 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 to pay public and private interests seeking protection from competition which hurts. Congress should not retreat from its position that competition is intended to be painless and that the only alternative to such competitive hurt is a cartel. 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 a manufacturer'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 manufacturer absorbs any such costs, 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 pass.

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, with the hope that its purpose may be fulfilled. 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. MAHAN. 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. HERR. I understand that. Nevertheless, the brief statement the Senator from Nevada has made has given some of the highlights of the bill, of course. May I ask the Senator to 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 (H. R. 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 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 number of bars 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 STEPANOVA KASENKINA

The bill (H. R. 622) for the relief of Oksana Stepanova 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 Wojciech and Stanislaw Wojciech 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 "$5,244;" 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. ALDRETT

The bill (H. R. 654) for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Aldrett was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HILDEGARD DOTTING AND JUDITH INGEBORG DOTTING

The bill (H. R. 667) for the relief of Hildegard Dotting and Judith Ingeborg Dottling 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 GUILLA PONTRELLI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 756) for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilla 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 the 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. 761) 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. 890) 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 THELEMMANN

The bill (H. R. 899) 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 Onore, Vincenzo Andreani, Lambro Sarramini, and Alessandro Costello was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PIETRO GIANNETTINO

The bill (H. R. 1184) 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. 1283) 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. 1284) 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 Bucy. 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, 65 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 reasonable sum 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.
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.
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Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations are now in joint session. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that they may meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Wherry, I do not want to object to the consideration of this bill, but I desire to propose a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. INGEBORG RUTH BATTLER MCLAUGHLIN

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. 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. KIECHER

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

ELENA ERBZE

The bill (H. R. 1475) for the relief of Elena Erbze 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 fees and head taxes” 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. 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 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 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, and the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 26, 1930, (44 Stat. 817), as amended by the act of October 10, 1940, (54 Stat. 1091; 18 U. S. C. 68), is further amended by striking from the proviso the figures "$6,000" and "$10,000", and substituting therefor the figures "$15,000" and "$20,000", respectively.

GRAHAM KULBEK, HIS WIFE LUDMILA KULBEK, AND THEIR MINOR SON, MARTIN KULBEK

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

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent resident to 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 a 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 "Ludmila" and insert "Ludmila Kubelik", as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ralph 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 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 June 14, 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 husband’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.

Seeking 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 a pension based on her husband’s honorable naval service. However, under applicable law and regulations the payments could not be made retroactive; the 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.

This is the 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 2, 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 fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000,” so as to make the bill read: "Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ruth Alice Crawshaw, the widow of Ralph Everett Crawshaw (S.C. 6877/4), 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.

SUCK KAT

The bill (H. R. 268) 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 a 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. McPARDLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to correct certain inequalities 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 “assistant, 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 for new teachers 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 the officer’s work be satisfactory. I understand this will have a good effect on the morale of school personnel.

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. 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—Assistant principals, 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 $8,330 per year is reached."

Sec. 2. The third sentence of section 2 of such act, as amended, is amended 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 substituting the following in lieu thereof: "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: “(e), except as provided in section 2 of this act.”

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

(a) Teachers in junior high schools, now assigned to salary class 2, group C, shall be
transferred and assigned to salary class 2, group B, 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 5, group B, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 5, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

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

"(j) In vocational or trade schools shall be transferred and assigned as follows:

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

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

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

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

\( \text{(i) Research assistants shall be transferred and assigned as follows:} \)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

\( \text{(ab) Supervisors of penmanship now assigned to salary class 7, group A, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 7, group C, of the foregoing schedule with the title of instructor in the teachers colleges;}} \)

\( \text{Sec. 7. On July 1, 1947, and on the first day of June of each year thereafter, if his work is satisfactory, every permanent teacher, school officer, or other employee, shall receive an annual increase in salary within his salary class or position as hereinbefore provided without action of the Board of Education. A program of in-service training for teachers and administration shall be established by the Board of Education to promote continuous professional growth among teachers, school officers, and other employees.} \)

\( \text{Sec. 7. Section 9 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:} \)

\( \text{"Sec. 9. (a) Every teacher, librarian, research assistant, and instructor in the teaching colleges in the service of the Board of Education shall be transferred and assigned either to group A or to group C in salary classes 1 to 8, inclusive, in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of this act. Every teacher, librarian, research assistant, counselor, and instructor in the teachers colleges appointed on or after July 1, 1947, without regard to eligibility either to group A or to group C if the salary class to which he is appointed is divided into group A and group C. Every teacher, librarian, research assistant, and counselor transferred and assigned on July 1, 1947, to a group A, or appointed to a group A on July 1, 1947, shall be divided into group A or group C. If the closing date for such teachers, librarians, research assistants, counselors, and instructors, is on or after July 1, 1947, shall be assigned according to the Board of Education establishing to the Board's satisfaction the attainment of a recognized master's degree.} \)

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

\( \text{Sec. 8. Section 15 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:} \)

\( \text{"Sec. 15. There shall be appointed by the Board of Education, on the recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, a chief examiner for schools for white pupils and a chief examiner for the board of examiners for colored schools. All members of the board of examiners shall serve without additional compensation."} \)

\( \text{Sec. 9. Appropriations to carry out, after June 30, 1951, the purposes of sections 2, 4, and 5 of this act, and so much of section 7 of this act as relates to subsection (a) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended, are authorized. The appropriations for general administration, general supervision and instruction, and vocational education, George Washington University, shall be at the rates of 5% for public schools contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1950, approved July 18, 1950, and in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1951, approved July 18, 1950, are hereby made available for carrying out the purposes of such sections of this act for periods prior to July 1, 1951, on the basis of documentary evidence establishing the attainment of a recognized master's degree.} \)

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

\( \text{The amendment was agreed to.} \)

\( \text{The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.} \)

\( \text{CALL OF THE ROLL} \)

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

\( \text{The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.} \)

\( \text{The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:} \)

...
The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Horn] 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, and has 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. Bresee] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Duff]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

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 Nebraska [Mr. Malone]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. Wherry] 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. Nye] 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 upon which amendments have been submitted, there is a motion to consider the resolution on the table.

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 herefore read for the information of the Senator, but is not upon 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 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. Brewster] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors of 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 result was announced—yeas 37, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—37

Bennett. Ferguson. Morse.
Harkleber. McLellan. Smith, N. C.
Hart. Hickenlooper. Sprague.
Hoey. Maybank. Stennis.

NAYS—41

Bryant. Humphrey. Mooney.
Harkleber. McLellan. Smith, N. C.
Hart. Hickenlooper. Sprague.
Hoey. Maybank. Stennis.

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 would say we have just done, as they ever have been.

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 order 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 record today, and since the printing begins on Tuesday, we must ask ourselves what is going to happen to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They face the task of having to be published on an only somewhat expurgated version of their most secret papers. When they wrote or approved, they believed that these papers would not be published—that they would be confidential for themselves, their lawful superiors, and the commanders to 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 Senate—everyone else so far as I can see except a few stray dissenters—have accepted the theory that an officer, who disobeys with the avowed purpose of disclosing the integrity of his lawful superiors compels 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 will be a secret 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, something of the sacred rights of the people to know all the facts. They are, I believe, profoundly mistaken. If this theory is accepted, 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 will be kept secret and truly confidential. Today, the arbiter of what is and of what is might insist, therefore, upon publishing the very documents which Senator Russell and Senator Taft, and I might add all the other responsible officials, are on notice from here on out that some paper or any other 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 son writing to his partner, or to Senator Taft writing to Senator Wherry, if they felt sure that their letters would be published—most particularly at the moment when they would cause the maximum embarrassment. Letters written in confidence that they will be published will be the kind of letters that are written for publication. They will be phony 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 does not 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 written 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 life and death problems with the military security and the high policy of the United States.

But if this 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 hold the votes of the people to know can be met by destroying the rules of confidence and publishing anything and everything themselves. Why they think it right, why they believe it to be part of the very substance of liberty, that some things are 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 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 which was 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, he would publish an expurgated 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, if in order to dispense with it today—or what are the plans? Several Senators have asked me what the plans are in respect to that bill.

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

Mr. ELLIS. 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 this bill this afternoon. 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. McMahan, 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. McMahan. 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 land under the Kremlin, is a vivid testimonial to what is in the minds and hearts of the American people. I call particular attention to the fact that 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. Obviously, 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 sending 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 “and declare” and insert “declares”; in line 9, after the word “of,” to strike out “America’s” and insert “the”; in the same line, after the word “desire” 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 with the Congress,” or 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 becoming aware 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 Senate 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 bill was passed over.

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

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. ELLENDER. 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, I hereby present the unanimous-consent agreement at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, 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; 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. ELLENDER. If 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.
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 appropriate amendment.

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 Arkansas 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 move that 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 certainly yield to them. I would, however, be able to give the Senate the best we can.

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 we not dispose of one proposal at a time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed 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. McCarran be entitled to begin his speech at 2 o'clock, or such time as may be agreed to by the Senate, that such speech be given to him; or, if he does not use all the time, that the limitation on debate be given to him; or, if he does not use all the time, that the limitation on debate be temporary and that the limitation on debate be temporary and that the limitation on debate be temporary and that the limitation on debate be temporary and that the limitation on debate be temporary. Is that correct?

Mr. McCarran. 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 so desires, is to be given to him; or, if he does not use all the time, that the limitation on debate begins 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 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 non-controversial 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 non-controversial committee amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I always hesitate a little to agree to such a proposal. I agree if the majority leader insists on it. Difficult is to ascertain which amendments are non-controversial.

I would like very much to let an amendment be adopted on the assumption that it was non-controversial, 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 we not dispose of one proposal at a time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed 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. McCarran be entitled to begin his speech at 2 o'clock, or on the conclusion of Mr. Williams' address. If prior to said time it is agreed 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 them, respectively: Provided, however, That during the consideration of any individual amendment or motion, neither 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. 1925) to expand the authority of the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate 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 at the Coast Guard's cost, and which was specifically mentioned in the statute, by reason of the fact that the islands have been under naval government and therefore meet the requirements of the law.

However, on July 11, 1944, the Constitution of the Trust Territory will be transferred to the Department of the Interior, and it will no longer be under naval government. It is extremely doubtful that the Coast Guard will
have authority to continue to maintain these essential aids to navigation after that date. I believe the bill, when enacted, the autho-

rity of the Coast Guard will remain unimpaired after the transfer of the is-

lands to the Interior Department, which, I repeat, Mr. Johnson of Colorado.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. 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 sur-

pese the authority of the Coast Guard?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. 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 detined to perform that function, so that makes the bill necessary.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill, amended in the Senate, was agreed to. The House passed the bill, on the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations, as I understand, and recommends approval, and I have a personal interest, since I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, so I shall vote in favor of engrossment.

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

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, the bill (H. R. 1192) to extend the time limits of the Act of August 24, 1912, to permit the BF Goodrich Company to extend the time period for the operation of a number of airfields in the United States, was amended in the Senate at the request of the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, to remove the language which would have prohibited the extension of the airfields.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

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
PHILIP J. HINCKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1113) for the relief of Philip J. Hinck, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "sum", to strike out "$150", 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. Hinck, of Middlebury, Vt., the sum of $150. The payment shall be in the form of a payment of all claims of the said Philip J. Hinck 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 person or corporation 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 punished:

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ATHANASIOS ELIAS CHELIOZIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1254) for the relief of Athanasios Elias Cheliozis, 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 Act, Athanasios Elias Cheliozis 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 filing of a proper petition for naturalization, Athanasios Elias Cheliozis shall be entitled to file an application for naturalization, which shall be in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe.

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 nonexistent 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. 67?) 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. LEPAUVER. 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 relating 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 for 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 this bill, which shall be in line 5, to strike out "more" 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 108 (c) of the National Security Act, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows: "The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include four full-strength divisions, four full-strength air wings, and such other land combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic thereto, 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 United States 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. 567, 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, or the Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?
Mr. SCHOEPEPPEL. 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 have no objection to 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 Chairman 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, in so far as the matter of retirement is concerned. The appointment of one of the members of either the Fire Department or the Metropolitan Police 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 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 without amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill is Calendar 198, House bill 321, which is on the floor 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. McCARRAN. Is there objection to the bill?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if an explanation is desired, I may say that 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. McCARRAN. 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 an amendment to the Veterans' Administration Act of 1944, as a premium payment for an optional one, unless the Veterans' Administration receives from the insured a request in writing for payment of dividends 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 Agriculture. The report, while recommending that the bill be passed, states that if it becomes law, "it is susceptible to the pressure of the big growers and employers in this country illegally." Without such safeguards, the Ellender bill would serve, just as Senator Chavez charged, to bring back the days when Lincoln's order to bring about peonage in my State and in certain other areas of the United States.

The amendment 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.


MR. HUMPHREY, Chairman.

Dear Mr. Ellington:

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 Migrant Labor). I should like to point out that the committee considered the legislation and ordered it reported to the Senate the report of the Commission was issued. Therefore, I submit that any suggestion that the legislation may harm the Commission's recommendations is not true.

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 impossible to satisfy the labor needs. The United States Department of Agriculture has served notice they intend to terminate the present international agreement in that an adequate number of Mexican workers are not being imported. In view of this condition, the United States Government is authorized to do the things necessary to the effective operation of the United States-Mexico agricultural labor agreements. Workers from Mexico, ar,ce, will guarantee compliance by employers in this country with the indi-
There are many phases of the wetback problem to be considered in recommending legislation, as stated by Senator S. 881, which would provide severe penalties for the employment of illegal emigrants, a matter that concerns the Railroad Committee on the Judiciary. There are still other methods proposed for solving the problem, and I suggest that it would be impossible to force the President, all of them and enact this legislation by June 30.

Sincerely yours,

ALEX J. ELLINGER, Chairman.

Replacing 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 leaders 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 difference of opinion between a military commander and civilian authority. It is much broader and much deeper than that. Nor is it 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 effort 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 Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The Communist leaders did not name General MacArthur in their resolution of June 4, 1948; 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 Communist Party has 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 Communist agent to the Philippines, writing as a foreign editor of the Daily Worker, presented an amalgamation of slanderers purporting to be the words of the Communist Huk's 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 declared General MacArthur to be "the puppet for the imperialist 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 out the American occupation, to the benefit of the Communist fold. The Communists therefore reacted violently against General MacArthur's statement on September 17, 1945, that the occupation policy is not merely to carry out a revolution in Japan, but to keep order and bring about the same chaos as in Germany.

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 seize the occupation policy 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 his speech 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 now gave up on the idea of a defeat for MacArthur. They regarded him as the chief obstacle to their success in the Far East. The organizers of the Cominform such as the Committee for Lasting Peace for Peasants of the Cominform such as the Communist sympathizers, short-sighted liberals, and others blinded by hatred and philosophies not only of Japan but of all Asia, could be counted.

Mr. President, I have said that attacks by officials of our own State Department were made against General MacArthur. 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 carried 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 statement that 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 order 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 parallel to 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 260,000 troops, and MacArthur's occupation force had undertaken a course parallel to 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 260,000 troops, and MacArthur's occupation force had undertaken a course parallel to 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 260,000 troops, and MacArthur's occupation force had undertaken a course parallel to 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.
Immediately 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—influencing the Soviet cabinet 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 II.

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 our own destruction, but of the destruction of the world. We must avoid committing everything possible to help the redemption of China.

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 inasmuch as I do not believe it is 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 mainland and should 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 arise to unify China and should be resolved to do everything possible to help the redemption of China. In the meantime, we should support Chiang Kai-shek 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:

“On February 26, 1949—I said:

Flushed with recent victories, the red hand behind the Communists is making itself known in Asia today. Korea is a powder keg, ready to explode in our face if we are not prepared as a force in opposition to communism. Reports already indicate the situation approaches outright war between the South Koreans, whom 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 recorded 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 were the results until we stopped, 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 we give up Formosa and allow the force of Chiang Kai-shek and all the guerillas and resistance forces in Asia to languish and die, we shall allow the Chinese Communists to consolidate their hold in 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 the brink of our own self-destruction, which is not a war between the Soviet Union and Japan, and 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.

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

Today the Communist Party is running to the Senate, but I desire to say that the Senator might have said for the Ruskons, 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. This was because of reasons which the Senator was confronted with the question of confirming the nomination of Acheson as Under Secretary of State, there developed in the Senate a debate which the Senator has 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 if 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, unbecoming, and wrong vote, but 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 Monday, 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 8 Senators voted against it. When 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 required $80,000,000 and the means to be brought into the Russian orbit and more than 12,000,000 square miles of territory to fall under the control of communism.

With the announcement'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?

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 by a man who brought back to the United States, even though he has more information and more knowledge of how to operate in the Pacific than does the Secretary of State.

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 spirit 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 dignified frontiers of peace.

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. Burton), 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. 672) 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. BURTON 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 who have received 80,000,000 letters and have been unable, by bill, to furnish emergency food aid to India. We intend, on the amendment to be included in the bill, to allot, to be printed, and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

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 sections 5 and 6 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Sec. 5. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary of State, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to utilize not in excess of $150,000,000 during the period ending June 30, 1952, of the funds appropriated in title 750 of the Eighty-first Congress, for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

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

The statement by Mr. McCarran is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

We are cautioned daily against emotionalism and hysterical solutions to the problems facing the United States today. This would indeed seem to be good advice. However, I do not think it is sincerely given, for we find that when emotionalism and hysteria seem to favor the passage of legislation, the Administration is 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 wherever we may provide to the limit of our ability to do so.

The natural tendency of the American people to help distressed people has 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 unbelievable 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 accept the fact also that this country can provide sufficient grain to alleviate some of this famine situation. I will not accept the facts that we are without ability to deprive our people of necessary food. I must state, however, that this grain is not that which is used in the United States. It belongs to private individuals.

I have read in the metropolitan press many letters written by the citizens of the United States who have been crying for at least 2 months about the Congress not doing something for the starving people of India. I know of many greatly distressed letter-writers who have reached into their own pockets in an effort to alleviate these conditions. The grain is available, and the means through which it is available is available. There are facilities by which any private individual, who is concerned and feels that, charity, 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 I never have opposed, any help for starving people. Accepting the situation as it is stated with respect to the inadequacy of Indian food supply, the only 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 by the people of India, even in the eyes of the people in the United States as a result of the wanton 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 6 or 10 months. The Indian Government has appealed to the Government of the United States for its assistance in 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 anywhere within the Government of this country was that a right grant, although I will admit that a foreign government would be persuaded to ask for a grant rather than to appeal in our record of generosity in such requests. The Indian Government, any government, is confronted with responsibilities that 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.

There is one example of what has happened in this case. With the apparent assistance of our State Department the responsibility of the United States for this food aid 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, so we set about to take this money and give the requested assistance. Of course, they had no grain to give, but they did have the right of going to talk to the citizens of the United States to get 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 $300,000,000 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 says the people that we are one 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 have in the United States. We are concerned now that we are carrying a debt burden that has the potential destructiveness equal to that of the sinister power in this domain. 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 the factors, I do not see how anyone in his right mind could evaluate the present situation and arrive at a decision to grant or lend the aid other 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 assets, and in return that government must use those assets in providing that which is necessary to the maintenance 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Dollar assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

### India—Sterling balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rupees 1</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
<th>Pounds sterling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>3.303</td>
<td>1.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>4.164</td>
<td>1.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>3.188</td>
<td>1.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 rupee = 1 1/2 shillings
2. The reduction noted between the years 1947 to 1948 was due to: 1. India assumed England's pension obligations. 2. India purchased war stores on band in India from England.

### India—Status of sterling debt

#### United States trade with India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>United States imports from India</th>
<th>United States exports to India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947-48</td>
<td>$1,750,000,000</td>
<td>$1,219,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-49</td>
<td>$1,800,000,000</td>
<td>$1,214,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-50</td>
<td>$1,800,000,000</td>
<td>$1,214,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ECA Division of Statistics and Reports.

From the United States? If her trade position is not such that she can meet this payment out of current account, then she must explore the possibility of making such payments out of accrued assets. Of course, our economic boys then will say that something must be done, interfere with her ability to carry on her present trade and meet all of her current account obligations. Very likely the solution for the moment, what would be the next step, then?

This bill 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 think it would look with favor upon her ability to carry on her present situation, accepting this 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 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 to 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 coming to this Congress, we have been presented, and we had today, some action. This action cannot be without the basis of the principle that 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 and it seems incredible 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 hearty taxpayers when India can and should shoulder the responsibility for future payment. This assistance can only be justified on the 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 is 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 to call the attention of this body a matter which is seriously impeding our country’s defense effort. Over 7 months ago President Truman signed the Defense Production Act, which authorized, among other things, the establishment of the Defense Minerals Administration, a body whose primary 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 afraid that supposition has now proven to be erroneous, and instead of stimulating the domestic industry, production has been held to a standstill although no Government plan or policy has been forthcoming. Without a policy the miners and producers have no strategic metals and minerals and cannot work.

They have no foundation on which to base their plans.

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 function as soon as sufficient and adequate staff had been acquired. Only a few days ago representatives of the Defense Minerals Administration were testifying before the full Appropriations Committee, stating 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 have been given a warm reception, many of them have quit, complaining that their hands were tied, that there was no program at all, that no one was there to waste 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 immobility 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 with such high promise could have accomplished nothing. I checked and found, from the Defense Minerals Administration’s own records, that since their establishment they have received 1,686 applications for all types of aid. The far greatest percentage of these applications were for a loan or a loan guarantee as authorized. Only one loan application of the hundreds received has been approved, and this for $700. Only one loan application has been approved after 7 months of operation.

Again, I wish to emphasize that this agency was established with the primary purpose of providing the Defense program with a domestic supply of essential raw materials. I can assure you that this is not happening.

Our country’s defense effort 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. A policy of action to increase the production of metals and minerals for the defense effort. The Defense Minerals Administration has been given a job to do, the time for organization is over. 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. 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 at wholesale as of May 20, to become effective May 9, 1953. This has resulted in livestock producers rushing their cattle to market before they are fast­ened to their best salable weight. This is resulting directly in a loss of meat for the American people. The feeders who produce much of our meat are suffering losses.

And, as pointed out by the Agri­culture Committee of the Senate, the an­nouncement of controls 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 Control 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 ceiling prices on beef sold at wholesale be rescinded at once. I am in full accord with this resolu­tion.

The senior Senator from Nevada 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 was 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 overhaul.

The Office of Price Stabilization has im­posed controls with respect to beef prices subjects the meat in­dustry to unfair discrimination which no other industry enjoys.

This is not price control—it is confisca­tion and regimentation. What kind of regimen is this? What kind of a regimen is as given in Webster’s dictionary is “a sys­tematic course of diet.” How systematic can we get? In a small group of loony 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 control of too easy credit. These are things which get at the source of inflation. They cause fear, indecision, confusion, black markets, and we have all thought about that.

Controls of this nature have no part in a pro­gram to control inflation. I would like to see a policy of production and a program of production 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 nebulous 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?” America has always been based on competition. If we eliminate competition what then?

In an American way of thinking. Competition is a good, healthy thing for America, and I, for one, am inter­ested in America—And America—And 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 the controls are not followed to the letter, tighter en­forcement will ensue. What does that lead us to? A poll type of government 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 the controls are not followed to the letter, tighter en­forcement will ensue. What does that lead us to? A poll type of government 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 the controls are not followed to the letter, tighter en­forcement will ensue. What does that lead us to? A poll type of government 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 the controls are not followed to the letter, tighter en­forcement will ensue. What does that lead us to? A poll type of government 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.
requirements, tax money will have to be spent to buy the 50-cent aides 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, and what then?

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 less than a 36-month extension agency once it has been born—then a full-scale overhauling is in order. The roll-back regulation on beef should definitely be reconsidered.

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 appeared in his column of December 28, and carries the subhead, "Safety board." The other item appears in Mr. Sibley's column of March 6, and has to do with 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 December 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 committees 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 as or effectively as an independent air safety board."

[From the Boston Traveler of March 6, 1951]

SAFETY BOARD—BELOW-PAUL 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.

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

This is conjecture, neither pilot having surveyed 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 CAB's Instrument Landing System, since the flagpole which slashed a wing was 650 feet to the left of the centerline of the runway, and affected the course from the chain of events.

But the CAB report nearly exonerates ILS, by assuming that the pilot was not using visual means during this breach of safety.

An independent air safety board might also have reasoned:

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

But the CAB report, willing to guess in some matters but not in others, does not touch on such points. It remarks: 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—objects of public and industry sympathy. It is located directly under the thumb of the rule implementer and enforcers, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and a tiny group of individuals inside the CAB, especially the CAB's chairman and his advisors.

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

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'CONNOR

Even in this fast-moving age, 100 years is a long time. And when an industry has rounded out a century and a quarter, its service to the Nation 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 will be both pertinent and of general interest.

I take pardonable pride in the fact that the first wholesale plant was located in the State of Maryland. One hundred years ago, Jacob Fussell, a milk dealer located at 180 Exeter Street in Baltimore, was 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. He immediately made his fluid-milk customers who 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 were in Europe for hundreds of years before Fussell's first enterprise. The story of ice cream from that day on is really an integral part of the development of America. In Europe and the other nations of the world a few small retail manufacturers were making rare exotic 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-product-ion, made this a popular and enduring household delicacy. In our country it became America's favorite, available to everyone in all walks of life.

Mr. O'CONOR. Senator, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a statement I have prepared regarding the 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'CONNOR

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a statement I have prepared regarding the embargo on shipments of war material to Red China.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONNOR

Formal action yesterday by the United States in requesting that all United Nations members at once impose an embargo on shipments of war material to Red China, is a positive move in the right direction which will have the unanimous support of Members of this body and others who feel that Red China is distinctly in line with efforts which have been under way in the Senate, for some time, to bring about a cessation of war materials to Red China.

It is distinctly in line with efforts which have been under way in the Senate, for some time, to bring about a cessation of war materials to Red China.
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 livelihood of the economy of foreign nations is involved. Some difficulty was experienced even within our own government and convincing the responsible authorities as to the dangers inherent in policies which permitted enemy countries to obtain highly strategic materials which they could use against our own troops and the fighting forces of our allies.

But, as 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 normal trade estimates of what constitutes normal trade.

When trade figures which are in the possession of our Subcommittee on Export Controls and Policies reflect increase of 500 percent and more in the shipments of rubber, for example, it is not surprising that 2,200 percent are registered with regards 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 what basis these shipments to Red China are made.

It is incumbent upon us, in justice to our own fighting men who have suffered so horribly from Communist aggression in Korea, to be prepared to take the fight 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 so much huge supplies of strategic materials and products to Communist areas around the world that it could be assumed that these materials would be used against the nations of the west either in the field or, of course, in preparation for future aggression elsewhere.

Our Nation must continue to insist that the British Government give official recognition that 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 interest 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 refusal of the Senate 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, 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 exempting such person from the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284, of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of service, or the payment of or compensation for services, a 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 the messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 3: William K. Allabe, of Idaho.

Frederic P. Bartlett, of New York.

Burton Y. Berry, of Indiana.

Clarence E. Birgford, of the District of Columbia.

Ralph J. Blake, of Oregon.

Ralph A. Beorstein, of the District of Columbia.

Niles W. Bond, of Massachusetts.

Elmer H. Bourgerie, of Maryland.

Aaron L. Brown, of Ohio.

Robert Y. Brown, of Alabama.

Prescott Childs, of Massachusetts.

Barber Cowles, of Maine.

Cabot Coville, of California.

Howard Elting, Jr., of Illinois.

Jerome T. Gasparro, of New York.

Eugene A. Gilmore, of Nebraska.

Bernard Gutter, of Washington.

Edmund A. Guillon, of Kentucky.

Theodore J. Hrabak, of New York.

John J. Haggerty, of Virginia.

John N. Hamlin, of Oregon.

Parker T. Hart, of Massachusetts.

James E. Henderson, of California.

L. Randolph Hicks, of Mississippi.

John A. Hopkins, of Iowa.

Morris N. Hughes, of Illinois.

Fred W. Judray, of Wisconsin.

Perry N. Jeter, of Virginia.

Howard P. Jones, of New York.

Erwin P. Keefer, of Indiana.

Woodruff Kilcom, of the District of Columbia.

Bertel E. Kuniholm, of Massachusetts.

Buto 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 Newbeg, of Massachusetts.

William C. Okey, of California.

Marcellus C. Parsons, Jr., of New York.

Troy L. Perkins, of Kentucky.

C. Montague Phipps, of California.

Paul J. Revely, of Connecticut.

Arthur R. Ringwalt, of Nebraska.

Andrew G. Roen, of Montana.

Albert W. Scott, of Missouri.

Charles Nelson Spinks, of California.

Robert B. Streper, of California.

E. Paul Tenney, of Washington.

Charles W. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.

Shelton Thomas, of New York.

Frederick van den Anker, of North Carolina.

Woodruff Wallner, of New York.

Milton K. Wells, of Oklahoma.

Charles H. Weston, of Massachusetts.

Evan M. Wilson, of Pennsylvania.
The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 5:

Robert W. Ross, of California.

Edward Anderson, of Florida.

Leonard Lee Bacon, of New York.

N. Spencer Barr, of California.

James D. Bell, of New Mexico.

Carl Breuer, of New York.

Weldon O. Brown, of Texas.

Glen W. Bruner, of Colorado.

John H. Burns, of Oklahoma.

Frank P. Calder, of New York.

Donald B. Calder, of New York.

Turner C. Cameron, Jr., of Alabama.

Robert D. Bower, of Illinois.

V. Lansing Collins, Jr., of New York.

Harry Conover, of New Jersey.

Austen B. Davis, 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 E. Elwood, of Iowa.

Frederick K. Farnworth, of Colorado.

Robert S. Folsom, of Massachusetts.

Paul E. Geler, of Ohio.

Louis E. Gipson, of Illinois.

Richard E. Gnade, of Pennsylvania.

Bartley P. Gordon, of Massachusetts.

Cape D. Green, of Ohio.

Robert Grinnell, of New York.

Claude H. Hall, Jr., of Maryland.

Wesley C. Halbrook, of Virginia.

William W. Hancock, of California.

John B. Holt, of Maine.

Richard S. Huestis, of New York.

Harwell Johnson, of South Carolina.

Sidney K. Lafoon, of Virginia.

Frederick P. Latimer, Jr., of Connecticut.

Hamilton A. Lowney, of New York.

R. F. Fidgeway Lineaweaver, of Pennsylvania.

Walter J. Linthicum, of Maryland.

Raymond E. Luehr, of New York.

Ernest de W. Mayer, of New York.

David H. McKay, of Massachusetts.

John M. McLeary, of Massachusetts.

John Gordon Mein, of Kentucky.

Robert G. Miner, of Maryland.

H. Gordon Minnigero, 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.

Rolle L. Riall, of Nebraska.

Edward J. Rowell, of New York.

Roy Richard Ruhottom, Jr., of Texas.

M. William Scudder, of Montana.

William Langdon Sands, of Florida.


Harold Sina, of Tennessee.

Henry T. Smith, of Georgia.

Henry W. Spelman, of Oklahoma.

Paul J. Sturr, of Connecticut.

Horace G. Torbert, Jr., of Massachusetts.

Murat W. Williams, of Virginia.

David G. Withrow, Jr., of Oregon.

William Witman, 3d, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 6 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Robert W. Adams, of Texas.

Robert G. Bailey, of New Jersey.

Milton Barlow, of New York.

Taylor G. Belcher, of New York.

Donald C. Bergus, of Indiana.

Robert O. Bissell, of Minnesota.

Thomas D. Bowie, of Minnesota.

John W. Bowing, of Oklahoma.

Robert A. Bunting, of Connecticut.

Howard Brandon, of Georgia.

Clay Brean, of Wyoming.

Clarence T. Brien, of Louisiana.

William L. Brewer, of Texas.

Lewis D. Brown, of New York.

Missola L. Crumly, of Washington.

Roland H. Bushner, of Oklahoma.

Wilbur F. Chase, of Ohio.

Keld Christensen, of Iowa.

Charles Phillip Ciskz, 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 California.

Dwight Dicke, of New Jersey.

Donald P. Downes, of Nevada.

William J. Duffield, Jr., of Massachusetts.

L. Milner Dunn, of Utah.

William F. S. Eastham, of New Hampshire.

Marth F. Hess, of New York.

William P. Hudson, of North Carolina.

Alfred G. Ives, of Georgia.

Joseph J. Jones, of New York.

William C. Lakeland, of New York.

Samuel O. Lane, of California.

Armistead M. Lee, of Virginia.

Scott Lyon, of Ohio.

George L. Minor, of Oklahoma.

Oliver I. Marcy, of Massachusetts.

David E. Mark, of New York.

Edward N. McCull, of Texas.

Thomas W. McKee, of Maryland.

Thomas D. McKiernan, of Massachusetts.

Cleveland B. McKnight, of Georgia.

Lee E. Metcalf, of Texas.

Joseph J. Montroll, of New York.

Robert W. Moore, of Iowa.

Andrew E. Olson, of Washington.

Clifton L. Olson, of California.

W. Paul O'Neill, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

Alexander M. Page, of Oregon.

Norman K. Pratt, of Pennsylvania.

Luber C. Sanderson, of California.

R. T. S. Smith, of Illinois.

Herbert C. Sproul, of New York.

Wells Stabler, of the District of Columbia.

Charles G. Stefan, of California.

Gerald Strickland, of Connecticut.

John H. Stutesman, Jr., of New Jersey.

John L. Topping, of New York.

Temple Washington, of California.

H. Andre Weismann, of New York.

Jackson W. Wilson, of Texas.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 8:

Theo C. Adams, of Texas.

Thomas W. Alnsworth, of New Hampshire.

Willard Allan, of Colorado.

Arthur B. Allen, of the District of Columbia.

James F. Amory, of Virginia.

John C. Amundson, of New York.

Alfred L. Atherton, Jr., of Massachusetts.

John Campbell Austin, of Pennsylvania.

Philip Axelson, of Delaware.

Robert C. Ayward, of Massachusetts.

William M. Bates, of Missouri.

Robert M. Berry, of Massachusetts.

Sister C. Blackinton, Jr., of North Carolina.

James J. Blake, of New York.

Vincent R. Blake, of Michigan.

Howard L. Boorman, of California.

William D. Brewer, of Connecticut.

Robert T. Cawley, 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 H. Calkins, of Minnesota.

Ralph G. Clark, of New York.

S. Wilson Clark, of California.

Stephen A. Combs, of Colorado.

Thomas J. Corcoran, of New York.

Henry L. Custer, of California.

Richard H. Courtney, of California.

William D. Craig, of California.

David C. Cuthrell, of Connecticut.

Philip M. Dale, Jr., of New Hampshire.

Nathaniel Davis, of New Jersey.

Robert D. Davis, of Oklahoma.

John M. Dennis, of Massachusetts.

Frank J. Devine, of New York.

John B. Dexter, of Maryland.

William B. Dunn, of Texas.

Samuel D. Eaton, of New York.

Hermann F. Ellis, of Pennsylvania.

Richard A. Ericson, Jr., of Minnesota.

Richard T. Ewing, of Maryland.

John M. Farrar, 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 Ohio.

James A. Garvey, of California.

John N. Gatch, Jr., of Ohio.

Scott George, of Georgia.

Howard C. Goldsmith, of California.

Herbert Gordon, of New York.

John G. Grissett, of Oklahoma.

Philip C. Habib, of California.

Philip E. Haring, of Pennsylvania.

Gregory Henderson, of Massachusetts.

Robert S. Henderson, of California.

Converse Hettinger, of Wisconsin.

John H. Holdridge, of California.

Walter P. Houts, of California.

Paul R. Hughes, of California.

Vernon V. Huyke, of Minnesota.

Edward C. Ingraham, of Massachusetts.

Richard G. Johnson, of New York.

Howard D. Jones, of Oklahoma.

Alphonso A. Jones, of Pennsylvania.

Harold G. Josef, of Ohio.

Abbot Jud, of Rhode Island.

Warren A. Alley, of Massachusetts.

Jack T. Kilgore, of Indiana.

Richard H. Lamb, of Washington.

James F. Lardard, of Pennsylvania.

Edward T. Long, of New York.

Matthew J. Loomis, Jr., of New York.

Boye L. Lowry, of Washington.

John E. MacDonald, of New Hampshire.

Robert J. Macquaid, of Pennsylvania.

Frank E. Maetridge, of Connecticut.

Francis E. Manarin, of Massachusetts.

Philip W. Manhard, of Pennsylvania.

Eugene V. McAlvittie, of Massachusetts.

Richard M. McGilvray, of Connecticut.

Glenn R. McCarty, Jr., of Iowa.

Stephen H. McLintic, of Maryland.

James H. McFarland, Jr., of Michigan.

Joseph P. 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. Molbert, of Idaho.

James D. Moftett, of Minnesota.

Thomas H. Murfin, of Washington.

John L. Murphy, of Oklahoma.

William Nessleid, Jr., of Michigan.

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 Illinois.

Paul O. Priest, of New York.

Ernest E. Ramsaur, Jr., of California.

John B. Root, of New York.

Robert W. Rice, of Illinois.

James R. Ruchel, of Wisconsin.

Samuel O. Ruff, of North Carolina.

John A. Sabini, of the District of Columbia.

Mrs. Corey B. Sanderson, of Idaho.

Dwight E. Scudder, of Nebraska.


Michel F. Smith, of Texas.
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 (Pub. L. 80th Cong., 5th Sess., 361, 60th Cong.).

**Eugene Niedringhaus, Jr.**

**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**

James Donald Bickel

Aaron David Betts

Bruce Barth, Jr.

Charles Albert Bensen

James Albert Bienert

David Anderson Betts

George Anthony Bieber, Jr.

John Wendell Buckstead

James Sereno Brett

Thomas Hubert Hastings

John Daniel Foldberg

John Hillman Gardiner

John Bernard Norvell

Sanford Lacy Parks

Charles Oliver Ordway

John Bernard Norvell

Harry William Harmon

Fred Richard Miller

Frank Myer Boshore

Alphonse C.본주

Ralph Lee Auer

Bruce Barth, Jr.

Merton Juel Bangerter

Ransom Edward Barber

William Chauncey Barritt

James Thomas Barron

Philip Charles Barth, Jr.

Haron Anthony Barton

Frank Myer Boshore

Robert Edmond Bauers

Peter Anthony Bezeklewicz

Aaron David Bernstein

David Anderson Betts

George Anthony Biecher, Jr.

James Donald Bickel

David Leroy Bills

Elmer Havens Birdseye

James G. Beckman

John Joseph Bohan, Jr.

John McGee Bohan

William James Bradley, Jr.

Robert Clay Breckinridge

James Sereno Brett

Patrick Matthew Brian

Norman James Brown

Charles Edwin Bryant

Richard Joseph Buck

John William Bracken

John Robert Byers

Charles Draper William Canham II

Clyde A. Carson

David Allene Carroll

David Giles Carter

Lawrence McDaniel Cashon

Robert William Chapman

Theodore John Charney

James Alden Check

Joseph William Clarke II

Ryburn Glover Clay, Jr.

Joseph Gordon Clemens, Jr.

Roland Hooper Cooper

Sanders Ashford Cortner, Jr.

Albert Crescento Costanza

P. J. John Gulden

John Bartley Cousin

Jimmi Stewart Cox

Francis Wilson Craig

Lawrence Pope Crocker

William Edward Crouch, Jr.

Arthur Charles Crowe

J. Godfrey Doherty

Philip Archibald Curry

John David Cuff

Michael Charles Curtis

Richard Backer Dawson

Allen Matthew Robert Drury

Anthony Joseph Delano

Frederick Lockwood Denman

William Lawrence Depew

Thomas Barnett Delamatus, Jr.

John Thomas Derrick

Otto Carl Doerringer, Jr.

John Joseph Dorton

Laurence Lewis Doss

Juan Francisco Dosal

Lee Edward Duke

Norman Eber DuLap

William Car Ilsley

Bruce Erland Elmslie

Alain Clair Elmslie

Henry Coffee Evans, Jr.

Charles Boel Ewing, Jr.

Joseph Luther Elrod III

William Dwight Farrington

George Charles Fichak

Robert Elliot Fitch

Robert William Fingerson

Joseph Vincent Fleming

John Daniel Foltz

Redmond Vincent Forrester, Jr.

Peter John Foss

John Bernard Foster

Thomas George Foster III

Alan Arthur Frick

Hugh Stephen Gaglian

George Henry Goads

John William Gage

Roderick Bruce Gilbertson

Charles Roland Gildart, Jr.

William Lewis Givens II

George Massie Gividen, Jr.

Chandler Goodnow

John Alexander Graham III

Selden Bain Graham, Jr.

Clinton Edwin Granger Jr.

John Walter Hanricher

Myres Standish Grant

Theodore William Griesinger, Jr.

William Elgin Grugan

James Tabot Guyer

Philip Haines Gwynn

Frank Edmund Hamilton

Eben Nathanial Hand, Jr.

George Davis Hardesty, Jr.

George Lawrence Harman

Richard Lee Harris

Barry McKnight Harries

Thomas Ure Harrold

Edward Parke Hartnett III

Thomas Hubert Hastings

John Philip Hauersen

John Vaughn Hamiller, Jr.

John Allen Hemphil

Kenneth Guynn Herring

Roy Jacob Herte, Jr.

John Peter Hill

Paul Richard Hily, Jr.

John Hinton, Jr.

Jonathan Frank Holman, Jr.

John Ferguson Hook

John Randolph Hock

Thomas Morgan

Robert Arthur Howe

Joseph Wood Hutchinson, Jr.

Robert Wood Hyatt

Jerry Shannon Ingram

Frederick French Irving

Robert Michael Isaac

Charles Edward Jackson

Guy Earl Jester, Jr.

Dean DeLaine Johnson

Harlan Warner Jarrott

Kermit Douglas Johnson

Maynard Benjamin Johnson

Robert L. Johnson

Russell Leroy Johnson

Walter Henry Johnson

Lincoln Griffin Jones

Norman Dean Jostad

Donald Joseph Kasun

James Addison Keeley

Earl Loyd Keeling

Lawrence Michael Kelly

James Richard Kimzey

Walter Allan Kimball

Charles Leland Knapp

Albert Ray Knight, Jr.

Joseph William Knittle, Jr.

Michael Kovalky

Marvin Joseph Krupinsky

Joseph Delta Laflur, Jr.

Donald James Leehey.

John Joseph Lefler

William Lyman Lemmitzer

John Bronco Lewis

Alan Arthur Lichtenberg

Robert Bruce Lins

Harry Warner Lombard

William Charles Lousell, Jr.

Joseph Albert Luger

Edward Page Barron, Jr.

Samuel Ayer Lutterich

Patrick Hugh Lynch

Robert Emanuel Malm

William Andrew Malouche

Edward Murphy Markham III

Jack Wayne Martin

Louis Brookins

Robert Lee Massenburg

Edward Eli Matney

Owen Edward McCrystal

Richard Carlyle McClure

Neil Oliver McClay

Lynn Maynard McIvor

Robert Roughter McCullough

James William McDonald

Robert Heyburn McWain

Charles Crawford McIntosh

Charles Brannon McLean, Jr.

Richard Philip McLean

George Allen Meighen

Edward Charles Meyer

Louie Gay Michael, Jr.

Joseph Douglas Michel

Ronald Hugh Millam

Robert William Milburn

Fred Richard Miller

Stuart Livingston Miller

Walter Bernard Miller, Jr.

Wayne Dickson Miller

Lawrence Lester Mints

John Little McFar

William Sidney Monroe

Newton Bedford Morgan, Jr.

John Joseph Moroney, Jr.

Edward John Mueller, Jr.

Dean Duane Mulder

Frank Ager Muliens

Daniel James Myers

Edwin Thompson Nance, Jr.

Paul Eugene Niedringhaus, Jr.

Cecil Ward Nix, Jr.

Donald James Norton

John Bernard Norvell

Thomas Christian Odderstol, Jr.

Desmond O'Keefe, Jr.

Robert Orlikoff

George William Orton

Henry Charles Osborn

Garland Logan Owens

William Gladdone Owens, Jr.

Everter Sanford Perkins

Norton L. Pope

Hugh Heflin Pattillo

Jober James Paszkerka

Donald Dewey

Ernest Dishman Pezotta

Edward Albert Pelougian

Karl William Feltz
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, unless otherwise indicated:

Kie Oldham Doty
William Frederick Lockman, Jr.
James Myrick Lowere
Richard Paul McClung III
Edward Allen Partain
Walter Carper Phillips, Jr.
Bruce Henry Roberston

I nominate the following-named individual for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 1, 1951, under the provisions of section 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualifications:

Robert Adam Renneman

Promotions in the Regular Army

To be majors, Medical Corps

To be lieutenants, Medical Corps

To be majors, General's Corps

To be lieutenants, General's Corps

To be captains, Medical Corps

To be lieutenants, Medical Corps
To be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps
Richard Eugene Ogden, Jr., William Henry Otto, Jr.

To be major, dental corps
Stephen L. Goldberg, Jr.

To be captains, Dental Corps
William Henry Hausman

To be lieutenant colonel, Veterinary Corps
Jasper Leon Van Avery, Jr.

To be first lieutenants
James Charles Burch, Jr.
Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Further instance of the war effort; that it is necessary to provide for the support of the armed forces and other agencies involved in the war effort.

Combs D. D., offered the following prayer:

And seeking earnestly to do Thy will and the desperate needs of a world torn by the storms of hatred and war. And may we always act like Christian brothers 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 to all mankind.

In the sphere of human relationships we may always act like Christian brothers and sisters, 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 problems of our own country and the desperate needs of a world torn away 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 yesterday, he did on today, May 4, 1951, sign the following enrolled bill:

S. 371. 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.

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:

Abbot, Granahan, Miller, N. Y.
Antuso, Granger, Moran
Armstrong, Gregory, Murphy
Bakewell, Granger, Moran
Barkley, Gregory, Murphy
Bartlett, Harris, Va., W. Va.
Barrett, Harris, Va., W. Va.
Bassett, Hébert, Nelson
Brooks, Hébert, Nelson
Buckley, Hébert, Nelson
Byrne, N. Y., Hébert, Nelson
Case, Hébert, Nelson
Ceffler, Hoffman, Ill., Reams
Chadwick, Bolen, Bearden
Cherry, Bolen, Bearden
Chew, Adams, Wash., Roosevelt
Cole, N. Y., James, Sauser
Combs, Jarvis, Scott.
Currie, Mo., Kearney, Hugh D., Jn.
Dawson, Austin, N. Y.
Dexter-Colfied, Kee, N. Y.
Dingell, Kersten, Wis., Vail
Dollinger, Kirwan, Vinton
Doyle, Kline, Watts
Elston, Kluczynski, Whiteraker
Flue, Lehman, Wintail
Fugate, McGillivray, Wood, Idaho
Gavin, McKinnon, Woodruff
Gillette, McGann, Woodroffe

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 further consideration of the bill H. R. 3880, with Mr. TEMPLE 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. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, as one of the fresh men 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 other members of this very able subcommittee.

During the hearing of the 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 offices of the Government. I should like to call the attention of the Committee to a few of the comparatively minor points which at this 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 expenditure and what our future is.

If you study the thirty-five odd departments with which our committee has been dealing during these months of intensive hearings, you 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 $16,800,000. 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 communications—telegraph and telephone—totalled 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 requests 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 great 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 request that that 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 have 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 through the list.

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 a half million dollars, comparatively small perhaps,