By Mr. BEALL (by request):
H. R. 6691. A bill to prohibit the sale in the District of Columbia of chicks, ducklings, and young rabbits during the 3-week period before and after Easter; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BERRY:
H. R. 6692. A bill to amend section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRYSON:
H. R. 6693. A bill to amend section 17 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons informally contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6694. A bill to amend section 6 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to provide for fair compensation amendments to World War II formal contracts for delivery of certain strategic or critical minerals or metals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. R. 6695. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled, "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country, and to confer on the State of Oregon civil jurisdiction over Indians in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:
H. R. 6696. A bill for the relief of the State of New Hampshire and the town of New Boston, N. H.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:
H. R. 6697. A bill to amend the laws relating to the construction of Federal-aid highways to provide for equality of treatment of railroads and other public utilities with respect to the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of such highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. D'EWART:
H. R. 6698. A bill to provide adequate school facilities at the Fort Peck project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:
H. R. 6699. A bill to amend paragraph 1774, section 201, title II, of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER:
H. R. 6700. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the prospecting, development, mining, removal, and utilization of the mineral resources of national-forest lands or lands administered for national-forest purposes or in connection with national-forest programs not subject to the operation of the general mining laws or the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended, the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands, or for the development of which no other statutory authority exists; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:
H. R. 6701. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATMAN:
H. R. 6702. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:
H. R. 6703. A bill to terminate Federal discrimination against the Indians of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:
H. R. 6704. A bill to provide for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:
H. R. 6705. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WITHROW:
H. R. 6706. A bill to amend the Seniority Act for Rural Mail Carriers to provide a method for the promotion of substitute rural carriers to the position of regular rural carrier; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YORTY:
H. R. 6707. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRYSON:
H. J. Res. 382. Joint resolution to provide for setting aside an appropriate day as a national day of prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:
H. J. Res. 383. Joint resolution to safeguard the economic stability of the United States by imposing limitations on grants of new obligational authority for, and on expenditures during, the fiscal year 1953; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SCUDDER:
H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to provide for the conveyance of the Muir Wood toll road by Marin County, State of California, to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois.
H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to nominations of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:
H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of a manual of veterans' rights and benefits; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL: Memorial of Colorado State Senate, that the Congress of the United States enact legislation establishing a single purchasing and surplus property disposal department for the armed services and to provide that supervisory personnel employed by the Federal Government be not awarded extra compensation or additional rating principally by the reason of a large number of employees under supervision; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:
H. R. 6708. A bill for the relief of Ching Zoi Dong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:
H. R. 6709. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Hollweg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:
H. R. 6710. A bill for the relief of Charlestown Milling Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:
H. R. 6711. A bill for the relief of Oscar Ward Hancock, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:
H. R. 6712. A bill for the relief of Hisami Yoshida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:
H. R. 6713. A bill for the relief of John Szabo, also known as Janos Szabo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKINNON:
H. R. 6714. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen J. Heissel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:
H. R. 6715. A bill for the relief of Ciro Lanna di Francesco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:
H. R. 6716. A bill for the relief of Elisa Albertina Rigazzi (Cioccio); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
H. R. 6717. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Caralli; 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:

562. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 37 members of the Center United Presbyterian Church of New Castle, Pa., opposing any appointment to the Vatican, whether as Ambassador or representative from this country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

563. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the mayor of Hackensack, N. J., demanding immediate termination of the use of Teterboro Airport as a replacement point for the planes heretofore operating out of the closed Newark Airport; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1952

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 10, 1952)

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:

Our Father, who revealest Thyself in all that is true and pure and lovely, we beseech Thee to so strengthen our resistance to evil, so cleanse our hearts of impurities that they may be fitting audience chambers for Thy presence, knowing that it is the pure in heart who shall see God. O Thou who art life and in whom there is no darkness at all, help us so to fling open the windows of our lives and to lift its curtains that we may be flooded with Thy light.

We pause at noontide to acknowledge our human frailties and to lean our weakness against the pillars of Thy almightiness. Grant us wisdom, courage, and understanding adequate to meet the difficult demands of each recurring day. Make us worthy ministers of Him whose love alone can conquer hate. Heal our sorely wounded world. And may our own attitudes to our fellow members of

Thy family help to break down the barriers to human brotherhood.

"Break every weapon forged in fires of hate;
Turn back the foes that would assail Thy gate;
Where fields of strife lie desolate and bare,
Take Thy sweet flowers of peace and plant them there."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 19, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 18, 1952:

S. 905. An act for the relief of Margaret A. Ushkova-Rozanoff and Mrs. L. A. Ushkova.

On February 20, 1952:

S. 493. An act to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 529) for the relief of Humayag Dildilian and his daughter, Lucy Dildilian, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 575. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Fiala;

H. R. 607. An act for the relief of Ronald Yee;

H. R. 615. An act for the relief of Samuel David Fried;

H. R. 751. An act for the relief of Loretta Chong;

H. R. 755. An act for the relief of Dr. Eleftheria Paidoussi;

H. R. 812. An act for the relief of Karel Vaclav Malinovsky;

H. R. 978. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michi Masaoka;

H. R. 1158. An act for the relief of Isao Ishimoto;

H. R. 1416. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Valdengo and Albertina Gioglio Valdengo;

H. R. 1428. An act for the relief of Claude Foranda;

H. R. 1446. An act for the relief of Calcedonio Tagliarini;

H. R. 1467. An act for the relief of Henry Ty;

H. R. 1790. An act for the relief of Dorothea Zirkelbach;

H. R. 1815. An act for the relief of Hideo Ishida;

H. R. 1819. An act for the relief of Hisamitsu Kodani;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Mrs. Carla Mulligan;

H. R. 2178. An act for the relief of Lee Lai Ha;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of Kazuyoshi Hino and Yasuhiko Hino;

H. R. 2355. An act for the relief of Nobuko Hiramoto;

H. R. 2370. An act for the relief of Carl Schmuser;

H. R. 2403. An act for the relief of Leda Taft;

H. R. 2404. An act for the relief of Mark Yoke Lun and Mark Seep Ming;

H. R. 2606. An act for the relief of Dimitra Galtanis;

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aiko Eijima Phillips;

H. R. 2676. An act for the relief of Andrijana Bradicic;

H. R. 2784. An act for the relief of Fumiko Higa;

H. R. 2841. An act for the relief of Yai Wing Lee;

H. R. 2920. An act for the relief of Priscilla Ogden Dickerson Gillson de la Fregonniere;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Giovanni Rinaldo Bottini;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mehmet Salih Topcuoglu;

H. R. 3132. An act for the relief of Sister Apolonia Gerarda Sokolowska;

H. R. 3136. An act for the relief of May Quan Wong (also known as Quan Shee Wong);

H. R. 3271. An act for the relief of Toshiaki Shimada;

H. R. 3524. An act for the relief of Jan Yee Young;

H. R. 3592. An act for the relief of Paul Tse, James Tse, and Bennie Tse;

H. R. 3825. An act for the relief of Marlene Bruckner;

H. R. 4224. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Hartley;

H. R. 4790. An act for the relief of Helga Richter;

H. R. 4911. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Maria Kuebler;

H. R. 5185. An act for the relief of Epifania Giacone;

H. R. 5389. An act for the relief of Ching Wong Keau (Mrs. Ching Sen);

H. R. 5525. An act for the relief of Abraham Davidson;

H. R. 5558. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Krause;

H. R. 5687. An act for the relief of Peter Mihaly Berend;

H. R. 5893. An act to make additional funds available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for direct home and farmhouse loans to eligible veterans, under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; and

H. R. 6231. An act for the relief of Gordon Uglow.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 191) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, February 20, 1952, he signed the enrolled bill (S. 759) to extend to screen vehicle contractors benefits accorded star-route contractors with respect to the renewal of contracts and adjustment of contract pay, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MAYBANK, and by unanimous consent, certain members of the Committee on Banking and Currency were excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow and Friday because of official business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HENNINGS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the Judiciary Committee was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present memorials, and transact routine business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Francis C. Gross, of Stonington, Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation to complete the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for reorganization of Government agencies; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A resolution adopted by the Associated Townsend Clubs of Hillsborough County at Tampa, Fla., favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—MEMORIAL OF RANSOM COUNTY FARMER'S UNION, LISBON, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, together with the signatures attached, a memorial from the Ransom County Farmer's Union of North Dakota, of Lisbon, N. Dak., remonstrating against universal military training.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD with the signatures attached, as follows:

RANSOM COUNTY FARMER'S UNION,
Lisbon, N. Dak., February 2, 1952.

To Our Honorable Senators and Congressmen, Washington, D. C.:

The following letter was approved and adopted by the Ransom County Farmer's Union board of directors, which met in regular session at Lisbon, N. Dak., on February 2, 1952:

"We, the Farmer's Union board of directors, unanimously oppose the passage of the Universal Military Training Act for the following reasons:

"No. 1. The farm manpower in our county is dangerously depleted, and unless some of these young men are left on the farms pro-

duction will be seriously curtailed on all necessary commodities.

"No. 2. Selective service, with draft age lowered to 18½ and Armed Services ceiling up to 5,000,000 men, is doing the needed job already.

"No. 3. Universal military training would destroy our democratic way of life. We learn from history that such conscription has brought the downfall of nations and even civilization. Our men are taught discipline and obedience, but are not taught to think for themselves.

"No. 4. There is not one single, solitary, sound reason for enactment of UMT at this time. It is being ramrodded now during a period of national emergency and excitement because proponents know it would be overwhelmingly defeated at any other time."

We solicit your cooperation in defeating this act; please use your influence to this end.

Ransom County Farmer's Union Board of Directors: Fred A. Musel, Lisbon, N. Dak., President; B. H. Hanson, Lisbon, N. Dak., Vice President; Mrs. Anson J. Anderson, Secretary; R. A. Holkestad, Fort Ransom, N. Dak.; William G. Fisher, Libson, N. Dak.; Frank Hicenec, Milnor, N. Dak.; Andy Anderson, Lisbon, N. Dak.; W. R. Humphrey, Lisbon, N. Dak., Directors.

RESOLUTIONS OF LITHUANIAN CITIZENS OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the splendid nations established after World War I was Lithuania, from whose land many of our fine citizens are descended.

It is indeed an unfortunate fact that one of the aftermaths of World War II was the extinguishing of the light of that young nation and of her freedom-loving Baltic neighbors. But that light shall yet shine again, we are sure, in the family of nations.

So long as the Soviet darkness encircles it, however, there is the gravest danger that there will be mass extermination of the heroic Baltic peoples whose ranks have always been filled with men and women who would die for freedom.

It is only natural, therefore, that friends of Lithuania, like friends of Baltic and other lands enslaved by the network of Soviet tyranny, should be deeply interested in advancing international law so that the crime of mass murder be set forth and be legally punishable under the law of nations.

I have received a resolution from Rev. Joseph A. Dambrauken, of the Lithuanian Cultural Club of Milwaukee, conveying the views of the people of Lithuanian descent in my State in remembrance of the thirty-fourth anniversary of the declaration of independence of the land of their forefathers.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY VOTED, AFTER DUE DELIBERATION, AT THE OBSERVANCE OF THE THIRTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA, AT ST. GABRIEL PARISH, 1575 SOUTH TENTH STREET, MILWAUKEE, WIS., ON FEBRUARY 17, 1952

Whereas the people of Lithuania, one of the first victims of bolshevism, have been forcibly deprived of their sovereignty and of the basic rights of all liberties ever seen and mass deportation to Siberia and other parts of Soviet Russia; and

Whereas the Lithuanian nation is strongly opposed to any alien occupation and continues to fight for freedom and independence; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania, strongly opposed against internal communism, along with their kinsmen in the free world, represent a reliable outlet in the present fight of the free nations against Communist aggression; and

Whereas all freedom-loving nations look upon the United States of America which always has been the strongest opponent of the oppressed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting appeal to the President, Secretary of State, Members of the United States Senate, and Congressmen from the State of Wisconsin with the request to do everything possible—

1. That the Genocide Convention be immediately ratified by the United States Senate;

2. That the ratification of the Genocide Convention be implemented by all possible efforts of the United States Government within the United Nations in order to show the world the most terrific enslavement of all people under the Soviet regime and to do everything possible that this horrible crime be stopped;

3. That the liberation of Lithuania and other Russian-occupied countries be included in the program of the American foreign policy; and

4. That the existing underground movements behind the iron curtain be given direct and effective assistance in their unequal life-and-death struggle for freedom and independence; be it further

Resolved, That this meeting expresses its gratitude to the Government of the United States for its great initiative in supporting the cause of free Lithuania, and be it finally—

Resolved, That we, the Lithuanian Americans of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., reaffirm our adherence to the American democracy and pledge our wholehearted support to the Government in its efforts to fight for international peace founded on principles of freedom and justice for all the people on earth.

REV. JOSEPH A. DAMBRUSCAN.
M. TORGAN.
PROMAS TUNITIE.
STANLEY BURTH.
BERNICE URLAKES.

THE MERCHANT MARINE—RESOLUTIONS OF THE PROPELLER CLUB OF UNITED STATES AND MERCHANT MARINE CONFERENCE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the Propeller Club of the United States, ever mindful of the need for preservation of an adequate merchant marine, adopted many excellent resolutions at its twenty-fifth annual convention held in New York recently.

Many of these suggestions are so closely allied with the long-range shipping bill which the Senate successfully passed at the last session, that I ask unanimous consent to have four of these resolutions printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The Propeller Club has on numerous occasions in the past provided constructive suggestions to meet the problems of our merchant fleet. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to all the members for their splendid work of the past and express the hope that they will continue to provide recommendations for our oft-neglected merchant marine.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON SHIPBUILDING AND SHIP REPAIR

The preservation and continuous active operation of an adequate shipbuilding and ship repair industry as a necessary prerequisite to the development and maintenance of a United States merchant marine is vital.

However, both shipbuilding and repair, despite their importance to the national defense and security, is jeopardized by the action of the Defense Production Administration in curtailing the steel requirements for that program by 33⅓ percent and allocating insufficient steel and other critical materials to permit the shipyards with contracts on hand to maintain normal schedules.

The misconception on the part of National Production Authority, and the general public as well, that new ships are not needed because of the surplus of war-built vessels now in moth balls completely overlooks the actualities of the military logistics of today.

There also exists a dangerous indifference as to the need for any additional modern passenger ships despite the fact that most of the American traveling public has to rely on foreign flag vessels for transportation, particularly in the Atlantic area, and that there is a vital need for vessels suitable for conversion to troop carrying ships in the even of an all-out war emergency.

Accordingly the Propeller Club of the United States vigorously urges that—

1. The declaration of policy set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and again in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 should be reaffirmed and aggressively implemented and be wholeheartedly supported by all Government agencies as vital to the welfare of the United States and the national security;

2. The amendments to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, now pending before the Congress, known as the long-range shipping bill (S. 241), which has previously been endorsed by not only the Propeller Club of the United States, the ship operators, and shipbuilding industries, but also by shipyard workers, maritime labor and veteran's organizations, should be enacted by the Congress without further delay so as to encourage private shipping concerns to place orders for new vessels under provisions of the act;

3. There should be adopted a sound long-range ship-construction program to provide those types of vessels needed to establish and progressively maintain in an orderly manner an adequate modern and well-balanced United States merchant marine.

4. Such a program should include passenger liners, combination cargo and passenger vessels, cargo vessels, tankers, and special types required to furnish adequate service in the water-borne commerce of the United States;

5. Such a program is vital to the continued existence of shipbuilding and ship repairing and to allied industries specializing in marine work, as well as to that of the merchant marine itself; and that

6. It is essential to the national defense and security that sufficient controlled materials be allocated to shipbuilding and ship repair to permit the production of necessary ships and the processing of ship-repair work expeditiously.

RESOLUTION ON EQUAL ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FOR AMERICAN SHIPPING

The Propeller Club of the United States affirms the belief that the Congress intended that American shipping shall have equal competitive opportunity in the broadest

sense, for the progressive development of a strong, world-wide American Merchant Marine. The provisions of the law relating to foreign competition should not be given a narrow interpretation, which would tend to negate the spirit and intent of the act, which is designed not only to enable American-flag operators to meet foreign flag competition but also to promote the foreign commerce of the United States. Under no circumstances should the lack of foreign competition of a particular character disqualify the American operator or prevent the initiation of new American-flag services for the carrying of the foreign commerce of the United States. Moreover, the fluid character of world commerce, both in diversionary routes and substitute commodities, should be recognized when the subject of competition in foreign trades is considered.

RESOLUTION ON GOVERNMENT-FINANCED AND MILITARY CARGOES

The Propeller Club of the United States strongly approves the congressional policy which has been established that our merchant shipping is entitled to governmental patronage to the extent of at least 50 percent of all cargoes financed by Government-aid funds, and that all strictly United States defense cargoes, shall move in American ships. While recognizing the necessity of a military transport service, we urge that this be confined to planning and direction and as a nucleus for expansion in time of military necessity. We urge that all governmental military cargo and personnel of adaptable character, and destined to areas served by or serviceable by our merchant marine, be routed to move via privately owned merchant ships of the United States, and public terminals, wherever possible.

RESOLUTION ON DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST AMERICAN SHIPPING

The American merchant marine is faced with alarming and increasing discrimination against its vessels by certain foreign governments in the transportation of international commerce. American ships are not afforded the same trading privileges and opportunities which we afford the ships of these nations in our ports, and in competing for our commerce. Some foreign governments insist upon the shipment of a large part, if not all, of their commerce in ships of their nationality. American vessels are not afforded an equitable competitive opportunity. In other instances currency and exchange regulations, and in some cases preferential charges, operate against shippers who would patronize the vessels of the United States.

The Propeller Club of the United States urges that all administrative and diplomatic recourses be utilized, and if these fail specific legislation be enacted, to guarantee equal treatment of our ships in foreign ports. Competition for private international commerce should not be confused with the United States congressional policy requiring that at least 50 percent of the United States Government-financed (gift) cargoes be shipped in American vessels.

TRAFFIC STUDY OF TRANSPORTATION IN METROPOLITAN AREA OF THE DISTRICT—RESOLUTION OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY (MD.) CIVIC FEDERATION

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, recent changes in schedule by the Capital Transit Co. and dropping of certain bus routes serving Maryland people in the Metropolitan area have not only brought considerable inconvenience to the people of that area but have raised a question as to what continuing responsibility the District transportation system has to these people whom it originally served and many of whom at least were induced to settle in these areas by reason of that transportation service.

The Montgomery County Civic Federation, representative of the home owners of that county, by resolution at its regular meeting on February 4, have requested that the responsible authorities of the State, District and Federal Government, take steps to have a traffic study made so that the future of the transportation service in that area may be programmed on a factual and reasonable basis.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Civic Federation requests the Public Service Commission of Maryland, the Public Utility Commission of the District of Columbia and the Interstate Commerce Commission, jointly or separately, to conduct a far-reaching investigation of the aim, objectives, and actions of the Capital Transit Co., and that the investigating agencies be specifically charged with conducting a thorough inquiry into the inequities and hardships imposed upon the transit-riding public of the contiguous Maryland area by the continued application of an arbitrary fare and service demarcation at the borderline between the District of Columbia and the State of Maryland; be it further

Resolved, That the Public Service Commission of Maryland, the Public Utility Commission of the District of Columbia, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the appropriate committees of Congress, jointly or separately, conduct a comprehensive investigation of the present and future transportation needs of the county, and the entire Metropolitan area, and publish a report of their findings; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be directed to the Public Service Commission of Maryland, the Public Utility Commission of the District of Columbia, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the District of Columbia, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the District of Columbia Committee of the United States House of Representatives, the Interstate Commerce Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Inter-Federation Council, the Montgomery County Council, the Maryland delegations in the United States Congress, the Prince Georges County Federation, the People's Council of the State of Maryland, and all newspapers in the Metropolitan Washington area.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1344. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to forcible entry and detainer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1194);

S. 1822. A bill to amend the act creating a juvenile court for the District of Columbia, approved March 19, 1906, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 1195);

S. 2381. A bill to amend section 86, Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 1196); and

H. R. 5256. A bill to secure the attendance of witnesses from without the District of Columbia in criminal proceedings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1197).

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

S. 2667. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; without amendment (Rept. No. 1198);

H. R. 3860. A bill to amend the act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1199);

H. R. 4419. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1200);

H. R. 4703. A bill to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1201); and

H. R. 6273. A bill to amend the act relating to the incorporation of Trinity College of Washington, District of Columbia, in order to make the Archbishop of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Washington an ex officio member and chairman of the board of trustees of such college; without amendment (Rept. No. 1202).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2658. A bill to amend the act of September 25, 1950, so as to provide that the liability of the town of Mills, Wyo., to furnish sewerage service under such act shall not extend to future construction by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1203).

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2447. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1204).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 2692. A bill for the relief of St. Alexius Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. TOBEY):

S. 2693. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River Flood Control Compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2694. A bill to authorize and request the President of the United States to appoint a committee to designate the most appropriate day for National Children's Day, and to proclaim such day for appropriate observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2695. A bill to grant veterans a preference with respect to the purchase of certain real property acquired under the reclamation laws and no longer needed for the purpose for which it was acquired; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 2696. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. RUSSELL):

S. 2697. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2698. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Romano;

S. 2699. A bill for the relief of Rose Cohen;

S. 2700. A bill for the relief of Betty Kiyoko Saito; and

S. 2701. A bill for the relief of Anna Aiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2702. A bill to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 2703. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 2704. A bill for the relief of Anna I. R. Wells, Edna V. R. Decker, Barbara P. R. Moore, and W. S. Rosasco, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to provide for quarters, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, for troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CONNECTICUT RIVER FLOOD-CONTROL COMPACT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which, if enacted, will grant the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River flood-control compact.

The bill (S. 2693) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River flood-control compact, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO PEANUTS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and my colleague the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to price supports for peanuts. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me regarding the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2697) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. GEORGE (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement by Mr. GEORGE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE

This bill eliminates those provisions of the current peanut marketing quota law which permit the growing of peanuts for oil in excess of what might be termed the "regular peanut marketing quota." During World War II and immediately thereafter the peanut growers of this country were encouraged by the Government to greatly increase the production of peanuts. The record shows that the growers responded to this encouragement and made a splendid contribution to needed additional production. This all-out effort on the part of peanut growers resulted in their having land, labor, and equipment geared to a new high level of production. After the need for this expanded production had passed rather drastic cuts in acreage were proposed to be put into effect in a very short period of time. I believed that the growers were entitled to a reasonable period of time to make the necessary adjustments from peanuts to alternative crops. Accordingly, in 1950, when a large reduction in peanuts was in prospect in order to bring edible nuts in line with demand, I favored the excess peanuts for oil provision to cushion the adjustment that would be necessary. The same device was used again in 1951. However, it appears that producers have had what they think is an adequate time to make the necessary adjustment to place the peanut program on a sound basis without the excess oil provisions. It is my desire to see the peanut program in 1952 placed on the same sound basis as the other programs as soon as possible. Therefore, at this time I am introducing this bill along with Senators ELLENDER, ANDERSON, AIKEN, HOEY, HOLLAND, and RUSSELL.

The companion measure in the House, by Congressman WHEELER, of Georgia, is H. R. 6375.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO MAKING OF TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 130) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements, which were inadvertently omitted when the joint resolution was introduced, and that the joint resolution be reprinted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS REGULATIONS AND WORLD WAR VETERANS' ACT, 1924, RELATING TO ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION IN CERTAIN CASES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 318) to amend the Veterans Regulations and the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide additional compensation for the loss or loss of the use of a creative organ; which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "THE FEDERAL BUDGET IN BRIEF" (S. DOC. NO. 104)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have "The Federal Budget in Brief" for the fiscal year 1953 printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "MANPOWER, CHEMISTRY AND AGRICULTURE" (S. DOC. NO. 103)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the staff report of the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor Management Relations of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, entitled "Manpower, Chemistry and Agriculture," be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 575. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Fiala;

H. R. 607. An act for the relief of Ronald Yee;

H. R. 615. An act for the relief of Samuel David Fried;

H. R. 751. An act for the relief of Loretta Chong;

H. R. 755. An act for the relief of Dr. Eleftheria Paidoussi;

H. R. 812. An act for the relief of Karel Vaclav Malinovsky;

H. R. 978. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michi Masaoka;

H. R. 1158. An act for the relief of Isao Ishimoto;

H. R. 1416. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Valdengo and Albertina Gioglio Valdengo;

H. R. 1428. An act for the relief of Claude Foranda;

H. R. 1446. An act for the relief of Calcedonio Tagliarini;

H. R. 1467. An act for the relief of Henry Ty;

H. R. 1790. An act for the relief of Dorothea Zirkelbach;

H. R. 1815. An act for the relief of Hideo Ishida;

H. R. 1819. An act for the relief of Hisamitsu Kodani;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Mrs. Carla Mulligan;

H. R. 2178. An act for the relief of Lee Lai Ha;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of Kazuyoshi Hino and Yasuhiko Hino;

H. R. 2355. An act for the relief of Nobuko Hiramoto;

H. R. 2370. An act for the relief of Carl Schmuser;

H. R. 2403. An act for the relief of Leda Taft;

H. R. 2404. An act for the relief of Mark Yoke Lun and Mark Seep Ming;

H. R. 2606. An act for the relief of Dimitra Gaitanis;

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aiko Eijima Phillips;

H. R. 2676. An act for the relief of Andrijana Bradicic;

H. R. 2784. An act for the relief of Fumiko Higa;

H. R. 2841. An act for the relief of Yai Wing Lee;

H. R. 2920. An act for the relief of Priscilla Ogden Dickerson Gillson de la Fregonniere;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Giovanni Rinaldo Bottini;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mehmet Salih Topcuoglu;

H. R. 3132. An act for the relief of Sister Apolonia Gerarda Sokolowska;

H. R. 3136. An act for the relief of May Quan Wong (also known as Quan Shee Wong);

H. R. 3271. An act for the relief of Toshiaki Shimada;

H. R. 3524. An act for the relief of Jan Yee Young;

H. R. 3592. An act for the relief of Paul Tse, James Tse, and Bennie Tse;

H. R. 3825. An act for the relief of Marlene Bruckner;

H. R. 4790. An act for the relief of Helga Richter;

H. R. 4911. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Maria Kuebler;

H. R. 5135. An act for the relief of Epifania Giacone;

H. R. 5389. An act for the relief of Ching Wong Keau (Mrs. Ching Sen);

H. R. 5525. An act for the relief of Abraham Davidson;

H. R. 5558. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Krause;

H. R. 5687. An act for the relief of Peter Mihaly Berend; and

H. R. 6231. An act for the relief of Gordon Uglow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4224. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Hartley; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 5893. An act to make additional funds available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for direct home and farmhouse loans to eligible veterans, under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 191) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

By Mr. McMAHON:

Address on the brotherhood of man delivered by him at the annual Brotherhood Week dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Washington, D. C., February 19, 1952.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

Address by Senator AIKEN regarding the work of the Hoover Commission, delivered at the Second National Reorganization Conference, held in the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 18, 1952.

Article referring to the Senate Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, written by Donald O. J. Messenger, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 18, 1952.

By Mr. PASTORE:

Address delivered by Senator BENTON before National Productivity Committee at Rome, Italy, on November 28, 1951.

Sermon delivered by Most Reverend Vincent S. Waters, D. D., bishop of Raleigh, N. C., at annual red Mass at the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Catholic University, on January 13, 1952.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address on the Benton amendment to the Mutual Security Act, delivered by Senator BENTON before the Anglo-American Press Association meeting in Paris on November 7, 1951.

Editorial on the displaced-persons problem, published in the Saturday Evening Post of February 9, 1952.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him and articles by Leslie Roberts and A. M. Richards in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Article entitled "Only a Little Matter of Nine Billion Dollars," written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of February 19, 1952.

By Mr. HOEY:

Article entitled "Race Issue Has Nation Boiling: Public Is Misled as to Facts," written by Davis Lee, and published in the Newark (N. J.) Telegram.

Editorial entitled "Union Shop by Government Decree?" published in the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Deeper Channel Urgent Tri-State Need," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 13, 1952.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in the February 16, 1952, issue of Chemical Week, there appeared an article entitled "The Seaway: For Better or for Worse." The article points out that the question now is not one as to whether the seaway should be constructed, but where it is to be located. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SEAWAY: FOR BETTER OR FOR WORSE

The St. Lawrence seaway argument, which has been around long enough to vie with capital punishment as a high-school debating subject, this week seemed to be rolling closer to reality.

The latest appeal for the seaway came 2 weeks ago when President Truman submitted a special message on the subject to Congress. In doing so, he echoed the feelings of every President since Taft and every New York Governor since Al Smith. But his appeal for a United States-Canada seaway probably fell on deaf ears.

The United States and Canada in 1941 signed an agreement for the joint development of the 46-mile International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence and for coordinated, but separate, action on the other portions of the 1,200-mile seaway. Railroad and ocean port opposition has successfully stymied ratification of this agreement.

Disregarding the Washington inaction, however, Canada has been busy drilling test holes as part of its engineering work. And while any seaway would take 5 to 6 years once the engineering was completed, there is a good chance that Canada will begin token excavation this year on a seaway which is part of one of the two development possibilities:

SEAWAY ALONE

Forgetting about the latent 2,200,000,000 in hydroelectric horsepower, Canada can construct a 27-foot-deep channel on her side of the international boundary, generally following the course of the present 14-foot canal. It is possible, from an engineering standpoint, to do this, though the cost to Canada would be enormous. Canadian citizens, however, feel so strongly on the matter that they would probably dig the seaway with their hands if asked to.

According to Canadian and some American experts, an all-Canadian canal would not change the water flow in the river, and thus need no approval by the United States-Canada Joint Council, which must pass on water diversions. Canada has set up a seaway authority with full power to construct a canal with money supplied by the sale of bonds. Tolls charged would be applied toward repayment.

SEAWAY AND POWER

Unlike a seaway, development of power would need transborder cooperation. Barring Federal Government participation, most logical American participant is New York State, which has set up a power authority with the St. Lawrence project as one of its goals.

Canada recently negotiated with the Province of Ontario, giving the province full authority over power development. New York and Ontario would love to get together and develop the badly needed power, but the United States Government, which says it wants the seaway, is the dog in the manger. The Federal Power Commission turned down the New York application, apparently because it feels all hydroelectric projects should be Federal—and allegedly against the opinions of its engineers, who said that the project is feasible.

While power under this proposal would be a cooperative venture, the Canadian seaway authority would have sole responsibility over construction of a ship channel. Navigation facilities under this plan would cost less than those without power development, and would be considerably better from an engineering standpoint.

While there is doubt over even the starting date, several companies—including at least three chemical firms—have purchased extensive tracts of land on the eastern Great Lakes. For the companies the purchase is merely speculation on eventual establishment of a seaway.

COMMODITY SHIPPING

From the United States viewpoint, the change in commodity distribution that a seaway would bring would not be all to the good. In general, it would promote lower costs to shippers of bulk commodities—iron ore, coal, grain, superphosphate, rubber, alumina, cryolite—when shipping large amounts to a single point. This, however, would mean that railroads would lose some revenue—and hence be pressured to ask higher rates on finished products.

One of the main arguments for the seaway, however, has to do with iron ore deposits in Labrador. It is also an example of how financial interests in undeveloped resources can bring a change in opinion.

In Cleveland, back in 1948, business interests presented a solid and united front against a seaway. Iron and steel companies there—like their counterparts throughout the Nation—feared competition from imported metal on their own home ground.

But since then, the powerful M. A. Hanna Co. (linked with Hollinger in exploring the Quebec-Labrador iron deposits) saw that a seaway would be profitable to its interests. Promise of cheaper ore melted opposition, and on October 19, 1951, the chamber of commerce adopted a resolution favoring construction of the seaway jointly by the United States and Canada.

PROS AND CONS

This reversal in Cleveland left only the railroad interests in the city still "con." Of course, opposition from the eastern railroads is formidable—even more so since they have the full support of the Association of American Railroads.

The AAR is throwing all its mimeograph machines into the fray. Unfortunately, the picture it paints is too inky black to be wholly believable.

The same thing is true on the other side: Proponents have painted such a rosy picture that all but the most naive optimist again must doubt the reality of their portrait.

Actually, there is some truth in the claims of each side. The pros say that the seaway is needed for defense, but the cons argue that it would take too long to get ready, and anyway, it couldn't be defended from an air attack. Rejoinder by the pros is that neither could the MacArthur lock at the exit of Lake Superior, and two ore routes are better than one.

Say the cons, American ships with a small enough draft to go through a 27-foot seaway account for only 5 percent of world tonnage. The pros reply that this is a statistical misrepresentation since it matches United States under 27-foot-draft tonnage with the world total, no matter what the draft. To this the cons say that, percentagewise, more foreign ships could navigate it. Not wholly as an answer, the pros state that when such navigation begins, United States ships will be built to fit.

On the use of the seaway, the pros assert that shortages of high-grade iron ore will make deep St. Lawrence channels a necessity since, even in transshipment, only 5 million tons of ore could be transported in one season. The cons' reply: Beneficiation of low-grade ores will more than supply needs, and even at present, the industry's problem is not getting enough ore—it has more than it can process—but in getting the required steel scrap. To this, the pros point to the fact that the spectacular growth of the steel industry has been on the eastern seaboard, not in the Middle West, and the higher cost of taconite would put these mills to a further disadvantage.

Similar arguments can be made on costs, self-liquidating provisions, significance of power development, foreign competition, and what have you.

THE UNARGUABLE REASON

There are many debatable points about the seaway, but only one favorable argument to which there is no even partly adequate reply: Despite what the seaway might do to some forms of transportation in the United States, Canada needs it for its own industrial development. Transportation, without a smidgen of doubt, is the most pressing problem in the development of Canada's natural resources.

Canadian railroads and the port of Montreal, which stand to lose as much as their American counterparts, now raise no objections.

Since our own reserves of many raw materials are diminishing in size and increasing in price, Canadian development is of prime importance. For this reason, Canada has been termed—accurately in meaning, but unfortunately in the choice of words—"the United States last frontier."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on February 1, 1952, I wrote to General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, asking for his present opinion as to the advisability of constructing the seaway and having the United States cooperate in its development. Under date of February 8 General Bradley replied to my letter. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to General Bradley and his reply be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

FEBRUARY 1, 1952.

Gen. OMAR N. BRADLEY,
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL BRADLEY: I am one of 26 cosponsors in the Senate of the St. Lawrence resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 27, which, as you know, President Truman strongly recommended for early passage in his message to the Congress on January 28.

The President has consistently urged in this as in previous messages that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project should be jointly completed by the United States and Canada, as an aid to the security and the defense of both countries, and that it should remain under their joint jurisdiction in the operation of the seaway, in control of tolls, and in other regulations vitally affecting our American shipping, including iron ore, steel, foodstuffs, and other tonnage.

I enclose copies of my remarks in the Senate on January 28 on the President's message and the historical summary I inserted in the RECORD on January 23.

As the President points out in his message, the Joint Chiefs of Staff at two former Senate hearings and the United States-Canadian Permanent Joint Board on Defense have repeatedly recommended joint completion and joint control of the seaway by both countries.

It seems to me that for us to abdicate and surrender our equal jurisdiction over a boundary waterway as vital as this one is to us, reaching into the heart of the great producing areas of our countries, would raise very serious problems indeed for those charged with our national defense.

I, of course, have in mind the mutually friendly relations which have long existed between the United States and Canada, which, I am sure, will always continue. At the same time, I know you will have a clear view of the desirability of keeping our share of boundary waters under our jurisdiction as we have on the Columbia, the Colorado, and the Rio Grande, not to mention the Panama Canal.

I should greatly appreciate it, therefore, if you would comment upon the recommendations referred to in the President's message and furnish me with your opinion on important factors that need to be considered in arriving at a preference between the joint development plan and the alternative all-Canadian seaway project, from the standpoint of our national defense.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

FEBRUARY 8, 1952.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I have read your recent letter and the enclosed material concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and power project with a great deal of interest. I welcome the opportunity to give you the reasons I feel the completion of the project continues to be important to our national defense. Some of these have previously been presented to Congress.

The St. Lawrence seaway will provide an additional continental line of communications with the following advantages to national defense:

(a) It affords access to additional shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities.

(b) It affords access to additional sources of high-grade iron ore in Labrador.

(c) It affords access to additional ports by oceangoing shipping in quantity increasing in proportion to the depth of channel provided.

(d) It can be expected to provide a large source of cheap dependable power.

(e) It may well encourage industrial dispersal from the eastern seaboard.

The project has the following military disadvantages:

(a) It will be closed for 4 to 5 months of the year because of ice conditions.

(b) It will be susceptible to traffic interruptions by enemy action; e. g. sabotage or air attack.

Since the project is important to our national security, it would appear that we could best maintain our national interest by participation and sponsorship. By our participation in the construction and operation of the seaway, we would maintain in our own hands some measure of control of the development of this important natural resource.

It appears also that the joint development will be constructed in a shorter period of time than the alternative all-Canadian seaway, because of the international division of the work; accepting the desirability of the project, rapid completion is an additional advantage of the joint development.

It is conceivable even though improbable that at some future time a situation may arise whereunder the United States might find itself in a situation of international tension, with Canada neutral. In such an event United States ownership and operational control of the St. Lawrence seaway might make an important contribution to the security of the United States. It could be visualized that exclusive Canadian ownership of this seaway might well be embarassing to the United States under such conditions.

I am convinced that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project should be supported to the extent that it does not seriously conflict in requirements for materials and manpower with current production programs essential to our national build-up of military strength.

Sincerely,

OMAR N. BRADLEY.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it will be noted that the reply of General Bradley emphasizes the advisability of United States participation in the construction of the seaway and the urgency of its being constructed as soon as possible, contingent upon the supply of labor and material.

Mr. President, I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the testimony of Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, under date of February 20, 1951, in which he points out the comparatively small requirements of material and labor which would be necessitated by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

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

As Director of Defense Mobilization, I have had to weigh the advantages I have discussed against the cost in terms of manpower and materials which the construction of this project would impose. My support of the project, therefore, takes into account this important consideration.

To explain my judgment on this, let me point out that none of the materials requirements set forth in the NSRB report constitutes as much as one-half of 1 percent of

our annual supply. For example, the 30,000 tons of steel a year required for the project is something less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent of our current ingot production. The copper requirement of 500 tons a year amounts to one-twentieth of 1 percent of the annual supply from domestic ores alone. Even in the case of cement, where the fraction is largest, 750,000 barrels a year is approximately three-tenths of 1 percent of the annual supply that can be counted on during the 5-year period of construction. In each instance, therefore, the amount of materials required is so small as to be negligible in the total mobilization framework.

The same is true in the case of manpower. In addition to the manpower engaged in production and moving the materials needed for the project, its construction will require 7,000 American workers on the site. This is equivalent to hardly more than one-hundredth of 1 percent of the civilian labor force.

It is with these insignificant fractions of our available supply of materials and manpower that we can purchase, if we act wisely and promptly, the vital and strategic advantages that construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project can confer.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont may yield to me for a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I correct in my understanding that it is now definitely settled that there will be public hearings on the seaway proposal beginning the 25th of this month, and that they will be ended by the 1st of March, so that a vote on the question may be had.

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding that the Committee on Foreign Relations voted yesterday to begin hearings next Monday.

Mr. FERGUSON. That will be February 25.

Mr. AIKEN. It is also my understanding that the committee voted to limit the duration of the hearings to 1 week.

Mr. FERGUSON. And that there will be action at the conclusion of the hearings. That was my understanding, and I desired to ascertain whether it was the understanding of the Senator from Vermont, who is taking an active interest in the subject of the seaway.

Mr. AIKEN. My understanding is the same as that of the Senator from Michigan. I certainly appreciate the willingness of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to permit the committee to hold these hearings.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know the Senator hopes that there will be no delay in the hearings, so that an early vote may be had in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair may have a word to say about this matter, he would call attention to the fact that Senators have been so kind to him in connection with the dams on the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers that when the proposal to develop the St. Lawrence seaway is brought before the Senate there will be nothing in the world for him to do but to vote for it, and the Chair does expect to vote for it. The dams which have been constructed on the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers, which I played such an active and important part in having built, and of which I am so proud, have worked wonders for the economic development of Tennessee, and the whole great area served by them, and the development of the St. Lawrence seaway will, in my judgment, perform the same great service for all New England and the other northern States. The Chair is speaking as a Senator, and not as the Presiding Officer.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am glad to hear these remarks from the present occupant of the chair as a Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I not only appreciate the kindness of the President pro tempore, the Senator from Tennessee, but I also appreciate his broadmindedness and his attitude in general with regard to the St. Lawrence seaway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator from Vermont.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Moody
Anderson	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hennings	Mundt
Benton	Hickenlooper	Neely
Brewster	Hill	Nixon
Bricker	Hoey	O'Conor
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Robertson
Byrd	Ives	Russell
Cain	Jenner	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Seaton
Chavez	Kerr	Smathers
Clements	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Connally	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Lehman	Sparkman
Duff	Lodge	Stennis
Dworshak	Long	Taft
Eastland	Magnuson	Thye
Ecton	Martin	Tobey
Ellender	Maybank	Underwood
Ferguson	McCarran	Watkins
Flanders	McClellan	Wiley
Frear	McFarland	Williams
Fulbright	McKellar	Young
George	McMahon	
Green	Monroney	

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 50, to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 17 OF EACH YEAR AS "CITIZENSHIP DAY"

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar 1071, House Joint Resolution 314, designating September 17 of each year as Citizenship Day.

The reason for my making the request is that the President must make a proclamation in connection with the celebration of the day, which is now being celebrated in May as I Am An American Day, and which it is proposed to transfer to September 17. A great many people do not understand why the proclamation has not been made. As I understand, there is no objection to the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 314) designating September 17 of each year as Citizenship Day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have no objection to its present consideration, but I shall ask some questions with reference to it when it is under consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from North Carolina if he will in a few words explain the purpose in transferring the celebration from May to September.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I was a member of the original group which sponsored Citizenship Day many years ago, when the celebrations first began. September 17 is today already designated as Constitution Day. It is proposed that the same day be also designated Citizenship Day. September 17 is considered to be more convenient, from the standpoint of the group which is sponsoring the celebration of Citizenship Day, than the day in May on which the celebration is now being held. The reason for this precipitate action, if such it may be classified, is that May is rapidly approaching, and a great many people all over the country—it is expected that thousands of people will participate in the celebration—cannot understand why they have not been notified. Mr. Hyatt, from my State, who is an Assistant Attorney General, and the director of the Citizenship Program, has not been able to notify anyone because the President has not made the proper proclamation.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to ask another question: Will the transfer of the date mean that Citizenship Day will henceforth come on so-called Constitution Day?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. That is correct; yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. So it is very fitting that Constitution Day be combined with Citizenship Day, because in effect they reach the same objectives.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. That is quite true.

In this connection, I may also say that the movement for Citizenship Day has developed to such an extent that a great many of the courts now are celebrating that day by proper and appropriate ceremonies at the time aliens are naturalized, and become new citizens of the country. Those ceremonies are a part of the entire program.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have no objection to the joint resolution; in fact, I think the step it proposes is a very logical one to take.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 314) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATEMENT ISSUED BY SENATOR McCARRAN REGARDING SPECIAL POWERS FOR NEWBOLD MORRIS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement issued by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, relative to the question of granting certain special powers to Mr. Newbold Morris, and the Judiciary Committee's consideration of this question. I call particular attention to the situation mentioned in this statement, with regard to the complete lack of authority Mr. Morris now has.

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

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, will himself head the seven-man subcommittee which will handle the administration-sponsored bill designed to give Newbold Morris, special assistant to the Attorney General, subpena powers and the power to grant immunity.

The full Judiciary Committee this morning unanimously requested Senator MCCARRAN to take the chairmanship of the subcommittee to which the bill was ordered referred with instruction to report back to the full committee next Monday. The bill, Senate Joint Resolution 132, was introduced last Thursday, February 14, 1952, by Senator CLEMENTS, in his capacity as acting Democratic floor leader.

Members of the seven-man subcommittee, besides MCCARRAN, are Senators EASTLAND, O'CONOR, SMITH of North Carolina, WILEY, FERGUSON, and HENDRICKSON. The subcommittee will hold its first meeting Wednesday morning, Senator MCCARRAN said. Meanwhile, the Senator said, the professional staff of the Judiciary Committee will be pushing toward completion of an exhaustive study of the whole subject involved in the President's request.

Senator MCCARRAN declined to predict what action will be taken by either the subcommittee or the full committee, but termed the President's request "one of the most revolutionary proposals ever made to Congress by a Chief Executive."

If the bill should be enacted as the President has proposed it, Senator MCCARRAN said, "it could have far-reaching effect, including substantial impact upon both the legislative and judicial branches of Government."

"We must examine this proposal very carefully in all its phases," Senator MCCARRAN said, "because if we act in an unadvised manner now, or without full appreciation of what we are doing, we may wake up too late to a realization of what we have done."

Senator MCCARRAN said that, speaking only for himself, he was willing to go on record as opposed to giving Mr. Morris the power to grant immunity. "That is a tremendous power," the Senator declared. "In actual practice, the justification for giving immunity usually should be only a situation in which that is the only way to get testimony which, in turn, is essential to making a case. Under lesser circumstances, immunity should not be granted. In no case should there be a grant of immunity without a full appreciation of all the facts, a knowledge of what is involved, and a weighing of the desirability of getting the witness' testimony, against the interest of the Government in punishing a wrongdoer. To give the power to grant immunity, to be used as it apparently is intended to be used here, in connection with a secret investigation, which may or may not ever reach the stage of presentation to a grand jury or to a court, is almost to invite excessive liberality in the giving of immunity baths."

Respecting the question of granting subpena powers to Mr. Morris, Senator MCCARRAN said he was willing that Mr. Morris should have such powers, provided assurance could be had that the powers so granted would not and could not be used to interfere with the proper investigatory activities of congressional committees. To this end, Senator MCCARRAN said, he would favor a provision that any documents secured by Mr. Morris under subpena powers granted him by the Congress should in turn be subject to congressional subpena. If this should be done, Senator MCCARRAN pointed out, it would be possible for key documents in connection with some congressional investigation to be subpenaed by the executive investigator, invested with the character of executive papers, and thereafter denied to the Congress, or kept from the Congress for an indefinite period of time.

"It would appear," MCCARRAN said, "from the President's message to Congress in connection with this bill, that he (the President) has already given Mr. Morris substantial power and authority with respect to obtaining documents from within the executive branch of the Government; a power apparently far more extensive than has ever been granted to the Congress. In fact, it would appear that the President has given Mr. Morris power to secure documents, access to which has been specifically denied to congressional committees."

"Actually," MCCARRAN continued, "no such power has yet been given to Mr. Morris, unless the President's message to the Congress is in itself a grant of power to Mr. Morris, which must be doubted.

"Not only has no Executive order been issued, granting Mr. Morris any power whatsoever, or even defining his duties; but there has been no directive of any nature to any agencies of the Government outside the Department of Justice with respect to the cooperation which is to be furnished Mr. Morris; nor has there been even a letter to the head of any department or agency outside the Justice Department, asking that Mr. Morris be given such cooperation.

"Perhaps the President feels that his public statement that he has given such a directive will be read by the heads of all departments and agencies, and understood by them as a Presidential order. But that is not the way Presidential orders are made official. I believe Congress will feel, quite properly, that something a little more formal is desirable.

"Not only has the President not granted Mr. Morris any specific authority; even the Attorney General, so far as we have been able to ascertain, has done nothing to define or outline Mr. Morris' authority, or to give him any instructions. The only authority Mr. Morris has, so far as the committee has been able to determine, is whatever general authority has been vested in him through his appointment, by the Attorney General, as a Special Assistant to the Attorney General. Any such authority is, of course, to be regarded as a delegation of the Attorney General's own authority, and must of necessity be exercised under the direction and supervision of the Attorney General, and is subject to being withdrawn at the discretion of the Attorney General. So there is nothing in that line which Congress can regard as any reliable and independent grant of authority to Mr. Morris.

"In view of this situation, I believe that whatever power and authority Congress sees fit to grant should be granted upon the explicit condition, a condition which should be made prerequisite, that the President by Executive order grant to Mr. Morris powers adequate to permit him to have access to all the information he will need from other departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government; and that the power which Congress grants to Mr. Morris shall be contingent upon his retaining and exercising the powers to be granted by the President under Executive order. In other words, if the President revokes or amends his Executive order, the powers granted by the Congress should automatically be withdrawn.

"In requiring that the President issue such an Executive order before any grant of powers from Congress can take effect, it should be stipulated that the Executive order shall grant powers at least as broad as those which the President, in his message to the Congress, indicated he had already granted. In other words, the President should be required to make good on his statement to the Congress, before any special powers granted by the Congress to Mr. Morris are permitted to become effective."

THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the essentials of a sound Japanese peace treaty were laid down by General MacArthur in June 1950, at a conference in Tokyo with Secretary of Defense Johnson, General Bradley, and Mr. John F. Dulles.

At that time General MacArthur recommended an early end of the occupation, with restoration of sovereignty to Japan, and an agreement with Japan that the United States would maintain armed forces in Japan to prevent the Soviet Union from moving into the military vacuum left in the far Pacific.

Mr. Acheson and Mr. Dulles say the present treaties are virtually the same as the proposals of General MacArthur, but General MacArthur has not said so.

The treaties before us meet neither of two objectives laid down by the general in June 1950. They do not restore complete sovereignty to Japan, and they do not give the United States the power to prevent Soviet occupation of Japanese

territory. They leave us where we, ourselves, may be completely defenseless in the Pacific.

On the surface the peace treaty ends the occupation and restores full sovereignty to Japan. On the surface the security treaty between the United States and Japan permits the United States to keep armed forces in or about Japan to protect Japan against armed attack. The actual legal language of the treaties gives no such assurance.

These treaties are contracts which concern the defense, possibly even the survival, of the United States. We in Congress are the counsel for the people of the United States. We cannot read in any casual way contracts which concern our very survival. We must look at all the possible interpretations, and must read all the fine print.

When the treaties are read carefully, we find that General MacArthur's simple proposals for independence for Japan and security in the Pacific have been transformed into a legal maze, by whose vague or complex clauses Japan is firmly tied into the United Nations superstate, and the military powers under the peace go, not to the United States, but to the United Nations. The treaties permanently subject American forces and American policy in the Pacific to the rule of the United Nations, to the confusion and indecision we see today in Korea. Never again will there be any escape from the toils.

Since June 1950, both Secretary Johnson and General MacArthur, who were present at the Tokyo Conference, have been summarily removed from office.

The President has entrusted the treaty making, not to the State Department, as set up by law, but to one man, a personal representative of the President. For over 18 months Mr. Dulles has been going about secretly from one foreign capital to another, giving other nations his version of our foreign policy, and, in return, giving us his version of their wishes. It is in this twilight zone that the Japanese settlement has been transformed from an open agreement between sovereign nations to a masterpiece of double talk which ties Japan and the United States firmly into a United Nations superstate, a superstate whose board of directors includes the U. S. S. R. This superstate will permanently dominate our foreign policy and military power, as it now dominates our attempt to win victory over the Chinese-Korean Communists.

DOUBLE TALK

The Senate is asked to ratify four separate treaties.

The first is the peace treaty between Japan and the nations opposed to her in World War II.

There are also two treaties of mutual defense, one between the United States and Australia and New Zealand, the other between the Philippines and ourselves.

The fourth is the all-important security treaty between the United States and Japan, which governs our military rights in the Pacific.

The treaties are written on two levels, in a kind of double talk. In order to gauge their effects on the military security of the United States, we must examine them on both levels.

Let us look first at the simple words and what they seem to mean, then at the hidden meaning underneath the pleasant language.

WHOSE PACIFIC BASES?

The most important question is that of our right to bases in Japan, conveyed in the Japanese-American Security Treaty. You will remember, Mr. President, that the text of this treaty was not available to Members of the Senate of the United States before it was signed at San Francisco.

In the Japanese Security Treaty, Japan grants to the United States the right to "dispose United States land, sea and air forces in and about Japan."

These forces may be used, according to the treaty, first, to maintain international peace and security; second, to defend Japan against attack; third, to put down internal riots or disturbances in Japan if caused by an outside power.

It certainly does not help our prestige in Asia to be given domestic police powers in Japan under the false hope that our military could cope with a Russian fifth column there.

But the main issue is whether we have any substantial rights even to bases.

While this agreement is in force, says the treaty, Japan will not grant bases or other rights of garrison or transit for ground, air, or naval forces to any third power, although the occupation powers may retain them under certain conditions. However, the preamble frankly calls the whole security treaty a provisional arrangement.

The sting is in the tail. Article IV of the Japanese Security Treaty provides the treaty shall expire "whenever in the opinion of the Governments of the United States and Japan there shall have come into force such United Nations arrangements as will satisfactorily provide for the maintenance by the United Nations or otherwise of international peace and security in the Japan area."

In plain English all the rights to bases or transit given the United States under this treaty would vanish into thin air the minute the President of the United States decided the United Nations was ready to take over. Our forces in Japan would have the same status as the United States forces which went into Korea at the end of June 1950. Within 2 days, by the stroke of a pen, President Truman transformed them all into the United Nations forces.

Since then, our military men have been unable to make a single military decision without being blocked far up in the invisible recesses of the United Nations.

What the President did for our forces in Korea, the executive could do for the whole American establishment in and about Japan; and no one, in Congress or anywhere else in the United States, could stop him.

I want to make this point very clear. Under this pact the President could by a stroke of the pen put an end to the American Army, the American Air Force and soon, the American Navy.

Physically, the men, the planes, and the ships would still be there; but they would not be American.

Mr. Dulles, in his inimitable way, shows us exactly where we stand:

The present bilateral arrangement—

He says of the American-Japanese Security Pact—

is only an initial step in an evolutionary process of collective security.

The "evolutionary process" apparently means that the Pacific Security Pacts, with Japan, Australia, and New Zealand, will soon be expanded with China into a Pacific NATO, and our forces will be assigned to it, as they were assigned to the United Nations in Korea.

But a Pacific NATO would still be the United Nations, except that one more confusing, invisible scaffolding would have been added to the upper echelons, where decisions are reached, far above Congress or our Constitution.

The troops and bases we secure in Japan will be, not a stone wall barring Soviet expansion, but a paper curtain with a stone wall painted on it.

SECURITY IN THE PACIFIC

If there were no other reason but article IV of the Security Treaty, I believe the Members of this body could not in conscience vote for this settlement. But there are other reasons, in all four agreements.

What protection would Japan have under this treaty? If the Communists chose to attack her, she would, at best, become a second Korea, with half her territory occupied by Communist "volunteers" or fifth columnists pouring in from Sakhalin and the Kuriles, with the rest a shambles, while our men vainly tried to hold back the Red hordes, forbidden to bomb Sakhalin for fear of offending the Soviet Union. The Japanese know this, if our Asian experts do not.

This is the best these treaties promise us—an uneasy peace while our men are bracketed into U. N. forces, and then, sooner or later, a sudden eruption by the Soviet Union, in which our Navy and Air Force are prevented, somewhere in the U. N., from protecting our troops and taking the offensive for victory.

Some one may say, the President never would turn additional military power over to the U. N. while the war was going on in Korea. But that war will be over within 24 hours when the Communists give the word.

If the war in Korea is replaced by a temporary peace, and our forces in and about Japan are transformed into U. N. forces or Pacific Treaty Organization forces, what will be our military situation in the Pacific? The answer is that our military power will no longer be under the direction of the American people or their elected representatives. It will be under the direction of the U. N., with the U. S. S. R. a member of the governing board, that is, the Security Council.

Our former forces in Japan can be used only if they are engaged in any United Nations action in the Far East.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator

from Indiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true, also, that the commander in chief might be a foreigner?

Mr. JENNER. That is absolutely correct.

Our former forces in Japan can be used as the Security Council desires, and they cannot be used for any purpose the Security Council opposes. Today's Korean stalemate will be our policy in the vast Pacific.

Let us suppose that, after 6 months of so-called peace, the Chinese Communists broke the armistice. If we wanted to resume the war, we could ask the Security Council for permission. If the Soviet Union vetoed our resuming the attack, we could not move. We would have no troops in the Pacific subject to American orders. We could not assign our former armies to attack Red China, because they would not be under American sovereignty. Furthermore, Japan could not move to our assistance.

If we broke out of the U. N. and somehow regained control of our troops and ships and bases, Japan could not legally give us the use of any ports, docks, airfields, or other military facility in or about Japan.

What does "in or about Japan" mean? Does it include Okinawa? Formosa? Unaided, we could perhaps attack Red China from somewhere in the middle of the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. Dulles says "this is a good treaty. It does not contain the seeds of another war. It is truly a treaty of peace."

But if we read the fine print, the Japanese treaties give no hope of peace or security, unless it be the peace of appeasement and slow defeat.

By article 2 (c) of the peace treaty, Japan renounces all right, title and claim to the Kurile Islands and to South Sakhalin. The treaty does not say these areas are to go to the Soviet Union. It leaves them hanging, with no place to go, no U. N. trusteeship or anything else.

The U. N. enters every loophole in this treaty, but not this, the most obvious one.

Soviet armies are now occupying both Sakhalin and the Kuriles. They are only a few miles from Hokkaido, the most northern island of Japan; and the Soviet fifth columnists are crossing into Japan every day.

Mr. Dulles says these islands are being taken from Japan to conform to the Potsdam Agreement, though why we should carry out the terms of the infamous Potsdam Agreement is not explained.

Potsdam is a polite name for the Yalta Agreement, which said we were giving Sakhalin to Russia to undo the peace settlement of the Russo-Japanese War.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from California for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Potsdam declaration to which Mr. Dulles refers at that point refer to the ultimatum which was delivered to the Imperial Japanese Government, setting forth the terms under which their surrender would be accepted? If the Senator will put that connotation upon the Potsdam declaration, rather than on the more formal agreement at Potsdam, I think it would be more in keeping with what Mr. Dulles had in mind in the statement quoted.

Mr. JENNER. There is so much double talk that, while I am making this speech I invite the Members of the Senate to look into the peace treaty and other treaties very carefully. I think we are not only planting the seeds of more war, but that the treaty is worse than the Potsdam and Yalta agreements combined.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, we have the historic fact that the message was sent to the Japanese Imperial Government setting forth the terms under which their surrender would be acceptable, and they had to accept something. They did accept these terms. So, I think that is the relationship to Potsdam which Mr. Dulles had in mind.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, why should we undo the Treaty of Portsmouth, made by Theodore Roosevelt? Why should we give Russia the Kuriles, which it never owned? These two areas are stepping stones for military or subversive invasion of the northernmost island of Japan by Soviet forces. The Kuriles also are a link in the island chain of our Pacific defenses.

To permit the U. S. S. R. to keep the Kuriles is, militarily, like opening a gate in the center of a wall guarding a beleagured city and saying, "all is well—most of the wall still holds."

That is the incredible position taken by General Bradley at the hearings on this treaty, but it is hardly a position the Senate can endorse.

This treaty leaves the United States wide open to a second attack on Pearl Harbor launched from the Kuriles.

I am happy to endorse the analysis and criticism of these provisions which the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has so ably presented to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Another break in our possible security is hinted at in the curious provision in article 2 (e) of the peace treaty by which Japan renounces all claim to the Antarctic.

Again her claims are not legally transferred to anyone. The State Department is known to favor the internationalization of the Antarctic. Is this provision one of the links in a carefully devised plan to give the Antarctic to the U. N.? Here again the military issue is uppermost.

So far the Antarctic has not been drawn into any war. But in another war we may have to send warships or commercial vessels around Cape Horn. Submarine bases and weather stations in the Antarctic might be as important as Greenland and Iceland were in the last war.

We hear there are at present no installations in Antarctica, but how do we know? As Miss Elizabeth Kendall said before the committee, the penguins do not tell. If the State Department is planning to turn the Antarctic over to the U. N. or any other international organization, why not say so openly? What is there to hide?

The most serious break in our security in the Pacific is abandonment of the Republic of China. Free China was not invited to the signing of the peace treaty. That in itself is a strange and ominous fact.

We were told by Mr. Dulles' private communications system that our allies in the U. N. were not willing to have free China's representatives present.

We have no explanation of why the United States Government did not speak out openly for its staunchest anti-Communist ally, an ally who had been fighting Japan since 1937 and the Soviet Union since 1927.

We are left with a serious problem here.

Why were the negotiations about China's presence carried on in secrecy? Why did not our Government make an open and unequivocal statement of its position?

Is it possible, as we have heard said so often, that our Government secretly opposed the free Chinese and "let it be known" to our allies that we would not object to confusion on that issue?

Is that why Secretary Johnson and General MacArthur, who laid down a fine plan for the peace treaty, were summarily dismissed, and Mr. Dulles, like Ulysses, began his wanderings?

When the peace treaty was published last summer there was an immediate protest because free China was excluded.

It was feared that administration sympathizers counted on economic pressure to force a Japanese agreement with the Communists, for the sake of their raw materials and their markets.

We have had from Mr. Dulles' followers smooth-sounding promises that, just as soon as the Japanese treaties are ratified by the Senate, Japan will choose, of her own free will, to make a treaty with free China. What do they mean?

Now we have a letter from Premier Yoshida of Japan to Mr. Dulles.

This letter was written December 24, 1951, but held up until January 16, 1952.

The letter is as follows:

> The Japanese Government desires ultimately to have a full measure of political peace and commercial intercourse with China which is Japan's closest neighbor.
>
> At the present time, it is, we hope, possible to develop that kind of relationship with the national government of the Republic of China, which has the seat, voice and role of China, in the United Nations, [and] which exercises actual governmental authority over certain territory.
>
> My Government is prepared as soon as legally possible to conclude with the national government of China * * * a treaty which will reestablish normal relations between the two governments in conformity with the principles set out in the * * * treaty of peace.

Then note this very revealing sentence of Premier Yoshida:

> The terms of such bilateral treaty shall, in respect of the Republic of China, be applicable to [note well] all territories which are now, or which may hereafter be, under the control of the National Government of the Republic of China.

The British press expressed some doubt whether Premier Yoshida was completely free when he wrote that letter, or whether his hand was "guided" by someone in our Government. I share that doubt.

Many people are convinced this private and personal arrangement, by letter, with another government, takes care of all our fears. But does it?

It may be answered that Mr. Yoshida said his Government would never deal with the Communists.

I agree that we can have confidence in Mr. Yoshida insofar as he feels free to speak frankly. But how long will Mr. Yoshida remain in office? The next elections will be held in Japan in April. There is a powerful fifth column in Japan. It is being strengthened every day by the U. S. S. R.

We heard last April that sympathizers with communism wanted General MacArthur out of Japan, so that his occupation could not add to the political stability during the election.

Mr. Yoshida has certainly not strengthened his chances of reelection by saying he will not trade with Red China. The Washington Post says he has signed his political death warrant. Did someone plan it that way?

If a left-wing or neutralist government is elected in Japan, how will the treaty operate?

If a left-wing Japan is a part of the United Nations, where will we be?

The Soviet Union has not yet signed the treaty. Where does it stand? We must consider all the possibilities. The Soviet Union may sign this treaty and get all its privileges. It may refuse to sign and remain at war with Japan until it gets new concessions. It may wait for election of a left-wing or neutralist government and do business with it. The treaty is wide open for any move it wishes to make. Only we are tied down.

Certainly no Member of this body is confused by the stage show of opposition to the treaty which the Soviet Union put on at San Francisco. When the Soviet Union opposes something dangerous to its security, they do it with more than words. A theatrical performance like that at San Francisco is, like all theatrical performances, meant to create an illusion in the minds of the audience.

The U. S. S. R. liked the treaties. They feared we might object, so they put on their show of opposition as the best way to get the treaties ratified quickly. Whichever way we turn, things are not what they seem.

THE MYSTERY OF MAINLAND CHINA

Suppose Japan does recognize a Nationalist China with sovereignty over Formosa. We are then left with another problem. What becomes of the vast territory of mainland China, with its 450,000,000 people? The treaties do not say.

Is Mr. Yoshida's letter, by chance, a link in the long train of events pointing to recognition of Red China and her admission to the United Nations and a seat in the Security Council?

Is it the State Department's real plan to pay due respect to free China—momentarily—while it quietly amputates all mainland China from her sovereignty?

Is it the plan to leave this mysterious entity, mainland China, as a political vacuum to be filled later by a Communist government with hands clean enough to be admitted to the United Nations?

Here another horrid doubt arises.

Has the American State Department ever given its word unequivocally to support the sovereignty of the Nationalist Government over the whole mainland of China?

Have we all been deluded by the double talk?

Have we only imagined Free China meant China?

Do we have to hunt for a hidden meaning every time the word China is used?

Do all the published statements of the administration dealing with the Republic of China mean a republic sovereign over Formosa only, never over the mainland?

Is our refusal to give military aid to China, such as we give to Tito, part of the evidence that our Government is determined to keep Chiang from regaining control of the mainland?

Is that why the Navy of the United States is stationed in Formosan waters—because without our opposition, Chiang's forces could reestablish themselves on continental China?

Does the Japanese peace treaty, then, make sure of a vast political vacuum in mainland China? Is it the plan to fill this vacuum with a synthetic Tito who will soon apply for admission to the United Nations?

Such speculations, Mr. President, would be unjust except that it did happen to Mihailovitch and Poland and Bulgaria and Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

Furthermore, we have reports that American officials of the CIA are operating with plenty of cash in Formosa and perhaps in China, attempting to organize a mysterious third force.

Now we have before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security the evidence that John Davies wanted the pro-Communist clique which had advised the State Department, to guide the CIA in its thinking on China.

It may be a part of the plan also to have a democratic uprising on Formosa, in favor of the new Tito, and then join Formosa to the new and untarnished Red Government of China.

By such simple steps all the original plans of the pro-Soviet bloc in the State Department can go merrily forward, perfectly legal within the framework of these treaties.

With a new collectivist government set up in mainland China, a Red government cleverly cleansed of the odium of the Korean war, who would be sovereign over the former American forces in Japan once they were transferred to the United Nations? Obviously the governing body would include the new China.

The Chinese Red leaders who a year ago ruthlessly denounced our American fighting men before the United Nations would be seated on whatever council directed the new United Nations security forces.

To complete the picture let us recall what is planned for India. Mr. Stassen warned us at the Internal Security hearings that all signs preceding the collapse of China are now visible in India, and all the same people are congregating there.

Alfred Kohlberg reports the plan is to separate the Indian "peoples" from their government by point 4 and other American funds, and let Nehru fall, like Chiang, without letting it look as if we pushed him.

I ask, Mr. President, if such is our hidden policy, whose hand do you think is at the controls? Whose scheming brain is calling the moves? How long will it be before we see the long arm of the Soviet Union manipulating the puppets?

I should not be willing to put before the Senate any such Machiavellian example of political double talk. But we live in an age of political double talk, and the stakes, let us not forget, are destruction by guile of our Armed Forces in the Pacific, and even of the United States itself.

Let us look at the double talk again. Let us remember every time the word "China" appears it has a double meaning. If by the words "Nationalist China" the State Department always means Formosa only, and the people go on believing they mean the true Republic of China, we have a beautiful instrument for confusion of the public mind, a perfect smoke screen to hide whatever the State Department decides to do.

Could someone somewhere have planned it that way?

If the State Department by Nationalist China means Formosa only, then we have no assurance whatever of the status of mainland China under these treaties.

We must read the fine print once more. We must look at the double meaning once again.

The peace treaty gives to "China"—I quote "China"—all Japan's special rights and interests in "China," including benefits and privileges under the protocol of Peking on September 7, 1901.

Will the Republic or mainland China get legal claim to the indemnities still due Japan from the Boxer Rebellion?

The proposed treaty gives to China the right to seize all the property, rights, and interests of Japan and Japanese nationals, including those in possession or under the control of the Allied Powers. But which China?

Finally, it gives to China the right to reparations in the form of labor for the processing of raw materials into finished goods. But to which China?

Under the treaty and Mr. Yoshida's letter, all these rights would be divided between a China on Formosa and a mainland China, which might be Red China or a clean, scrubbed, well-behaved Communist satellite, under a new mask.

If that is so, and it seems from the text that it must be so, we are confirming a treaty which will give to an undefined mainland China all the rights Japan has held in China. It will give this same mainland China all the Japanese property to which she can lay claim under trading-with-the-enemy rules or laws.

The peace treaty says that the right to seize and dispose of such property shall be exercised in accordance with the laws of the Allied Powers concerned and the owner shall have only such rights as may be given him by these laws.

All such property, that is, will come under mainland China law only. We shall have the story of General Chennault's air line on Hong Kong, which the British courts turned over to Red China, multiplied 10,000 times.

Finally, this treaty gives mainland China all claims to American aid. Could we have here the mysterious reason why the funds which Congress voted for China have been spent so slowly?

The most important clause is that which gives to China all claim to reparations in the form of labor for production, salvaging, and other work.

Do we see at last the mechanism by which the industrial wealth of Japan is to be drained off, with our help, for Communist China?

Mr. Dulles said at San Francisco:

> Governments represented here have claims which total many billions of dollars and China could probably claim as much again.

He says that a hundred billions "would be a modest estimate of the whole."

At best, the reparation clauses in this peace treaty do not ring true. Why should Mr. Dulles say:

> The Japanese will need to develop the capacity to perform services which others want * * * This calls for willingness on the part of the Japanese people to work hard, to work efficiently and to work with creative imagination so that they can anticipate the wants of others.

What is this but double talk? Has any nation ever developed more capacity to perform services which others want than the Japanese? Crowded on islands with a very low supply of raw materials, they were so ingenious, so hard-working, that they pulled themselves up in a few years to become one of the great industrial powers of the earth.

This statement can serve no purpose but double talk. Its smooth surface hides something. In my speech of August 24 I pointed out that the reparations clause is usually supposed to refer to the Philippines. I further said:

> But does it not fit Red China exactly? China was an occupied country.
>
> If Japan makes a commercial agreement with Red China, will she not be obliged under the treaty to process Chinese materials as a form of reparations for the occupation of China?

I confess that I was naive, Mr. President. I thought Japan would at least have to take one overt step toward making a commercial agreement with Red China. But no. I underestimated the finesse of the makers of this treaty. The Republic of China is quietly redefined as sovereign over Formosa, and all the claims to reparations fall automatically to mainland China, this curious hidden entity to which we have not yet found the clues.

According to Mr. Dulles, China has a claim to about $50,000,000,000 in reparations, of which Formosa has no share. Formosa was Japanese territory in the last war. All claims would then revert to mainland China. She can demand that Japan process her cotton and steel and other materials until the debt of $50,000,000,000 is paid in full.

Mr. Dulles says that this plan for reparations is something much better than reparations in the past, which were paid by financial transactions between governments, not by direct labor. But someone must pay the wages of workers in his reparations scheme, or the workers must go unpaid. What could be simpler, in the fashion of the day, than to let the United States supply the wages and working capital under the new overseas procurement or point 4?

We could build up Japan's factories, equipment, and transport, and then somewhere in U. N., a rule would be discovered by which, under the treaty, mainland China could claim X percent of the output of all Japanese factories in the name of reparations.

Or she could compel the Japanese Government to commandeer plants and labor, and process the goods the Communists need, while Japanese labor was slowly reduced to the status of labor in the U. S. S. R.

In my August statement I quoted Owen Lattimore as saying that the industries of Japan were largely designed to use the raw material of China. He continued:

> Machinery made in Japan from Chinese raw materials offers the cheapest kind of capital goods that China can obtain from any source and Japan can deliver goods to China at all the seaports, instead of over one railway line that enters China from Siberia.

Obviously the Communists want Japan to take the place of Russia in supplying China with the capital goods she needs for her factories, her airports, her submarine bases, and her atom-bomb plants. We are providing the means to do just that in this treaty.

What could be more ingenious than to let the United States prime the pump by putting in the equipment and working capital in the name of national defense and mutual aid, until the U. S. S. R. is ready to let Red China's "Armies of Liberation" sweep over all Asia?

Last August I also quoted from Prof. Thomas George in Modern China. He said:

> Japan is, of course, of tremendously great importance to Communist global strategy.
>
> It (Japan) would give to world communism the greatest industry in the Far East.
>
> It would be sufficient to feed all the Red armies of Asia with armaments, and so precipitate the communization of all Asia.

Professor George concludes:

> Red forces can then freely proceed southward through Formosa, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Australia and eastward toward Alaska, Canada, and the United States.

That is the ultimate goal, Mr. President, always.

STATE DEPARTMENT SUPPORT OF RED CHINA

To understand all that these treaties may mean to our military security, I must ask you, Mr. President, to go back with me over the steps in our relationship with the Nationalist Government on Formosa.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] knows this story better than any other Senator. He has followed it closely and has been outspoken about it.

On October 15, 1951, Time magazine referred to a statement by Secretary Acheson, as of December 1949, saying we must shake loose from the Chinese Nationalists, and another from a high State Department official saying:

> Acheson has been steadily arguing with Truman to go along on an early recognition of Communist China.

Recognition of Red China was delayed, according to the story, only by Congress and some of the military. The President was quite won over. That opinion was widely accepted at the time, but it could not be proven. We have recently had confirmation under oath of the unremitting efforts of our State Department to recognize Red China.

Mr. Harold Stassen described, before the Internal Security Subcommittee, the meeting of the leaders of public opinion, held by the State Department October 6, 7, and 8, 1949. At these sessions the dominant group, including Owen Lattimore, Lawrence Rosinger, and Benjamin H. Kizer, all members of the dominant group in IPR, discussed how to condition American public opinion to recognize Red China.

"We must also," they said, "disentangle ourselves from the Chinese Nationalists," almost the very words quoted in Time magazine as Acheson's policy.

A minority in the 1949 meeting argued there was a strong opinion in the country and in Congress against recognition. But Mr. Nathaniel Peffer said:

> If this country * * * is at a stage in which the Government is hog-tied against its better judgment because some people are going to blow up, then God above help the Republic.

By the Government, of course, he meant the executive branch.

By some people who are going to blow up, he obviously meant Congress. Senators are in that group.

State Department officials and their supporters had not the slightest intention of changing their policy because Congress and the country were against it. Not at all. The only question was that of preparing the American public opinion for recognition.

The method was to be a series of small steps of which it would be very difficult for anyone opposed to recognition to say at any point, "This shall not be done."

Such is the standard practice in thought control.

The inner circle were sure the American people will rather quickly adapt themselves to recognition once it was an accomplished fact.

I am reading from the records of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security.

One essential step was to make "a public disavowal of the blockade Chiang Kai-shek is conducting with respect to China."

No military aid was to be given Chiang, no aid was to be given the guerrillas on

the mainland and ECA aid was to be withdrawn from China.

We were to encourage the recognition of Red China by Britain and India, and follow with our own recognition soon afterward, "to keep the great English-speaking peoples in step."

In the next few months, until the invasion of South Korea, the American State Department took an astonishing number of steps that closely followed the lines laid down at this conference by the dominant or IPR group, for conditioning the American people to gradual recognition of Communist China.

Within 6 weeks, Secretary Acheson protested to the Chinese Nationalists when they stopped American ships going through the blockade to supply Red China.

This was what Mr. Kizer had suggested as primary. On December 5, Mr. Acheson said the United States did not recognize the legality of the blockade.

On December 23 the Department sent out to the Voice of America and the information agencies, its shocking orders to say the expected fall of Formosa was not of any significance to the United States.

On January 5 the President said the United States had "no intention of providing military aid or advice to the Nationalists on Formosa," or of using its Armed Forces to protect Formosa.

On January 12, 1950, Mr. Acheson made his historic statement that both Korea and Formosa were outside the line of our security in the Pacific.

This was the signal to the Soviet satellites that they could invade Korea and Formosa.

It was widely accepted in diplomatic circles here at the time that the United States Government intended to abandon the Nationalist Government of China but expected its allies to pull its chestnuts out of the fire, to avoid any interference by reactionary Members of Congress.

Mr. Thomas Reid, a member of the Labor Party, said in the House of Commons, on April 6, 1950, in the debate on recognition:

As I understand it, the American Government was consulted from start to finish, and I think I am right in saying that the American Government raised no opposition at all to the recognition of the Communist Government by Britain.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] also submitted to our hearings a clipping from the New York Times of November 10, 1950, in which the Italian Foreign Minister, Count Sforza, said in Rome that the Italians had finally decided not to recognize Red China, but they have been "influenced strongly by some 'alluring suggestions' made to him by very responsible quarters during his trip to the United States last September."

These suggestions were that the Soviet Union would not veto Italy's admission to the U. N. if we agreed not to veto Red China.

Note that these "alluring suggestions" that Italy support Red China were made by "very responsible quarters" in the United States 3 months after the outbreak of the war in Korea.

State Department support of Red China, before Korea, was clear enough, Mr. President. What is not so clear is the shocking fact the State Department has given no real evidence of a change toward Formosa since the fatal days of late June 1950, when the Communist satellites in Asia became our open enemies.

Do we have any statement by any State Department officials which unequivocally supports the Nationalist Government as the legally constituted sovereign over all China? Always we have double talk.

During the terrible first winter of the Korean war our representatives were saying that the admission of Red China was a "procedural matter" and we could not veto it. Then they said Red China could not shoot its way into the United Nations—meaning it could be admitted a few months after a cease fire.

It was not until April 1951, in the Senate hearings on the ouster of General MacArthur, that even our military leaders first said Formosa was essential to our defense.

I shall mention one more point, the most significant of all: Just as soon as President Truman sent our men into land fighting on Korea, he issued to the American Navy his strange, fantastic, indefensible order to guard the Red China coast and stop the Nationalist blockade which had been keeping supplies from Red China by sea. He also forbade free China to help the guerrillas on the mainland.

Who whispered to Mr. Truman, after the Korean war started, to issue the order using our Navy to complete the Lattimore-Rosinger-Kizer plan to isolate free China? Who whispered to him to order the President of China not to help China's armies on the mainland?

Before the same Internal Security Subcommittee, last fall, Adm. Charles Maynard Cooke, former chief of staff to Admiral King, told us that in October, 1951, 18 months after the Korean war began, the United States was still not sending substantial military aid to Formosa and was still barring Chiang from helping his own mainland forces, his own armies which had never surrendered.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] said:

I understand we are now sending them equipment and help.

Admiral Cooke replied:

Well, it is not arriving there very fast.

He added:

If we are attacking [the Reds] north in Korea, and south * * * in Indochina, and [if] we [were to] use what we put into Formosa to push in the center, then it would immediately call for higher priority [for the shipment of arms to Formosa].

Mr. President, by what name should we call military leaders who order men to fight and die on the right flank, let them fight and die on the left flank, but use force to prevent the troops in the center from attacking?

Admiral Cooke described as follows what he considered to be the correct military objective:

I think they [the free Chinese] ought to be free to attack the mainland. * * * I would send them immediately into Korea so they could get war experience in conjunction with our troops. * * * I would do both if our forces in Korea need them.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] asked again:

If the United States Fleet were not there to exercise coercion upon the Formosans and upon the Nationalists, is there any probability that they would be attacking the mainland with raids?

Admiral Cooke replied:

Yes.

Mr. Morris asked whether raids would aid the guerrillas' morale.

"Yes; very much," said the admiral.

Our order neutralizing Formosa was, said the admiral, "a wet blanket on the spirit."

He also said:

If you have an armed force in existence for a long time, and your relatives, mothers and fathers and all, are being slaughtered on the mainland, and you can't do anything about it, you get depressed. * * * You run into few mainland Chinese * * * [on Formosa], who have not relatives that have been executed on the mainland. * * * so a lot of them are just burning with desire to return to the mainland, to liberate their fellow-countrymen.

But as time goes on, if they get too much of a hopeless feeling, then that tends to die down; it gets quenched somewhat.

Here is the tragic picture of half a million men rotting on Formosa, although they might be fighting side by side with our men, lifting their spirits, giving meaning to the war, and cutting our casualties in half.

Mr. President, I call your attention to the fact that today our Formosa military policy is still the policy of the State Department-IPR meeting in October 1949, where Owen Lattimore, Lawrence Rosinger, and Benjamin Kizer were the dominant group and Philip Jessup agreed that the higher logic was on their side.

They need only a little time. It will take only a year or two more, Mr. President, before the brave, eager army on Formosa has lost its military spirit.

It will take only a year or two more, Mr. President, before the Communists in China have consolidated their hold on the mainland, killed all the leaders friendly to us, brain-washed the others, and put the uncomplaining Chinese to work—as the Russian peasants were put to work in 1927—to build a mass-production war industry for the Red armies.

The Reverend William R. Johnson, who for 35 years worked as a missionary in the interior of China, told the foreign relations committee during the hearings on these treaties:

Fifteen million six hundred seventy-two thousand and fifty executions and an additional 20,000,000 estimated deaths by suicide and starvation are the incomplete totals of lives destroyed in China during the 2 years prior to last August.

He continued by saying:

Such statements regarding Chinese conditions are most difficult to accept. They are nevertheless true.

Destruction of life by such means continues at a million and a half monthly.

Mr. President, such is the Red China our State Department tried so hard to bring into the United Nations, into the Security Council, in a position over our Armed Forces in the Pacific and the Atlantic theaters.

It is, as Mr. Johnson said, the greatest genocidal holocaust in history; but our State Department has uttered no word of protest against the massacre of old men, helpless women, young students, and religious leaders of our most valiant ally.

While the clock ticks, Mr. President, the Communist plan for complete control of all Asia moves forward relentlessly, helped by someone, somewhere, within our State Department.

While the clock ticks, Mr. President, our men in Korea are dying to provide a screen behind which the plans of the dominant group of the State Department and the IPR can be fulfilled.

THE PACIFIC PACT

There is one more almost invisible pattern underlying these treaties. This is seen in the steps by which Japan is firmly welded into the United Nations; the Pacific states are to form a regional pact under United Nations control, and the United States, after committing its overseas defenses to the United Nations, will become in fact another province in a U. N. world, from which there will be no escape.

The preamble to the peace treaty says Japan declares its intention in all circumstances to conform to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

It is also to strive to realize the objectives of the universal declaration of human rights. It is to create in Japan domestic conditions of stability and well-being, as defined in articles 55 and 56 of the Charter of the United Nations. Finally, in public and private trade, it is—and I quote from the treaty—to "conform to internationally accepted fair practices." Why is this included in a peace treaty? Are Japan and the United States to be barred from making peace unless they accept their role as spokes in U. N., and work only by way of U. N. machinery and U. N. political philosophy?

If this is true, as it seems to be, then the Members of the United States Senate should have it clearly in mind. They are voting for or against our right to make a treaty as an independent nation. Is the Senate prepared to approve the universal declaration of human rights? If so, why does it not approve the declaration openly? Why this subterfuge about approving it for Japan through this treaty? Would that not commit us morally and legally to acceptance of the principles of that declaration, on some later issue? If so, why the indirection?

Is the Senate prepared to vote that Japan must operate under articles 55 and 56 of the Charter? These two paragraphs set up a world welfare state, dealing with domestic problems, and we are insisting that Japan must join it.

Article 55 of the U. N. Charter says:

The United Nations shall promote:

(a) Higher standards of living, full employment * * *.

* * * * *

(c) Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Do we want to guarantee racial equality to the aborigines in Japan? Or to American agitators in Japan, who, under Communist control, might appeal to the U. N. for equality in Japan? Do we want to guarantee to Japanese women equal treatment in industry, politics and problems of sex? UNESCO has tried to manage all those problems, but not with complete success.

Should we take on the domestic problems of Japan, or do we, in this body, already have enough to deal with?

In the matter of private trade, we insist that Japan shall conform to internationally accepted fair practices, although Mr. Dulles himself told us at San Francisco that these fair-trade practices have not yet been spelled out in international conventions.

What is the advantage of our insisting in the treaty that Japan must be bound hand and foot to the U. N. when by the same action we make ourselves a segment of U. N. and transform American armed forces into an international force which can move only under the orders of the U. N., which includes Russia?

The reason, Mr. President, can be found if we bring together the parts of this grand design. The parts are the security treaties with Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines.

We now see why they are bracketed with the Japanese Peace Treaty. These four treaties together set up a Pacific counterpart of NATO. NATO and PATO together are the new regional superstates which are temporarily to hold the supergovernmental powers of U. N., in order to distract attention and gain time, until the present colossal failure of the U. N. in Korea can be washed from people's brains.

Mr. Dewey outlined the plan, in double talk, in his speech before the National Industrial Conference Board. He explained that we must include Indochina, Thailand, Burma, and Indonesia. Of course, the new China will come in. PATO will, like NATO, be an international sovereign body, with its own governing apparatus and its own money. The money and the staff have already been provided.

Section 509 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 provides that the President may authorize the head of any Government agency to—

(b) Detail, assign, or otherwise make available to any international organization in which the United States participates any officer or employee of his agency to serve with or as a member of the international staff of such organizations.

Are you sure, Mr. President, that we in Congress know exactly how many Government employees have been or will be assigned to international organizations in which the United States participates? Are you sure, Mr. President, that we know exactly what they are doing?

That is not all. Section 406 (b) of the 1949 Mutual Defense Assistance Act says:

Personnel of the Armed Forces may be assigned or detailed to noncombatant duty, including duty with any agency or nation.

Further on, in section 411 (f), the law defines "Armed Forces" as including the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard"—and I ask you to listen carefully, Mr. President—"and the Reserve components thereof." Does that mean, Mr. President, that we have authorized the Chief Executive to assign any one in the Reserve to duty with any U. N. agency? If so, that may be very important in connection with universal military training. Does that legislation keep all the young men of the Nation for 8 years under obligation to serve in any international organization to which the President wants to assign them for some bold new program? American military and civilian personnel are already being assigned to NATO, to what extent we hardly know. NATO is not American. It is not responsible to the American Congress and the American Constitution.

When Congress asks NATO for information, they do not have to pay any more attention to us than they do to Luxembourg.

To understand what we have here, we must go back to the plan Mr. Acheson proposed to the Collective Measures Committee of the U. N. Assembly in New York in 1950.

The plan is supposed to bypass the Security Council with its veto, but, under the double talk, it is also a plan for giving the U. N. its own armed forces—the test of sovereignty, and so making it in fact world government.

The plan again is in two steps.

World government forces will be built up under NATO and PATO, because the stock of U. N. is, at the moment, very low.

But NATO and PATO are securely locked in the arms of the all-enveloping U. N.

In this new set-up there will be no nonsense about American commanders acting for U. N.

The Associated Press reported on October 3, 1951, that "one of the major criticisms of the MacArthur command * * * was that it operated almost independently of the United Nations * * * The subcommittee (collective measures) recommended that in the event of a future attack, the military operations should be handled by an executive military authority * * * required to work closely with all participating countries * * * within the framework of United Nations' policies and objectives," the commander to be fired abruptly if he failed to carry out what U. N. wanted.

In the Korean war the United States commander had some leeway. This will never happen again.

But who is U. N., Mr. President? It certainly includes Soviet Russia, and it will include Red China under one mask or another.

What is our role in Congress in control of such an armed force? The answer is simple. We will draft Americans to defend their country and the President will put them under a command which clearly is not to be American. General Eisenhower has said, since he was assigned to NATO, that he was only one-twelfth American. Do all the military and civilian personnel now on American Government payrolls, but assigned to NATO, feel, as General Eisenhower does, that they are only one-twelfth American? Will the employees assigned to NATO think they are only one-twelfth American?

What, I ask, is happening to our beloved country?

THE ROAD BACK

We started the Japanese peace talks with General MacArthur's proposal for a simple treaty between sovereign nations, establishing peace and permitting the United States to guard Japan against invasion, until her army and navy are reestablished.

We end with a legal maze in which the United States will not have any armed forces in or about Japan at all, and cannot move its men in the U. N. contingent except as the U. N. or its regional units direct.

We are making the confusion of the Korean war and the Kaesong peace our permanent policy in the Pacific.

It has been very difficult for me to disentangle my mind from the soft, enticing words in which these treaties are described, to keep on analyzing and analyzing until I found what was the pattern underlying it all.

I can understand how it may be difficult for Senators to disentangle the true pattern from the multitude of details when they are so busy.

I can understand their reluctance to search for evidence that this treaty is not what it seems, that someone has laid a fair and innocent-looking carpet of leaves and grass over a mortally dangerous booby trap.

But I say to the Members of the Senate that we have been there before. We have faced just such a choice before.

In December 1945, Gen. George Marshall was sent to China, with instructions from Mr. Truman to urge the Nationalist Government to include other political elements in its government. This statement was duly reported in the press next day. It was as delicate as the thread of a spider's web, but it told all informed persons that China was ordered to establish a united-front government like that by which the Communists destroyed Poland, Bulgaria, and the rest of central Europe.

In these governments, the Communists needed only two offices—interior and communications, namely, the secret police and the propaganda. From there they knew how to intimidate the whole.

This news item told us, in 1945, that somewhere in the State Department, some unknown Alger Hiss was powerful enough to put Soviet policy into an American Presidential directive, to clothe it in Soviet propaganda language and to induce or compel the military to go along.

Chiang refused to enter a united-front government, and the Communists, with General Marshall's help, turned to the trick of continuous peace negotiations, and, as in Korea today, built up their armies and won.

In 1950, the warnings of Congress and all warnings to arm Korea were ignored, and the invasion began.

In early 1951, General MacArthur told us how we could win a victory over Red China. The President said "No." For nearly a year since then our men have been fighting and dying.

In June 1951, the Communists asked us for mock peace negotiations like those in China. Again we let them reform their units and build up their air force, while we retreated step by step from our published objectives.

At three crises we have had the facts, the thin, delicate, almost invisible facts, of the Communist hand in our foreign policy, and we have ignored them.

We went along with Alger Hiss' U. N.; with John Carter Vincent's instructions to Marshall; with the secret management of the Korean war.

Three times we thought the spider-webs were not real. Three times we expected Soviet conspirators to broadcast what they were doing. Once again we have the same choice.

The present Japanese peace treaty is part of the Hiss-Acheson-Lattimore design for the sell-out of Asia, and the wrapping up of our military might in the coils of the U. N.

The proposed treaties would mean final and ultimate betrayal of the men who fought Japan, of the men now locked in mortal combat with Communist forces on the dark and bloody battleground of Korea.

There is one difference. Congress had no hand in the shame of Yalta. Marshall's journey to China was made without asking our approval. The Korean war was started without our consent.

But the planners are bolder now. They have submitted this document to us, and ask us to sign on the dotted line.

Mr. President, I said in the beginning that we in the Senate were counsel for the people of the United States. We are asked here to sign in their behalf contracts which will determine, for decades, our military power in the Pacific, perhaps even our ability to defend our own homeland.

These contracts are written in double talk. Taken at face value, the contracts seem to arrange a just peace in the Pacific. Read as any lawyer would read a contract in his client's interest, they open the door to complete loss of our military bases in Japan, a vast build-up of Red China at our expense, and the permanent subjection of our foreign policy and our fighting men to world government under the United Nations.

Again and again we have seen the same double talk, always the fair promises at the beginning, always the deadly losses in the end. What would we think of lawyers who, after so many deceptions, would sign a contract committing all the resources of their clients to the same dubious words, to be carried out by the same dubious men?

It is axiomatic in an honest contract that the terms shall mean the same thing to both parties. If we want to make this a good contract, we can do it now. If we fail, we cannot blame the President, the State Department, or anyone else.

If we do not like these treaties, we are not left without recourse. We do not have to continue the occupation indefinitely. We can by reservations remove all limitations on Japan's sovereignty, or ours, eliminate the clauses carrying out Yalta, and make an iron-clad statement that the President may not transfer any American troops, bases, overseas construction, or equipment to any other nation, group of nations, or international body, without the consent of Congress.

We can withhold assent to the provision about reparations.

We can add a reservation stating that "China" in the treaty means the duly constituted Republic of China, now on Formosa, but with legal sovereignty over all China, including Manchuria.

We can submit a much simpler treaty to our cosigners. Perhaps they will be willing to go along with us in spite of Mr. Dulles' doubts. We have only Mr. Dulles' word for it that they will not.

We have here a choice, not only between General MacArthur's proposals for the treaty and those of Mr. Dulles, but we have the old choice between two radically different concepts of American diplomatic and military policy. General MacArthur's simple proposals are a continuation of our historic policy of free intercourse between sovereign nations. That policy flowered into the Monroe Doctrine and the Open Door. We took the position in Asia, as in Latin America, that we could not permit any world power to crush an unarmed nation within the zone of our security, and add her helpless millions to its conquering might.

Mr. Dulles' treaty is a continuation of the strange, new policy which began when Mr. Hull was pushed aside, when the seasoned far-eastern experts in the State Department were pushed aside, when even General MacArthur was pushed aside, by men approved by the IPR and the figures in the shadows who guided their hands.

Last March I said we were being governed by people with a blueprint for our destruction, and we were right on the timetable. That was a few weeks before Mr. Truman's dismissal of General MacArthur.

Now I say, Mr. President, that these treaties, as they stand, are the next step on the timetable, one year and thousands of young lives later.

A year ago I said:

> This country cannot lead the world in a return to barbarism.
>
> There is a better way, and Congress must find it.

There is no one who can guard our security but Congress. The people cannot act. The men in the Armed Forces cannot choose their course. We alone can act, in this contract, for the American people.

For a few days, here in this Chamber, the fate of our country will tremble in the balance.

It is not given to many men to have so great a trust placed in their hands. If we fail, no one will ever repair the damage.

If we accept the challenge, we can turn aside now from the deceit and double-dealing of the last decade and start the long climb back to an open, honest American foreign policy.

In the next few weeks, Mr. President, we shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 56. An act for the relief of Francis Kueen San Thu, Mary Luke Thu, Catherine Thu, Victoria Thu, and Anne Bernadette Thu;

S. 211. An act for the relief of Maria Enriquez;

S. 440. An act for the relief of Evangelos and Michael Dumas;

S. 544. An act for the relief of Joseph Rossabi, Corrine Rossabi, Mayer Rossabi, and Morris Rossabi;

S. 607. An act for the relief of Adam Styka and Wanda Engeman Styka;

S. 740. An act for the relief of Albert Walton:

S. 750. An act for the relief of Edward Chi-Kan Lam;

S. 811. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Sakata Lord;

S. 821. An act for the relief of Wong Woo, also known as William Curtis;

S. 904. An act for the relief of Roy Y. Shiomi;

S. 1133. An act for the relief of Sophie Strauss;

S. 1256. An act for the relief of Barbara Ann Koppius;

S. 1359. An act for the relief of Virgine Zartarian (also known as Vergin Zartarian);

S. 1401. An act for the relief of Lore A. M. Hennessey;

S. 1462. An act for the relief of Joseph Boris Tchertkoff;

S. 1560. An act for the relief of Camilla Pintos;

S. 1683. An act for the relief of Carlos Tannoya;

S. 1839. An act for the relief of Willy Giroud;

S. 1844. An act for the relief of Panagiotis Carvelas;

S. 2054. An act for the relief of Tomizo Naito;

S. 2119. An act for the relief of Claudia Tanaka;

S. 2172. An act for the relief of Mieko Takamine; and

S. 2271. An act for the relief of Carol Ann Hutchins (Sybille Schubert).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 20, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 56. An act for the relief of Francis Kueen San Thu, Mary Luke Thu, Catherine Thu, Victoria Thu, and Anne Bernadette Thu;

S. 211. An act for the relief of Maria Enriquez;

S. 440. An act for the relief of Evangelos and Michael Dumas;

S. 544. An act for the relief of Joseph Rossabi, Corrine Rossabi, Mayer Rossabi, and Morris Rossabi;

S. 607. An act for the relief of Adam Styka and Wanda Engeman Styka;

S. 740. An act for the relief of Albert Walton;

S. 750. An act for the relief of Edward Chi-Kan Lam;

S. 759. An act to extend to screen vehicle contractors benefits accorded star-route contractors with respect to the renewal of contracts and adjustment of contract pay;

S. 811. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Sakata Lord;

S. 821. An act for the relief of Wong Woo, also known as William Curtis;

S. 904. An act for the relief of Roy Y. Shiomi;

S. 1133. An act for the relief of Sophie Strauss;

S. 1256. An act for the relief of Barbara Ann Koppius;

S. 1359. An act for the relief of Virgine Zartarian (also known as Vergin Zartarian);

S. 1401. An act for the relief of Lore A. M. Hennessey;

S. 1462. An act for the relief of Joseph Boris Tchertkoff;

S. 1560. An act for the relief of Camilla Pintos;

S. 1683. An act for the relief of Carlos Tannoya;

S. 1839. An act for the relief of Willy Giroud;

S. 1844. An act for the relief of Panagiotis Carvelas;

S. 2054. An act for the relief of Tomizo Naito;

S. 2119. An act for the relief of Claudia Tanaka;

S. 2172. An act for the relief of Mieko Takamine; and

S. 2271. An act for the relief of Carol Ann Hutchins (Sybille Schubert).

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, at this time I move to recommit Senate bill 50 to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with instructions that hearings be held on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator be willing to modify his motion so as to make of it a motion to recommit the bill with instructions for further study, and also to consider the granting of commonwealth status to these Territories if consistent with the later determination of the Congress? It would require a constitutional amendment to establish the new status, in which Territories could approach statehood. If they were not quite strong enough or did not have sufficient population to attain statehood, they would still have a self-governing status. I believe that a motion to recommit should provide not only for the study of the question whether or not these Territories should be granted statehood, but also the question of whether, perhaps, another status, between statehood and territorial status, might be proper.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to modify my motion, so that in addition to instructions to hold hearings on Senate bill 50, the committee will also be instructed to study the question raised by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I want the record to show that the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is not now occupying his desk and is not making this motion.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would appreciate the record so showing.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have endeavored to work out a unanimous-consent agreement for a limitation of debate on the pending bill. I regret to state that the first day when such an agreement can become effective is next Wednesday. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning next Wednesday at 12 o'clock noon debate upon the motion to recommit, offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] be limited to 2 hours to each side.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, did I understand the majority leader to say next Wednesday?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; a week from today. The time for debate to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in accepting the modification suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] to the motion to recommit, does the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] understand, since the motion now involves a constitutional amendment, that the bill will have to be considered by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. MONRONEY. Undoubtedly it would be properly considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. However, since it has an interlocking interest with the bill which is now pending, I believe it would be very wise for the Senate in the motion to recommit to direct the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs also to study the question, because its recommendation and determination would be important advice to the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Florida will yield, I should like to point out that by unanimous consent the Senate can make any disposition it desires with respect to any such motion.

Even though under the Standing Rules of the Senate, as adopted under the Reorganization Act, the Committee on the Judiciary does have jurisdiction over constitutional amendments per se, there is no reason why the Senate should not direct the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to consider a constitutional amendment which would deal with Territorial and insular affairs.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I inquire of the Senator from Arizona whether he stated that 2 hours of debate would be allowed to each side?

Mr. McFARLAND. Two hours to each side; that is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Beginning on Wednesday of next week, when the Senate meets at noon?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would the distinguished majority leader be willing to amend his unanimous consent request by excluding the consumption of time for the insertion of irrelevant and routine matters in the RECORD? Ordinarily we assemble at noon. Most Senators do not come to the floor at noon because they know that a dozen or more Senators will be engaged in making routine insertions in the RECORD. If it could be provided that such routine matters be excluded it would be quite possible that the debate would be speedily concluded and the vote taken on Wednesday.

Mr. McFARLAND. Under the unanimous consent request debate would begin at noon. The only way a Senator could make an insertion in the RECORD thereafter would be by a Senator in control of time yielding to him for that purpose. However, the debate would have to start when the Senate convened.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If a Senator in control of time yielded for that purpose the time would be taken out of the time of the Senator so yielding?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With that understanding, I have no objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Majority Leader include the usual clause with respect to germaneness?

Mr. McFARLAND. It would not be possible to consider an amendment to a motion to recommit, as I understand. I do not think that the germaneness clause would pertain to a motion to recommit. The only thing involved in the unanimous-consent request is a motion to recommit.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe it would be possible for a Senator to move to amend the motion to recommit so as to instruct the committee to bring in a bill on civil rights.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not understand how a motion to recommit could be amended. However, I shall be glad to include such a clause in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Could a motion to recommit be amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. But it would be only as to instructions, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It could be amended to include instructions.

Mr. McFARLAND. In that case, Mr. President, I include the germaneness clause. An amendment may be offered to instruct the committee to bring out some other bill. For that reason I include the germaneness provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement, as modified? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

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

Ordered, That on Wednesday, February 27, 1952, beginning at the hour of 12 o'clock noon, further debate upon the motion of Mr. SMATHERS to recommit to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with certain instructions the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union be limited to not exceeding 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. SMATHERS and Mr. O'MAHONEY respectively: *Provided*, That no amendment to the said motion that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be in order.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement with regard to the work of the Senate. We expect to have a call of the calendar on Monday. Inasmuch as the debate on the pending bill probably will not last until next Wednesday, there may be some other business transacted between now and that time. If so, it will be announced later.

I wish again to warn Senators that from now on their duty is to be on the floor of the Senate; that we will not try to accommodate Senators with respect to time on Friday, Saturday, or Monday, to permit them to be absent. We shall try not to have sessions on Saturday, but we shall meet on Saturday if we do not make proper progress with debate and if we do not take more votes than we have taken in the past, or move along more rapidly than we have in the first part of this session. I hope that Senators will be present on the floor of the Senate. That is where the Senate transacts its business.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only thing I should like to say to the majority leader is that Senators must attend committee meetings. For instance, we are having a meeting this afternoon of the Armed Services Committee on the UMT legislation, in marking up the bill. There are also other committees of the Senate meeting this afternoon. After all, a Senator has a dual duty to perform; one is on the floor of the Senate and the other is in attendance at committee meetings. A Senator cannot possibly be in two places at the same time.

Mr. McFARLAND. I believe the distinguished Senator from California misunderstood me. I was giving warning that Senators should not leave town, which makes it impossible for them to come to the floor to vote. We may have votes any day from now on.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only reason why I made that point was that many times people come to the galleries of the Senate Chamber when Senators are practically speaking to empty desks, and they do not realize that the absent Senators are attending meetings of committees. Yesterday there were three or four such committee meetings being held during the afternoon session.

Mr. McFARLAND. I meant no reflection upon Senators who are unable to be on the floor during debate. I realize that Senators have various duties to perform, and are carrying out those duties to the best of their ability. That is my opinion of the Senate. I know that by and large Senators remain in Washington and are available to vote on issues which come before the Senate. However, whenever we try to get a unanimous consent agreement one or two Senators say they can not be present on a certain day, and for that reason they object. The only way we can transact the business of the Senate is to push the business to the point where it will be voted on even if we cannot get a unanimous-consent agreement.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, for the Armed Services Committee, I wish to report favorably the nominations for the promotion or original appointment of 2,465 persons within the Armed Forces. These are all routine nominations and none are of flag or general officer rank. The Armed Services Committee is now holding several flag and general officer nominations pending further study. It is hoped that this study will be completed shortly. The nominations which I am reporting have the unanimous approval of the committee.

In order to avoid the cost of printing the names of all of these individuals in the executive calendar, which I understand to be approximately $600, I now ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, these nominations be confirmed by the Senate and that the President be notified of this action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? Without objection, as in executive session, the nominations are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified.

DEATH OF AMERICAN MISSIONARY AFTER STARVATION IN RED CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in today's Washington Evening Star there appears the following article by the Associated Press, and I desire to call it to the attention of the Senate:

UNITED STATES WOMAN DIES IN HONG KONG AFTER STARVATION IN RED CHINA

HONG KONG, February 20.—Methodist Missionary Gertrude Cone, 50, of Geneva, Ohio, died today about 36 hours after arriving from Red China on a stretcher.

A Methodist spokesman said death was caused by a cancer discovered only yesterday and aggravated by severe malnutrition. He said she lived the past 3 months on a daily ration of one bowl of rice and one dill pickle.

Doctors at Hong Kong's Matilda Hospital said the cause of death was not determined.

Miss Cone, who taught English and music at the Baldwin Girls' School in Nanchang, Kiangsi Province, was carried to the Hong Kong border on a stretcher at midnight Monday. She was accompanied on the 500-mile trip from Nanchang by a Chinese Communist Foreign Bureau official, a nurse, a doctor, and one other unidentified Chinese.

An ambulance waiting at the border took her to the government hospital, where she died.

The Methodist spokesman said Miss Cone applied for an exit permit a year ago but it was granted only 10 days ago.

He said also that Chinese Reds wouldn't let her write to Hong Kong for money when she fell ill last August.

Miss Cone came to China in 1927.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say that on January 31, as appears on page 682 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I placed in the RECORD at that time a list of the names of 32 Americans who were being held in Chinese Communist prisons; and I called attention to 33 more who were under house arrest, and to some 300 who had been denied exit visas. I also called to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the country the fact that those persons are the forgotten Americans in that area of the world, and that unless some affirmative steps are taken, one by one those persons will either die in China or will be released a day or two before their death, as was done in the case of the missionary to whom I have just referred.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING HEARINGS ON AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to repeat, for the benefit of the Senate, and for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a statement of the wishes of the Banking and Currency Committee with respect to the hearings on the Defense Production Act. A few minutes ago the majority leader referred to the necessity of having the Senate get down to fundamental legislation. I understand the minority feels the same way.

Sometime ago I stated that on March 4 the Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings on the proposed amendments to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. At that time I said, and I now repeat, that unless those who are interested in submitting amendments, together with a statement or explanation of the amendment which should be submitted at the same time, do so by March 4, the committee will not be able to hear them.

Before setting the March 4 date for the commencement of hearings I discussed it at a full committee meeting and all the members present agreed on that date. Anyone who desires to be heard by the committee should file a written request to be heard, and should attach to his request a copy of the statement he desires to make before the committee. At this time I repeat that notice, because the committee will not be able to comply with requests by persons in various parts of the country to be heard after the hearings get under way on March 8, 9, or 10, for instance.

On March 4 the Banking and Currency Committee desires that all persons who wish to be heard by the committee have their statements on file with the committee at the committee's meeting that morning. I am afraid that it will not be possible for the committee to hear those who do not do so. The committee must follow that procedure, because obviously the committee must act expeditiously, in order to permit the Senate to proceed with this necessary business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the idea of the chairman of the committee is a very excellent one. I suggest that those who are interested in having changes made in the law, file with the committee not only copies of their statements, but also the text of the changes they propose. In fact, it is desirable that both be filed in duplicate, so that the members of the committee may have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with such matters prior to the hearings, and thus be able to shorten the hearings.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. Certainly it is the desire of all members of the committee to have all persons who wish to be heard by the committee file in advance copies of their statements and also any legislative proposals which they wish to have considered by the committee. I emphasize the importance of that matter, because the committee cannot again indulge in hearings as lengthy as those held in the past on this matter, which has been sometimes going on for months and months during the past 2 years. The committee now is very familiar with the law and with the changes proposed to date, and there is no reason to spend time unnecessarily going over and over the same proposals, which have been presented to the committee at length in the past.

So I repeat that persons who do not file by March 4 copies of their reports or statements and the text of any legislative changes they propose will have difficulty in being heard by the committee. On March 4 the committee wishes to receive their statements and any legislative changes they propose, in order to expedite the work of the committee, the Congress, and the Nation.

Unless I make this statement some persons might wish to give testimony at great length, perhaps even to such an extent that it would not be possible for the committee to report any bill on this subject this session.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] that Senate bill 50 be recommitted with instructions.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in support of my motion that Senate bill 50 be recommitted, I wish to ask the indulgence of the Senate for approximately 45 minutes. I hope I shall not take more than that length of time to present some of the arguments regarding why I believe the bill should be recommitted.

At the outset, I should like to state that it has been some 13 months since I had the honor of becoming a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. During my service on the committee I have learned to have the greatest respect and admiration for the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. In regard to all matters other than Senate bill 50, he has conducted the hearings fairly and impartially, and in most instances with dispatch. At all times he has evidenced great patience and discernment, and his sparkling humor has always made it a great pleasure indeed to serve with him on the committee.

However, during those 13 months I have observed that even he, with his great talents, still remains human, like all the rest of us. He makes less errors than the rest of us do; but, like the rest of us, he does make some errors.

The senior Senator from Wyoming naturally is anxious, as all the rest of us would be if we were honored by being appointed chairman of such an important committee, to see the committee make accomplishments for the benefit of our great Nation, accomplishments of credit to himself and to his committee, accomplishments which would result in having his great name carved on the records which go down into history.

I know that it was such a desire which caused the Senator from Wyoming to have Senate bill 50 reported from the committee without providing an opportunity for witnesses to be heard and questioned—in short, without having public hearings held.

Mr. President, I believe in progress and in the logical and sensible growth of our Nation. So far as I am concerned, I have no inherent prejudice against the admission of additional States into our Union. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I admit that the general principle of admitting Territories into our Union is ordinarily a good one. That is the way our Nation has become great in size, wealth, and importance.

However, as in the case of all general principles, there are some exceptions. It is incumbent upon us as Senators, and it is particularly incumbent upon those of us who are members of the committee before which these matters are brought up for determination, to examine carefully in regard to whether the general principle of statehood fits a specific case.

The case before us at the moment is that of Alaska. However, at a future time we shall have brought before us the cases of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and I do not know how many others, once we depart from the rule of admitting only Territories which are contiguous to other States or

to other contiguous United States Territories. The staff of the Library of Congress will be happy, I am sure, to affirm the fact that every State admitted to the Union was either contiguous to another State or to a Territory owned by the United States—a Territory in the path of progress and which logically could be expected to become a part of the United States. So we know that, once we have departed from this rule by taking in noncontiguous Territories and making them States, all the arguments that we hear now, which are being made on this floor in behalf of Alaska, will be made, and I think in many instances with much more justification, for Hawaii and for Puerto Rico, and possibly for Guam and the Virgin Islands.

Therefore, Mr. President, this is not an issue to be resolved upon any emotional basis, but rather upon a logical analysis of the facts. It seems tremendously important to me that each Senator should remember that the legislation which we are now considering calls for action by the Territory of Alaska, and that, if it complies, the wheels set in motion can never be stopped.

We cannot compromise with our consciences by rationalizing that some later session of this Congress can correct our mistake if we make a mistake. The proposal before us presents a step which, once taken, is irrevocable and forever will alter the size and the shape and the responsibility of our Nation. I repeat that the permanency of this proposal is, of course, not a bar nor even an argument against statehood. But the fact that affirmative action on this legislation is irrevocable and irretrievable should certainly serve as a caution signal, warning us that it is a matter which cannot under any circumstances be treated lightly or hurriedly.

An examination of the committee record, Mr. President, will reveal that the questions of admitting Hawaii and Alaska as States were considered together; that in discussion of the committee these two questions were handled interchangeably and simultaneously. I am sure the record will show that the junior Senator from Louisiana and the junior Senator from Florida asked that hearings be held on these measures calling for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. Hearings were asked for on several occasions. Finally, after several meetings had taken place, the question of hearings was brought to a vote, and the committee decided, by a vote of 7 to 6, that hearings would not be held on these vital and important measures of admitting two new States to the Union.

Now, Mr. President, it is my understanding that because it was recognized that the Senate, meeting as a body, was so large and had before it so many highly complicated and important matters, that it was impractical for it to examine into the details of all legislation; that better and more expeditious work could be done by dividing Senators into separate committees, where detailed and thorough analysis of legislation assigned to it could be made; where witnesses who were for, and witnesses who were against would have the opportunity to testify; here Senators who sought information and clarification on any questions involved in the legislation could have the opportunity of asking questions of the various witnesses; where Senators could develop the good points and the bad points of the proposed legislation; and, above all, where the current and up-to-date facts could be developed for the record so that the committee could make an intelligent recommendation based on the current facts.

Obviously, the desirability of up-to-date hearings on all important legislation cannot, and I am sure will not, be successfully disputed. Many Senators who are on other committees, their time occupied with matters before their own committees, when called upon to vote on pending legislation, depend a great deal for guidance on the recommendation of the members of the committee which has held detailed hearings on that proposed legislation. Therefore, each Senator has a responsibility to learn all that he can about the good and the bad points of suggested legislation which comes before his committee, in order that he can be of intelligent assistance to his fellow Senators, who in turn are studying legislation before their committees and making recommendations to him.

The opportunity to discharge this responsibility was denied to the junior Senators from Louisiana and Florida. We were prohibited the basic, fundamental right of having public hearings on this highly controversial, questionable, and obviously important piece of legislation. It seems to me it should be pointed out that not only were no hearings held in this Congress on the substantive question of admissibility of Alaska into our Union as a State, but there never have been any full or open hearings regarding the provisions of Senate bill 50, which we are called upon to consider and pass.

Since the last open hearing was held on this subject, some 17 new Senators have been sworn into this body for the first time. There have been no hearings on Alaska held since these men have become Senators, and yet these 17 Members are asked to vote on this legislation. They are asked to be good fellows and to go along, merely because senior Senators were here and can remember some of the testimony of bygone days; and because of this, the new Senators are asked to accept their conclusions and to go along.

Mr. President, I ask you, is that either fair or proper legislative procedure? All of us know that Congress operates on a 2-year period. Every matter of legislation which is pending at the end of any one Congress, if not enacted into law by the end of that Congress, legally dies. At the beginning of the new Congress, in the following year, we take up some of the matters which were not acted upon in the previous Congress; but even so, when we do that, new legislation must still be introduced. Memberships to committees once again are assigned, and each measure is then considered as a new bill which must be acted on de novo by the current Congress. If such were not the case and Congress a continuing body, we might be considering the first bills which were ever introduced, on a variety of subjects; for example the first bill on Alaskan statehood introduced by Representative WICKERSHAM many years ago.

We might have bills before us today carrying the names of Webster and Clay and Borah and Norris. But that is not the case. When the Congress comes to an end, the legislation then pending comes to an end; that when the Seventy-eighth, Seventy-ninth, or Eighty-first Congresses ended, the committees also came to an end, and had to be reconstituted at the commencement of the following Congress. This is done, of course, because all of the Members of the House of Representatives must stand for reelection every 2 years, and one-third of the Members of the Senate are up for reelection every 2 years. Many new Members come in to replace old Members; and the majority leadership sometimes changes. So, quite properly, it is deemed that at the end of the 2-year period the Congress, technically and actually, comes to an end, and every problem which is presented at the new Congress must be newly introduced and newly discussed. That, Mr. President, is only proper. Because of scientific discoveries, because of new responsibilities of Government, because of changing international situations, 2 years is a long time, and much can happen to change the applicable facts and conditions which pertained 2 years previously. We all know of programs which seemed desirable and necessary 2 years ago, yet today they do not appear so necessitous or so urgent.

Of course, Mr. President, few matters now pending are of more importance to this Nation than the issue of admitting new noncontiguous States into the Union. We have heard it argued on the floor of the Senate many times that we have taken States noncontiguous to States into the Union. That point was presented yesterday to the very able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. But we have never taken a Territory into the Union as a State which if it were not contiguous to another State, then, at least, contiguous to another Territory of the United States. Alaska presents a distinct departure from this precedent.

Mr. President, the new members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were told that there were literally thousands of volumes of testimony both for and against Alaskan statehood which could be found in the Library of Congress. As a matter of fact, we were told that the volumes covered many walls in the Library of Congress, and that as freshmen Senators those public hearings, as they were recorded in the volumes in the Library, were available to us. Yet, Mr. President, I submit that we could have searched the Library of Congress for a long time, we could have looked into the records of hearings on Alaska since the first hearing was held, and we would not have found the first word that had to do with Senate bill 50 on which we are asked to vote, for the simple reason that there is no record anywhere of any public hearings ever having been held on S. 50. Surely, Mr. President, the specific provisions of leg-

islation embodying such a radical change warrant the careful study and consideration of public hearings.

The Senate committee in the Eighty-first Congress held hearings on a bill which was passed by the House of Representatives, known as H. R. 331. It was considered 2 years ago. But I submit that there is a vast difference between the provisions of that bill upon which hearings were held and the bill upon which we are now asked to vote.

In order to acquaint myself with the problem I have read some of the past hearings on the question. I have studied the bill, and particularly I have studied the committee report on House bill 331 which was passed by the House of Representatives. As I read the records and the reports many questions came to my mind which I should have liked to ask the witnesses, those who live in Alaska and who will have to live under statehood if it is granted. Many of the questions which I should like to have asked and should like to go into very thoroughly were in past hearings brushed over very lightly.

Then, Mr. President, as everyone knows, there is a vast difference between reading an answer and hearing an answer. Anyone hearing an answer from a witness has the opportunity of looking the witness in the face and observing his demeanor, his directness, and his candor. By that method we have a much greater opportunity of determining the worth of the testimony of a witness. Our appellate courts consider only questions of law on review. The very able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] sat many years as a judge of the circuit court of his State, and he knows that to be an established legal fact.

Many questions which arose in my mind, Mr. President, are still unanswered for the sole reason that I was not permitted to question witnesses. If I did not like an answer which I might have read and wanted to question the witness further, I had no opportunity at all to question him. I feel that the practice of depriving committee members of the right to question witnesses at regularly conducted hearings on important proposed legislation should not be permitted to become an established practice in the United States Senate. If depriving new committee members of the right to sit in on public hearings on questions of importance, such as the pending bill, is permitted to develop as a practice, it could in time destroy an orderly parliamentary system.

On practically every matter which comes before the Senate any Senator can go to the Library of Congress and find much material, pro and con, upon the subject. But is that orderly procedure? Is it fair to a new Senator who has just become a member of a committee?

Let us consider the question of universal military training. Hearings are once again being held on this question in the House of Representatives. As we all know, hearings have been held on it on many previous occasions. Countless hearings have been held on the St. Lawrence waterway, and the same is true with regard to the size of our Armed Forces, and other questions. When such matters arise, the chairmen of committees ordinarily hold hearings, because it is well understood that conditions which pertained to those problems more often than not have changed over a 2-year period.

There was an interesting bit of procedure before the committee, Mr. President, which I think well deserves the attention of the Congress. Only recently the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs took up the question of submerged lands. The able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] had proposed an amendment to the proposed legislation which was then pending before the committee. His amendment would have provided a particular method of using the money secured from the development of the oil found under the submerged lands. The question of holding hearings was discussed, and his amendment was rejected by the committee by a vote of 7 to 4, after which the tidelands bill was reported to the Senate. However, to the surprise of a number of members of the committee a public hearing was called by the chairman on February 7, 1952, to consider the amendment, although it had been previously disposed of by the committee, and the bill which it proposed to amend had already been reported to the floor.

Yet when six members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs asked and voted for public hearings on the question of Alaskan statehood, they were denied the privilege of having such hearings.

The chairman explained his action on the Hill amendment to the tidelands bill, and I will read it into the RECORD. It appears at page 445 of the hearings:

> This meeting of the committee was not called for the purpose of reopening the action of the committee upon the resolution, which has been reported, but was called merely because there was a substantial request for the opportunity by substantial citizens to present their testimony. The Congress of the United States is always ready to receive petitions from the citizens of the United States, and the rule of free speech still applies, so I think if we confine ourselves to listening to the testimony of these witnesses we shall be through very quickly, and the matter will be fought out on the floor of the Senate, as was the desire of the committee, not only with respect to the resolution as reported but with respect to other amendment and alternative suggestions.

Mr. President, there we have an instance of a public hearing being called at the request of one or, at the most, two Senators, on a matter which had already been disposed of which was on a subject no longer before the committee, and which had been disposed of by already being voted on by 11 members of the committee. Yet, Mr. President, look at the other situation, the matter of Alaskan statehood, with respect to which six members of the committee asked for hearings but which were denied.

I cannot understand such procedure when members of the committee who have never had an opportunity to hear witnesses and to observe first hand evidence pertaining to one of the most important questions ever to come before the Congress are denied the right of such hearings, and yet a hearing is granted on a matter already settled by vote of the committee.

There are a number of questions in my mind, Mr. President, about the advisability of granting statehood to Alaska at this time. Since I was not afforded the privilege of taking them up in the committee hearings, I should like to discuss some of these questions briefly on the floor of the Senate.

As I said at the outset, I am not opposed to the general proposition of admitting Territories into the Union of States when they can benefit from statehood, and when it can be shown that they can also contribute to the Union.

The fact of the matter is that statehood, if thrust upon Alaska at this time, could well hinder and harm Alaska's development, rather than help it. Witnesses representing various organizations should have been asked about some of the facts applicable to Alaska rather than have been permitted merely to testify that they were in favor of the general principle of admitting additional States to the Union.

I think it should have been pointed out in public hearings, Mr. President, that if the map of Alaska were superimposed upon the map of the United States, the Territory of Alaska would be found to reach all the way from Charleston, S. C., on the east, to San Francisco, Calif., on the west.

We would find that that vast territory contained some 375 million acres of land. We would find that Alaska has a coast line longer than the entire coast line of the continental United States. We would find, however, that in that vast territory there were only 108,000 civilians, and that of that number 35,000 were natives—Aleuts, Eskimos, or Indians.

In all the history of the United States, Mr. President, no State has ever been admitted to the Union with so small a population, compared with the total population of the United States, at the time of admission, as would be that of Alaska if it were admitted to the Union this year. It is no test to say that when Florida was admitted back in 1845 its population was only 70,000. At the time when Florida was admitted to the Union there were only 20 million people in all the United States. The percentage of Florida's population in proportion to the total population of the United States was much higher than the percentage of Alaska's population is to the 150 million people in the United States today.

Because of the vastness of Alaska, and its small population, if we admitted Alaska to the Union this year, there would be fewer people per square mile than in any Territory that has come into the Union—less than one civilian for every five square miles.

It seems to me that there should have been pointed out at the public hearing the fact that on a basis of proportionate population and density of population we would be lowering the bars to a level to which they have never before been lowered.

Unlike other Territories, Mr. President, Alaska today is not a burgeoning, growing, or expanding Territory. On the contrary, while it is true there has been some small percentage of growth in Alaska, if we eliminate the military population now there the growth will be found to have been but 2 or 3 percentage points higher than the growth of the State of Florida, and it is not any higher than the growth of the State of California in the past 10 years.

Of course, it is easy to talk about the percentage of growth because we are dealing with small figures in Alaska. Whenever you begin with small numbers it takes only a slight increase to have a big percentage of gain. I know that in my State during the last election there was one precinct which increased its vote by 100 percent. It went from three to six. Yet that 100 percent does not mean too much in actual numbers.

We know, as a matter of fact, that in Alaska in 1947 some 31,163 acres were filed upon for homesteading. Yet in 1951 only 18,143 acres were filed upon for homesteading, indicating a decrease of almost 50 percent.

The number of farms has been reduced in the past 10 years. Ten years ago there were 623 farms in all Alaska. According to recent information, by 1950 there were only 525 farms. There are more farms than that in Montgomery County, Maryland. There is hardly a county in the State of Oregon, represented in part by the able senior Senator from that State [Mr. CORDON], who now sits before me, that does not contain more than 525 farms.

The Federal income-tax returns reveal that from 1945 through 1950 the income decline in the Territory of Alaska, and was only revived after the Korean war broke out, and the Federal Government, through the military department, put tremendous sums of money into Alaska.

According to testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which I was not able to hear at first hand, but which I dug out of records in the Library of Congress, as I was advised to do, I learned that the salmon industry is declining. Its volume of production has decreased. I found that the mining industry, which 10 years ago was employing approximately 8,000 men, is today employing only about 2,000.

I cite these figures only to show that the people of Alaska today are having such econuomic difficulties that they are already having a hard time meeting the costs of their Government. The figures show that with the costs of their present Territorial government they are having to pay a higher per-capita tax than the citizens of any State are having to pay for their State government. Yet even the proponents of statehood for Alaska will admit that the cost of carrying on the statehood government today will be anywhere from 50 to 100 percent more than the present cost. People who are thinking about going to Alaska to homestead would not like the idea of having their taxes increased 100 percent, and the increase in the already heavy burden on the people would be certainly an odd inducement to offer to get settlers to travel to Alaska to develop a new State.

Mr. President, several witnesses, who were in favor of statehood, came before the House committee when it was holding hearings on House bill 331. They testified that anyone who was thinking of going to Alaska to homestead should have $5,000 in his pocket, and, in their own words, "an awful good credit." If a man has $5,000 in his pocket, and if in addition to that he must have the cost of transporting his family approximately 4,016 miles, which is the distance from Chicago to Anchorage, such a man is so well off that undoubtedly he is not going to leave the United States and go to Alaska, that beautiful, but, nevertheless, rugged frontier country.

The other day I listened to an argument with respect to statehood as it affects our national defense. It seems to me that questions on this subject should have been asked of expert witnesses. It seems to me that the actual situation should have been developed before the committee this year, so as to show whether or not its was necessary, from the standpoint of proper defense, that Alaska be a State. I know that many persons have been quoted on this subject. General Eisenhower has been quoted to the effect that Alaska is the number 1 trouble spot of the world today. However, I wish to refer to the statement by Rear Adm. Ralph Wood, World War II commandant of the Seventeenth Naval District which comprises Alaska. He said:

> In my opinion it makes no difference whether Alaska is a State or a Territory, so far as national defense is concerned. Were Alaska to become a State tomorrow, it would not alter, I am sure, the general over-all consideration of our defense problems. The question of national defense is not germane to the issue.

It was interesting to me to read the committee report on the bill. Of course no hearings were held, but the committee wrote a report anyway. It very frankly stated:

> The committee recognizes that, from the point of view of military tactics, strictly speaking, statehood would work no immediate changes in the military situation with respect to Alaska.

Everyone of us knows that one of the saddest sights to be seen when a war overwhelms a land is the spectacle of many helpless civilians walking up and down the highways, with everything they own on their backs. We all know that if Russia should decide to attack us from the Bering Straits, and into Alaska, if she should suddenly happen to take a road or knock out a granary, or capture food supply stores, it would place upon the backs of the military the responsibility for feeding the civilians in that area and evacuating them. It would give the military a greater cause for worry than they probably would have in contending with the Russians. That has been the history of warfare wherever warfare has involved great populations.

Yesterday I happened to overhear the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] say that we had to take Alaska into the Union in order to convince the people of the world that we are really democratic, and to prove to the world that we love our fellow men. It seems to me that if we were forced to take Alaska in as a State before Alaska is ready, the only thing it would demonstrate would be that we could be forced into untenable positions by very small criticism.

Did we not enter World War I to save the world for democracy, and suffer in the neighborhood of 364,000 casualties? Did we not enter World War II again to save the world for democracy and prove our love of our fellow men? It cost us in the neighborhood of $330,000,000,000, and approximately 317,000 dead. Did we not enter Korea to preserve the right of people to have self-government? Thus far that operation has cost us more than $10,000,000,000, and more than 100,000 casualties.

Have we not spent $12,500,000,000 on the Marshall plan, to help preserve the democracies of Europe, all of which represents great sacrifice on the part of the American people? Have we not spent, under point 4, many billion dollars to prove our willingness to help other people?

To say that those who have heretofore been unconvinced of our democratic views would be forced to change their minds by reason of our granting statehood to some 108,000 people seems to me to be a rather ridiculous argument.

As we talk about the tremendous financial cost of statehood to the people of Alaska, I wonder if they themselves have not discovered that perhaps at the present moment they do not want to add that burden to their other problems of distance, weather, and high transportation rates.

At the last session of the legislature in Alaska two resolutions were considered. One of them was called memorial No. 26. It urged the Congress of the United States to grant immediate statehood to the Territory of Alaska. The other resolution was No. 36. It urged the Congress of the United States to give Alaska the authority to elect its own governor and own judges. The latter resolution was passed. The legislature voted in favor of urging the Congress to give Alaska the right to elect its own governor; but it did not vote in favor of memorial No. 26—the resolution urging the Congress of the United States to grant statehood to Alaska. Is it any wonder that it did not?

The people of Alaska know, from an examination of the figures, that the cost of statehood would increase the burden of taxation on them by 100 percent. When the proponents were here several years ago testifying as to how much statehood would cost, they admitted that it would cost in the neighborhood of $5,000,000. As estimates indicating how they arrived at that figure, they said, for example, that the care of the insane would cost $200,000; that the Governor's office and the office of the Secretary of State would cost $50,000; that road maintenance would cost $2,000,000. All expenses now being paid by the Federal Government. Yet we find the Federal budget for 1953 has the following items for Alaska: With respect to care of the

insane, the cost, instead of being $200,000, is $559,000. For the Governor's office, instead of $50,000, the amount is $112,000. Instead of road construction and maintenance costing $2,000,000, as had been estimated, the cost is $3,300,000.

That is only the beginning of the cost. Is it any wonder that the people of Alaska themselves have not been enthusiastic or vigorous in bringing about a resolution urging the Congress of the United States to grant them statehood at this time? As a matter of fact, we all know that when the referendum was held in 1946, of the four geographical and judicial divisions, two of them voted against it. The vote was only 9,630 for, and 6,822 against. Certainly that is no thundering majority—only 9 percent of the 108,000 civilians.

The reason those people have great doubt about the proposal is that they recognize that under present conditions the cost of statehood will not be an inducement to people to go to Alaska and develop the land. With its rugged climate and great geographical distance from the United States already deterring development, the high cost of operating under statehood is a burden of compelling significance. Congress can best help the people of Alaska and help the Territory of Alaska to develop, by breaking the tight stranglehold which the Department of the Interior today has on 99.4 percent of all the land in Alaska. That is the way the Congress can be of use to the people of Alaska. Let us develop the Territory of Alaska by affording inducement to a sufficient number of people to go there, so that they can finally carry their own load. What the Congress should do is require that the Department of the Interior to divest itself of about half the land which today it holds in Alaska, turn it over to Alaskans, and allow them to open it up for homesteading. The way the Congress of the United States can help the people of Alaska is to answer the plea of the people of Alaska to be allowed to elect their own Governor, just as Puerto Rico has the right today.

The people of Alaska want the right to select their own judges. The Puerto Ricans have such a right. The people of Alaska want to travel up the road of more and more self-government.

The way the Congress of the United States can help the Alaskans, and help the Territory of Alaska to develop, is to give them help as I have described.

Senate bill 50, which is now pending, does none of these things. It would release 20,000,000 acres of land 5 years after statehood had been granted; but with 20,000,000 acres of land being turned over to Alaskans, the Department of the Interior would still be left in control of 93 percent of all the land in Alaska. Alaska needs the opportunity to be free from the heavy, deadening hand of bureaucracy which has held it back for so many years. What the people of Alaska need is an opportunity to open up their lands, and to prove to the people of the United States that they have an attractive place, with a strong economy that can sustain a larger population. After that it can benefit from statehood, and contribute something to the Union.

One of the deplorable results of not having hearings on this question is that there are many questionable features about the bill itself. I feel reasonably certain that if the people of Alaska had had an opportunity to testify on the pending bill they would have opposed certain features of it. One of them I wish to talk about at the present time.

Mr. President, I wanted to ask the proponents of the bill a number of questions with reference to certain of its provisions. I wanted to ask them what they thought of section 1 of Senate bill 50, which is radically different from House bill 331, as it was passed by the House in 1950 and as it was when the Senate last held hearings on it. House bill 331 contained this language:

> That all that part of the United States now embraced by the Territory of Alaska, including a distance of one marine league from the line of coast, shall become the State of Alaska.

The Senate committee changed the language of H. R. 331 to read as follows:

> That the inhabitants of all that part of the United States now constituting the Territory of Alaska, as at present described, may become the State of Alaska as hereinafter provided.

A number of questions immediately arise in connection with the change in the language. However, when S. 50 came before our committee in executive session—it had already been drafted by someone—the language of H. R. 331 had again been changed to read:

> That the inhabitants of all that part of the United States now constituting the Territory of Alaska, as at present described, are hereby authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State government, with the name aforesaid, which State, when so formed, shall be admitted into the Union, and that the said State of Alaska shall consist of all the Territory now included in the said Territory of Alaska, all as hereinafter provided.

By this change the Senate committee has radically altered the House version of the last Congress. It has struck out the provision which said that the area of the new State shall include "a distance of one marine league from the line of coast." In effect, it has removed the guaranty to the State of Alaska that it owns the submerged lands one marine league from its coast line.

Obviously, Mr. President, those who wrote the bill intended that Alaska should definitely not own that one marine league of land from the coastline. That conclusion is inescapable. Otherwise why are the words of the House bill, on which Senate committee hearings were held and approved, changed without hearings? What reason could there be for not giving Alaska this guaranty?

The act of Congress admitting the great State of Oregon into the Union specifically set out the boundary as "one marine league from the coast line."

The presidential proclamation admitting the rich and influential State of Washington into the Union gives full validity to the Constitution of the State of Washington, which defined its boundary as "one marine league from the coast line." The 1850 act of Congress admitting California as a State into the Union set the boundary of the State of California as being "3 English miles at sea," which is one marine league.

Why should Alaska be denied the same right which is given to the other Pacific Coast States?

Mr. President, I remind you that Alaska has the longest coast line of any State in the Union. As a matter of fact, it has more coast line than all the States of the Union combined.

The inhabitants of Alaska hope that they may discover oil. Indications are that oil might be discovered in the submerged lands. In the recorded testimony before the committee they testified that they consider their fisheries—the marine life just under the water off the coastline—as one of their most valuable rights. Yet those who urge this proposed legislation as now drafted would take this valuable asset away from the people of Alaska.

It seems to me that the people of Alaska should have an opportunity to come before the committee to say whether they agree to it. Even Governor Gruening was not called to answer the question. Why has Alaska had its submerged lands taken away? I say it is because this bill was written or drafted originally by the Department of the Interior and hearings held in the confines of the committee, with no public hearings held.

Mr. President, I believe that the answer as to why the language was changed lies in the fact that those who were responsible for the handling of section 1 are some of the same persons who sponsor legislation placing the title of submerged lands in the Federal Government.

Senate bill 50, as it is written, would constitute an opening wedge in the efforts of those who maintain that the Federal Government owns the submerged lands of the coastal States.

If Senate bill 50 is passed in its present form it could be argued that, since it was obviously the intent of Congress to deny Alaska title to its submerged coastal land, it must be the intent of Congress to agree with the present Supreme Court decision which departed from previously established law of approximately 52 decisions, which held that the submerged land for one marine league belongs to the coastal States.

Mr. President, I fail to see how any Senator from Oregon, Washington, California, Texas, Louisiana, Florida, or any coastal State who professes to believe that the coastal States own their submerged lands, out to one marine league, or further, could possibly support the pending bill, even though he may want to grant immediate statehood to Alaska.

The language of section 1, however, involves more than merely statehood for Alaska. It has been subtly inserted in the bill to resolve the question of title to submerged lands. I believe that every Senator interested in the tidelands issure or the submerged lands problem should take heed, and be warned.

How can the Senators from California and Texas and Louisiana, who are taking such a vigorous position that States

should own their tidelands, vote for statehood for Alaska under this bill, which takes away the submerged land and tidelands from Alaska and affirms the decision of the Supreme Court? How can they logically vote for this bill this week when next week we will have before us the quitclaim bill, which is a 100-percent reversal of this provision of S. 50.

No, Mr. President, I can see the Senate getting itself bogged down considerably, running one way one week, in affirming the Supreme Court decision in passing this statehood bill, and next week rushing frantically in the other direction on the question of who owns the tidelands. I do not think the Senate should be put in that position.

This is another reason why it is essential that hearings be held on matters like this which are of such grave importance. How can we vote today to take away the submerged lands from Alaska and next week, in following the requests of the Senators from California, Texas, Louisiana, and Florida, vote to give back to California, Louisiana, Florida, Oregon, and Texas their submerged lands?

Alaskans might not like having their land taken away one week and the following week see similar land given to the other States. By all logic and by all sense of reason it seems to me that if we vote in favor of Senate bill 50 as it is now written the Senate will be estopped from voting for any such thing as a quitclaim bill when that bill comes before the Senate.

Again, Mr. President, it seems to me that this matter is of such importance to the people of Alaska, with its tremendous resources offshore, that they should have been asked whether they would approve of this proposed legislation.

When this matter of Alaska not getting its tidelands was brought to the attention of Delegate BARTLETT, of Alaska, he submitted a memorandum to each member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, expressing this opinion:

> If there is any question whatsoever on this subject, I naturally would want to see Alaska's interests fully protected. But in this, as in other related matters, I have placed reliance upon the proposition that it is a well-settled ruling that a State shall be admitted to the Union upon a basis of full equality with the other States. In the long run, that would constitute absolute protection.

I note that Delegate BARTLETT states that he would like to have Alaska's rights fully protected, and by implication it can be assumed that he would be concerned over the question of tidelands, if he thought that the State of Alaska's rights were in any way to be minimized by this proposed legislation. He places his confidence in the rule that a State shall be admitted to the Union only on a basis of equality with other States. It is true that States are admitted on a basis of full equality with other States. However, when it comes to designating the geographic boundaries, those boundaries can definitely be limited by specifications in the enabling act, which is what Senate bill 50 amounts to.

If by this bill we take away from Alaska the marginal land extending one marine league out to sea, and if at a subsequent time we pass a quitclaim bill giving back to the coastal States that which they believed they always had, Alaska could not get her submerged lands, because from the time of the enactment of the original legislation admitting Alaska to statehood she was never given one marine league out to sea.

At the time when the other 35 States were taken into the Union, Supreme Court decisions had confirmed the well established rule that each coastal State owned the soils below the ocean to a distance of one marine league from the line of the coast. However, today the question of the marginal lands is in issue because of three recent Supreme Court decisions. Now the fact the Senate committee has deliberately stricken from its present bill the words "including a distance of one marine league from the line of the coast" would have to be reasonably interpreted as meaning that it was the intent of Congress specifically to exclude this area from the boundaries of Alaska.

In other words, if at a subsequent time the Congress were to decide that it wished to pass a quitclaim bill giving back to the States what they always claimed, Alaska still would not be able to have her marginal lands, because the marginal lands to a distance of one marine league were never given to Alaska at any time.

So, Mr. President, I should have liked to have had an opportunity to raise this issue in public hearings on this bill. It seems to me that all the proponents of statehood could well acquaint themselves with this particular problem and decide whether there is need for such great rush and great haste before the matter of who owns one marine league to sea is settled.

Let us remember that New Mexico waited some 62 years before becoming a State. Utah waited 46 years. Arizona waited 49 years. I wonder if the people of Alaska are willing to exchange the most valuable resource they have for immediate statehood. I do not believe the people of Alaska want to do that; I do not think they want to make such an exchange.

Mr. President, this bill can be improved and should be improved in many particulars. I am confident that many of the people of Alaska and the most enthusiastic proponents of statehood for Alaska would wish to have major changes made in this proposed legislation if given the opportunity.

I remind you, Mr. President, that this bill has come to the floor of the Senate without public hearings, without an opportunity for the people of Alaska or the proponents of statehood or the opponents of statehood to state what they like or what they do not like about the present legislative proposal.

In reading the record of the Senate hearings in 1950 on House bill 331, which was the predecessor of the S. 50, I was impressed by what the very able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said on this particular problem of hearings. As shown on page 164 of the hearings, the Senator from New Mexico said the following:

> You are certainly not outside of your rights in saying you want immediate statehood, and I think the delegation down here and the sentiment in Alaska indicates that immediate statehood is desired, and I think this committee, although I cannot speak for the other members, but as one member of it, I would like to see you have statehood immediately, but I do not see how you can have it without consideration being given to this bill line by line. There are questions in it that we may not understand.

The Senator from New Mexico was not talking then about Senate bill 50, because such consideration has not been given to Senate bill 50. The Senator from New Mexico was talking about House bill 331.

He said, further:

> If, as the result of that study, we may come to the conclusion that an amendment is necessary, that is perhaps unfortunate, but that is, nevertheless, inevitable.
>
> • • • • •
>
> I believe it is part of my responsibility as a Member of this body, and I think every member of the committee feels we ought to go carefully into every measure of this bill. I think if I did that and came out with some amendments that the people in Alaska might think would defeat statehood but which might not actually be the case, we are discharging our normal responsibilities as members of the committee.

Mr. President, as a rhetorical question, I ask the able Senator from Oregon or any other member of the committee whether this kind of careful attention was given to Senate bill 50. Of course, the Senator from Oregon knows, as does every other member of the committee, that careful attention was not given to Senate bill 50 at executive hearings and no public hearing was ever held upon this bill.

At the hearing on House bill 331, the able and forthright Senator from New Mexico went on to say:

> I don't question your rights in having the bill for immediate statehood passed, I realize you are well within your right to hope that this bill might do it just as it is drawn, but I don't think that absolves us from any responsibility to look at it carefully.

Mr. President, I wish to say that in connection with the responsibility of the committee, I am in the heartiest accord with the Senator from New Mexico. I feel that he has done an excellent job in expressing his conclusions and in stating the duties of congressional committees.

However, the hearings to which he referred were not held in the Eighty-second Congress—the Congress in which we are now meeting. The hearings to which the Senator from New Mexico referred were held in the Eighty-first Congress, at a time when the junior Senator from Louisiana and the junior Senator from Florida were not members of the committee. Those hearings were held, not on Senate bill 50, which we now are asked to vote upon, but on a bill which is radically different from the bill now before us.

Although I gained much information from reading the record of the hearings on House bill 331, I still am of the opin-

ion that all members of the committee are entitled to be present at public hearings, where they should have the right to ask questions of the witnesses, and where the witnesses have a right to appear either for or against the bill or any of its provisions. I feel that that is only proper legislative procedure.

Mr. President, I should like to have gone into this subject even more fully. I said I would speak for only about 45 minutes. It seems now that I have talked a little longer than that. I shall try to conclude my remarks by saying that I still would like to ask many questions of witnesses. Those who favor statehood for Alaska and those who are opposed to it. The more I have read the record, the more I have become convinced that questions should be asked. Facts need to be developed.

The more I have studied the matter of statehood for Alaska, the more I have become convinced that the only way we can help Alaska is not to thrust statehood on Alaska. To do so is to raise the taxes in Alaska almost 100 percent above what they are today, and today the average percapita tax is higher than that of any State in the Union; the granting of statehood to Alaska will in no way attract people to Alaska or encourage the development of Alaska. All the talk about Alaska's being the world's danger spot is no way to cause the development of Alaska. People do not like to go to what may be a no-man's land in the future.

I believe that the way for Congress to help Alaska is to get busy on the matter of breaking the stranglehold of the Department of the Interior on Alaska. I think Congress should get busy on the matter of giving the people of Alaska the right to elect their own governor and their own judges and the right to run their own affairs insofar as it is possible.

I think the Congress can help Alaska by divesting the Department of the Interior of about one-half of the 99 percent of the land of Alaska which the Department of the Interior now has a strangle hold on.

Again let me say, Mr. President, that I do not in any way approve of the manner in which this bill was brought to the floor of the Senate of the United States.

I could have been a nice fellow, and have said that I have great confidence in the chairman of the committee—and I do have, and certainly there is no one whom I consider a finer man than the senior Senator from Wyoming. However, the people of my State did not send me here to take orders from the great and distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming. They did not send me to the Senate to be a good fellow and to go along with a general principle, merely because a great many people thought the general principle was a good idea. They sent me to the Senate to serve as a member of a committee and to inquire into the facts regarding legislation which came before that committee, and to attempt to educate myself as to the facts, and then to cast a vote that would benefit all the people of these United States.

I have wondered, Mr. President, in the many times I have looked at these figures, whether it could have been the strategy of the proponents of statehood not to want to have any hearings whatever, in the knowledge that if current hearings were conducted, these rather rugged and unhappy facts about Alaska's going down the road rather than up the road would have been brought out; I do not know. But the fact remains that we did not have such hearings.

I believe that all major proposals are entitled to have a full and fair hearing. I believe that the questions involved in this bill should have been gone into exhaustively for they are of tremendous importance to Alaskans and all the rest of us. This was not done and for that reason I have moved to recommit this bill with instructions from the Senate, that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall forthwith hold hearings on this very important matter. If they are anxious to get this bill before the Senate again, that can still be done; but certainly this bill in its present form should not be brought before the Senate of the United States, with a request that it be considered and voted upon, until public hearings have been held on it.

FEDERAL MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL POLICIES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I should like at this time to offer some remarks with regard to our Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies. It will be recalled that the function of this subcommittee is to conduct a study into the manpower and personnel policies and practices of the Federal Government. My purpose today is simply to remind the Senate of the considerations which gave rise to the establishment of this subcommittee, to indicate briefly its background and organization, and to point out the course which its study is pursuing.

Mr. President, there is little need for me to stress here the fact that effective utilization of the Government's working force is crucial to successful and efficient performance of the heavy tasks the Government has had to shoulder during the current emergency. We all realize that poor manpower practices can clog the governmental machinery, delay or even cripple vital programs, and drain away money and manpower which we can ill afford to squander at this particular time.

Sound manpower and personnel policies are the lifeblood of any organization. In the United States Government, the largest and most complex organization in the world, the need for such policies and the difficulties encountered in seeking to achieve them are proportionately great.

Policies which may be adequate for normal peacetime operation need reappraisal when the Government is confronted with the unique and urgent demands of an emergency. The intensified mobilization program spurred by the outbreak of the Korean conflict has brought a rapid expansion and acceleration of Government activities. Established agencies have been called upon to shift their efforts to important new functions, and to gear many of their customary activities into the defense effort. New agencies have been set up to carry out other programs essential to national defense. And at the same time the Government has had to continue to meet the many other responsibilities which inevitably fall upon it.

One measure of these events can be found in the sharp increase in Federal employment since the Red invasion in Korea. Between June 1950 and November 1951, according to the latest Civil Service Commission report, the Federal working force rose from 1,966,448 to 2,508,190.

These developments have had a sharp impact on manpower and personnel administration in the Government. Large numbers of employees have had to be recruited in order to staff new and expanded operations, and this, at a time when private industry offered heavy competition for many types of skills. A tight labor market increased the probability of a heavier turnover of personnel. The threat of manpower shortage also created a risk that agencies would hoard personnel as a hedge against possible future needs. The mushrooming of defense agencies and the headlong pace of their activities inevitably brought the danger of wasteful and inefficient practices. Nondefense activities had to be throttled down in order to give priority to more pressing defense programs, despite a momentum to maintain business as usual.

At the same time, the urgency of the mobilization effort made it more important than ever that the Government procure and retain adequate numbers of well-qualified personnel, that its employees be channeled into jobs where they could contribute most to the defense program and the Government obtain the best possible performance from its employees in their jobs. Waste of money and manpower became doubly costly, since it cuts into the limited supply of these basic resources available for programs crucial to the defense effort.

Mr. President, the Senate squarely faced the need for a constructive examination into these manpower problems arising out of the emergency when it adopted Senate Resolution 53 on February 19, 1951. That resolution directed the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to personnel needs and practices of the Government departments and agencies. The objective set forth was the formulation of policies for the most effective utilization of Government civilian personnell during the period of the national emergency.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, has viewed this assignment as affording a rich opportunity to contribute to the mobilization effort by promoting the improvement of the manpower and personnel policies and practices of the Government. The task was given the immediate and careful attention it clearly deserved.

As authorized by the resolution, a subcommittee was appointed which, in addition to myself as chairman, is composed of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. President, the first phase of the subcommittee's work was devoted to planning the investigation so that there would be systematic inquiry into the many facets of the Government's personnel structure and to insure that attention would be focused on those problems most critical in terms of the Government's emergency needs. At the same time, considerable effort was directed at assembling a staff of people with the background and competence necessary to carry out an intensive study in this complex field.

After completion of these preliminary steps, the subcommittee staff moved into the actual body of the study. The bulk of this work has been done since October, when the grant of additional time and funds permitted an expansion of the staff to adequate size and enabled the study to extend into many areas it had previously been unable to reach.

It is my purpose today to outline briefly the general subject areas which have been marked out for study and to point up some of the specific problems which are being examined. The staff has prepared a progress report which will shortly be submitted to the subcommittee. After that report has been given careful study, I shall discuss here in some detail the actual findings of our inquiry to date.

Mr. President, I think it is appropriate to preface this discussion of our projects with a few comments on the standards we have set for ourselves in conducting this study. From the outset, our aim has been to make this a thorough and objective inquiry, and I believe we are adhering closely to that standard. Our purpose is to help bring about substantial improvements in Federal manpower policies, not to glamorize our own project by stirring up sensational headlines. I am confident that, with this as our purpose, the investigation has the enthusiastic support of most officials in the executive branch of the Government. Their continued counsel and cooperation are essential if this undertaking is to achieve maximum results. Superficial investigation and ill-considered pronouncements of opinions would only destroy the confidence the subcommittee has so far enjoyed and would disrupt the cooperative relationships we have established with executive officials who have worked in close harmony with our staff. Even more important, we recognize that our findings and recommendations will affect the welfare of two and one-half million Government employees and, through their impact on the operations of the Government, will be of considerable significance to the entire Nation. This is a large responsibility, and we are determined to treat it with the respect to which it is entitled. It is for these reasons that, despite constant pressure, the subcommittee has refused to be stampeded into announcing results of its inquiry prematurely. We are all well aware that isolated facts we may uncover, while perhaps startling standing by themselves, can give a highly distorted picture of the general practice in Government, and may easily be misconstrued when surrounding circumstances are not fully considered. Consequently, we have insisted, and will continue to insist, that findings and recommendations be announced only when a firm factual foundation has been established and after they have been subjected to careful scrutiny. When such an authoritative basis has been laid, the subcommittee will make full report and vigorously press for changes which it is convinced will promote better utilization of the Federal working force and achieve needed economies.

As Senators may recall, the scope of this inquiry was outlined in broad terms at the time the original resolution was proposed. In general, the examination was to be directed at the various manpower and personnel policies which control employment in the Federal service, including recruitment and selection of new personnel, utilization of employees in their jobs, and separation of personnel from the service.

This broad outline has been broken down into specific problem areas of Government-wide importance which are the subjects of the subcommittee's various projects. The more important of these may be summarized briefly:

One project of the subcommittee is devoted to an examination of the policies and procedures for recruiting and selecting personnel for positions in the Federal Government. This, of course, entails the study not only of the recruiting activities of the Civil Service Commission, but of the recruiting programs directly conducted by the various departments and agencies themselves. It also requires inquiry into recruiting practices in the field as well as those in Washington. We are undertaking to determine whether the Government's recruiting machinery is effective in getting the kind of people with the kind of skills needed to meet the requirements of the emergency period. At the same time we are appraising the various recruiting methods in terms of their cost, and in terms of their impact on the basic principles of open competition and selection on the basis of merit which underlie our civil-service system. In particular, I might mention that we are assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of roving agency recruiting teams which scout for new personnel throughout the country. We are also interested in determining whether recruiting practices during the emergency have to any extent resulted in forms of personal patronage displacing legitimate channels of recruitment.

Recruitment is closely related to a second project of the subcommittee, the policies with respect to the transfer of employees within Government. The transfer of Government employees from nonessential jobs into positions where they can contribute most to the defense effort is of major importance during the emergency. From the outset the subcommittee has worked with officials in the executive branch of the Government in an effort to establish a realistic and workable transfer procedure.

One of the most important factors in the proper utilization of employees in their jobs is good supervision. Recognizing this, the subcommittee is making a comprehensive examination of the methods and criteria used in government for identifying, selecting and developing employees to fill supervisory positions. We are determining whether there is a rational plan in all the departments and agencies for the selection and training of supervisors. We want to know whether consideration is broadly given to all qualified candidates, and not confined to those employees personally known to the supervisor or those within the particular section where the vacancy occurs. We want to know if the criteria upon which selection is based are related to the qualities required of a good supervisor, and not limited to mere seniority or technical proficiency. Our aim is to insure that the Government's selection methods result in getting the best qualified people in supervisory positions.

Another subject of particular concern to the subcommittee is the incentive awards programs. As the Senate knows these plans give employees cash awards for outstanding work performance and for suggestions which further efficiency and economy in governmental operations. The subcommittee is confident that such programs are capable of producing impressive savings. We are seeking to determine whether the incentive awards programs are being administered efficiently and aggressively so that they are having the maximum beneficial effect, and whether there is a need to simplify the statutory framework for these programs.

The subcommittee is also examining the grievance procedures employed in the Federal departments and agencies. We want to determine if too much operating time is consumed in handling individual grievances, whether the costs involved are excessive, and to identify any substantive defects in these procedures. Our attention was drawn to cases such as the Campbell case in the Government Printing Office where the efforts to dismiss this one employee cost the Government, according to officials at the Printing Office, more than one-half million dollars. Our study is considering grievances from the ground up, agency by agency, and through the appellate stages in the Civil Service Commission, with the ultimate aim of rendering grievance processes in Government far less cumbersome and expensive without encroaching on their basic functions.

The classification and pay plans in government, including the Classification Act of 1949, are another matter of foremost concern to the subcommittee. The administration of our pay plans to a large extent controls the type of service we will get from our employees. There has been considerable criticism directed at the classification plans because of inflated position descriptions and present methods of allocating positions. Furthermore, no single agency exercises control

over our various pay plans, and some of them are quite divergent in their approach and methods. For these reasons, we are now going into the whole matter of classification and pay-fixing systems to determine which ones are superior from the standpoint of providing Government employees with sufficient incentive to give the Government superior work. In addition, we are considering the advisability of consolidating present pay plans with a view to incorporating the better features of the present systems.

This subcommittee has been particularly interested in the problem of turnover in the Federal Government. There is a turn-over of roughly 33 percent in Government jobs in a single year. This results in a heavy cost due to the disruption of operations and the expense of recruiting and training replacements. Our job in this area is to identify the many causes of this high turn-over rate, and to suggest means of reducing their impact on individual employees.

Another major project of the subcommittee has been an examination into the procedures for laying off employees when a reduction in force becomes necessary. The staff of the subcommittee is undertaking to determine if the reduction in force procedures hamper operating efficiency and if the cost of separating Government workers is excessive. Equally important, we want to determine if it is possible to retain the most efficient employees in Government under the present system. This involves, among other things, an appraisal of the factors governing priority for retention during a reduction in force, and some measurement of the operating costs resulting from the substantial restaffing of Government offices due to the extensive "bumping" processing. We are convinced that large savings can be achieved through the streamlining of reduction-in-force procedures in Government.

The subcommittee is also appraising the effectiveness of the recently enacted Whitten amendment. This amendment provides, in essence, that most appointments to the Federal service during the emergency are to be temporary, and sets up time requirements for promotion. Its main objectives are to restrain the expansion of the permanent Federal working force during the emergency and to check the tendency toward hasty and unwarranted promotion. Whatever the validity of these objectives, the across-the-board application of the Whitten amendment has had a sharp impact on the three major phases of personnel administration—recruitment, utilization, and separation. The subcommittee is making a detailed analysis of the actual operation of this amendment to determine whether it has adverse effects in terms of operating efficiency and administrative cost which might justify consideration of its modification or repeal.

Another part of the work of the subcommittee has been to study the matter of personnel utilization not only in other departments but in defense as well. I should like to state briefly that efforts are being made to determine realistic criteria for the purpose of finding out which jobs can be performed by civilians, and which ones, because of their nature, necessarily require the service of military men. In a study of this type many things must be taken into consideration. We must realize that a gigantic task has been imposed upon the Department of Defense. We must realize also that last year we placed a civilian manpower ceiling of 500,000 employees upon the Department of Defense. I am not here to state that this action was wrong or ill-considered. Most assuredly, it was based upon sincere thinking on the part of the Congress in its honest effort to conserve the taxpayers' money. I do say, however, that it should be definitely determined whether this is the realistic approach and if such a ceiling will bring about the desired results without hampering one of the most important jobs which faces our country today. A thoroughgoing examination is under way. It is not a small job. It is one which must be approached in an objective way and with the use of some common sense.

Our aim is not merely one of appraising manpower utilization today. It is my earnest hope that such criteria and other information produced as a result of this inquiry will be of great benefit to all of us in the future.

Our study of manpower policies in the civil service has led us to an examination of the practice in government of hiring contractor employees. We must gage the extent of this practice, its costs, and whether this practice is consistent with the objective of manpower ceilings imposed by Congress.

Finally, the staff of the subcommittee is gathering material and statistics pointing to actual instances of overstaffing and duplication in various agencies of the Government. It is our practice, when we believe there is a case of overstaffing, to discuss the situation with the agency head and to cooperate with him in finding an appropriate solution. We are continuing to make on-the-spot examinations aimed at detecting waste of personnel by overstaffing or through the unwarranted practice of recruiting standby labor.

Mr. President, the foregoing is only a brief sketch of our major activities. There are other subjects, of course, but I do not feel I should take the time to go into them in this brief resumé. This outline, however, should be sufficient to indicate that the subcommittee is carrying out a comprehensive examination into the program for manpower utilization in the executive branch of the Government, and that we intend to submit each of our projects to careful analysis and appraisal. This requires some hard and painstaking work.

Earlier Congressional investigations and previous studies have been carefully studied. Detailed analysis of the mass of statutes, Executive orders, regulations, and policy directives relating to manpower utilization has, of course, been an essential part of the undertaking.

The heart of the project, however, is on-the-spot investigation in Government offices both in Washington and in other sections of the country. Our primary concern is to determine how the Government's manpower and personnel policies are actually working out in practice. This can be done only through extensive interviews with Government officials and line employees, painstaking accumulation of statistical data, and first-hand observation.

As I stated earlier, the job we are attempting to do cannot be done without the full cooperation of operating officials in the executive branch of the Government. I am happy to state that we have invariably had their wholehearted support. I might mention here that it is the policy of the subcommittee to submit each tentative recommendation to key officials and to interested groups to gain the benefit of their views. With their continued cooperation, this practice will go far toward insuring that the subcommittee comes up with workable solutions to the various problems it encounters.

We have also been greatly assisted by many Federal employees who have offered us their comments and suggestions. During the course of our work we have received hundreds of letters from employees all over the United States. Many have even taken the time to come in and talk personally with members of our staff. In some cases these employees were concerned with conditions of prejudice and favoritism in certain organizations; others criticized practices which they considered to be wasteful; and still others proposed revision of substantive legislation. These comments have done much more than simply assure the subcommittee of the widespread interest in its work. While it is not the subcommittee's function to redress individual grievances, many of these complaints pointed to widespread practices which the staff immediately set out to examine in some detail.

I have emphasized several times that the task before the subcommittee is a large and complex one. Perhaps this needs some explanation. We are dealing with an immense organization of over two and a half million people spread throughout thousands of installations in every one of the 48 States as well as at many overseas bases. These employees work for some 65 different departments and agencies, many of which include a number of quasi-autonomous bureaus, each carrying out a variety of functions, and each with its own particular personnel needs and methods of operation.

An intricate network of statutes and regulations governs the many aspects of the employment relationship between the Government and its working force. There are no less than 1,000 laws bearing on manpower practices in the Government, and at least 10 different systems of handling personnel and manpower management, each with its own body of detailed administrative regulations. This is one of the main causes of the complexity of our task—and, I might mention here, one of our primary objectives is to disentangle this snarl of statutory and regulatory provisions and clear away the underbrush of red tape.

No single group can hope to find all the answers to all the problems in this extensive field. But the subcommittee is confident that our efforts can and will accomplish much in terms of better

utilization of the Federal working force and by way of monetary savings. We recognize that we are dealing with a complicated pattern of practices which has grown up over the past 150 years. This means that we must be alert to gage the repercussions any recommended change will have throughout the rest of the system. But time-encrusted practices which serve no useful function cannot be tolerated merely because they have become a habit.

A number of officials in executive agencies have commented to me that the very presence of this alert and serious-minded inquiry has already spurred them to take stock of their own operations and initiate needed changes. This in itself is an important mark of progress toward our goal of promoting more effective utilization of manpower by the Government.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. SEATON. Mr. President, I understand there is a tradition in the Senate that a freshman Senator should be seen but not heard. Because of the fact that I do not expect to be here for a full year, Mr. President, I beg your indulgence to speak today; otherwise I may be forever foreclosed from addressing this body.

Mr. President, the old adage "There is nothing new under the sun" could hardly be truer than in its application to the objections we hear to statehood for Alaska.

The same type of objections were made against practically every Territory which ever applied for admission as a State. Experience has proved the objections false. California, Oregon, Wyoming, Arizona, Nebraska, and the others have gone on to become perfectly respectable and self-sufficient States despite the cries which were raised against them in earlier sessions of Congress. Each is a credit to itself and to the Union.

It is difficult to believe now that when California's admission was under consideration a little over 100 years ago, Senator Daniel Webster could have said:

> What can we do with the western coast? A coast of 3,000 miles, rock-bound, cheerless, uninviting, and not a harbor on it. I will never vote 1 cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific Ocean 1 inch nearer Boston than it is now.

I am sure some of the dreadful things we have been hearing about Alaska will be as hard to credit 100 years from now, when she is a prosperous and populous State, as are today the harsh words of the old Senator from Massachusetts.

Let me refer to what happened when my own State of Nebraska was seeking admission into the Union. The case for Alaska today is fully as strong, from the standpoint of population, of prevailing sentiment in favor of statehood, of resources and of record of accomplishment under a territorial status, as was that of Nebraska when she was seeking admission.

A bill to enable the people of Nebraska to form a constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union, was introduced in the House of Representatives early in the first session of the Thirty-eighth Congress in 1864.

When the bill was reported by the House Committee on Territories, Representative Cox moved an amendment which read:

> *Provided*, That the said Territory shall not be admitted as a State until Congress shall be satisfied by a census taken under authority of law that the population of said Territory shall be equal to that required as the ratio of one Member of Congress under the present apportionment.

The amendment was defeated on a yea and nay vote by 72 to 43, and the bill was then passed by a voice vote.

In the Senate, the bill was sponsored by Senator Wade, of Ohio, chairman of the Committee on Territories. Senator Trumbull, of Illinois, raised the question that there were not enough people to justify statehood, stating that he was informed the population was between 20,000 and 30,000, and adding: "The number of inhabitants necessary to send a Representative to the Congress of the United States is about 125,000." Senator Davis said it was 127,000, and added that the population of Nebraska at that time was twenty-eight thousand and a fraction.

Senator Foster, of Connecticut, also objected to the bill saying:

> If 25,000 people in that far-off region are desirous of paying the expenses and bearing the burden of a State government, it seems to me wonderful. I should like very much to know how many of the population of that Territory have asked to be made a State. For one, I should not wish to impose upon them the burden of a State government without their asking for it. It will make taxation very heavy to sustain a State government there.

To these objections Senator Wade replied:

> The first objection of the Senator from Illinois is that the population of Nebraska is not sufficient; that there ought to be population enough there for a representation in the House of Representatives. That has never been the rule in the organization of these Territories. I hardly know of one that has been admitted that had population enough at the time of admission to demand a representation in the House of Representatives under the apportionment. Some of them may have had sufficient population but they were very few. Why, sir, Florida existed as a State for a great many years before it had sufficient population to entitle it to representation. * * * You may take Florida, Arkansas, and Texas, and not one of them had the population requisite to entitle a State to a Representative. Texas had two Representatives assigned to her when she had nothing like population enough to entitle her to one.
>
> The next objection is that we are about to impose a State government on a people against their will. I should be as much opposed to that, sir, as the gentleman from Connecticut. He demands of me to know whether it is the wish of the people to be enabled to form a State government. That is the purpose of this bill. It is only to enable the people there, if they see fit, to meet in convention and determine either to have a State government or not.

Adverting to another objection by Senator Foster, Senator Wade continued:

> The Senator is afraid that we shall burden them with the expenses of carrying on a State government. I do not believe they would thank the gentleman for that kind advice. I have no doubt they are able to take care of their own concerns; they are intelligent; they do not want any counsel on that subject from without. If they do not want a State government they are not obliged to have it. The bill only enables them to have it if they want it. Then that objection falls to the ground.

It is interesting to note that the above-quoted remarks on population were the only ones in the Senate debate. The bill came up on April 12, 1364, and was passed by a voice vote.

When the constitutional convention had been held, a bill to admit Nebraska was introduced in the next Congress. It came up in the Senate in July 1866. In response to Senator Summer's question as to the size of the population, Senator Wade replied:

> I am assured by gentlemen who have been there and know all about it that the population cannot now be less than 60,000.

He added:

> The Territory is settling up with unprecedented rapidity; settlers are going in there very fast, as I am informed and believe. * * * I do not suppose that any extended argument need be made on this subject, because * * * when the people think themselves capable of carrying on a State government, when they feel that they would like to have the control of their own affairs in their own hands; it has been the policy of the Government to grant them that privilege. * * * and certainly when the intelligent people of the United States residing in a Territory anywhere have deliberately made up their minds that they are wealthy enough and numerous enough to set up for themselves, their decision ought to be respected.

Senator Johnson of Maryland asked what was the majority in the State that voted for the constitution; and to that question Senator Wade replied: "About 150, I think."

Senator Sumner then said:

> The Senator from Ohio tells us that the majority of the people in favor of the State government was about 150. Sir, it is by such a slender, slim majority out of 8,000 voters that you are now called to invest this Territory with the powers and prerogatives of a State.

Actually, Senator Wade had overstated even this small majority; for subsequently in the debate appears the official certificate of the election from Gov. Alvin Saunders of the Territory of Nebraska, saying that at the election authorizing the people to vote for or against the adoption of a State constitution for Nebraska, the vote for the constitution was 3,938 and the vote against was 3,838—a majority of 100 votes in favor of the constitution, out of a total vote of 7,776.

Senator Sumner continued:

> I think the smallness of that majority is an argument against any action on your part; but if you go behind that small majority and look at the number of voters, it seems to me that the argument still increases, for the Senator tells us there were but 8,000 voters.

Sir, the question is, Will you invest those 8,000 voters with the same powers and prerogatives in this Chamber which are now enjoyed by New York and Pennsylvania and other States of this Union? I think the argument on that head is unanswerable. It would be unreasonable for you to invest them with those powers and prerogatives at this time.

It is interesting to note that the subsequent debate brought out the fact that two companies of soldiers from Iowa, who were not eligible to vote, had voted, and that there was much discussion of the fact that the total vote was small and the margin by which the constitution had been voted infinitesimal; that it was beclouded by charges of illegal voting.

Senator Cowan, of Pennsylvania, speaking in opposition, said:

There are fewer people in the State of Nebraska today than there are in the county which I inhabit in Pennsylvania. Is it fair that their Senators, representing some 60,000 or 70,000 people, shall weigh as much as the three and a half millions of Pennsylvanians do?

Senator Hendricks, of Indiana, likewise was opposed on the ground that the denial of the suffrage to colored men was a violation of the act to provide a republican form of government, and that the 100-vote margin by which the Constitution was accepted was tainted with fraud. He declared his complete opposition to the proposal for Nebraska statehood.

Thereupon, Senator Brown, of Missouri, proposed an amendment that the act to admit Nebraska could not take effect until there had been held in Nebraska an election at which the voters could express their assent or dissent from the proposition to deny the franchise by reason of race or color.

Several other amendments having as their objectives the elimination of discrimination against color in the Nebraska constitution were proposed, but all of them were defeated.

Finally an amendment was presented by Senator Edmunds, of Vermont. It read as follows:

And be it further enacted, That this act shall take effect with the fundamental and perpetuate condition that, within said State of Nebraska, there shall be no abridgement, or denial, of the exercise of the elective franchise; or of any other right to any person by reason of race or color, excepting Indians not taxed.

The amendment was first defeated by a tie vote of 18 to 18, with 16 absent; but later the amendment was brought up again, and, was adopted by a vote of 20 to 18.

Meanwhile, there had come to the Senate reports from members of the legislature that the constitution, instead of being adopted by a majority of 100 votes, had in fact been rejected by 48 votes.

Senator Buckalew further charged that an Indian agent who had been in the State only 4 months not only had voted himself, but had cast the illegal votes of 18 half-breed Indians under his control. He pointed out that 6 months' residence was required and that Indians were also not qualified electors.

These frauds, he pointed out, were on top of the illegal voting of the Iowa soldiers previously referred to, of whom 134 had voted for the constitution and 24 against; and he said they were disqualified not only on the ground of being nonresidents but also because the organic act of the Nebraska Territory provided that "no soldier shall be allowed to vote in said Territory by reason of being in service therein."

The bill nevertheless passed the Senate by a vote of 24 to 15.

The reasons for this favorable Senate verdict, despite the smallness of the Nebraska vote in favor of the constitution, despite the smallness of the total population, despite the cloud which hung over the verdict because of alleged frauds, and despite the issue that had been raised over the discriminations against people because of their color, may be found in the arguments of a number of Senators who pushed the case against the condition of territoriality, as follows:

Senator Howard, of Michigan, said:

I hope that the condition of vassalage, that inconvenient Territorial condition, of which every man who has resided in a Territory any length of time will have seen great reason to complain, will now be removed, and that this intelligent, this enterprising community of pioneers will be relieved from these inconveniences and admitted to a full and complete fellowship as one of the sister States of the Union. I dislike Territorial government; it is the most degrading, it is the most inconvenient, and it is the most corrupting and embarrassing of all governments upon the face of the earth.

Much the same thought was expressed in the debate by Senator Sherman, of Ohio, who said:

I know very well that a Territorial government in a rapidly growing community like Nebraska is a great burden, irritating constantly. Their governor is appointed by the President. He may not have any sympathy with them, although I believe as to the Governor of Nebraska, he is in hearty sympathy with the people there; but he may not be. * * * He is their governor by no vote or voice of theirs. This state of affairs is always unpleasant to a people. They like to have the choice of their own governor. * * * Their judges are appointed by the President. * * * The people of the Territory elect only the legislative government. They have not their benefit of the share of public lands.

Is there any reason why we should continue these people under this kind of pupilage; why we should keep them under this kind of burden, unpleasant, irritating, depending upon the President of the United States for their executive authority, upon judges appointed by him for the administration of their laws, without any opportunity to improve their Territory? Is it right, or just, that for any slight reason we should keep them in that condition? It is always the case that these new communities rapidly seek to get out of the state of pupilage or Territorial state into the government of their own affairs. It is natural that they should do so. It seems to me that this Territory has now within itself all the elements necessary to enable its people to assume their own government. They have a hardy population; they have every advantage that we have. Why not, therefore, let them enter into the race of progress? Until this Territory is admitted as a State they cannot progress rapidly; no encouragement can be held out to them. * * *

Mr. President, is it not the interest of the United States to form as soon as possible all these infant Territories into States? What object can the United States have in holding any portion of the territory of the United States in a condition where it must be governed by executive laws or executive influence? None whatever.

Senator Sherman concluded.

These moving arguments are what persuaded the Senate to vote to admit Nebraska. The House, however, did not concur in the amendment of Senator Edmunds, but proposed a substitute which would leave the question of discrimination against colored people to a future action of the State Legislature. The Senate agreed to the amendment.

Nebraska was now admitted to statehood, subject to the approval of the President. However, President Johnson vetoed the bill.

He vetoed it on the ground, he wrote, that Congress had no right to prescribe the conditions of franchise to a State, and that the matter of acceptance of Congress' terms should be left to the people, rather than to the legislature. As a further reason for veto, he stated that the majority of 100 in a total vote of 7,776 could not, "in consequence of frauds" alleged, "be received as a fair expression of the wishes of the people."

President Johnson's unpopularity caused his veto to be overridden by a vote much greater than that by which the bill had passed, namely, 31 to 9 in the Senate and 120 to 43 in the House.

Mr. President, it was under these inauspicious circumstances that my own State entered the Union. That the circumstances were not unique, and that they certainly are not unique to Alaska, can be demonstrated by referring to what happened in the case of Oregon, now one of our most favorably known States.

When the bill to admit Oregon came up for a second time on May 5, 1858, the Congress having previously passed a bill for an enabling act to authorize the people of Oregon Territory to form a constitutional government, Senator William H. Seward, of New York, spoke as follows:

They are 2,000 miles from the center. It is not a good thing to retain provinces or colonies in dependence on the Central Government and in an inferior condition a day or an hour beyond the time when they are capable of self-government. The longer the process of pupilage, the greater is the effect which Federal patronage and Federal influence has upon the people of such a community. I believe that the people of Oregon are as well prepared to govern themselves as any people of any new State which can come into the Union.

I do not think the matter of numbers is of importance here. The numbers are estimated at 80,000. The present ratio of representation is 93,420, * * * but I shall never consent to establish for my own government any arbitrary rule with regard to the number of population of a State. I can imagine States which I would not admit with a million of people, and I can imagine those which I would admit with 50,000. * * * I shall vote for the bill.

Subsequently in the debate, Senator Douglas, of Illinois, discussing the question of population, had this to say:

Now, one word as to population. I do not think there are 93,423 people in Oregon—the number required, according to the existing ratio, for a Member of Congress. I think it ought to be a general rule for the admission of States to require that number. * * * I brought in this year such a proposition with a view to apply it to all Territories. I was willing to apply it to Kansas now, and to Oregon, if we had applied to Kansas. * * * But, sir, here are two inchoate States which have proceeded to make a constitution and take the preliminary steps for admission into the Union. You have agreed to receive one with less than the population required, and it has the smaller population of the two. Now, the question is, Shall we, after having agreed to admit Kansas with—say 40,000—refuse to admit Oregon with 55,000, as I think she has, or with 80,000, as her delegate estimates? I think it is a discrimination that we ought not to make.

Senator Mason, of Virginia, said this:

Well, where are we to stand, if States are to be admitted into this Union without reference to this population. Each State must of necessity have one Representative, at least, in the other House, and two here. You then have a vote of three in the joint legislation of the country against the half of one vote in one of the States which is properly entitled by its population to representation in the two Houses. It is unfair, unequal, and unjust; it is destroying the equilibrium of our institution. * * *

However, Senator Green, of Missouri, a member of the committee which reported the bill, took issue with Senator Mason. He said:

Is Oregon to come in as a sister in this Republic? She fancies herself capable of sustaining a State government. We see, by clear, moral evidence, satisfactory to anyone who will investigate the subject, that she has at this time about 80,000 inhabitants. We see a train of circumstances directing population to that Territory. We have a reasonable ground of expectation that even before next December there will be more than 100,000 people there. Why, then, should Oregon be kept out of the Union? By the admission of her as a State, we save the Federal Government from all the expenses of maintaining her Territorial organization. If she is willing to take upon herself the organic form of a State, and bear the burdens of a State, why not allow her to do so? Consider her great distance from you, and the uncertainty of communication. Is it to be a mere dependency of the Federal Government? Must it always look to the Federal head, and that Federal head more than 2,500 miles distant? * * * I believe it to be good policy for the Federal Government, and I believe it will be to the advantage and development, and growth and increase of Oregon as a State. While they feel dependent they do not exert themselves. It is a constant tax on the Federal Government to pay for governors, legislative councils, legislative assemblies, courts of justice, grand juries, and prosecuting attorneys. Why not save ourselves from all that expense, when we know it does not endanger the existence of the State to acknowledge her independence?

It seems to me that those words are very prophetic today.

The final speech on the bill was, again, by Senator Seward of New York, who, later as Secretary of State, was instrumental in bringing Alaska under the American flag. In his final argument, which was peculiarly pertinent to the admission of the Territory of Alaska into the Union as a State, he said:

In coming to this conclusion (to support the admission of Oregon as a State), I am determined by the fact, that, geographically and politically, the region of country which is occupied by the present Territory of Oregon is indispensable to the completion and rounding off of this Republic. Every man sees it, and every man knows it. * * * There is no Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, and, probably, no man in the United States who would be willing to see it lopped off, fall into the Pacific or into the possession of Russia or under the control of any other power; but every man, woman, and child knows that it is just as essential to the completion of this Republic as is the State of New York, or as is the State of Louisiana, on the Mississippi. It cost us too much to get it, we have nursed and cherished it too long, not to know and feel that it is an essential part. * * *

Well, then, she is to be admitted at some time, and inasmuch as she is to be admitted at all events, and is to be admitted at some time, it is only a question of time whether you will admit her today, or admit her 6 months hence, or admit her a year or 7 years hence. What objection is there to her being admitted now? You say she has not 100,000 people. What of that? She will have 100,000 people in a very short time. * * *

For one, sir, I think that the sooner a Territory emerges from its provincial condition the better; the sooner the people are left to manage their own affairs, and are admitted to participation in the responsibilities of this Government, the stronger and the more vigorous the States which those people form will be. I trust, therefore, that the question will be taken, and that the State may be admitted without further delay.

The vote being taken, Oregon, although lacking the requisite population, was admitted by a vote of 35 to 17.

There is yet another case I should like to mention. In Wyoming, the State so ably represented here in part by the distinguished Senator who is chairman of the committee which reported the Alaska statehood bill, the situation was similar.

The Fiftieth Congress in 1889 failed to act on the Senate bill to provide admission of Wyoming as a State, although the bill had been favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Territories. However, a majority of the boards of county commissioners in Wyoming had petitioned the Governor of the Territory to issue a proclamation for a constitutional convention, such as had been contemplated in the Senate bill.

The Territorial Governor of Wyoming thereupon issued the proclamation, calling for a constitutional convention for the purpose of framing a constitution and forming a State government preparatory to admission. The convention met and framed a constitution, which was submitted to a vote of the people of the Territory and which was adopted by a vote of 6,272 for, 1,923 against, the total number of votes being 8,195.

And here I quote from the memorial of the State Constitutional Convention of the Territory of Wyoming, praying the admission of that Territory as a State into the Union, which began:

The people of Wyoming, prompted thereto by a consideration of the great importance of an early escape from the Territorial condition and of the rights which pertain to American citizens.

Discussing briefly the grounds upon which the admission may be urged as a right, the memorial then stated:

It may be declared a settled principle of of the Government that territory acquired by the United States is, in the language of Chief Justice Taney, "acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress by absolute authority"; that "Territorial governments are organized as matters of necessity, because the people are too few in number and scant in resources to maintain a State government," but "are contrary to the spirit of our American Constitution" and "are to be tolerated and continued only so long as that necessity exists."

Senator Vest, of Missouri, spoke in opposition to Wyoming's plea for statehood, as follows:

If the question of admitting a State into the Union affected only and exclusively the population of that State, this conduct on the part of Congress might be to some extent excusable; there might be some palliation for the utter indifference with which such matters are now considered. But there is a dual aspect of this question. The admission of a State into the Union affects the rights of the people of every State in the Union alike. The admission of a State here without the requisite population, a reasonable population within the judgment of Congress, directly and absolutely affects the interests of the people in all the States.

Senator Vest was answered by the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Platt:

I want to take up the objections which have seemed to be prominently urged by the Senator from Missouri. He says that two Senators ought not to come here upon this floor from a sparsely settled State with a population which is 151,912, and have the same influence in this body and the same number of votes that the State of Missouri has. What he says about that applies as well to the State of Connecticut as to the State of Missouri, and I say as a representative of the State of Connecticut that I have no prejudice and no objection to two Senators from a new State, if that State is fairly entitled to admission into the Union, coming here and having just as many votes upon this floor as the two Senators from Connecticut, that is older and has a larger population.

It applies to the State of New York as well as it does to the State of Rhode Island or to the State of Missouri or the State of Connecticut. It might be said that New York, with its 5,000,000 people or more, ought to have more Representatives upon this floor than the State of Oregon, with three or four hundred thousand, or the State of Missouri, with its million, more or less—I do not speak by the book. But such has not been the theory of the Constitution of our Government. It was not the theory of the fathers, of the framers of the Constitution. They did not apportion the Senators who should occupy seats in this body according to the population of the States which they represented. The disproportion and disparity existed at the formation of the Constitution. It was never intended that there should be popular representation upon this floor; but it was intended that two Senators should represent each State. If that is so, and it be admitted that, under the general policy of this country and the conditions and circumstances under which other States have been admitted, Wyoming is to be admitted here as a State, then as a State she is entitled to two Senators upon this floor, as much as Florida is entitled to two Senators or Rhode Island is entitled to two Senators or Montana is entitled to two Senators, when New York and Pennsylvania and

Ohio and Missouri and all those States have vastly more population.

That argument fails to the ground the moment Wyoming presents herself within the conditions and circumstances which have hitherto been supposed to justify the admission of Territories into the Union as States; and I say, and the facts given in the report which has been read here show, that if a comparison were made between the resources, the population, the wealth, the character, the stability, the prospects of future growth of Wyoming and the other Territories that have been admitted as States it will be found that Wyoming does not fall below them in any respect, except in this one respect of population required by law for one Representative at that time, and those States are Florida, Oregon, Kansas, Nevada, Nebraska, and Colorado. Up to the admission of the four States at the last Congress, Oregon, Kansas, Nevada, Nebraska, and Colorado were the States last admitted, in the order named, and no one of them had at the time of admission an estimated population equal to the then unit representation. Other States have been admitted when the population was barely equal to the unit of representation. * * * The character of the people has been deemed to be of immensely more consequence than the question whether it possessed just exactly the number, or a number exceeding the unit of representation. * * *

But there is another consideration, and that is whether in the immediate future there is prospect that the population will be great enough so that the unit representation will be observed. Look at Wyoming. With perhaps a slow growth at first, her population is now most rapidly increasing. * * * This idea that we must wait before citizens of these Territories, as good as the men who occupy seats upon this floor, as well qualified to exercise and discharge all the duties of citizenship as the citizens of Missouri, or New York, or Texas, or Connecticut, or Vermont; that we must wait until they get the exact number, 151,912, and have it proved to a mathematical demonstration that they have it before the Territory can be admitted, is a claim which I think ought to find no support in this Senate. It never has found support here hitherto.

Arizona's entry into the Union was accomplished recently enough that an eyewitness account of the objections to her statehood was given a few years ago by the late Sidney Osborn, a member of the constitutional convention who lived to be Governor of that State. Speaking of the early days and the cry which was raised against Arizona, Governor Osborn said:

Arizona's resources, although developed only to a minor extent, were real; but its public revenue was altogether unequal to the building of roads, to securing the various things the desire for which moved the Territory's people to seek self-government.

No great perspicacity was required to discover that the reason for this lack of public funds was inherent in the Territorial revenue system. Taxes were, as a matter of fact, quite low—a condition, other things being equal, usually deemed to be highly desirable—but these other things, such for instance as taxes, were not equal. The reason was that by means of defective laws relating to the subject, corporate property—meaning specifically the property of mining, railroad, express, telegraph and telephone, and private car-line companies—constituting by far the Territory's major wealth, was assessed on a basis representing only an insignificant fraction of its value. * * *

When victory finally came to the forces which for so long had been struggling for statehood—and it is pertinent to mention that internal opposition to this movement centered to a large extent in the interests responsible for the prevailing unequal and inadequate taxation—the problem described was attacked.

A few figures will serve to illustrate the result. In 1911, the year immediately preceding statehood, all property in the Territory was valued at less than $100,000,000. Mining property comprised 19.3 percent of the total, and railroad property 19.1 percent. In 1914, when the State's new tax system became fairly operative, the assessed valuation was $407,000,000, of which 36 percent was mining property, and 22.14 percent railroad property, a readjustment rendered still more conspicuous by fairly adequate assessments of the property of express companies, private car lines, and telephone and telegraph companies. The Territorial levy of 90 cents on each $100 valuation in 1911 was reduced in 1914 to 44½ cents, and there was a proportionate reduction in county levies, while the total revenue of $881,000 for Territorial purposes in 1911 grew to $1,806,000 in 1914. * * *

The arguments against statehood, which were used in Arizona, were insufficiency of population, and prohibitive cost of supporting government. Subsequent events demonstrated that the arguments had no merit at all. It is well understood at the time they were advanced that opposition to statehood within Arizona was confined to industrialists who desired the status quo, and to a few politicians whose views were formed in Washington.

Note what was said of Arizona:

The arguments against statehood * * * were insufficiency of population, and prohibitive cost of supporting government.

Those arguments have a strangely familiar ring as we talk about statehood for Alaska today. They are no more valid of Alaska than they were of the States against which they were earlier raised.

Alaska is as deserving of statehood, and as ready for statehood, and as greatly in need of statehood, to come into her own, as were any of the present States when it was their turn before the bar of the Senate. Let us deal with the American citizens in Alaska no less generously in this matter than were our forebears dealt with in their respective Territories. Alaska, like all the other States, will keep the faith and carry on the grand old United States tradition.

Mr. President, we have heard much from those who oppose statehood for Alaska, and I doubt neither the sincerity nor the patriotism of those distinguished Members of this great body. But I cannot, in good conscience, join with them in opposition to Alaska's plea for statehood, or even in counseling further delay. Alaska, through more than 80 years as a Territory, has long since served her apprenticeship. As an organized Territory—as an inchoate State—Alaska's star has for too long been denied its rightful place on the glorious flag of the United States of America.

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

Mr. SEATON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Nebraska upon his excellent address. It is very informative, and I am happy that he has given the Senate the benefit of his views. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator if he believes that Alaska will develop as rapidly as a Territory as it would as a State.

Mr. SEATON. I do not believe there is any possibility of its developing as rapidly as a Territory as it would as a State.

Mr. McFARLAND. In other words, the Senator from Nebraska is of the opinion that more people would go to Alaska and develop it if it were a State than would be willing to go there and cast their lot with those already there if Alaska remained a Territory. They would want the full privileges of citizens of the United States, including the right to vote and govern themselves.

Mr. SEATON. I think the conclusion of the Senator from Arizona is a very logical one, because that has been the experience when other Territories subsequently became States.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does not the Senator feel that the question is whether there exists in Alaska the natural resources necessary to support the population, and which, if developed, would also support the government?

Mr. SEATON. Yes; I think that is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, and I wish to say again that I am happy he has made such a forceful address and reviewed the debates when in earlier days other Territories sought admission to the Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SEATON. It is a pleasure to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to remark that I count myself fortunate to have had the opportunity of listening to the splendid address on statehood for Alaska which the junior Senator from Nebraska has just made. He has revealed a very broad knowledge of all the facts which surround the problem, and has presented them in a logical manner which, it seems to me, should convince any open mind that statehood should be granted.

I was particularly pleased to hear the Senator's reference to the fact that, in his opinion, statehood will be a stimulus to population, and that the argument that the people of Alaska should wait for statehood until they have increased their population is a false argument which falls of its own weight. The population of every State which has been admitted to the Union has increased after statehood.

Mr. SEATON. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Population does not increase at a rapid rate before statehood. To say that a Territory must have sufficient population before it may attain statehood is to deny to the present inhabitants of a Territory, and to those who would like to go there if it were a State, the opportunity of attaining statehood.

If ever there was a time when the door should be opened to local development, to local industry, and to local mining, now is the time. The records which are

before the Senate are clear that the vast mineral resources of Alaska can best be opened by granting statehood. We all know that the people and the industries of the United States need a much greater supply of minerals from United States Territory than is now available.

It has been correctly pointed out that in the first 50 years of this century the consumption of minerals in the United States, exclusive of petroleum, increased fourfold. When petroleum is included, the increase was fivefold.

Alaska is a Territory which is rich in undeveloped mineral resources. The granting of statehood, with the opening of the door of opportunity to people who desire to seek opportunity, will mean the unlocking of this vast storehouse of mineral wealth.

I am happy that the junior Senator from Nebraska has made the argument so clear.

Mr. SEATON. I join heartily in the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming as to the advantages to flow from granting statehood to Alaska. I should also like at this time to express my thanks, both to the majority leader and the Senator from Wyoming, for their gracious comments.

ORDER FOR A CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, February 25, when the Senate convenes, the calendar be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1045, where the call of the calendar was concluded the last time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF HARRY A. McDONALD TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I give notice that immediately after the call of the calendar on Monday the Senate will go into executive session and proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Harry A. McDonald, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The notice will be entered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Thomas D. Quinn, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia; and

John James Malloy, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to call the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edwin A. Locke, Jr. to be representative of the United States of America on the Advisory Commission of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howland H. Sargeant to be Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

BUREAU OF MINES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John J. Forbes to be Director of the Bureau of Mines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I should like to call attention to the nomination of John J. Forbes, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, which has just been confirmed. The committee held a hearing on this nomination, and thereafter unanimously recommended the confirmation of Mr. Forbes.

I wish to say for the record that seldom if ever have I heard a more dramatic story than that which was revealed about the progress of Mr. Forbes. At the age of 10 he was a breakerboy in a coal mine in Pennsylvania. Although at that early age he had to leave school and to enter the realm of the workaday world, he later found it possible to return to school. He finished grammar school, and took 2 years of high school. He was not deterred because he had not finished. Later he entered college. He became a teacher, and later became an engineer. He has spent many years in the Bureau of Mines, and has made a remarkable record as a safety engineer during that period.

In my opinion, the story of the progress of the breakerboy of Pennsylvania, from picking slate in a coal mine to becoming Director of the United States Bureau of Mines, is one of the thrilling stories of which America has heard so many.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the executive calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lincoln MacVeagh to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter J. Donnelly to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry routine nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the routine nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the routine nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James A. von der Heydt, to be United States attorney for division No. 2, district of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edwin Langley to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harley A. Miller to be United States attorney for the district of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of A. Roy Ashley to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 21, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, February 20 (legislative day of January 10), 1952:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James Clement Dunn, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Italy, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France, vice David K. E. Bruce.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Mark Lansburgh, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years from March 4, 1952. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 20 (legislative day of January 10), 1952:

UNITED NATIONS

Edwin A. Locke, Jr., of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Advisory Commission of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Howland H. Sargeant, of Rhode Island, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

BUREAU OF MINES

John J. Forbes, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

Lincoln MacVeagh, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

Walter J. Donnelly, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria.

ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

Sidney A. Belovsky	Douglas MacArthur 2d
Samuel D. Berger	Elbert G. Mathews
John H. Bruins	Robert Mills McClintock
John Willard Carrigan	Jack K. McFall
Norris B. Chipman	J. Graham Parsons
Franklin C. Gowen	R. Borden Reams
Carlos C. Hall	G. Frederick Reinhardt
Outerbridge Horsey	Arthur L. Richards
John D. Jernegan	William T. Turner
Kenneth C. Krentz	Ivan B. White
Robert P. Joyce	Charles W. Yost
E. Allan Lightner, Jr	
Raymond P. Ludden	

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

Patten D. Allen	Miss Constance R. Harvey
Maurice M. Bernbaum	J. Jefferson Jones 3d
Myron L. Black	Randolph A. Kidder
James E. Brown, Jr	Nat B. King
Thomas S. Campen	Ridgway B. Knight
Joseph B. Costanzo	Eric Kocher
Robert T. Cowan	Edwin M. J. Kretzmann
Richard H. Davis	William L. Krieg
Andrew E. Donovan 2d	Perry Laukhuff
James Espy	Andrew G. Lynch
Willard Galbraith	
Robert F. Hale	
Thomas C. Mann	Joseph Palmer 2d
John Frémont Melby	Edward E. Rice
Miss Kathleen Molesworth	Ral L. Thurston
Charles P. O'Donnell	John W. Tuthill
Elim O'Shaughnessy	T. Eliot Weil
	Fraser Wilkins

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

W. Wendell Blancké	Eldred D. Kuppinger
Byron E. Blankinship	Donald W. Lamm
V. Harwood Blocker	Edward T. Lampson
William L. Blue	William Leonhart
Robert M. Brandin	Aubrey E. Lippincott
Herbert D. Brewster	Rupert A. Lloyd
William C. Burdett, Jr	Edwin W. Martin
William F. Busser	Robert H. McBride
Don V. Catlett	Charles Robert Moore
Robert P. Chalker	Carl F. Norden
Ralph N. Clough	Julian L. Nugent, Jr.
Wymberley DeR. Coerr	William J. Porter
William E. Cole, Jr.	Archibald R. Randolph
Thomas J. Cory	George W. Renchard
Raymond F. Courtney	Milton C. Rewinkel
William A. Crawford	Harold H. Rhodes
Thomas P. Dillon	Maurice S. Rice
John Dorman	W. Garland Richardson
Arthur B. Emmons 3d	Robert W. Rinden
Thomas S. Estes	Leslie L. Rood
Nicholas Feld	Claude G. Ross
C Vaughan Ferguson, Jr.	Terry B. Sanders, Jr.
Dennis A. Flinn	Alexander Schnee
Albert B. Franklin	Elvin Seibert
A. David Fritzlan	Harold Shullaw
Paul F. Geren	Frank G. Siscoe
G. McMurtrie Godley	Byron B. Snyder
Marshall Green	Joseph S. Sparks
Paul L. Guest	Wallace W. Stuart
Franklin Hawley	Orray Taft, Jr.
Martin J. Hillenbrand	John E. Utter
John Evarts Horner	Andrew B. Wardlaw
Robert Janz	George Lybrook West, Jr.
Harry W. Johnstone	William A. Wieland
Easton T. Kelsey	Charles D. Withers
William Kling	
William Koren, Jr.	

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

William R. Duggan	Edward W. Mulcahy
John F. Fitzgerald	Richard A. Poole
John C. Fuess	Leslie Albion Squires
Charles Gilbert	

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Frederic S. Armstrong, Jr.	Miss Dorothy M. Jester
Oscar V. Armstrong	Thomas M. Judd
Quentin R. Bates	John Keppel
George F. Bogardus	Stephen A. Koczak
John A. Bovey, Jr.	George T. Lister
William T. Briggs	Albert K. Ludy, Jr.
Edward West Burgess	Donald S. MacDonald
Gardner C. Carpenter	John A. McKesson 3d
Stanley S. Carpenter	Everett K. Melby
Stanley M. Cleveland	Joseph A. Mendenhall
William B. Connett, Jr.	Miss Betty Ann Middleton
Ralph S. Collins	John Y. Millar
John B. Crume	Daniel W. Montenegro
Richard T. Davies	David D. Newsom
Alfred P. Dennis	Miss Helen R. Nicholl
Miss Eileen R. Donovan	James F. O'Connor, Jr.
Thomas A. Donovan	Miss Mary S. Olmsted
Leon G. Dorros	David L. Osborn
Thomas J. Dunnigan	Robert Irving Owen
Paul F. DuVivier	Arthur L. Paddock, Jr.
Thomas R. Favell	Leon B. Poullada
E. Allen Fidel	James W. Pratt
Seymour M. Finger	C. Hoyt Price
Richard B. Finn	Ellwood M. Rabenold, Jr.
John I. Fishburne	Robert J. Redington
William Dale Fisher	Edwin C. Rendall
David L. Gamon	John Frick Root
Norman B. Hannah	Neil M. Ruge
Charles E. Higdon	Peter Rutter
John D. Iams	Cabot Sedgwick
Joseph A. Silberstein	Miss Mary Vance Trent
Clyde W. Snider	Oliver L. Troxel, Jr.
Ernest L. Stanger	Raymond A. Valliere
John L. Stegmaier	Wayland B. Waters
Richard H. Stephens	George M. Widney
Robert A. Stevenson	Louis A. Wiesner
James S. Sutterlin	Robert M. Winfree
Nicholas G. Thacher	Joseph O. Zurhellen, Jr.
Malcolm Toon	

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

Charles C. Adams	Walter E. Jenkins, Jr.
Norman Armour, Jr.	William M. Johnson, Jr.
John H. Barber	Bayard King
Miss Dorothy M. Barker	Steven Kline
Robert J. Barnard	Francis X. Lambert
Raymond J. Barrett	Herbert B. Leggett
Carl E. Bartch	Earl H. Luboeansky
Raymond J. Becker	Dayton S. Mak
Frederic H. Behr	Doyle V. Martin
James R. Billman	Parke D. Massey, Jr.
Vincent S. R. Brandt	Robert A. McKinnon
Jack B. Button	Daniel J. Meloy
Peter R. Chase	Sam Moskowitz
Thomas F. Conlon	Clifford R. Nelson
John A. Conway	Daniel O. Newberry
Carleton S. Coon, Jr.	John F. O'Donnell, Jr.
Jonathan Dean	Robert L. Ouverson
Robert W. Dean	Charles E. Paine
Morris Dembo	Howard W. Potter, Jr.
Walter H. Drew	Lawrence P. Ralston
Adolph Dubs	Marion J. Rice
Robert W. Eastham	William F. Ryan
Warrick E. Elrod, Jr.	Miss Louise Schaffner
Emmett B. Ford, Jr.	John P. Shaw
Jack B. Gabbert	Matthew D. Smith, Jr.
John I. Getz	Ralph S. Smith
Seymour H. Glazer	Moncrieff J. Spear
Culver Gleysteen	Thomas C. Stave
John D. Gough	Lee T. Stull
James C. Haahr	Godfrey Harvey Summ
Pierson M. Hall	George E. Tener 2d
Charles M. Hanson, Jr.	Adelphos H. TePaske
William N. Harben	Sidney Weintraub
Russell C. Heater	Park F. Wollam
Thomas F. Hoctor	Wendell W. Woodbury
Miss Priscilla Holcombe	Charles G. Wootton
Jerome K. Holloway, Jr.	Mrs. Martha H. Mautner (nee Halleran)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

James A. von der Heydt, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 2, district of Alaska.

Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

Harley A. Miller, of Puerto Rico, to be United States attorney for the district of Puerto Rico.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

A. Roy Ashley, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of Warren M. Kirk et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 21, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Warren M. Kirk, on page 326, and ending with the name of Rudolph C. Vitek, which is shown on page 328.

The nominations of Martin Putnoi et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 4, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Martin Putnoi, which is shown on page 768, and ending with the name of Milton F. Callero, which is shown on page 769.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

Appointments in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Department of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, Eighty-second Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951):

To be captains, United States Air Force (Medical)

James H. Corey, Jr., AO2239990.
Robert A. Flaherty, AO976573.

To be captain, United States Air Force (Dental)

Bob. K. Merrill, AO1786767.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (Medical)

Robert F. Cavitt, AO2239820.
William V. Relyea, AO2213168.
Hal E. Snedden, O2051339.

To be first lieutenant, United States Air Force, Dental)

Philip F. M. Gilley, Jr., AO1907518.

Appointments in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Department of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Jack L. Barnes, AO1910823.
Richard O. Barwin, AO1910825.
Charles D. Bosstick, AO1910832.
Edward F. Call, AO1910838.
Curtis R. Hutchison, AO1910891.
Robert M. Landon, AO1910904.
Carl J. Lauderdale, Jr., AO1910906.
Ralph H. Myers, AO1910923.
William P. Olsen, AO1910926.
James V. Powell, AO1910935.
Henry R. Rieder, AO1910938.
Henry C. Wurthmann, Jr., AO1910970.

Appointments in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Department of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

John H. Bennett	Joe A. Logan
Edward J. Buck, O1341397	Francis C. Van Gorder
David L. Gray	Robert D. Peacock, O1341287
George A. Gustafson	Earl E. Yanecek
Robert E. Henry	

Appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of colonel, with date of rank to be determined by the Department of the Air Force under the provisions of Private Law 368, Eighty-second Congress:

Joseph F. Carroll, AO948277.

Appointments in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, Eighty-second Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951):

To be captain, United States Air Force (Medical)

James L. Eavey, AO1725822.

To be captains, United States Air Force (Dental)

John H. Bonbright, Jr., AO2213522.
Robert R. Hase, AO1697684.
Vernon C. Maggard, AO1906926.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (Medical)

Walter J. Berger, Jr., AO1906214.
Edward Bradford, AO2212261.
James S. Cheatham, AO977698.
Jerald P. Hough, AO1906319.
Bruce C. Newsom, AO1906790.
Fred E. Stull, Jr., AO975550.
Robert P. Sturr, Jr., AO1906717.
Charles W. Upp, AO2238724.
Stanley C. White, AO2214056.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (Dental)

Alexander A. Calomeni.
George F. Coons, AO2087405.
Sidney A. Hagen, AO726775.
Daniel J. McAtee, AO1055663.
John P. Shelton, Jr., O889670.

Appointments in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, Eighty-second Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951):

To be captain

Walter I. Horlick, AO563344.

To be first lieutenants

Charles R. Burton, AO439217.
William G. Catts, AO677980.
Michael R. Donovan, AO1647402.
John R. Frazier, AO411252.
William J. Kelly, AO1852064.
Thomas J. Krauska, AO691644.
Albert T. Nice, AO373954.
Charles F. O'Connor, AO664803.
David D. Webber, AO717928.

Appointments in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Warren G. Berger	James E. LaRue, Jr.
Stuart L. Brown, Jr.	James F. Low
William E. Brown, Jr.	Alfred M. Miller, Jr.
Jules B. Gerard	Thomas L. Moore
Billie B. Hunt	Roland W. Parks
Benjamin F. Ingram, Jr.	George Wray, Jr.

Appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

Jere D. Guin

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The nominations of Murray W. Ballenger et al. for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 14, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Murray W. Ballenger, on page 142, and ending with the name of Doris Cranmore, which is shown on page 145.

The nominations of John P. Adams et al. for appointment in the Navy and/or appointment in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 23, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John P. Adams, which appears on page 455, and ending with the name of Ray M. Burrill, which is shown on page 457.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Cedric M. Powell, pastor, First Methodist Church, Piper City, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, creator of all that is in heaven and earth, Thy name is above every name, and Thy power beyond all power of earthly men. May Thy way be the desire of our hearts and pleasing Thee our greatest reward as we seek to lead our fellow men toward the fulfillment of Thy promise to give us Thy kingdom.

Thou hast given us all things needful for our happiness and peace, but too often our sinfulness has kept Thy blessings from us. So forgive us when we hate and seek to hurt our brothers and use the gifts Thou has given to satisfy our selfish desires.

Help us to live not by our complaints but by our appreciations, and not be weary in welldoing. For unto Thee belongeth all glory and honor, all power and dominion, both now and evermore. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52–12.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION 1171 FROM THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Executive communication 1171 has been referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is a communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense seeking an amendment to section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 with reference to the jurisdiction of Boards of Review—boards created to review discharges of men from the armed services.

While it is true that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has jurisdiction over this law, the Boards of Review are administered entirely by the Secretary of Defense and relate entirely to matters coming within the jurisdiction of the Secretary. I therefore believe that it will be more appropriate to have this matter considered by the Committee on Armed Services and ask unanimous consent that the Executive communication No. 1171 may be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.