By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6957. A bill to provide for the establishment of certain priorities in the awarding of military procurement contracts within regions suffering economic distress through unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6958. A bill to amend the act of May 31, 1940, entitled "An act to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes," so as to require the inclusion of certain stipulations in contracts for carrying the mails by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 6959. A bill to amend section 1699, title 18, United States Code, relating to the unloading of mail from vessels; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6960. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6961. A bill to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 6962. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to alleviate shortages in railroad freight cars and other vehicles during periods of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 6963. A bill to provide that in certain cases education and facilities on Federal property shall continue to be available to children residing in adjacent areas until June 30, 1954; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6964. A bill to prevent the infiltration of subversive persons into Government employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6965. A bill to amend subsection (e) of section 753 of title 28, United States Code so as to fix the salary for reporters in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 6966. A bill to provide for adjustment in the salary of certain rural carriers attached to post offices of the first class; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COX:

H. Res. 561. Creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of foundations and other comparable organizations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 6967. A bill authorizing the issuance of patent in fee to Paul Afraid of His Horses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 6968. A bill for the relief of Maria Buffoni and Emma Botta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 6969. A bill to effect entry of a minor child adopted by United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 6970. A bill for the relief of Araxi Nazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6971. A bill for the relief of Francesca (or Frances) Romeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. R. 6972. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence D. Grimshaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6973. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Phyllis Jackson Grimaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6974. A bill for the relief of the Wilbraham Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 6975. A bill for the relief of Ellen Sonja Sadlowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 6976. A bill for the relief of Henryk Blaszkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6977. A bill for the relief of William L. Gleeson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 6978. A bill for the relief of Gerald A. and Lynn W. Roehm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE (by request):

H. R. 6979. A bill for the relief of Jose Pineiro Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 6980. A bill for the relief of Cha Dong Bok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 6981. A bill for the relief of Betty and Irene Robertson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 6982. A bill for the relief of Panagiotes G. Karras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 6983. A bill for the relief of Gevork Zohrab Bandarian; 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:

618. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of P. W. Goss, 518 Division Park Hill, North Little Rock, Ark., and others relative to the passage of H. R. 4411; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

619. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C. C. Fergerson, president, Jackson Townsend Club, No. 18, Jacksonville, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 1679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

620. Also, petition of Mrs. A. P. Marshall, secretary Orlo Vista Townsend Club, No. 1, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

621. Also, petition of L. O. Robertson, and others, Everett, Mass., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

622. Also, petition of Miss Irene B. Whetstone, Chicago, Ill., relative to renewal of demand for impeachment stated in petition No. 314, dated June 12, 1951, and referred to the House Judiciary Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 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:

Eternal Spirit, in whom alone is the strength of our hearts and the hope of our world, we come in our noontide fellowship of prayer, not so much to seek Thee as to open our fallible lives in penitence and need to Thy waiting strength. Make our own lives, we pray Thee, quarries out of which stones for the new temple of humanity may be fashioned.

In these days of great peril and critical decisions, as against the powers of darkness Thou art unloosing the fateful lightning of Thy terrible, swift sword; save us from all policies whose reaping will be another harvest of horror for our children's children. Give us to know clearly and to follow faithfully the things that belong to our peace and to the peace of the whole world. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 10, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1368. An act to amend subsection (a) of section 1107 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901, as amended by section 2 of the act of December 20, 1944 (D. C. Code, sec. 15–403 (a)), and to amend section 467 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901 (D. C. Code, sec. 16–323); and

S. 2667. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

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

H. R. 1758. An act to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6805. An act to increase the salary of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1953; and

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 664. An act to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," and for other purposes; and

S. 1345. An act to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] may be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow so that he may make an address at the Army War College at Carlisle, Pa.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

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

ENDORSEMENT OF CANDIDACY OF SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of South Carolina has adopted a concurrent resolution endorsing the candidacy of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL and commending him to the people of the Nation for nomination and election as President of the United States.

I am honored to deliver this resolution to the Senate of the United States, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The South Carolina Legislature, in adopting this resolution, has put into words the deep, sincere feelings of all the people of this land who have had the opportunity to observe and know Senator RUSSELL. To all the people who have come to know him as a lawyer, a governor, a legislator, a statesman, and above all, a great humanitarian, his announcement has come as a refreshing breeze on a troubled and sordid political picture.

It is a pleasure to be able to present this resolution, adopted by my own people, to the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and, under the rule, to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution endorsing the candidacy of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, and commending him to the peoples of our Nation for nomination and election as President of the United States

Whereas the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, United States Senator from Georgia, has finally consented to become a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President of these United States; and

Whereas he stands for constitutional government, the American way of life, the rights of the States, and his honesty, integrity, and knowledge of the workings of our Government are unquestioned; and

Whereas Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL is eminently qualified for that high honor, and is a true American Democrat of the finest type who will make a great President and leader for our Nation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Carolina (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do hereby endorse the candidacy of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, and commend him to the peoples of our Nation for nomination and election as President of the United States.

RESOLUTION OF CITIZENS OF NEWPORT, VT., PROTESTING AGAINST HIGH INCOME TAXES

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by citizens of Newport, Vt., assembled at the annual city meeting, which reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the meeting that a stop must be put to the squandering of our tax money by the Federal Government; that relief must be granted to the taxpayers; that our Senators and Congressman be informed that we object to the continued high rate of Federal income taxes imposed upon us;

"*Resolved*, That our Senators and Congressman be informed that their support in Congress of any laws, resolutions or proposals, for the unwarranted spending of our tax money will be condemned by us; that our Senators and Congressman are requested to join with any and all other Senators and Members of Congress in a joint effort to reduce the spending of our tax money; that all bills, resolutions or appropriations be carefully examined to determine if the amounts of money can be reduced or if the projects calling for appropriations can be postponed to later years;

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be certified by the mayor and city clerk and forwarded to each Senator and Congressman from Vermont."

This is to certify that the above resolution was presented to and adopted by the legal voters of the city of Newport at the annual city meeting held at Newport, Vt., on March 4, 1952.

FRED B. CRAWFORD,
Mayor of the City of Newport, Vt.

AUSTIN J. BEEBE,
City Clerk of the City of Newport, Vt.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CHICAGO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE URGING GREATER INTEREST IN REGISTRATION AND VOTING IN PRIMARIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, recently the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce selected Gen. J. W. Hilton as its president for the next year and one of the first actions taken by the chamber under his direction was the adoption of a resolution directing the Americanism committee of the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce to urge a greater interest in registration, voting and the selection of good candidates for public office.

The chairman of this Americanism committee is Vincent L. Knaus, a Chicago attorney, who has done a great deal of work in this field and who has also directed the Americanism activities of the religious liberty committee of the Knights of Columbus. I have known Vincent Knaus a great many years and can testify to the spirited and unselfish public service which he has rendered in the field of Americanism and in arousing the electorate to its responsibilities at the polls.

In this connection I present the resolution which was adopted by the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce on February 20, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO SOUTH CHICAGO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas in the State of Illinois a primary election is to take place April 8, 1952, at which time both parties will nominate candidates for the various offices in the gift of the State, county, city, and other subdivisions thereof, and it is important that citizens vote in the primary and disclose their political affiliations without fear or favor; and

Whereas the first duty of a citizen in a Republic such as ours is voting, which is an expression of party choice at the primary, of certain candidates, and the election of these candidates so selected in the election in November; and

Whereas people have shown a lack of interest to participate actively in politics—which is the science of government—and feel that government should function automatically like a machine, and that participation in politics is too time-consuming and refuse to become acquainted with the functioning of government of the State, county, and National, that it is too complicated and requires a high degree of intelligence and choices are difficult to make and can only be made by carefully going over the records of the candidates and that takes too much effort; and

Whereas politics and government has been now associated with hoodlums, racketeers, and fixers in the public mind, and in no time the worst elements of our population will have control of legislatures (both State and city councils) and of candidates for office who will run our governments, both State and local, so that it is time to be alarmed and steps must be taken to stem the deterioration of moral standards in this field of social science—we have paid dearly for our laziness in the past—because it may seal our doom; and

Whereas a neglected vote, or badly given vote, is a social sin because it gravely harms the community and the very State itself and the same makes the voter automatically responsible for all the harm that follows not only to conscience but to the very soul itself: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Americanism committee of the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce urge all citizens to register and to vote regardless of their party politics at the coming primary, April 8, 1952, and to make a

proper choice of the candidates submitted by both political parties after due deliberation thereon.

Respectfully submitted.

VINCENT L. KNAUS,
Chairman.
Col. HORACE F. WULF,
FELIX V. MENCLEWICZ,
Members.

FEBRUARY 20, 1952.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 171. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Pielecki Kennedy (Rept. No. 1261);

S. 569. A bill for the relief of May Hosken (Rept. No. 1262);

S. 762. A bill for the relief of Alexander Urszu (Rept. No. 1263);

S. 779. A bill for the relief of Ziemowit Z. Karpinski (Rept. No. 1264);

S. 794. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shuting Liu Hsia and her daughter, Lucia (Rept. No. 1265);

S. 1420. A bill for the relief of Pinfang Hsia (Rept. No. 1266);

S. 1469. A bill for the relief of Julie Bettelheim and Evelyn Lang Hirsch (Rept. No. 1267);

S. 1527. A bill for the relief of Sisters Dolores Ilia Martori, Maria Josefa Dalmau Vallve, and Ramona Cabarrocas Canals (Rept. No. 1268);

S. 1555. A bill for the relief of Rosarina Garofalo (Rept. No. 1269);

S. 1855. A bill for the relief of Joachim Volk, also known as Steven Craig Delano (Rept. No. 1271);

S. 1891. A bill for the relief of Lubo Paskalovic (Rept. No. 1272);

S. 2102. A bill for the relief of Alcide Orazio Marselli and Angelo Bardelli (Rept. No. 1273);

S. 2266. A bill to authorize and validate payments of periodic pay increases for temporary indefinite employees of the Department of the Navy within the period of March 17, 1947, to July 1, 1948 (Rept. No. 1274);

S. 2770. A bill for the relief of Matheos Alafouzos (Rept. No. 1275);

H. R. 748. A bill for the relief of Basil Vasso Argyris and Mrs. Aline Argyris (Rept. No. 1276);

H. R. 1416. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Valdengo and Albertina Gioglio Valdengo (Rept. No. 1277);

H. R. 2283. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Yamashita, the Japanese fiancée of a United States citizen veteran of World War II, and her son Takashi Yamashita (Rept. No. 1278);

H. R. 2775. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margarete Elise Vollrath (Rept. No. 1279); and

H. R. 2833. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Bing and Nina Bing (Rept. No. 1280).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 992. A bill for the relief of Daniel Walkonsky, and his wife, Xenia Walkonsky (Rept. No. 1281);

S. 1189. A bill for the relief of Anthony Lombardo (Rept. No. 1282);

S. 1766. A bill for the relief of Frederic James Mercado (Rept. No. 1270);

S. 1843. A bill for the relief of John Kintzig and Tatiana A. Kintzig (Rept. No. 1283);

S. 2051. A bill for the relief of Naomi Saito (Rept. No. 1284);

S. 2307. A bill for the relief of Holger Kubishke (Rept. No. 1285);

S. 2635. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller (Rept. No. 1286); and

H. R. 3668. A bill for the relief of David Yeh (Rept. No. 1287).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 365. A bill for the relief of Anna Krueger, Jean Krueger, and Edith Krueger (Rept. No. 1288); and

H. R. 899. A bill for the relief of Malka Dwojra Kron (Rept. No. 1289).

By Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2677. A bill to restore to 70 pounds and 100 inches in girth and length combined the maximum weight and size limitations for appliances, or parts thereof, for the blind sent through the mails; without amendment (Rept. No. 1292).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. Res. 288. Resolution extending the authority of, and providing additional funds for, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, under Senate Resolution 58, to investigate personnel needs and practices of the various governmental agencies; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1290) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

[redacted], Abramowitz, William, or Velvel Abramovitch.

[redacted], Abramowitz, Fanny, or Abramovitch (nee Feigel Nadler).

[redacted], Aguilar, Maria Asuncion Juarez.

[redacted], Alanis-Carrillo, Joaquin.

[redacted], Allbut, Ena Joyce, or Joyce Allbut (nee Nisen).

[redacted], Allie Abraham.

[redacted], Anderson, Paul Bruno.

[redacted], Argyropoulos, Lukas.

[redacted], Anemaet, Johannes Franciscus.

[redacted], Arellano, Irene Reyes, or Irene Arellano or Irene Emilla Reyes.

[redacted], Arias-Aguilar, Aurelio, or Aurelio Arias.

[redacted], Arias, Juana.

[redacted], Aronis, Antonios Nicholas.

[redacted], Balita, Miti Ndina, or Peet Ndina Balita.

[redacted], Bank, Adolf Christoph Frederich, or Frederich Bank or Adolf Bank.

[redacted], Baranoff, Constantin Alexandrovich, or John Bean.

[redacted], Baumann, Gearge Francis, Jr., or Georg Franz Barron.

[redacted], Beaven, Richard.

[redacted], Becker, Frauke-Virginia.

[redacted], Bendjy, David.

[redacted], Bendjy, Jennie Promnan.

[redacted], Benjamin, Claire, or Claire Cox.

[redacted], Biernacki, Vera.

[redacted], Bjelik, Karos, alias Carl Bjelik.

[redacted], Borg, Spiro Charles.

[redacted], Borriello, Guiseppe, or Joseph Borriello.

[redacted], Bouchard, Joseph Adelard, or Joseph Adelard Viateur Douchard.

[redacted], Brachler, Therese, alias Therese Pichler.

[redacted] Branoff, Endria Eloff, or Alex Eloff.

[redacted], Bratta, Vittorio Galiano.

[redacted], Brennan, Cecile Marie (nee Fortin).

[redacted], Brenzinger, Eric Gustav, or Erich Brazinger.

[redacted], Brock-Jones, Sieglinde Elfriede, formerly Sieglinde Elfriede Liebl.

[redacted], Brock-Jones, Marold (formerly Harold Liebl).

[redacted] Byker, Marie Hooyer, or Marie Cornelia Byker.

[redacted], Caleca, Louise Elena, or Bastianon.

[redacted], Caliboso, Diana E., or Fabiana Hstoista Caliboso.

[redacted], Caliboso, Archangel Estoista.

[redacted], Campa de Mendez, Estella, alias Estella Campa-Lopez or Estella Mendoza.

[redacted] Campbell, Vera Myrtle (nee Goodwin).

[redacted], Capozza, Giuseppe, or Joseph or Tommaso Appolini.

[redacted], Castaneda, Martin, Jr.

[redacted], Castaneda-Palomares, Sarah, or Sara Castaneda.

[redacted], Charchian, Jean (nee Boyajian or Johan).

[redacted], Chavez, Juan, or Juan M. Chavez.

[redacted], Chin, Leung Toy, or Jobco Chin.

[redacted], Choy, Tommy, or Lap Hing Choy or Choy Back.

[redacted] Cimino, Pasquale.

[redacted], Cohen, Bessie.

[redacted], Cohen, Joseph Louis.

[redacted], Cohen, Rose, alias Rose Les Cohen or Rose Kuhowski.

[redacted], Coburn, Wellington Bates.

[redacted], Corvi, Pier Luigi.

[redacted], Christiani, Pietro.

[redacted], Cromwell, Harold Cecil.

[redacted], Dalech, Bernard John.

[redacted], Damonte, Antonio.

[redacted] Daniel, Sylvia Constantia.

[redacted] De Aguilar, Mercedes Beltran Vda.

[redacted], De Canto, Adela Matta.

[redacted], Defever, Lucienne Mary Rose (nee Bessette).

[redacted], DeGomez, Conception Avalos.

[redacted], DeLa Pena, Waldemar, formerly Morgenweg.

[redacted], Delatto, Giacomo Giovanni.

[redacted], DeMunoz, Carolina Sotelo, or Carolina Sotelo or Carolina Sotelo Munoz.

[redacted], DeOlachea, Juana Vasquez-Jiminez, or Jennie Vasquez.

[redacted], DePerez, Nicolasa Vela, or Nicolasa Vela Perez.

[redacted] DeRamirez, Petra Montanez Vda, or Petra Montanez.

[redacted], DeVejarano, Maria Dolores Del Real.

[redacted], Devletian, Reginald Hratchia.

[redacted], Dewart, Allan.

[redacted], DeYarak, Rosina Cota.

[redacted], DeZaragoza, Esperanza Mora.

[redacted], Diamond, Lillian.

[redacted], Diaz, Bernardo Fernandez, or Bernaldo Diaz or Bernardo Diaz.

[redacted], Dicken, Arnold.

[redacted], DiPinto, Donato.

[redacted] DiRosa, Rosalia, or Rosalia Cataudella Di Rosa, or Rasalia Cataudella.

[redacted], Dragotto, Natale.

[redacted], Durando, Pasquale, or Patsey or Patsy Durante.

[redacted], Eckson, Eleodoro Gregory.

[redacted], Eglesias, Teodoro Rey, or Teodor Rey Eglesias or Rey Teodore or Teodoro Rey.

[redacted], Englefield, Rupert Harold.

[redacted], Feher, Istvan, or Stephen Feher.

[redacted], Feloukajis, George Nicholas.

[redacted], Figueroa-Ruiz, Francisco Humberto.

[redacted] Finkelstein, Laura Ann (nee Annie Laura Fields).

[redacted], Flores, Franciso Banda (alias Francisco Banda alias Francisco Banda Y Flores.
[redacted], Foote, Marie Elizabeth (nee Labby).
[redacted], Foote, Howard Eugene.
[redacted], Foy, Henry Lawrence.
[redacted], Friedrych, Elza or Elsa (Elza or Elsa Shatzkin).
[redacted], Frontera, Francesco, or Francesco Frontero.
[redacted], Fujinami, Hirokichi, or Shodo Kubota or Hirokichi Mochida.
[redacted], Gaon, Abrahani, or Abraham Gaonoff or Abraham Rayim Gaon.
[redacted], Ganino, Victoria (nee Maione).
[redacted], Georgeff, Kiril, or Karl Georgoff.
[redacted], Gibbs, Penelope Georgina.
[redacted], Glazek, Judith Agnes, or Judith Agnes Heller or Keller.
[redacted], Glidewell, Dorothy Maud (nee Clark).
[redacted], Golias, Dimitrios Ioanou, or James John Golias or Lampros Lampropulos.
[redacted], Goodman, Ethel.
[redacted], Gonzalez, Miguel.
[redacted], Gonzalez, Eduardo Lopez.
[redacted], Gottschalk, Caroline, or Caroline Specht (nee Caroline Maurer) or Carla or Karla Gottschalk.
[redacted], Green, Harry.
[redacted], Green, Lily.
[redacted], Guarnes, Rosa Miller, or Rosa Manjares Miller.
[redacted], Gutteridge, Albert Edward (Gutheridge).
[redacted], Gutteridge, Harriett (Gutheridge).
[redacted], Hahnel, Karl Josef.
[redacted], Hanson, Bella Elizabeth, or Bella Hanson (nee Della Elizabeth Peres Campbell).
[redacted], Harris, Raymond Lloyd.
[redacted], Harris, Johanna (nee Matiskainen), or Johanna Matson.
[redacted], Hassenfuss, John Herbert, or Herbert Gorit.
[redacted], Hauke, Ferdinand, or Fred Hauke or Fred Henke.
[redacted], Heller, Veronica (nee Kramer).
[redacted], Henley, Alma Zelda.
[redacted], Higashio, Shoichi.
[redacted], Hirdes, Arnoldus, or Arnold Hirdes.
[redacted], Hirdes, Helena (nee Van Der Stroom).
[redacted], Hoffman, Pauline.
[redacted], Hopkins, Bridie (nee Morrison).
[redacted], Hornshuh, Jeanne Elizabeth (nee Moran).
[redacted], Hwang, David Nien-Tzu, or Nien Tzu Hwang.
[redacted], Hwang, Rose Roo-Ma (nee Rose Roo-Ma Hsi).
[redacted], Ibanez, Feliz, or Felix Recopuerto Ibanez or Felix R. Ibanez or Felix Ibanes.
[redacted], Ide, Hiroko, alias Riro Ide or Kathleen Ide.
[redacted], Ide, Sada Abe.
[redacted], Ide, Tatsuro, alias Thomas Ide.
[redacted], Ikeda, Kenjiro.
[redacted], Jimenez-Ramirez, Jesus.
[redacted], De Jimenez, Josefina Perez.
[redacted], Jimenez-Solorio, Justo.
[redacted], Johns, Mary Ellen, or Mary Ellen Jackson, or Mary Ellen Kraskin.
[redacted], Johnson, Sonia Marie Angele, or Sonia Marie Angele Jeziorski.
[redacted], Jordan, Helen W. (nee Eleni Char, Fotopulo or Fotopoulos).
[redacted], Kadrovach, Leoma Beatrice.
[redacted], Kald, Arthur.
[redacted], Kaye, Marilyn Lucille (nee Fitzgerald).
[redacted], Keller, Max, or Matei Keller.
[redacted], Keller, Katharina, or Katherina Keller (nee Wagner).
[redacted], Kelley, Madeleine Ethel (nee Madeline Ethel Lowrie).
[redacted], Kessner, Philip F. Keschner or Solomon Kessner or Solomon P. Kessner.
[redacted], Kielczewski, Peter Paul, or Frank Zuk.
[redacted] Kim, Young Whee (nee Chung), or Moe Ja Chung Kim.
[redacted] Kim, Kwang Won, or Yong Duk Kim or Kim Kwang Won.
[redacted] Kjolier, Ejner Viggo Gedeson, or Harry Koller.
[redacted], Kleitsch, Benedick, or Benny Klein.
[redacted], Koenig, Gertrude Irmgard (nee Brender), or Thude Keoneg.
[redacted] Kolitsos, Gust, or Kostas Socrates Kolitsos.
[redacted] Kollias, Anastsios Theodorou, or Tom Poulos.
[redacted], Koretzky, Ernst, or Ernest Albert or Ernst or Ernest Koretsky or Koretski or Ernest Mally.
[redacted], Kostelic, Jakob, or Jacob Costello.
[redacted], Kurtz, Sam, or Samuel Balin.
[redacted], Lee, Sidney Ernest.
[redacted], Latokaw, Marof Din, or Marof D. Latokaw or Gani.
[redacted], Lazarides, Lazarus Nicholas, or Lazarus Lazarides.
[redacted] Lessard, Hector Michael.
[redacted], Lessman, Helene (nee Scheider).
[redacted], Lessman, Elaus J., or Klaus Scheider.
[redacted], Leyba-Munos, Galvarino Carlos, or Charles G. Leyba alias Galvarino or Carlos Leyba-Munos.
[redacted], Lieb., Rosalie Adelheit.
[redacted], Lo, Shih Ching.
[redacted] Longo, Teodosio, or Frank T. Longo.
[redacted] Longo, Esther (nee Vela), or Esther Velas.
[redacted] Lopez de Lara, Guadalupe.
[redacted], Lubian, Christa Helene Elfrieda.
[redacted], Lugo-Oquita, Jesus.
[redacted], Lu, Yi-Chuang.
[redacted], Lyons, Roderick J.
[redacted] Mabuchi, Kenneth Kent.
[redacted], Malischnigg, Roland Lothar, or Roland Lothar Crosby.
[redacted], Manzo, Antoinetta or Antonietta.
[redacted], Marcotte, Parfait Albert Joseph., or Albert Joseph Marcotte.
[redacted], Martin, Roger Milton Napoleon Joseph.
[redacted] Martinelli, Margaret Schmaltz, or Margaret Schmaltz or Margaret Martinelli.
[redacted] Matsumoto, Tsuta, or Tsuta Kubo.
[redacted], McDonald, Andrew Joseph.
[redacted], Meloch, Johannes Ernst.
[redacted], Micka, Peter Boldika, or Ernest D. Thessinger.
[redacted], Miller, Walter Otto (Mueller).
[redacted], Mione, Vincenzo, or Vincent Mione.
[redacted], Mitrakas, Despina.
[redacted], Mitchell, William Blair.
[redacted], Miyagishing, Yoshi Saburo, or Yoshi Saburo Miyo.
[redacted], Montour, William Feliz, alias Provencal or Provencher.
[redacted], Moore, Caroline Elnora (nee McInnes).
[redacted], Moore, William Elmyn.
[redacted], Moreno, Pedro Pablo.
[redacted], Morgan, Herta (nee Gartner).
[redacted], Mori, Tarao, or Torao Noma.
[redacted], Moses, Gatha, Abu-Nader (nee Gatha Abu-Nader).
[redacted], Motoyoshi, Masara, or Paul Motoyoshi.
[redacted], Mueller, Edward.
[redacted], Murray, Louis Victor, formerly Louis Victor La Place.
[redacted], Nachameczyk, Susanne.
[redacted], Nakawatase, Masoyoshi.
[redacted], Nasser, Evelyn Fegaly.
[redacted], Nerio, Yutaka Toya.
[redacted], Nesmith, Darlene Catherine, or Darlene Catherine Robertson.
[redacted], Nickoloff, Sterio, or Steve Nickaleff or Sterio Nicoloff.
[redacted], Nishiyama, Fusako.
[redacted], Okrepki, Stefan Perkoski.
[redacted] Olesen, Alexander Herman Juul Friis, alias Alex Olson or Olesen.
[redacted], Olsen, Olaf Trygve, or Teddy Olsen.
[redacted], Orlando, Andrea, or Andrea Giunta.
[redacted], Ortega-Hernandez, Felipe.
[redacted], Pappas, John, or John Steve Pappas or John Sperks.
[redacted], Peko, Stefan, alias Steve Peko.
[redacted], Peters, Ruth Hahn, or Heung Fox Hahn.
[redacted], Pineiro, Maria (nee Loriz).
[redacted], Pistolis, Kleomenis, or Constantinos Kappellas.
[redacted], Placencia-Haro, Maria.
[redacted], Psychoyos, Apostole, or Apostolos Sinogias.
[redacted] Purdy, Myrtle Jean Latimer.
[redacted] Rabsatt, Lubin Edsmond.
[redacted], Raia, Giovanni, or John or John Rira alias John Lattauzio.
[redacted] Raney, Mary Elizabeth (nee Ferris), or Mary Elizabeth Reeves.
[redacted], Raney, William Franklin.
[redacted], Reeps, Salley, or Sarah Reeps Wee Schwaine.
[redacted], Regolino, Giuseppe.
[redacted], Renda, Carmine Stefona, alias Graetna Passaquindici.
[redacted] Richards, John Purnell.
[redacted] Riddlebaugh, Louise Hulda Frieda (nee Mitsching), formerly Anderson alias Steinfurth alias Lundt.
[redacted], Romero, Eduardo.
[redacted], Rossel, Wilhalmina, formerly Raes and Seedeker (nee Rottier).
[redacted], Rotner, Jean (nee Szajndli Fuks or Jean Fox).
[redacted], Rotondo, Sebastiano.
[redacted], Rugo, John, or Giovanni Rugo.
[redacted], Sabatino, Colomba (nee Candro).
[redacted], Salafia, Maria (nee Carnevalini).
[redacted], Salas-Davila, Jose Gabriel.
[redacted], De Salas, Vita Siller.
[redacted], Salmeron-Carillo, Nicolas, or Nicolas Salmeron or Silvestre Acero Aquallo or Joaquin Salmeron.
[redacted], Sanchez-Perez, Victoriano.
[redacted] Sasati, Iskender.
[redacted], Scholl, Gert Michael, or Michael Scholl.
[redacted], Schlichting, Peter Bernd, or Peter Bernd Irlenborn.
[redacted], Schon, Czilla Zsu-Zsanna.
[redacted], Schon, Erika Maria.
[redacted], Schwartz, Clarence Graham.
[redacted], Scibetta, Michael Joseph, or Michael Scibetta alias Andrew Iacuzzo alias Thomas Burgio.
[redacted], Scott, Lucia Joan (nee Vasquez).
[redacted] Shamey, Mary, formerly Abraham formerly Unis (nee Torini) alias Mary Allie.
[redacted], Shee, Chin (Chin Toy Ling).
[redacted] Shirai, Naboru.
[redacted], Shun, Wong Fung, or Frank Wong.
[redacted], Sieu, Louis.
[redacted], Sineiro, Manuel Freire, or Manuel Freire Sin or Louis or Lucio Costa.
[redacted], Singh, Sher, or Pheru or Pherco Singh.
[redacted], Sinko, Jozef, or Joe Sinko.
[redacted], Skaljac, Branko.
[redacted], Skarzynska, Marie Therese.
[redacted], Sogikoglu, Penyamin Benny.
[redacted], Somers, Lorna Jean Salisburg.
[redacted], Soper, Annie Arabel (nee Ball).

[redacted], Sotelo, Rachel Frias, or Raquel Sotelo.
[redacted], Soucek, Anna, or Anna Souchek or Anna Waltz.
[redacted], Spencer, Peter, or Jean Pierre Lievin Marie Van Swae.
[redacted], Srour, Farid Tannous.
[redacted], Smith, Atelina Ericksson Hermens.
[redacted], Smith, Christian Raymond, or Raymond Empt.
[redacted], Stein, Abram, or Alex Stein.
[redacted], Sternshein, Bessie.
[redacted], Stokov, Nikola Martin, or Nick or Nik Stokov.
[redacted], Stover, Heinrich Dietrich.
[redacted], Struck, Nellie (nee Gerych or Gerecz), formerly Nellie Kondrat.
[redacted], Sugawara, Shuji Richard.
[redacted], Sugawara, Haru Hazel (nee Uyehara).
[redacted], Sugawara, Albert Moduyuki.
[redacted], Sugawara, Katherine Meiko.
[redacted], Szittner, William John.
[redacted], Szewczyk, Irene, alias Irena Rogizinski.
[redacted], Takata, Saburo.
[redacted], Takei, Rikizo, or Sakae Take.
[redacted], Tamm, Bernhard Karl, or Bernard Tamm.
[redacted], Tanaka, Harukichi.
[redacted], Tanaka, Takeshi.
[redacted], Tcheou, Han Ming.
[redacted], Tcheou, Pao Tan (nee Chu).
[redacted], Tesari, Rosalia or Rozolis.
[redacted], Tesari, Ernest.
[redacted], Tokar, John Gerald.
[redacted], Torres-Chavez, Eva Elena.
[redacted], Tsardis, Stelios.
[redacted], Tseng, Nancy Ngai Chen (nee Shih).
[redacted], Usman, Mohammed.
[redacted], Valdivia, Roberto Padilla.
[redacted], Varga, Sandor, alias Alexander Varga.
[redacted], Vasquez-Medina, Epifania.
[redacted], Vega, Amada Silva (nee Silva), formerly Lopez.
[redacted], Villegas de Daher, Amalia (nee Amalia Villegas-Esparza), alias Molly Villegas or Molly Daher.
[redacted], Walton, Ernest.
[redacted], Watanabe, Tomi.
[redacted], Watanabe, Masataro.
[redacted], Wolfson, Phyllis Regina (nee Wittels).
[redacted], Wolfson, Harry David.
[redacted], Yasuda, Himi (nee Himi Kuwahara).
[redacted], Yong, Chung, or Yong Chung.
[redacted], Yong, Soon Yai, or Hannah Park.
[redacted], You, Mar Ging.
[redacted], Yousef, Abouker, or Ali Yousef.
[redacted], Yribar, John, or Juan Yribar.
[redacted], Zabala, Mary (nee Toth) alias Mary Sabala.
[redacted], Zandes, Anna.
[redacted], Zarcone, Anna.
[redacted], Zarcone, Nicolo.
[redacted], Zarocostas, Nicholas Louis, or Nickolas Louis Zarokostas.
[redacted], Zimmermann, Eitel Otto, or Fred Baker.
[redacted], Zukar, Nicholas, or Nicholas Sukar.
[redacted], Angulo-Moreno, Vincent Louis.
[redacted], Balzano, Ciro.
[redacted], Barsalini, Leonetto.
[redacted], Bruhn, Hans Friedrich.
[redacted], Caragis, Costa Stathes.
[redacted], Carlot, John.
[redacted], Cechovic, Winfried Dalhoefer, *or Winifried Dalhoefer.*
[redacted], Cherevkoff, Theodore Dimitry, or Theodore Tcherewkoff.
[redacted] Chiu, Yee Mee, or Lee Yee Mee Chiu.
[redacted], Christie, Luis De Amechazurra.
[redacted], De Benedittis, Anibale.
[redacted], De Dampremy, Charles Andre, or Charles Andre.
[redacted], DeRodriquiz, Maria Senovia Claudia Hernandez, or Carmen Rodriquez.
[redacted], Dintchos, Constantinos Demetrious or Constantine Dintcho or Konstantinos Dintsos.
[redacted], Dirscherl, Charles Karl.
[redacted], Dyballa, Jean Alexander.
[redacted], Ebert, Franklin.
[redacted], Edwards, Thelma.
[redacted], Edwards, Joyce.
[redacted] Ehrhart, Henrietta Lavada, formerly Davis or Crawford or Haines.
[redacted], Ekiert, Tadeusz Zbignien Josef, or Theodore Ekiert.
[redacted], Enge, Hans Werner.
[redacted], Franz, Gladys.
[redacted], Gaglione, Vincenzo.
[redacted], Garcia-Contreras, Felipe.
[redacted], Grasso, Luigi, or Luigi Leonardo.
[redacted], Groke, Florrie, or Florence Mary Grocock or Florrie Milloy or Florrie Imler.
[redacted], Hohner, Harvey Patrick.
[redacted], Jessee, Elizabeth Eileen (nee Wight).
[redacted], Jones, Evelyn Ivera.
[redacted], Kame, Kameniro.
[redacted], Kame, Mitsuko (nee Yamanoto).
[redacted], Kan, Ho Chao.
[redacted], Kang, Chunghai Yoon (nee Chung Hai Yoon).
[redacted] Kelly, Theresa Mae Clarke, or Theresa Mae Clarke.
[redacted], Klein, Jacques Paul Joseph.
[redacted], Kusumoto, Kotaro.
[redacted], Lindquist, Gustav Johann Emil.
[redacted], Lira, Louis, or Luigi Lira.
[redacted], Listfeldt, Hans Guenther.
[redacted], Lombardi, Guglielmo, or William Lombardi.
[redacted], Luchinski, Isabella Trea (nee Stackl).
[redacted], Manis, Alice (nee Kotterou).
[redacted], Masuda, Tadao.
[redacted], Mayeda, Shizue, or Shizue Mayemura.
[redacted], Mayeda, Atsuko, or Atsjko Maeda or Betty Atsuko Mayemura or Atsuko Mayemura.
[redacted], Moore, Lena, formerly Higgins (nee Edwards).
[redacted], Moreno, Margarito.
[redacted], Nakamura, Kokichi, alias Joji or George Hanazono alias Tong Som.
[redacted] Nielsen, Svend Odderskjar.
[redacted], Oderkirk, Vern Ray.
[redacted], Perez-Calvillo, Angelo Joseph.
[redacted], Preston, Fay Caro.
[redacted], Rafee, Elias Ben, or Elias Ben Dollah or Elias Ben Dollah Rafee.
[redacted], Ramirez-Soto, Jose Apolonio.
[redacted], Rivera-Machado, Felipe, or Phillip Rivera-Machado.
[redacted] Ryono, Katsuhiko, or Kaijiro, Higo.
[redacted], Schlittenbauer, Klaus.
[redacted], Schroeder, Mary Joanne, or Maria Johanna Hechtbauer.
[redacted], Scorza, Mario Scorza, or Oreste Mario Scorza.
[redacted] Semenuk, Semeon Peter, or Samuel Peter Semenuk.
[redacted] Shee, Lee, or Lee (Sue Fong) Shee or Lee Sue Fong or Mrs. Gin Shue.
[redacted], Jean, Gin Bak, or Jean Gin.
[redacted], Fung, Gin Ben, or Ben Gin.
[redacted], Shibata, Ichiro.
[redacted], Shibata, Shimako.
[redacted], Shida, Tokuzo.
[redacted], Shida, Haruko.
[redacted], Shinomiya, Tsuneshici.
[redacted], Shinomiya, Misae (nee Misae Mukai).
[redacted], Siew, George Hing, or Daniel Goerge Hing Siew or Daniel Shaw.
[redacted], Simpson, Adela Lim, or Quejadow Nee Lim.
[redacted], Sisevich, Anthony Joseph Krivickas, or Anthony Joseph Krivickas.
[redacted], Smilovici, Silvio.
[redacted], Sotelo, Agripina Dosouto Velasco (nee Velasco), formerly Gonde.
[redacted], Tanabe, Takeo, or Takeo Tanax.
[redacted], Tardif, Joseph Patrice, or Patrick Tardif or Joseph P. Tardis or Pat Tardif.
[redacted], Teque, Jose Maria D'Oliveira, or Joe Mailand.
[redacted], Velthuis, Petrus, or Pete Velthuis.
[redacted], Veres, Augustin, or Alez Rosu or Alec or Alex Veres or Gus Rosu or Gus Veres.
[redacted], Voutsinas, Panagis.
[redacted] Wadosky, Nickolas, or William Anderson or William Alexander Anderson.
[redacted] Watson, Barbara Monica, formerly Koechel.
[redacted], Williams, Vivana.
[redacted], Wu, Ming Bin.
[redacted], Yang, Herman Sen-Deh.
[redacted], Young, Harry Hong, or Harry Young or Jew Hong Young.
[redacted], Zarraga, Louis or Luis, or Luis Zarraga Camiruaga or Luis Zarraga y Camyvuaga or Luis Cirello or Luis Cirrelo or Luis Cirella or Louis Corega.
[redacted], Alonso, Alfonso Francisco.
[redacted], Ballesteros, Alicia Soto, or Alicia Soto.
[redacted], Bilardi, Gennaro, or Gennaro Biraldi or Billardi or Giovanni Boccardi.
[redacted], Borrego, Felipe.
[redacted], Borrego, Enrique Onesimo.
[redacted] Brandes, Abraham (Abe).
[redacted], Bresaz, Giuseppe or Joseph, or Joe or Giuseppe Breez.
[redacted], Chalwill, Luther Leopold.
[redacted], Corcacas, Manoussos Iannis, or Manoussos Corcacas.
[redacted], Dagnino, John.
[redacted], Damian, Bernice.
[redacted] Danyluk, Peter.
[redacted] De Moreno, Andrea Maria Castro.
[redacted], De Saldivar, Concepcion Godinez.
[redacted], De Vargas, Maria Martina Rico, or Maria Martina Vargas or Maria Frias Rico or Maria Martina Rico.
[redacted], Drapaniotes, Theodore, alias Toddy Drapatos or Drepanics.
[redacted], Escarsega, Esteban or Esteban Escarsega-Rios or Esteban Escarciga.
[redacted], Eskildsen, Lucile Maria.
[redacted], Faine, Leo Alphonsus.
[redacted], Fattorini, Giuseppe or Joseph.
[redacted], Fernandes, Jose, alias Jose Fernandes De Barros.
[redacted], Fiddickow, Anita Sophie.
[redacted], Fiddickow, Gernot.
[redacted], Garbis, Achimidis Spiridon.
[redacted], Ceddes, John.
[redacted], Godfrey, Rosezella Glenn.
[redacted], Gomez, Jesus or Gomez.
[redacted], Gorin, Lionel Frederick.
[redacted], Gutchkoff, Alexander.
[redacted], Haas-Heye, Anna Victoria.
[redacted], Hahn, Dominik, or Dominik Koch alias Fred Berger.
[redacted], Hajipetry, Vasilios, alias Bill George alias William H. George alias H. Petry alias William G. Petres.
[redacted], Hazzard, Joyce Ellen Mariam, alias Joyce Ellen Marian Mesnard.
[redacted], Heber, Joseph, alias Joseph Huber.
[redacted], Heber, Eva, alias Eva Huber (nee Wertschek).
[redacted], Hernandez-Lira, Julia, alias L-z Perez.
[redacted], Hinkson, Oliver Mowat.
[redacted], Hinsey, Elena, or Elena Volpe.
[redacted], Hirai, Tayeko, or Taeko Hirai.
[redacted], Huerta-Navarro, Francisco.
[redacted], Ioannou, Pandelis Efstratios, or Paul Yoannou.

[redacted], Ikemoto, Tokiko (nee Nakamura).
[redacted], Iovine, Salvatore.
[redacted], Jewett, Mary Barbara.
[redacted], Joanou, Michael George.
[redacted], Kailama, Satu Marja Leena, or Maria Lena Mortti.
[redacted], Kruschak, Rudolf Stephanus, or Rudolph Stephanus Kurschak.
[redacted], Lane, Ceferina Lopez Calderon.
[redacted], Lerma, Emeterio.
[redacted], De Lerma, Guadalupe Gonzalez, or Guadalupe Gonzalez.
[redacted], Lopez-Yslas, Mateo.
[redacted], Lourenco, Jose, or Joseph Gardoso.
[redacted], MacCalla, Sandra Edith (Olga Pavloff).
[redacted], Mackin, Blanche Emalie, or Blanche Emelie Gregoire.
[redacted], Maruyama, Yoshiko (nee Acki).
[redacted], Masel, Herman.
[redacted], Matheosz, Adrian Israel, or Andrew Mathews or Bin Ali Odin or Odin Ben Ali.
[redacted], Miller, Sol, alias Chaim Bzaja Perelout.
[redacted], Miller, Fannie, alias Fajga Perelout.
[redacted], Moran, Robert Davis.
[redacted], Moy, Robert, alias Moy Han Goon.
[redacted], Norcross, Agnes Carola Spanier.
[redacted], Norcross, Muse Anatol, formerly Spanier (nee Koteney).
[redacted], Norcross, Regina Gertrude Spanier.
[redacted], O'Barr, Ivy Ruth (nee).
[redacted], Ouchakoff, Robert Michael, or Robert A. Mitchell.
[redacted], Paganos, Nick, or Nicholaos Pagonis.
[redacted], Perez-Romer, Silvano.
[redacted], Place, Suzanne.
[redacted], Poliadis, Alexander, alias Alexander Paul Southgate.
[redacted], Richmond, Ralph Henry, or Harold Jones or Herbert Jones.
[redacted], Rigot, Marcel Robert Roger or Marcel Rigot.
[redacted], Rubin, Nathan.
[redacted], Rumpf, Zillah Violet Adelaide, or Joyner or Mitchell (nee Beaney).
[redacted], Santucci, Antonio.
[redacted], Scavetta, Vanda (nee Maletesta).
[redacted], Schapira, Albert.
[redacted], Schiller, Suzana, or Suzanne Schiller.
[redacted] Sediakin, Victor, or Victor Dewitt.
[redacted], Sediakin, Barbara, or Barbara Dewitt or Varvara Sediakin.
[redacted], Serna-Melendez, Ignacio.
[redacted], Shee, Wong Ham, or Fay King.
[redacted], Shields, Thomas.
[redacted], Simor, Frances or Francesca.
[redacted], Sorens, Anna Linsboth (nee Linsboth).
[redacted], Sotelo, George.
[redacted], Taseff, Caroline Charlotte (nee Paruch).
[redacted], Tatakis, Steve John, or Stamateos Tatakis.
[redacted], Terriguez, Enrique Ruben, or Henry Boetcker Miller.
[redacted], Turnbull, Muriel Elaine.
[redacted], Uriarti, Adrian.
[redacted], Vergara, Tamosa.
[redacted], Von Spreti, Alexander Wilhelm Graf, or Alexander Allwine.
[redacted], Zalunardo, Alesnardro.
[redacted], Chang, Chuan, alias John G. Chang.
[redacted], Gluck, Gizella.
[redacted], Gluck, Eugene.
[redacted], Alferieff, Nicholas.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1291) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

[redacted], Aban, Anthony Jelito.
[redacted], Abe, Shinzaburo.
[redacted], Abelson, Daniel, or Daniel Abkevitz or Daniel Abkevits or Daniel Abkiewitz.
[redacted], Ali, Askar, alias Asod Ali.
[redacted], Antolini, Carmen Santiaga, or Carmen Antolini Franklin.
[redacted], Antunes, Antonio.
[redacted], Arreola, Eduvino Garcia.
[redacted], Arron, Fage, or Bernice Arron or Bernice Faye Lewis.
[redacted], Arron, Leonard Herbert, or Leonard Harvey Arron or Jack Lewis or Raymond Jack Lewis or Jack Lewis.
[redacted], Atwell, Kathleen Marie (nee Mackenzie).
[redacted], Balluch, Franz or Mike.
[redacted], Balluch, Josephine.
[redacted], Bernardi, Guiseppe, alias Giuseppe Barnardi or Joe Bernardi.
[redacted], Blake, George Vincent.
[redacted], Biovin, Pauline Juliette (Drinkwine).
[redacted], Boivin, Dorothy Blanche (Drinkwine).
[redacted], Bouquet, Jean Louis Alexander.
[redacted], Bourkas, Peter Stolias Bourkas.
[redacted], Brandauer, Hannalore.
[redacted], Briels, Mary Frances, or Mary Frances Beech.
[redacted], Brozeika, Simanas, alias Simon Brozeika.
[redacted], Burham, Fabiola Justine, alias Fabiola Justine Desrochers.
[redacted], Burham, Thomas Bert, alias Thomas Bert Kafulski.
[redacted], Cano, Luis Zanbonino, or Luis Salmeron Plaza.
[redacted], Cantarel, Pierre Leon.
[redacted], Carannante, Vincenzo.
[redacted], Cassita, Theresa.
[redacted], Cerniglia, Nicolina (nee Zaffiro).
[redacted], Chapman, Reginald Standfield.
[redacted], Chavez-Rojas, Manuel, or Manuel Rojas Chavez.
[redacted], Chinnery, Walter Ecidro.
[redacted], Chogyoli, Hatsu.
[redacted], Ciocia, Pantaleo.
[redacted], Cipriano, Romero-Garcia, or Romero Cipriano.
[redacted], Cowell, John Edward, or Jack Cowell.
[redacted], Decker, Joseph Sabaloo Thomas.
[redacted], DeDominguez, Maria Gutierrez.
[redacted], Dominguez-Molina, Fausto.
[redacted], DeFlores, Julia Arredono Vda, or Juliana Arrendondo or Julia Arrendondo.
[redacted], DaGrassa, Martin.
[redacted], Deguchi, Hina.
[redacted], Demas, Esther Adeline (nee Emery).
[redacted], DeQuionnes, Jennie Chavez vda.
[redacted] DeRodriguez, Beatriz Lopez.
[redacted], Dery, Gerard Albert.
[redacted], Diehl, Frieda Katharina, or Frieda Katharine Werner (maiden name).
[redacted], DiPaola, Salvatore.
[redacted], Duran-Corrales, Angel, or Angel Corrales-Duran or Angel Duran.
[redacted], Enrizuez, Jose Vasquez, or Jose Enriquez.
[redacted] Eversley, Ethel, alias Ethel Cornelius.
[redacted] Fah, Nee Ting, or Ding Fat.
[redacted], Fau, Alexander, or Alexander Wou or Alexander Vou.
[redacted] Fischer-Stern, Gyorgy.
[redacted], Fischer-Stern, Marianne.
[redacted], Fisher, Janet Grahm-Forbes Sutherland, formerly Janet Grahm-Forbes Farrell (nee Janet Grahm-Forbes Sutherland).
[redacted] Fivel, Oscar Henry.
[redacted], Fruitier, Marius Jacques, or Marius J. Fruitier.
[redacted], Fujiwara, Hatsuighi, or Jack Fujiwara or Hatsuichi Jack Fujiwara.
[redacted], Garetti, Dario.
[redacted], Gebauer, Dietmar Karl.
[redacted], Glassman, Jennie (nee Jennie Polikoff), alias Gertrude Polikoff.
[redacted], Godfrey, Joan Heather.
[redacted], Gonzalez, Eusebio.
[redacted], Gonzalez-Vega, Prisciliano.
[redacted], Gonzalez, Rafael Castro, or Ralph Castro Gonzalez.
[redacted], Goomis, Fara, or Fara Gomis.
[redacted], Granados, Rosa.
[redacted], Gross, Rose (nee Brandes).
[redacted], Guajardo, Jesus Maria, or A. E. Nelson, Jr.
[redacted], Hanson, John Henry.
[redacted], Helberg, Edward.
[redacted], Held, Werner Carl.
[redacted], Hemelberg, Madolan Pansy (nee Rogers).
[redacted], Hernandez, Catarino, or Catarino Hernandez-Gallegos.
[redacted], Hjertaker, Samuel Olaisen.
[redacted], Hohnsbein, Elizabeth Dora Grunspan, or Elizabeth Grunspan Hohnsbein (nee Elizabeth Dora Grunspan).
[redacted], Hoyos-Rosas, Alicia, or Alicia Hoyos.
[redacted], Hrynkiewcz, Anthony, or Antonio or Anton Hrynkiewicz.
[redacted], Hrzich, Thomas.
[redacted], Iacobucci, Anna Cesidia Lucia (nee DiPietro), or Anna Lucy DiPietro or Iacobucci.
[redacted], Jasinskas, Jonas.
[redacted], Jasinskas, Danute Marija Vaillokaitis.
[redacted], Jesolva, Jerced Duque, or Merced Duque Y Santos.
[redacted], Jiluma, Abdul.
[redacted], Justus, George Robert.
[redacted], Kalmanowicz, Chaim Aron.
[redacted], Kalmanowicz, Gerda (nee Diamant).
[redacted], Kamii, Akira Arthur.
[redacted], Kamii, Mieko.
[redacted], Kanafani, Kamal Hasan.
[redacted], Kaplan, Libuse Beker, formerly Libuse Beker (nee Svoboda).
[redacted], Kawaguchi, Masao, or Masao Kawaguti.
[redacted], Kiss, Mary Magdalene.
[redacted], Kleinberg, Magda Morvay.
[redacted], Klingstet, Natalia.
[redacted], Kordis, Stavros Christophoros, or Steve Kordis.
[redacted], Korte, Hendrik Albert.
[redacted], Kruk, Aron Mordko (Krug).
[redacted], Kudor, Ignac Kovolick.
[redacted], Lamanna, Giuseppe, or Joseph Lamanna or Joe Lamanna.
[redacted], Langheim, Janet Regina, formerly Loth.
[redacted], Lear, Norman, or Nechemia Lerman.
[redacted], Lindsay, Mary Isabel (nee McNevin).
[redacted], Lopez-Salas, Manuel, or Manuel S. Lopez or Manuel L. Salas or Manuel Lopez or Manuel Lopes.
[redacted], Lorentzen, Olav.
[redacted], Loya-Verduzco, Margarita A., or Margarita Alva Loya.
[redacted], Luchyshin, Devaunna Ginger.
[redacted], Luchyshin, Ronald Marion.
[redacted], Ma, May Ho, alias Ma May Ho.
[redacted] Martin, Annie Christiane, or Annie Christiane Kissack.

[redacted], Martinez, Armando, or Armando Valdes Martinez.
[redacted], Martinez, Lazaro, or Lazano Martinez-Garcia.
[redacted], Martinez, Apolonio, or Apolonio Rzequiel Martinez.
[redacted], Martinez-Cortez, Monico.
[redacted], Martinez, Elena Originales de.
[redacted], Mata, Fabiana (nee Fabina Orona).
[redacted], Matsukawa, Teruko (nee Teruko Nagai).
[redacted], Maybury, Patrick Joseph.
[redacted], McArthur, Bertie Alfred.
[redacted], McKenzie, William Horne.
[redacted], Meredith, Constance Lydia.
[redacted], Miyagishima, Shinichi, or Tom Satsuki Nakamura or Tom Shinichi Nakamura.
[redacted], Moesoff, Leo Teodor, or Leo Teodore Moisoff.
[redacted], Monteiro, Artur Da Assuncao.
[redacted], Morales-Machuca, Arthur.
[redacted], Morrison, Sylvia Avalon Pichette.
[redacted], Moussin-Poushkin, Basil.
[redacted], Moussin-Poushkin, Eugenia, or Musin-Pushdin or Moussine-Pouchdine.
[redacted], Murata, Yoshinori.
[redacted], Nakashima, Kunisuke.
[redacted], Nakayama, Keizo, alias Kaye Downs.
[redacted], Navarro, Ramon, or Ramon Navarro-Ochoa.
[redacted], Neigi, Seid, or Said Nagi.
[redacted], Nou, Gustav.
[redacted], Oguich, Hubertina Hokanna (nee Meurissen).
[redacted], Okuno, Ringoro, or Ringoro Matsui.
[redacted], Okuno, Hari (nee Hamano).
[redacted], Olessoff, Maria (nee Maruszyk).
[redacted], Olson, Ed Olivus, or Edward Olson or Eddie Olson, or Eddie Oliver Olson.
[redacted], Osland, Irene Gloria.
[redacted], Ota, Toshio, or Henry Ota.
[redacted], Ozawa, Shigeru.
[redacted], Ozawa, Takazi.
[redacted], Ozawa, Kazuo.
[redacted], Ozawa, Tikako, or Chikako Ozawa.
[redacted], Pacheco, Rosa Emma.
[redacted], Pacheco, Elijio.
[redacted], Pacheco, Ignacio.
[redacted], Pacheco, Manuel.
[redacted], Paolone, Ferdinando, or Ferdinand or Fred Paolone.
[redacted], Paul, Roswitha Hannelore Rose Marie.
[redacted], Peck, John L., also known as John Laszlo Peck or Ladislau Pek.
[redacted], Pedroza-Avelar, Guillermo, or Ruben Hioes-Rogelio.
[redacted], Pellegri, Fortunato.
[redacted], Pelletier, Esdras Joseph, or Harry Pelletier or Esdras Josef Pelletier.
[redacted], Pence, Margaret Janet.
[redacted], Perea, Ercilia Quezada, or Ercilia Quezada Vda De Perea.
[redacted], Perea De Rivera, Aurora, or Aurora Perea Rivera.
[redacted], Perez-Perez, Alejo.
[redacted], Pittakides, Michel Kosta.
[redacted], Pollock, Annie Greenwood (nee Brown).
[redacted], Pollock, Jack Proctor Patterson.
[redacted], Ramirez, Ana Rosa.
[redacted], Randall, Babe May.
[redacted], Ray, Marvin Hell, formerly Marvin Escobar Hess.
[redacted], Ray, Leopold Hess, formerly Leopold Escobar Hess.
[redacted], Riccitelli, Giuseppa, or Giuseppa Ciarleglio or Josephine Riccitelli.
[redacted], Rice, Marjorie Margaret (nee Marjorie Margaret Joy).
[redacted], Romano, Giovanni, or John Romano.
[redacted], Rosenberg, Johanna (nee Tauber).
[redacted], Rosenberg, Josef.
[redacted], Sakai, Sei.
[redacted], Sakuma, Goro.
[redacted], Salse-Quellar, Pascual.
[redacted], Sandani, Libia, formerly Proietta (nee Rossetti).
[redacted], Scarvelis, Michael Emmanuel.
[redacted], Schacht, Wilheim Alfred Max, or William Schact or Henry Schacht.
[redacted], Schmaltz, Andrew, or Andres Schmaltz.
[redacted], Schmaltz, Mary, or Marie Schmaltz.
[redacted], Schumburg, Hans Detlef Niels.
[redacted], Sebald, Margaret Elizabeth (nee Miller).
[redacted], Seiciuc, Zaharia, or Zaharia Grigori Seiciuc.
[redacted], Seifert, Hermann.
[redacted], Serrano, Aniceto, or Aniceto Serrano-Tercero.
[redacted], Singerman, Cecilia (Lillian) (nee Newman).
[redacted], Smith, Ovin Elliott.
[redacted], Smith, Joyce Elaine.
[redacted], Smith, Rosalia Eglantine, or Rosalia Eglantine Knight or Rosalia Eglantine Wells.
[redacted], Stevoff, Kime, or Kime Steve Stavroff.
[redacted], Sterr, Horst Otto.
[redacted], Streck, Hella.
[redacted], Strelkute, Agnes, or Agota or Agota Strielkute or Agota Strielkus or Agota Strelkus.
[redacted], Sullivan, Rudolph.
[redacted], Tada, Kimiko Sano, or Kimiko Sano.
[redacted], Teramoto, Gitaro.
[redacted], Theodore, John, or Ioannis Pandelis Theodorou or Yovan Pandoff Todoroffsky.
[redacted], Thomanek, Franz Rainer.
[redacted], Thompson, George Carr.
[redacted], Tong, Chan, or Chan Hong or David Chan or Lim Leong.
[redacted], Torzewska, Barbara Emelia.
[redacted], Tow, Elizabeth (nee Harrison), formerly Price.
[redacted], Tressider, Dora Caroline (nee Williams).
[redacted], Treulieb, Gustav Gunther.
[redacted], Truglia, Maria (nee Sica).
[redacted], Tsavalas, Soterios Konstantine, or Soter Tsavalas or Charles Savalas.
[redacted], Turkkan, Nevzat Ekrem Attila.
[redacted], Salvanera, Antonia Vaca de, or Antonia Vaca-Zaragoza.
[redacted], Vafiades, George Konstantinos.
[redacted], Vasques, Frank, or Francisco Vasquez-Ray or Frank Vasquez or Francisco Vasquez or Francisco Basquez or Frank Ray Vasquez.
[redacted], Vecchio, Giuseppe, or Lo Vecchio.
[redacted], Vlahos, Evangelos, or Evangelos Vlakos.
[redacted], Vlamis, Platon, or Platon Vlannis or Platon Antonios Vlamis.
[redacted], Wang, Yuan.
[redacted], Wang, Ming Hung, alias Mary Wang (nee Ming Hung Ling).
[redacted], Woo, Meng I., or Anglea Meng I. Woo or Meng I. Tung.
[redacted], Yamashita, Tsurumatsu.
[redacted], Ying, Wu Tieh.
[redacted], Hsin, Wu Lung.
[redacted], Yoshida, Hisao James, or James Hisai Yoshida.
[redacted], Zoda, Salvatore.
[redacted], Zuber, Herman Joseph.
[redacted], Carmalis, Mary, or Mary Carmali or Maria Caramali.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 11, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States, the following enrolled bills:

S. 664. An act to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," and for other purposes; and

S. 1345. An act to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2834. A bill to provide for the payment of lump-sum death benefits to the survivors of certain employees of contractors with the United States during World War II; and

S. 2835. A bill for the relief of Teodoro Egues Munagorri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2836. A bill for the relief of Kristine Lea Kimball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2837. A bill for the relief of Samuel Chalut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2838. A bill to authorize appropriations to assist the States and their political subdivisions in the salvage of railway and streetcar rails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2839. A bill to continue beyond June 30, 1953, authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2840. A bill to authorize the establishment of an Inventions Awards Board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 6805. An act to increase the salary of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1953; and

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Clemente Ruiz Nazario, of Puerto Rico, to be United States judge for the district of Puerto Rico, vice Thomas H. Roberts, resigned;

Harry E. Pratt, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 4, district of Alaska;

William W. Hart, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois; and

Howard L. Doyle, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Eighty-nine postmasters.

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Eric A. Johnston, of Washington, to be a member of the Public Advisory Board;

W. John Kenney, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security, vice Richard M. Bissell, Jr., resigned.

William H. Draper, Jr., of New York, special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to be also the representative of the United States to the seventh session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

Frederick L. Anderson, of California, to be deputy special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plentipotentiary;

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 to France, vice David K. E. Bruce;

Ellsworth Bunker, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Argentina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Italy, vice James Clement Dunn;

Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Syria, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal, vice Lincoln MacVeagh; and

Frederick C. Oechsner, of Louisiana, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the diplomatic service.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive G, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a supplementary convention between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Ottawa on October 26, 1951 (Ex. Rept. No. 5).

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. BYRD:

Address by Gov. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, before the Georgia General Assembly, in Atlanta, Ga., February 6, 1952.

By Mr. MORSE:

Four editorials dealing with the existing strike on certain railroads in the United States: (1) An editorial entitled "Government's Strike," published in the Washington Post of March 11, 1952; (2) editorial entitled "The Railroad Strike," published in the Wall Street Journal of March 11, 1952; (3) editorial entitled "The Long Dispute," published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 11, 1952; and (4) editorial entitled "Behind the Rail Crisis," published in the New York Times of March 11, 1952.

Article entitled "Willingness To Pay Taxes," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post of March 11, 1952.

By Mr. HUNT:

Editorial entitled "Capt. Rhoda Milliken," published in the Washington Daily News of March 6, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Thinking It Over," written by Austin V. Wood, and published in the Martinsburg (W. Va.) Journal of March 1, 1952, discussing the 1952 election.

By Mr. WILEY:

Material relating to the rehabilitation of physically handicapped Americans.

RULING OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT ON GRANTS BY THE RED CROSS TO FLOOD SUFFERERS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to speak for not to exceed 2 minutes with reference to a letter I have received from the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kansas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during the past few weeks I have received a number of letters from citizens in our State who are disturbed by the recent Treasury Department ruling to the effect that the taxpayer must reduce his flood losses by the amount of grants received from the American Red Cross.

The citizens of Kansas, together with the citizens of Oklahoma and Missouri, suffered severe flood losses last year. It was a national disaster and was so recognized by our Federal Government.

The Red Cross, in its usual prompt and efficient manner, stepped in immediately to relieve temporary hardships, and later spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for the rehabilitation of the citizens who suffered these severe losses.

Millions of our citizens in this Nation contributed to the flood-disaster relief fund, which was used by the American Red Cross for the purpose of assisting those who suffered so disastrously.

Now it develops that when these taxpayers file their income taxes, they must reduce their flood losses by the amount of the grants received from the American Red Cross.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue advises me that this decision on their part is based on a ruling made in 1948, which states, in part, as follows:

> It is the opinion of this office that since the American Red Cross is a national organization having a tax-exempt status, contributions made by it are not to be considered in the same light as gifts by individuals or private enterprises and that the awards in question are not gifts as contemplated by section 113 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code. This conclusion is based on the fact that the purpose of the American Red Cross in making the awards for fire losses was not to enrich the recipients but merely to alleviate the losses which they, by reason of their circumstances, are unable to bear and the further fact that the award is received on a performance basis, i. e., the recipient is required to use the amount thereof for the specific purpose intended.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this ruling and requirement on the part of the Bureau of Internal Revenue is grossly unjust and unfair to thousands of our citizens who suffered irreparable losses.

For instance, if I make a direct contribution as a gift to assist an individual who has suffered a disastrous loss, it would not be a taxable item, but on the other hand, when I contribute directly through the Red Cross for the same purpose, it becomes taxable, or at least not a deductible item.

I am certain that millions of our citizens who contributed so generously through the American Red Cross did not contemplate that this gift, although given through the American Red Cross, would be treated any differently than a direct contribution to an individual.

When the Senate again considers tax legislation, I expect to call this matter to its attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of my remarks a letter I received from Mr. Fred S. Martin, Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

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

MARCH 5, 1952.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to our telephone conversation today in which you inquired relative to the position of the Bureau as to the effect of Red Cross awards to owners of property damaged by the 1951 flood of the Kansas River.

This letter is not intended as a ruling in the case you mentioned but it may be stated in general that the Bureau has been following a ruling made in 1948 reading in part as follows:

"* * * You request to be advised whether such awards should be taken into consideration in determining (1) the casualty loss; (2) basis for future sale, that is, the actual cost or only amount contributed by the owner, and (3) the basis for depreciation, actual cost or only the amount contributed by the owner.

"It is the opinion of this office that since the American Red Cross is a national organization having a tax-exempt status, contributions made by it are not to be considered in the same light as gifts by individuals or private enterprises and that the awards in question are not gifts as contemplated by section 113 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code. This conclusion is based on the fact that the purpose of the American Red Cross in making the awards for fire losses was not to enrich the recipients but merely to alleviate the losses which they, by reason of their circumstances, are unable to bear and the further fact that the award is received on a performance basis, i. e., the recipient is required to use the amount thereof for the specific purpose intended.

"The conclusion of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Edwards* v. *Cuba Railroad Company* (268 U. S. 628; T. D. 3728, C. B. IV–2, 122) may be applied to the situation in the instant case insofar as the treatment of the amount of the award, for Federal income-tax purposes is concerned. Applying the principle laid down in that case and other cases involving similar circumstances, the awards made by the American Red Cross are neither taxable income nor a gift to the recipient but merely a reimbursement for his capital expenditure. It follows, therefore, that to the extent that the amount of the award is in excess of the recipient's basis in the property prior to the fire loss such excess may not serve to increase the basis of the property for the purposes of subsequent disposition or depreciation allowances.

"The same results as above with respect to the limitation of the recipient's original basis in the property and the nonrecognition of any amount received in excess thereof are obtained by treating the transaction as an involuntary conversion of property within the meaning of section 112 (f) of the

code. Support to this treatment is given in the discussion contained in G. C. M. 21171, C. B. 1939-1 (pt. 1), page 169, involving an award to a railroad company of new facilities, the cost of which was borne by the State out of unemployment relief funds allotted by the Federal Government. The award in that case is similar to the instant case in that it was not made by way of compensation for the old facilities discarded or retired. In rejecting the application of section 112 (f) on the ground that the discarding or retirement by the railroad of its old roadway property did not constitute an involuntary conversion, the memorandum inferred that if there has been a destruction of the property, such as a fire loss, a contrary conclusion would have been reached.

"In view of the foregoing it is held that the recipient of the American Red Cross award is entitled to a loss only to the extent that the basis of the destroyed property, prior to its damage or destruction, is in excess of the amount expended for its restoration under the award. If the amount of the award is greater than such basis, the excess thereof may not be added to the recipient's basis for Federal income-tax purposes."

Very truly yours,

FRED S. MARTIN,
Assistant Commissioner.

MRS. MARGUERITE A. BRUMELL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4645) for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite A. Brumell, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. HENDRICKSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	McFarland
Anderson	Gillette	McKellar
Bennett	Green	McMahon
Benton	Hayden	Millikin
Bricker	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bridges	Hennings	Moody
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Mundt
Byrd	Hoey	Murray
Cain	Holland	Neely
Capehart	Humphrey	Nixon
Carlson	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kem	Seaton
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Lehman	Sparkman
Eastland	Long	Stennis
Ecton	Malone	Thye
Ellender	Martin	Underwood
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	McCarran	Welker
Frear	McCarthy	Wiley
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the purpose of addressing the Army War College at Carlisle, Pa.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 20.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20), to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in behalf of himself and other Senators. I read section 11 of the amendment:

SEC. 11. The United States hereby asserts that it has no right, title, or interest in or to the lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States, but that all such right, title, and interest are vested in the several States or the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the laws of such States, or the respective lawful grantees, lessees, or possessors in interest thereof under State authority.

Mr. President, it is my judgment that this amendment is not needed, because there has never been any assertion made that the Federal Government had any right, title, or interest in or authority over land beneath the navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States.

On the other hand, there has been a great deal of misunderstanding and misrepresentation with regard to the subject. I do not wish to imply even for a moment that any such misrepresentations have been made on the part of any Member of the Senate; but there can be no question that misrepresentations have been made, and that they have influenced the thinking of a great many people who are not so familiar with the subject before the Senate as are some of us.

In support of the statement that there is widespread misunderstanding with regard to the effect of Senate Joint Resolution 20, an effect which it is claimed may possibly jeopardize the title of the respective States to lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States, I wish to read from a letter which I received some time ago from the mayor of the city of New York, the greatest city in our Nation. The letter shows definitely that Mayor Impellitteri has completely misunderstood the effect of the legislation which is now pending before the Senate. The letter is brief, and I read it, as follows:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N. Y., February 1, 1952.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: The above resolution, H. R. 4484, has been passed by the House of Representatives and resolution S. 940 is still pending before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I strongly urge your support of resolution S. 940.

The purpose of the resolutions is to reaffirm that title to lands under tidewaters and navigable waters has always been vested in the States and their grantees, such as the city of New York.

The city of New York has a vital interest in retaining title to its water front and harbor lands and lands under water. This city's water front and harbor, developed and maintained under municipal control, is an invaluable asset not only to the people of New York, but to the entire Nation. The city's title to its foreshore and lands under water, as granted to it by ancient charters and by the State of New York, has never been challenged. It is of paramount importance to the development of this city that New York retain full and complete control over these lands and improvements. Recent assertions of title to lands under water by the Government of the United States are contrary to all historical precedents and to judicial determinations. Such claims might becloud the city's title to one of its most valuable assets and cause serious repercussions in maintaining and continuing the constant development and improvement of New York Harbor.

I firmly believe that the city's title is beyond question, but the resolutions would constitute a final recognition of that title and a disclaimer by the United States that it ever had any title to these lands.

Very truly yours,

VINCENT R. IMPELLITTERI,
Mayor.

Mr. President, I fully agree with the mayor of New York that the city of New York has a vital interest in retaining title to its water front, harbor lands, and lands under water. I go further and say that I fully agree with him with regard to the value of the water front and harbor lands as an asset to the people of New York and to the people of the entire Nation.

However, there has never been the slightest question with regard to the ownership and control of the harbor of New York. It has always been recognized as an inland waterway. It is many miles removed from the open sea. There cannot possibly be any question with regard to the manner in which the land is to be controlled. Nevertheless, the mayor of the greatest city in the Nation

is so much in doubt with regard to the question that he wrote me the letter which I have just read into the RECORD. Of course, the letter was written under a misapprehension of the facts.

I have taken pleasure in writing to the mayor as follows:

FEBRUARY 15, 1952.

Hon. VINCENT R. IMPELLITTERI,
Mayor, City of New York,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MAYOR IMPELLITTERI: Thank you for your letter. As you know, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, after considering the tideland matter, voted to report favorably the interim bill, Senate Joint Resolution 20, which, without deciding the fundamental issue of State versus Federal control over the lands beneath the open ocean, would permit immediate resumption of exploration and development work on the oil-bearing lands off Texas and Louisiana.

The Federal Government has never claimed, and does not now claim, any rights in the lands beneath navigable waters including true harbors and bays. You will note that Senate Joint Resolution 20, a copy of which is enclosed, refers only to the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf.

In the course of the hearings, the question of whether this legislation in any way affected inland waters was asked in specific reference to New York City's water front and harbor lands. The committee was assured by the Department of Justice and the Department of the Interior that inland waters and New York's water front and harbors are in no way affected by Senate Joint Resolution 20. In fact, they are specifically excluded.

As I am sure you appreciate, I would be among the first to oppose this legislation, or any legislation which dealt unfairly with New York's interests, or which sought to deprive New York State of equities which properly belong to us. In the case of tidelands oil, the situation is quite the reverse.

By agreeing to S. 940, we in New York State would be ceding our interest in one of our Nation's most valuable assets. In these underocean lands are oil deposits which can bring to the Federal Treasury vast amounts of revenue which can help relieve New York of heavy tax burdens which we might otherwise bear. Our State, as you know, bears a heavy share of the tax burden of the Nation. If the revenue from these oil deposits were given to the States which now unfairly claim these rights, it would place an unjustifiable burden upon our own State.

The allegation made to you that the Federal Government seeks title to lands under the bay and in New York Harbor are an example of the confusion which is being intentionally introduced into this situation with the purpose of beclouding the real issues and the real intent of those seeking the rights referred to above.

The Supreme Court has ruled that these rights are vested in all the people in all the States. We in New York should certainly not lend ourselves to an abandonment of these rights which mean so much to us.

I certainly thank you for writing to me and giving me the opportunity of setting forth my views on this very important matter. I would be glad to hear from you further after you have had an opportunity to study the views I have expressed.

With kind personal regards.

Very sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, I have read that correspondence to show how completely misinformed even intelligent men in high governmental positions are regarding the question of title to the lands under the navigable waters within the boundaries of the States.

Mr. President, I favor this amendment simply because it will reaffirm the declaration that the Federal Government claims no title to any of these lands. The Federal Government does not do so. The effect of Senate Joint Resolution 20 is incontrovertible, when it says that the United States asserts that it has no right, title, or interest in or to the lands beneath the navigable waters in the respective States.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to support this amendment, not because I think its adoption is necessary—for I think the issue has been clearly defined time and time and time again—but in order that those who may have any fears on this subject, like the mayor of the city of New York, will be better satisfied regarding the validity of the claims of the States to the lands beneath the navigable waters within the boundaries of the States. If there are such fears, certainly I think it is wise to give that assurance. I am particularly anxious to correct the false impression which unfortunately has gained ground.

Again I wish to say that I do not impute to any of my colleagues a desire to misrepresent. They have not misrepresented. However, that there has been misrepresentation on a wide scale in regard to this matter, I think is an undoubted fact.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Let me ask the distinguished Senator whether he knows of any formula or standard which ever has been adopted or agreed to for determining whether Long Island Sound, for example, is inland water or is it external water?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think there has been no formula regarding such questions; but certainly it is clear that Long Island Sound is inland water, for it is abutted by two land areas of the State of New York.

Similarly I think there can be no question that title vests in the State of New York in the case of the lands under New York Harbor or under the part of the seaward reaches of the harbor, running between the States of New York and New Jersey.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course the Senator from New York knows that Mr. BOGGS has originated a theory of arcs in regard to establishing seaward boundaries. So far as I know, that is the only theory which has been presented to us. That theory was not accepted by the World Court in the Norwegian fisheries case. Mr. Perlman, Solicitor General of the United States, went there and urged that theory in international law, but it was rejected.

On that theory, if a bay is more than 10 miles across its mouth, it would not be an inland water.

On the other hand, Russia claims the White Sea, which is 89 miles across its mouth, as being inland water.

Would the Senator from New York be willing to agree to an amendment to the amendment he has supported, which would reserve to the Congress the right to determine by law what are the internal waters of the United States?

Mr. LEHMAN. I would have to answer that by saying that in view of the fact that the amendment has been submitted on behalf of 18 or 20 Senators, I would wish to consult with them first; I am not authorized to speak for them.

However, certainly the Senator who submitted the amendment and those of us who are cosponsors of the amendment would, I am sure, be glad to consider any amendment to it which would not lessen its effectiveness.

Mr. LONG. I should like to propose this amendment at the end of the amendment, namely, to add the following language:

Provided, That the seaward boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the several States shall be established by the Congress of the United States by legislative enactment.

I send forward that amendment to the amendment, feeling that unless the Congress establishes this boundary, we then shall be confronted with the situation which has arisen in California. In that situation there has been appointed a master who is supposed to try to determine what is the boundary between the inland waters and the outside waters; but, in considering that problem, he has nothing whatever to guide him; there is no court decision on that question, except perhaps a decision by a district court which was trying to fix a line in connection with enforcing a smuggling law or a liquor law. Otherwise, the master has nothing for a guide.

Personally, I fear that unless Congress itself establishes this line, some minor official in one of the departments—not the head of the department or a policy-making branch of the Government—will try to establish a formula for determining this question, whereas actually it is a matter of international law involving Congress and the entire Nation. So it seems to me that the Congress should accept that responsibility.

If the amendment the Senator from New York has been discussing is offered, I hope my amendment to it will be accepted by the sponsors of the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Wyoming and his cosponsors will give consideration to any request of that sort.

However, let me say that I cannot see why anyone should object to this amendment. Regardless of whether it does or does not satisfy in all particulars the wishes of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the fact remains that the amendment certainly very greatly strengthens the protections—if any are needed, although I doubt that any are needed—available to the States in respect to the lands under their inland waters.

Mr. President, no question about these matters has ever been raised with me. To my amazement, the other day I heard raised in the Senate a question in regard to the rights of the Federal Government in connection with the lands beneath the Great Lakes or in connection with the lands beneath other large bodies of water within the confines of the United States or the States.

This amendment certainly should go a long way to reassuring the States that there is no desire or intention on the part of the Federal Government to claim anything to which it is not entitled.

Mr. LONG. Of course, as the Senator from New York knows, those of us who take the States' side feel that the doctrine of English law that the sovereign possesses the beds of all navigable waters would, if accepted here, actually be established as a rule governing tidewaters along the coast, and would merely apply to bays and harbors. The case in which that doctrine was first announced was Martin against Waddell. Someone mistakenly stated that the Pollard case first laid down that doctrine. The Pollard case was the first case that decided that new States had the same rights as the original 13 States, insofar as their State sovereignty was concerned; but the case of Martin against Waddell decided that the States were sovereign when they won their independence from the Crown, and that on the theory that they possessed sovereignty, they owned the beds of tidewaters. That was the language which was used at the time, and the tidewater rule was then applied in later decisions to waters which were not at all affected by the tide, waters such as rivers and streams and lakes inside the United States. Therefore, the junior Senator from Louisiana feels that the rule of law and the theory that the States originally possessed sovereignty was what placed them in the ownership of the beds of their streams and and their tidewaters.

I realize that the argument is made by my very able friend from Wyoming that the States never claimed this property, though that is a matter of opinion, and that the citizens were fishing on that property, which had been included in their colonial charters. The States, by my theory, might never have fixed the exact delineation as to how far out they claimed beds of navigable waters; but nevertheless, they claim that they always owned the beds of navigable waters. Of course, the Senator concedes that there is a fair argument about it.

Mr. LEHMAN. As the Senator from Louisiana knows, I am not a constitutional lawyer; I am not a lawyer at all. I can approach this question only from the standpoint of a layman; but when he refers to the use of the word "tidewaters" in a decision, it would seem to me that in all probability the courts were considering the waters between high tide and low tide; and to that extent there is no question. We are all willing to acknowledge that that is the law.

Mr. LONG. I suggest to the Senator that I doubt whether he could find a dictionary which would define "tidewaters" as the waters which are between low tide and high tide. I believe he will find that the definition in almost any dictionary, legal or otherwise, indicates that the term "tidewaters" is far broader than that, and includes waters affected by the ebb and flow of the tide, which generally affects the seacoast or the seaboard, rather than merely the beach between high-water and low-water mark.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, I realize that the definition contained in any dictionary would be much broader than that which I have given. But I think we must consider the language in the text. I am not familiar with the case, but if this was a case which was considered in determining the riparian rights——

Mr. LONG. I do not believe it was.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe my definition would probably be accurate.

Mr. LONG. I must dispute that point with the Senator. The first case announcing the doctrine, to the knowledge of the junior Senator from Louisiana, was the case of Martin against Waddell, decided with regard to Raritan Bay in the State of New Jersey, which set forth the doctrine that the sovereign owns the beds of all tidewaters, and that Raritan Bay is an arm of the sea, and certainly is tidewater. The facts of that case were not related to a dispute over a beach. That was a dispute over rights to an oyster bed, I believe.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the remarks of the junior Senator from Louisiana clarify, somewhat, the issue which is before the Senate at this moment, and certainly it needs clarification. The case to which he has just referred was, as he said, a case affecting Raritan Bay. It was not a case affecting lands submerged by the open ocean. The Senator from Louisiana nods his head affirmatively.

KING'S POWER ACQUIRED BY UNITED STATES

The confusion with respect to interpretation arises from the fact that in Great Britain in the early days, the King exercised certain dominant rights over waters and over minerals. The fact that we today refer to payments which are made to certain owners, including, sometimes, a State or the Federal Government, as royalties, comes from this early procedure. The British King claimed a right in everything. It is true, as the Senator from Louisiana has said, that in Great Britain the King claimed the right to the tidewaters; and that would mean, of course, that wherever the ebb and the flow of the tide showed their effects, then the King could put his heavy foot down upon the people.

Mr. President, we had a revolution in the United States of America by which we denied certain rights which the King claimed. One of those rights had to do with the external sovereignty of the united Thirteen Colonies, acting together as a unit. When the United States of America was established, the national power which had been claimed by the King of England went to the National Government of the United States, so far as external sovereignty is concerned. I think there can be no doubt about that.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator is expressing an argument with which many of us disagree. I call President Monroe as my witness, and as an eyewitness for my side of that case. I doubt whether the Senator can mention anyone who had anything to do with drafting the Constitution who ever argued that the Federal Government actually had powers over and beyond those given by the people, acting through their State governments, in the Constitution. In that document they gave certain powers which were expressly limited. Therefore, those of us who take the States' side at this time feel that, if the States surrendered that element of their sovereignty, someone should show us where in the Constitution it was surrendered.

I know the argument will be made here the Federal Government existed prior to the Constitution, and had powers which were not granted by the Constitution. Personally, I should like to see that argument documented.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me, then, to resume?

Mr. LONG. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is true that the Senator from Louisiana has cited the memorandum of President James Monroe in support of his point of view, but, as I have remarked to the Senator, the memorandum of President James Monroe was filed with the Congress of the United States, in connection with a veto which President Monroe had sent to the Congress with respect to a bill authorizing the expenditure of Federal funds for the purpose of building the Cumberland Road into Maryland. The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is sitting beside the Senator from Louisiana as I speak of the Cumberland Road, for which the President of the United States said the Government of the United States did not have the constitutional power to spend a dollar out of the Federal Treasury.

VETO OVERRIDDEN BY LATER CONGRESSES

In his veto message President Monroe said, "The only way we can build these internal improvements, such as the Cumberland Road, and I am for them"—I am paraphrasing his words, of course—"is by a constitutional amendment." That battle over internal improvements raged through several years and decades, perhaps, in the early history of the United States.

President Monroe was against them, because of what he termed a lack of constitutional power. His successor, President John Quincy Adams, was for them, and John Quincy Adams signed bill after bill providing for the expenditure of Federal funds for the building of turnpikes and roads of the kind President Monroe vetoed.

So the veto of President Monroe—the witness whom the Senator from Louisiana has cited—has been overridden by the Congress of the United States, decade after decade, without a constitutional amendment.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The particular message which was put into the RECORD was not the President's veto message, but his analysis of the formation of the Government and the independence of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the Senator will recall that the veto message referred directly to the memorandum in which President Monroe expressed his own views of the Constitution and stated that he was sending it down the next day.

Mr. LONG. That is true.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So it was, in effect, a part of the message. But my point now is——

Mr. LONG. May I quote from that message?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LONG. The President said:

To do justice to the subject it would be necessary to mount to the source of power in these States and to pursue the power in its gradations and distribution among the several departments in which it is now vested.

President Monroe was there speaking of how the power was derived. He was present at the drafting of the Constitution and had something to say with reference to its ratification and he carefully spelled out the fact that the States had this power and that only limited power was derived under the Constitution. I know the present Supreme Court considers the powers to be a hundred times stronger and broader than President Monroe considered them to be.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Louisiana is changing the subject a little bit. If he will permit me to do so, I will say, with a smile, that his argument can be best described by the witticism of a distinguished citizen of Kentucky who, a few years ago, early in 1948, when what was known as the Dixiecrat movement was beginning before the conventions of 1948 were held, remarked to me, "If at first you don't secede, try, try, again."

The arguments which President Monroe cited in the document to which the Senator from Louisiana refers were the arguments which were cited by those who sought to expand the principle that a State could secede from the Union. I cite a witness whose views have not been overriden by an act of Congress, whose views have not been overriden by the developments of years and who lived in the early days.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator permit me to cite this witness so that I can get the statement into the RECORD without interruption, and then I shall be very happy to yield.

JUSTICE STORY'S VIEWS

I am citing Mr. Justice Story who wrote the very famous Commentaries on the Constitution. I think every lawyer and every student of the Constitution will acknowledge that there is no greater authority upon the meaning and intent and the history of the Constitution of the United States than was Justice Story. In his commentaries Justice Story was giving his views as to the powers possessed by the Colonies. It will be recalled that the Supreme Court, in the California case, said that the Thirteen Colonies had none of this external power, which is the only subject with which we are dealing—the external sovereignty of the Nation.

I should like to read sections 211 to 216 of Justice Story's commentaries:

The Colonies did not severally act for themselves, and proclaim their own independence. * * * It was not an act done by the State governments then organized, nor by persons chosen by them. * * * It was an act of original, inherent sovereignty by the people themselves. * * * So the Declaration of Independence treats it. * * * Whatever, then, may be the theories of ingenious men on the subject, it is historically true that before the Declaration of Independence these Colonies were not, in any absolute sense, sovereign States; that that event did not find them or make them such; but that at the moment of their separation they were under the dominion of a superior controlling National Government whose powers were vested in and exercised by the general Congress with the consent of the people of all the States. * * * From the moment of the Declaration of Independence, if not for most purposes at an antecedent period, the United Colonies must be considered as being a nation de facto, having a general government over it, created and acting by the general consent of the people of all the Colonies. * * * In respect to foreign governments, we were politically known as the United States only; and it was in our national capacity, as such, that we sent and received Ambassadors, entered into treaties and alliances, and were admitted into the general community of nations, who might exercise the right of belligerents, and claim an equality of sovereign powers and prerogatives.

The truth is that the States, individually, were not known nor recognized as sovereign by foreign nations, nor are they now.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator tell me from what he is reading?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. These are quotations from sections 211 to 216 of the Commentaries on the Constitution written by Justice Story.

Mr. LONG. It is not a court decision, is it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator tell me whether Justice Story was alive at the time this Nation began, and whether he was an eye witness.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. That is, he was not an adult at the time.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator permit me to read the views of the court in 1842, in the case of Martin against Waddell? I read from page 1920 of the RECORD:

For when the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government.

And when the people of New Jersey took possession of the reins of government and took into their own hands the powers of sovereignty, the prerogatives and regalities which before belonged either to the Crown or the Parliament became immediately vested in the State.

That is what the court said, speaking officially in a court decision in 1842. That is completely in line with the views of President Monroe, who had something to do with the writing and ratification of the Constitution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Louisiana read an extract from the case which he put into the RECORD in his very thorough and scholarly speech of March 6. He read the whole paragraph, but I want to emphasize a portion of it. I am reading precisely the same words the Senator quoted on the 6th of March and which he has now requoted.

Mr. LONG. From where is the Senator about to read?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. From page 1920 of the RECORD of March 6, 1952, in the second column on that page.

For when the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves the sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government.

Whatever advantage the Senator from Louisiana may wish to take of the beginning of that sentence, however much he may wish to forget for the moment that the court was dealing solely with the waters of the bay and not with the waters of the ocean, he cannot forget, nor can the Senate forget, the concluding, qualifying clause: "Subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government."

EXTERNAL SOVEREIGNTY ELEGATED TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

I say it is historically true that in the Constitution of the United States the States delegated to the United States, and to the Government of the United States, all the attributes of external sovereignty. I need only mention the fact that there was delegated to Congress complete control over interstate and foreign commerce, and there was delegated also in the Constitution the power, whatever it might be, necessary to carry out any of the powers which were granted to the National Government.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In a moment I shall be very happy to yield.

Not only is that true, but in the cases which it is now sought to overturn, the Court has said specifically that the Waddell case, like the Pollard case, and all the other cases cited, referred to waters to which the Federal Government is asserting no title, namely, waters which are covered by the ebb and flow of the tide. These are not the tidewaters which were formerly claimed by the King of England when he asserted, and properly and legally so under the laws of Great Britain at that time, and probably at the present time as well, power over the external sovereignty of Great Britain. The British King had control over lands submerged by the open ocean, by inlets, by bays, and by navigable rivers.

JUSTICE MARSHALL'S CONCEPT

But the United States of America rebelled from the control of the King, and

set up a dual system of government unlike any other in the world by establishing States with local jurisdiction, and the Federal Government with national jurisdiction. So when John Marshall, as Chief Justice of the United States, came to interpret this question in the case of Gibbons against Ogden, he said in words which are not capable of being misunderstood, which have never been attacked or overturned, and which remain the law of the land, that the powers granted under the commerce clause of the Constitution are plenary powers and affect other powers, even those of the States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us what property was involved in the case of Gibbons against Ogden? Was it not the Hudson River?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Hudson River, yes.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator argue that because the Federal Government had a right to regulate a ferry on the Hudson River, the Federal Government therefore owned the Hudson River? The Senator just said power was delegated under the Constitution. In the case he was speaking of, respecting the Government's right to regulate commerce, it was held that the Federal Government had a right to regulate commerce, but the case did not hold that the Government owned the bed of the river.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say again to the Senator that when he cites a veto message from the President of the United States which turned out to be in error, which turned out not to be the view of the Congress of the United States, then I may be permitted to cite the views of the Chief Justice of the United States, merely to bring up another eye witness to combat the eye witness the Senator from Louisiana presents.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as the power to regulate commerce has been held to apply just as much to inland waters as to external waters as properly it should, can the Senator from Wyoming demonstrate to me why, if when the States delegated the right to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, that they thereby surrendered the beds of the marginal sea, then how did they fail to surrender, if he claims they have failed to surrender, jurisdiction over external waters? Can the Senator show me how they have failed to surrender jurisdiction over the Mississippi River, Chesapeake Bay, Long Island Sound, or any other navigable waters?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. As was pointed out in the other cases, and by Thomas Jefferson in the matter I spoke of yesterday, the original States, or some of them, at least, had passed laws governing their inland navigable waters. But the Senator will seek in vain for the citation of a single case in which any of the Thirteen Colonies ever attempted to exercise any external jurisdiction over the ocean.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator show me how a State is going to exercise external jurisdiction over the ocean before it comes into existence, before its rights are created? How were they going to exercise external jurisdiction?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the whole point of my argument. The States did not come into existence as political entities until they won their freedom from Great Britain. Prior to that time external jurisdiction was exercised by the King and the Government of Great Britain. We, acting as a united people, escaped from that control. We set up a new nation, and to that new nation we gave all the external jurisdiction there is.

The Senator from Louisiana is now leading a battle here to assert some of the sovereignty for his State which the American Revolution took away from the British King who had exercised it over the Thirteen Colonies. I say the time has not arrived for the surrender of that sovereignty which was won by all of the people of the new Nation for the Nation.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that the Senator is arguing in two directions. I believe he is arguing in the alternative. I should like to get this matter straight. I believe he is arguing, on the one hand, that the States never actually possessed sovereignty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has just acknowledged that.

Mr. LONG. On the other hand, I believe the Senator from Wyoming is arguing that the States possessed sovereignty but then surrendered it under the Constitution. It seems to me the facts are that the States possessed it and have never surrendered it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. The Senator is mistaking the argument of the Supreme Court in the Waddell case for my argument. I was merely pointing out that in the case the Senator cited, the Supreme Court said the power of the States was subject to the rights which were surrendered. So I am saying that the rights which were surrendered by the Constitution were all the power and jurisdiction which are attached to external sovereignty.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from Wyoming point out any other provision of the Constitution to support his contention, other than the provision in section 7, the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is section 8.

Mr. ELLENDER. Section 8; yes. In other words, are we to understand that the Senator is contending that the provision "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indiar tribes" gives rise to property rights?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I am not talking about that at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what the Senator is arguing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; the Senator from Wyoming is not saying that, and neither is the Senator from Louisiana, nor are any other opponents of the bill making any contention with respect to property rights per se. All this controversy is about one simple problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. As to who owns the bottom of the ocean?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; as to who has jurisdiction over lands which are submerged by the open sea --the sea, the ocean, the highway of commerce and of navigation, which is governed by national authority and not by State authority.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is so far as navigation is concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The problem was clearly set forth in the Supreme Court decision, and again it is set forth in every one of the cases which the junior Senator from Louisiana has cited. We have them here. They were gathered for the committee by the Library of Congress, and they include cases from Martin against Waddell, decided in 1842, Pollard's Lessee against Hagen, decided in 1845, down through United States against O'Donnell, decided in 1938. Every one of those cases refers specifically to lands under inland navigable waters of the coastal States, which are not affected by this bill. We seek to affirm these Supreme Court decisons by the amendment which has now been offered.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Wyoming, the distinguished chairman of our committee, has given some thought to this problem. As he knows, we did call witnesses, some of whom he summoned on his own motion, to help give us advice on the inland water problem. Would the Senator be willing to accept my amendment, that Congress should determine by law—which means, of course, that it would have to be by an act of Congress subject to the President's veto, like any other act of Congress—the boundaries of inland waters?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that I think his amendment is a little premature, for this reason: There is no doubt in my mind—and I do not hesitate to say it—that the Congress does have the power to fix the external boundaries. As the Senator knows, as a member of our committee, we have not attempted to study the complexities of the coast and geodetic surveys, which necessarily would be involved in fixing such boundaries.

SUPREME COURT INQUIRY AS TO BOUNDARIES

We know that in the California case the Court is seeking to find out what the formula should be for fixing such boundaries. It seems to me that it is better policy to await the determination of the

Supreme Court in that case, since it will be the affirmation or modification of a report by the special master who is now holding hearings on this very matter. It is better to await that than to attempt now merely to reassert a power which Congress already has. I do not think we ought to deprive ourselves, as this amendment might do, of the benefit of the report which will be made by the master. That is the only question I have in mind in that connection.

If the Senator would change the word "shall" to the word "may" I should be very much disposed to accept his amendment. My suggestion is made solely for the reason that I do not want to deprive the committee and the Congress of the benefit of whatever studies and conclusions may be derived by the special master and the Supreme Court on this very complex question.

But again I say, as I said during the hearings, that I have no hesitation whatever in affirming the principle which has been cited by the Supreme Court in decision after decision, that inland navigable waters, including bays, harbors, inlets, sounds, and the like, are within the jurisdiction of the States.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Actually the master has been trying to decide what the boundary line should be between inland waters and outside waters. As developed in our hearings in the brief time we had to go into this subject, he has absolutely nothing to go on. The nearest this country has ever come, so far as we can determine, to having anything at all to go on in deciding upon a boundary was when Mr. BOGGS went to a conference in Geneva and proposed a formula as a basis for study or discussion. No one ever agreed that that should be the basis for discussion. He said, "Why do we not use this as a starting point?" It was not even agreed that the suggested formula should be made use of as a starting point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Perlman urged such a formula upon the World Court in the fisheries case, involving Norway. He contended that such formula should be regarded as settled international law. The World Court spent one paragraph in rejecting it, saying that the so-called standard could not be regarded as meaning very much. The American delegate stated that in his opinion that formula could not be regarded as being accepted.

When we have nothing at all to go on, unless Congress undertakes to decide the question and reserves to itself the decision, again we shall have Mr. Perlman, Mr. White, and the other Federal officials injecting themselves into the issue. I should be pleased to hear their advice, but I believe that Congress should perform its function. This is not a judicial function. It happens to be a legislative function.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is quite right. However, because of the difficulties to which he has alluded, and which I have already mentioned, and knowing the numberless problems which our committee has to deal with, I am frank to say that I should like to see the special master appointed by the Supreme Court gather and correlate this material.

CONGRESS' POWER TO FIX BOUNDARIES

I acknowledge the power of Congress to fix these boundaries, and I say that if they are not promptly fixed I shall be very happy, when we have a little more time to give to this subject, if I am chairman of the committee, to appoint a subcommittee of which the Senator from Louisiana would be a member, to travel all around the coast of the United States and try to find out what the boundary is. As I say, if the Senator will modify his amendment so as to substitute the word "may" for the word "shall," I shall be very happy indeed to accept it.

Mr. LONG. Would it make the amendment acceptable if, rather than changing that word, we should leave it as it stands, with the word "shall," but provide that the master should present his recommendations to our committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should be very happy to go along with that suggestion.

Mr. LONG. I shall offer such language.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will let me see it after it has been drafted, I think we can agree on language which will accomplish the desired purpose, because we want to get along in a practical manner.

DOCUMENTATION AS TO CERTAIN PHASE OF KOREAN WAR

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Wyoming yield to me for a few moments?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Despite the formidable appearance of all the material before me, I wish to take only a few minutes to place certain very limited parts in the RECORD.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When I saw the books which the Senator brought in, I thought perhaps I would have a little opportunity for rest.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, in connection with the debate in the Senate, I was requested to provide some documentation for a claim which I made, that the State Department had invited the Communist armed forces into South Korea.

Yesterday, as soon as I could obtain the material, I placed in the RECORD a copy of an address delivered by Secretary of State Acheson to the National Press Club in January of 1950. I invited the special attention of the Senate to the following language in Secretary Acheson's speech. He said, as appears on page 2049 of the RECORD of March 10:

> This defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus. We hold important defense positions in the Ryukyu Islands and those we will continue to hold. In the interest of the population of the Ryukyu Islands, we will at an appropriate time offer to hold these islands under trusteeship of the United Nations. But they are essential parts of the defensive perimeter of the Pacific and they must, and will, be held.

I pointed out that the line thus drawn excluded Korea and Formosa.

I wish now to read an excerpt from a copy of a letter from Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I do not know the exact date of it, but the fact of the letter will not be disputed. It appeared in the September 1, 1950, issue of the United States News. It took quite a while to pry it loose. The President, you will recall, tried to suppress it. In the letter General MacArthur said:

> From 1942 through 1944 Formosa was a vital link in the transportation and communications chain which stretched from Japan through Okinawa and the Philippines to southeast Asia. As the United States carrier forces advanced into the western Pacific the bases on Formosa assumed an increasingly greater role in the Japanese defense scheme. Should Formosa fall into the hands of a hostile power, history would repeat itself. Its military potential would again be fully exploited as the means to breach and neutralize our western Pacific defense system and mount a war of conquest against the free nations of the Pacific Basin.

I skip a paragraph and continue to read from General MacArthur's letter:

> Nothing in the last 5 years has so inspired the Far East as the American determination to preserve the bulwarks of our Pacific Ocean strategic position from future encroachment, for few of its peoples fail accurately to appraise the safeguard such determination brings to their free institutions.
>
> To pursue any other course would be to turn over the fruits of our Pacific victory to a potential enemy. It would shift any future battle area 5,000 miles eastward to the coasts of the American Continents, our own home coasts; it would completely expose our friends in the Philippines, our friends in Australia and New Zealand, our friends in Indonesia, our friends in Japan and other areas to the lustful thrusts of those who stand for slavery as against liberty, for atheism as against God.

Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the current impression of the press at the time of Secretary Acheson's speech at the National Press Club, in which he excluded Formosa and Korea from our defense perimeter. I am looking at a copy of the Baltimore Sun of January 13, 1950. I observe on page 6 a map which shows the communistic-dominated areas, and the free areas: Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Okinawa, and other islands and areas, and Formosa and Southern Korea.

The caption of the map states: "State Department view of China."

The description reads:

> Map locates Outer Mongolia, Inner Mongolia, Manchuria, and Sinkiang, which Secretary of State Acheson has accused Russia of being in the process of taking over.

I pause to say that at the very moment Secretary Acheson is emphasizing the encroachments of Communist Russia in China he excludes Korea and Formosa from the areas which deserve our military interest and despite the fact that we had definite duties to help preserve those areas for unembarrassed disposition under later peace treaties.

The caption under the map to which I have referred continues:

Tannu Tuva was annexed by the Soviets in March 1948. The black area in China is that controlled by the Chinese Communists.

The sawtooth line is the United States' western Pacific defense perimeter as outlined by Acheson.

I add that the sawtooth line does not include Korea or Formosa.

Now we turn to the Washington Evening Star of Friday, January 13, 1950. The Evening Star of that date carries the same map. It is labeled AP Wirephoto. Under the map, which is exactly the same as the map to which I have referred, as printed in the Baltimore Sun, appears almost the identical editorial comment. It reads:

China—A State Department outline. This map locates Outer Mongolia, Manchuria, Sinkiang, and Inner Mongolia: North China areas which Secretary of State Acheson yesterday accused Russia of taking over. He said the process of attaching the areas to the Soviet Union is complete in Outer Mongolia and nearly complete in Manchuria.

Mr. President, I again interpolate that this was at the very time when the State Department put out maps and issued statements that Korea and Formosa were beyond the sphere of our military interest.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the map indicate that it is a map which was released by the State Department?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It so indicates to me, although I am not prepared to affirm it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask whether it would make any difference who actually released the map, when all one needed to do was to take the speech of the Secretary of State and mark a map according to the limits placed in his speech?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Washington is entirely correct. The only reason I refer to these maps is to show that the statement I made yesterday was the general opinion with respect to Mr. Acheson's statement at the time it was made, as it appeared in the newspapers of the country.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Colorado know of anyone who could safely maintain that the Secretary of State in his Press Club speech did not exclude both Korea and Formosa from America's sphere of military interest?

Mr. MILLIKIN. So far as I know, nothing of that kind has ever been maintained, with the exception of an implication which came in a question addressed to me on the floor of the Senate yesterday, asking me to document what I had stated. That is why I have been doing some documentation.

O, Mr. President, I could stand for an entire month on the floor of the Senate reading all the comments which have been made on the subject. I could go on endlessly with that subject. I am not particularly interested in proving the opinion. I merely wished to comply, I hope graciously, with the request which was made of me by a Senator from the other side of the aisle that I document what I was saying.

Mr. CAIN. I know that the Senator from Colorado, or any other Senator, would have no difficulty whatever in destroying completely the implication involved in the question asked yesterday.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree completely. I hope that there may be people foolish enough to continue to press requests for documentation and requests for proof. It would merely help to emphasize a subject which cannot be forgotten by the fathers and mothers of those who are being killed and wounded and lost in Korea.

I continue to quote from the Evening Star:

The black area in China is that controlled by Chinese Communists. The saw-toothed line is the United States western Pacific defense perimeter, as outlined by Mr. Acheson. It excludes Formosa.

Mr. President, I shall not ask that a copy of the map be printed in the RECORD. It can be found in the newspapers by anyone especially interested I have identified its presence. It is on page A-15 of the Washington Evening Star of Friday, January 13, 1950. My memory is that the same map was printed all over the United States. I do not know of any newspaper which in commenting on the subject did not agree with the plain language of Acheson's speech, namely, that he had excluded Formosa and Korea.

That is all I care to say at the present time in pursuit of the question of documentation. I thank the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for extending me this courtesy.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I rise to comment briefly and cordially upon the amendment offered yesterday afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, for himself and other Senators, about which the Senator from Wyoming said:

The amendment which we are offering is, in effect, an adaptation of Senate bill 1540, which was introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself in this Congress.

Mr. President, my reason for commenting cordially and favorably upon the amendment offered yesterday afternoon by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is not that I think the amendment by itself makes the pending joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 20, anywhere near sufficient in its recognition of the rights of the States, but that it does show that the Senator from Wyoming and his associates are beginning to see that the States do have a very definite and vital interest in this subject matter, and are beginning to make concessions, which I hope they may continue to make in even greater measure, so that the final legislative enactment on this subject, if any there be, will conform to the views of the advocates of Senate bill 940, introduced by approximately 35 Senators.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield at this point, to permit me to make a comment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rise because the Senator from Florida has referred to the amendment as a concession. I wish to have the RECORD perfectly clear that, as I interpret the amendment, it is not a concession at all; it is merely an affirmation of a position which we have taken from the very beginning.

Those of us who have opposed the quitclaiming of the bed of the open ocean have done so on the theory that the open ocean is one thing and the inland navigable waters are another thing, and that the rule which applies to the open ocean is the rule of national sovereignty, and the rule which applies to the inland navigable waters is the rule of State sovereignty. We are willing and anxious to make that affirmation a matter of law.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, in order that it may be completely clear why I state that the new amendment, as offered yesterday afternoon, for the first time comes nearer to protecting the rights of the States than has the earlier proposal, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have Senate bill 1540, which the Senator from Wyoming said was the measure of which his amendment of yesterday is an adaptation, printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently decided the cases of *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19), *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699), and *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707), holding that the United States has paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico adjacent to those States, seaward of the ordinary low-water mark and outside of inland waters; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States had previously held that the States own the beds of inland navigable waters within their respective boundaries; and

Whereas the Attorney General of the United States has declared, both before and since the aforesaid decisions, that the United States makes no claim of title to lands beneath inland navigable waters; and

Whereas, despite the reiteration of this disavowal with respect to title to lands beneath inland navigable waters, some concern

has been expressed that such claim might nevertheless be made; and

Whereas there is no intention to claim, on behalf of the United States, title to any lands beneath inland navigable waters; and

Whereas it is in the public interest that additional assurance be given by the Congress that the United States does not claim title to lands beneath inland navigable waters: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SECTION 1. That the United States hereby releases and relinquishes unto the several States and the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the laws of such States, and unto the respective lawful grantees, lessees, or possessors in interest thereof under State authority, all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to all lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States.

SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term "navigable" means navigable at the time of the admission of a State into the Union under the laws of the United States; the term "inland waters" includes the waters of bays, rivers, ports, and harbors which are landward of the open sea, as well as the area covered and uncovered by the tides; and lands beneath navigable inland waters include filled in or reclaimed lands which formerly were within that category; the term "submerged coastal lands" means submerged lands lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of the United States and outside of the inland waters and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of this act shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (1) which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (2) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (3) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (4) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians. This act shall not apply to water power, or to the use of water for the production of power, or to any right to develop water power which has been or may be expressly reserved by the United States for its own benefit or for the benefit of its licensees or permittees under any law of the United States.

TITLE II

SEC. 101. Any right granted prior to January 1, 1951, by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged coastal lands, or any such right to the surface of filled in or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to January 1, 1951.

SEC. 102. Nothing in section 101 of this title shall be construed as confirming or recognizing any right with respect to oil, gas, or other minerals in submerged coastal lands; or as confirming or recognizing any interest in submerged coastal lands other than that essential to the right to construct, maintain, use, and occupy the structures enumerated in that section, or to the use and occupancy of the surface of filled in or reclaimed land.

SEC. 103. The structures enumerated in section 101 shall not be construed as including derricks, wells, or other installations in submerged coastal lands employed in the exploration, development, extraction, and production of oil and gas or other minerals, or as including necessary structures for the development of water power.

SEC. 104. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal, limit, or affect in any way any provision of law relating to the national defense, fisheries, the control of navigation, or the improvement, protection, and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States; or to repeal, limit, or affect any provision of law heretofore or hereafter enacted pursuant to the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

TITLE III

SEC. 201. Any person seeking the authorization of the United States to use or occupy any submerged coastal lands for the construction of, or additions to, installations of the type enumerated in section 101 of title II of this act, shall apply therefor to the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, who shall have authority to issue such authorization, upon such terms and conditions as in his discretion may seem appropriate.

SEC. 202. Within 2 years of the date of the enactment of this act, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the use and occupancy of submerged coastal lands for installations of the type enumerated in section 101 of title II of this act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, from an examination of Senate bill 1540, and after comparing it even casually with the amendment submitted yesterday, it appears that the determined fight which those who believe in States rights have made in the course of this debate, in defending the rights of the several States, is beginning to show results and is beginning to pay off in a greater recognition than has heretofore been given by those who have been so insistently urging the enactment of what they call interim legislation, but what was admitted by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, on the floor the other afternoon, to be a measure sufficient in its terms to provide for the complete exhaustion of the oil and gas in all the submerged lands lying off-shore of all the States of the Nation.

Senate bill 1540 was a repetition of a bill introduced by the same Senators or some of the same group in an earlier Congress.

By comparing Senate bill 1540 with the earlier bill and with the amendment of yesterday afternoon, it will appear that the distinguished Senators who sponsor the amendment, headed by the Senator from Wyoming, are, as I have just stated, evidencing greater and greater appreciation for the claims of the States and the position of the States. Let me express the fervent hope that that attitude will continue and will ripen into an even greater showing of understanding of the rights and positions of the States.

Mr. President, in the first instance I wish to show, by a comparison between Senate bill 1540 and the amendment of yesterday, that the amendment of yesterday for the first time brings into the field the complete quitclaiming to the affected States of their submerged lands lying within the areas of the so-called Great Lakes, whose names are well known.

I think the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and the other Senators who were associated with him in connection with the introduction of Senate bill 1540, and who have been taking the position which they have been maintaining, were rather shocked to find, in the course of the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 20, that the distinguished Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. Perlman, who stated that under his direction Senate bill 1540 and its predecessor had been drawn up, had deliberately excluded any reference to the Great Lakes because, as stated by Mr. Perlman and as shown in the hearings, he felt that it was not timely for that particular portion of the subject matter to be covered by the legislation. He felt there was at least one real point of difference and differentiation between the beds of the Great Lakes and the beds of other waters which might be regarded as inland waters, which point was that international boundaries are involved in all the Great Lakes except one, and that even though we now have a friendly neighbor adjoining us there, and we hope we may always have a friendly neighbor there, namely, the present one, Canada, at the same time international boundaries are involved, so that the Solicitor General and those entrusted by him with the drafting of this particular piece of proposed legislation had felt it would be unwise to include the Great Lakes and the quitclaiming of the submerged lands within the Great Lakes States, lands which lie under the waters of the Great Lakes.

So I congratulate the Senator from Wyoming and his associates for finally recognizing the fact that there are States which are tremendously affected by the fact that large bodies of their areas, within their constitutional limits, lie under and are submerged by the waters of the Great Lakes.

Therefore, Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Wyoming and his associates for recognizing that fact for the first time and for including in their amendment of yesterday appropriate recitals under which, if their amendment should be adopted and if the joint resolution as thus amended should be enacted, for the first time provision would be made for the quitclaiming of the Great Lakes submerged lands to the States which are vitally affected.

In order that there may be no possible misunderstanding, at this time I identify as sections 1 and 2 the sections of Senate bill 1540 which pertain to the inland waters; and I identify as sections 11 and 12, as proposed yesterday, the similar sections of the amendment submitted yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The Senate will see by a comparison of those sections, and I wish the RECORD to show, that as a result of the determined effort made by those who on the floor of the Senate, in committee, and elsewhere have insisted that the States do have vital rights and interests which should be protected, for the first time

the advocates of this proposed legislation have recognized that there is here a vital question affecting several of our finest States, and those Senators have included in their amendment of yesterday a provision which is designed to quitclaim to those States their submerged lands.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me at this time?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator from Florida to allow me to say at this point that sections 11 and 12 were introduced in the form in which they appear in the amendment in order to make it clear that the purpose of Senate bill 1540 and of Senate bill 923 of the previous Congress and of the Congress before that, I believe, was merely to affirm a position which the Supreme Court has taken with respect to inland navigable waters, a position which the Government of the United States took with respect to inland navigable waters in the presentation of the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases, and a position which the sponsors of the pending joint resolution have taken from the very beginning. The amendment does not represent any change of view at all, but represents a positive affirmation of the position which it seems to us runs through the entire argument in this case. We base our position upon the argument that the open ocean is one thing, and that inland waters are another; and upon the argument that they were divided because the National Government received all the attributes of external sovereignty, and the States, of course, the attributes of State or local sovereignty.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator; and yet reiterate what I just said, namely, that the Solicitor General of the United States, in his appearance before the committee, made it completely clear that in the drafting of this particular legislation he specifically excluded reference to the Great Lakes, because he thought they involved a different question which it was not timely to solve by this particular legislation. So, I think a great step forward has been made by the Senators sponsoring this so-called, but miscalled, interim legislation, by their inclusion in the amendment of yesterday of specific provisions which for the first time recognized that there are serious questions in this field, affecting the Great Lakes States of the Union.

The next point I want to mention is the fact that, as shown by this amendment of yesterday and by comparing it with the provisions of Senate bill 1540, more and more are the advocates of this miscalled interim legislation beginning to realize that the States have very vital rights in connection with piers and docks and reclaimed lands which project into the ocean, and structures which have been erected upon such reclaimed lands and groins and bulkheads and jetties and other structures of that kind, which have been built freely up to this time, under the belief that the States had jurisdiction, with affirmative action taken by the States to give the right to individuals or to local units of government to use those portions of the bottom lands which were needed for these particular developments.

Mr. President, the view of our friends of the opposition has become increasingly one of recognition of the fact that there are tremendous and vital property interests which are included in this phase of the question; because, instead of limiting the quitclaiming of those parts of the beds of the ocean which are involved in these particular questions, as of the date of the California decision, which was the date involved in the earlier legislation, in earlier Congresses, and instead of quitclaiming it as of January 1, 1951, as is shown by a reading of section 101 of Senate bill 1540 to have been their intent, the distinguished Senators who offered this particular latest amendment have instead brought the date up to the time of the actual passage of this proposed legislation, if it passes, and up to the time it becomes law. Those Senators who are interested in this question can see that the date is thus brought forward a period of several years from the date stated in the original draft of this legislation by Mr. Perlman and those serving him, from 1947 to the date when this legislation shall be enacted, if it shall be enacted. They will see that point more clearly made, if they will compare section 14 of the amendment offered yesterday with section 101 of Senate bill 1540, and with the similar section of the earlier bills, which were pending in the Eighty-first Congress and in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. President, I shall not labor this question further. I am merely pointing out the fact that the continued insistence by those who believe in States' rights upon the fact that the States have vital rights involved in this question is beginning to pay off and is beginning to receive some recognition in the minds of those who are seeking to pass this so-called interim legislation. It is beginning to be realized by them that there are questions involved which do not pertain to oil, and which are entitled to very complete consideration by the Senate and by the Congress as a whole.

Mr. President, to conclude, briefly, I simply desire to state that while these showings of increase in the understanding on the part of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and his associates of the problems of the States are appreciated, yet they still fall far short of the recognition which I think must ultimately be given to the rights of the States in this vital field.

I invite attention to the fact that the permanent provision contained in Senate bill 1540, and which is an exceedingly objectionable provision to the States, is retained in the amendment offered yesterday. I refer to the provision which is to the effect that anyone who wishes to construct a dock, a pier, a wharf, a jetty, or any other structure on submerged coastal land, or to fill in or reclaim any land or to exercise any right in connection therewith, must subject himself to the jurisdiction of the bureaucracy of Washington. That fact is clearly shown by the sections of the amendment offered yesterday and numbered 18 and 19, and the Senate will find that they are identical with sections 201 and 202 contained in Senate bill 1540.

The States feel, and, I think, properly so, that it is an intolerable diminution of their sovereignty and an intolerable handicap on them, their activities, their cities, and their industries, to have to come to Washington with hat in hand every time they want to build a pier, a dock, or a jetty, or wish to fill a small area of the shallow land adjoining their coastlines in order that developments worth millions upon millions of dollars may be constructed thereon, as is the case in my own State of Florida, and in the State so ably represented by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], who is now sitting in the seat of the minority leader. It is felt that it is not only a substantial diminution of the sovereignty of our States to have a bureau in Washington handle matters of that kind, but that it imposes an intolerable handicap and barrier to their normal development in fields which touch them locally in the most vital way, for them to have to come to Washington in connection with every little detail of their own development to gain consent before they can use even a foot of their submerged lands.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Florida with respect to the phase of the issue which is presently before the Senate. We in New Jersey are greatly concerned. I am trying to obtain from the New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development, as of this afternoon, a complete record of New Jersey investments involved in this aspect of the debate. I hope to be able, for the benefit of the Senator from Florida and other Senators, to obtain before the debate is concluded statistics which I think will be amazing to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I know full well that some of the piers which have been erected at the expense of millions of dollars at the coast resort cities of his State, for instance, the Steel pier and the Heinz pier at Atlantic City, involve vital questions arising under the particular phase of the field now being explored in connection with the proposed legislation. While the amendment offered yesterday by the Senator from Wyoming and other Senators would perhaps clear up questions which are presented by structures already built, there still remains the fact that States are growing and developing and that the right to continue to develop their littoral and the shallow waters adjoining their shores constitutes one of the most important fields of their development. The States must insist upon their complete right to continue to exercise sovereignty over the lands adjoining their communities which mean so much in

connection with their development and continued prosperity.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I assume the Senator is referring to amendment 3–7–52–g; is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is 3–7–52–c, and it appears on page 2033 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday.

The point I am making is that no permanent concessions to the States are made by this amendment in the vital field of continued development of our coastal areas.

We know the strength of the effort being made by those who, like the Senator from New Jersey and myself, feel that the amendment falls far short of giving to the States the recognition of the freedom of action and the restoration of their vital sovereignty which are required if the States are to continue to develop and prosper as we hope they will.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I share completely the views of the Senator from Florida, and I hope that every Member of the Senate will give very serious consideration to the aspect which we are now discussing.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New Jersey, and I yield the floor.

PEANUT MARKETING QUOTAS

During the delivery of Mr. HOLLAND'S speech,

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2697, Calendar Order No. 1185, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I merely wish to say that I have conferred with the Senator from New Hampshire, on the opposite side of the aisle, and that he has no objection to having the bill considered at this time. It simply repeals certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which gave to the peanut growers certain additional acreage to be used for oil purposes only. It is a repealer; it reduces the quantity rather than increases it.

Among my cosponsors of the bill are the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who opposed the bill when I introduced it in the Senate, and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who also opposed it; but they are now glad to join with me in the repealer. I am very glad that is so, since it would seem wise to take action at this time, inasmuch as those in charge of PMA inform me that, unless the bill is passed this week, they will not know how to advise the planters.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Did I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from Georgia said that the Senator from Vermont joins in the bill with the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. He is one of the authors.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. So he favors it, of course.

Mr. GEORGE. He favors it. I spoke to the distinguished chairman of the committee, who is on the floor at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to state that I also joined in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee was unanimous in reporting the bill to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2697) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i). Repeal of these subsections shall not affect rights or obligations arising under marketing-quota or price support operations with respect to 1951 or prior crops of peanuts.

M. JEAN PAUL DAVID

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks in relation to the effort which is being put forth in France to combat Communist infiltration in that country. Recently I was privileged to converse with a member of the Chamber of Deputies of France, M. Jean Paul David, who became a member of the French Parliament in 1946 and was reelected in 1951.

M. David studied very closely the methods of propaganda employed by the Communists as well as their political activity in France. He also made a special study of the counterpropaganda used by the other French political parties to fight communism. He arrived at the conclusion that the struggle against communism must be waged by entirely different methods in order to obtain worth while results. He decided that the fight against communism had to be conducted on a nonpartisan level and by using the same tactics which the Communists used to further their ends.

In 1950, he created a new movement whose sole aim is to fight the French Communist party, which he considers to be the agent of Soviet imperialism in France. The movement which is called Peace and Freedom is designed to rouse and unite all those who are determined to fight for truth and against Communist lies.

It matters little what our political persuasions are or to what party we belong as long as we unite and have one aim, namely, to fight communism. All Frenchmen who wish to remain free must concentrate all their efforts and energies to fight for the defense of their freedom—

Says Jean Paul David.

In its campaign Peace and Freedom makes use of posters, pamphlets, weekly bulletins, and radio broadcasts. All these are designed to place before the public objective information which deflates Communist propaganda and exposes its lies.

The Peace and Freedom movement has already obtained most satisfactory results. In the 1951 elections, Communist candidates and their fellow travelers lost 500,000 votes, whereas it was expected that they would gain votes.

Membership in the French Communist Party declined by 30 percent in 1951. The circulation of the main Communist newspaper, L'Humanite, has fallen off from 500,000 daily to 160,000 daily.

So we can see, Mr. President, that the campaign of "Peace and Freedom" was really effective.

The violent attacks launched by the Communists against "Peace and Freedom" are without doubt the best proof that this movement has become a great danger to communism in France.

One example which proves how effective Peace and Freedom is in its fight against communism is that ever since 1917 the Communist Party in France was accustomed to organize parades to celebrate the anniversary of the October revolution in Russia. That revolution was extolled as the greatest achievement for the liberation of mankind. Peace and Freedom devised a poster which showed the balance sheet of that "great revolution," and the bloody and sinister character of a political upheaval which has brought death to all its initiators except four: Stalin, Andreyer, Molotov, Vorochilov. Other posters were pasted all over French cities and villages showing the roster of the names of Lenin's companions and coworkers, and the fate that had befallen them.

Mr. President, on that poster, which is in French and a copy of which I have here, are posted the names of persons who were members of the Politburo. The list begins with the name of Leon Trotsky, who was murdered by the GPU.

Six more names appear as members of the Politburo. All six were executed. The list ends with the name of M. Tomski, who it is noted committed suicide by persuasion.

There is another list containing the names of members of the diplomatic and consular corps who were executed. I notice alongside the names the information that some of them were imprisoned, some disappeared, some were poisoned, some were executed, and some were jailed and then disappeared.

The next list contains names of marshals and generals who were executed. Another list contains names of admirals and vice admirals who were executed. The next list is of NKVD men who were executed. Another list is of members of the diplomatic and consular corps who were executed. The next list is of leaders of the Comintern who were executed, liquidated, and disappeared. There is also a list of writers, historians, and artists who were executed, committed suicide, were liquidated, or disappeared. There is a long list of such persons.

Mr. President, instead of reading all these names into the RECORD, and since I believe this is a worth-while publication of names to show what really happened to those who were the founders

of this so-called liberation movement, this great humanitarian movement, I ask unanimous consent that the names be taken from the poster and printed in the RECORD following the various titles.

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

Members of the Politburo: Léon Trotsky, murdered by the GPU; G. Zinoviev, executed; L. Kamenev, executed; N. Boukharine, executed; A. Rykov, executed; G. Sokolnikov, executed; M. Tomski, committed suicide by persuasion.

Members of diplomatic and consular corps executed: I. Smirnov, executed; I. Smilca, executed; L. Serebriakov, executed; G. Evdokimov, executed; M. Bogoulavski, executed; N. Ouglanov, executed; A. Beloborodov, executed; I. Roudzoutak, executed; V. Lominadze, committed suicide; N. Skrypnik, committed suicide; A. Khandjian, committed suicide; I. Camarnik, committed suicide; H. Iagoda, executed; F. Khodjaiev, executed; V. Kouibychev, poisoned; V. Ossinski, executed; G. Petrovski, executed; K. Soukhomline, executed; V. Zatonski, executed; L. Kavtaradze, executed; V. Kossior, executed; G. Lomov, executed; N. Krylenko, executed; K. Radek, imprisoned, disappeared; S. Ordjonikidze, poisoned; T. Tcherviakov, committed suicide; I. Khodjaiev, committed suicide; P. Lioubtchenko, committed suicide; A. Enoukidze, executed; L. Karakhan, executed; B. Mdivani, executed; G. Safarov, executed; A. Rosengoltz, executed; G. Grinko, executed; I. Reingold, executed; M. Tchernov, executed; Preobrajenski, executed; Chr. Racovski, jailed, disappeared; Postychev, executed; Tchoubar, executed; Boubnov, executed; Eikhe, executed; Antipov, executed; Mejlaouk, executed; Soulimov, executed; Milioutine, executed; Soltz, executed; Arbouzov, executed; Iakovlev, executed; Unchlikht, executed.

Marshals and generals who were executed; Toukatchevski, Kork, Eideman, Primakov, Levandovski, Iakir, Ouborevitch, Feldman, Putna, Schmidt, Kouzmitchov, Kachirine, Dybenko, Blucher, Smoline, Ozoline, Hekker, Kouibychev, Khripine, Mezis, Bokis, Alksnis, Bielov, Egorov, Savitski, Velikanov, Corbatchoc, Soukhoroukov, Tkatchev, Pomerantzev, Apse, etc.

Admirals and vice admirals executed: Orlov, Sivkov, Loudri, Kojanov, Ivanov, Victorov, Mouklevitch, Kireiev, Douchenov, Smirnov-Sverdlovski.

NKVD men executed: Agranov, Balitski, Pauker, Zakosvski, Deribas, Mironov, Peters, Prokofiev, Messing, Trilisser, Sloutski, Moltchanov, Leplevski, Latsis.

Members of diplomatic and consular corps executed: Iouriniev, Davtian, Antonov-Ovseinko, Iakoubovitch, Arens, Podolski, Asmus, Arossiev, Rosenberg, Tikhmeniev, Bekjadian, Brodovski, Ostrovski.

Leaders of the Comintern executed, liquidated, and disappeared: Hélène Stassova, Bela Kun, Remmele, Waletski, Brandt, Borodine, Neuman, Piatnitski, Eberlein, Warski, Dombal, Max Hoeltz.

Writers, historians, artists executed, having committed suicide, liquidated, and disappeared: N. Goumilev, Averbach, B. Pilniak, Libedinski, B. Jasenski, N. Klioulev, Selvinski, Vorovski, Krotki, Stieklov, Friedland, Anichev, S. Daline, Rojkov, Lapinski, Kirchon, Ermilov, I. Babel, Parrassov-Rodionov, Mandelstamm, Tretiatkov, Erdman, Nevski, Zeidel, Piontkovski, Gronski, Loudianov, M. Koltsov, P. Vassiliev, Bezymenski, I. Kataiev, I. Makarov, Maznine, G. Serebriakova, Amaglobeli, Rafalski, Meyerhold, Selivanovski, Liadov, Arcadine, N. Satz, Maiakovski, Kousnietzov, A. Sobol, Essenine, Y. Piast, etc.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the impact of this poster campaign was so tremendous that last October, for the first time in 34 years, the Communists did not dare to organize any celebration for the bloody October revolution.

Peace and Freedom, which is a movement sponsored and spearheaded by a member of the Deputies, M. Jean Paul David, was determined to step up the fight. It has now taken the form of a universal movement. Peace and Freedom committees have been created in Germany, Belgium, Italy, The Netherlands, and Vietnam. Peace and Freedom has only one aim, namely, to destroy communism.

Mr. President, in our own country we have the same problem. The Saturday Evening Post recently published an editorial along the same line, entitled "Erudite Radicals Cannot Forgive an Anti-Communist." I shall read a portion of it:

From a recent letter by a New York man who, were it not for the horrid implications which have attached themselves to the word, might be described as an "intellectual":

"Even now, most of the college people I talk to react with shock and horror at the idea of a book by Whittaker Chambers. This includes many who have never been fellow travelers."

Mr. President, I should like to read another quotation from this editorial. Near the end it says:

So, ever since the House Committee on Un-American Activities, through a series of lucky chances and solid researches, took the lid off the Communist underground in America, we have had the discouraging phenomenon of the anti-anti-Communists. They have sneered and sniped at anybody whose testimony helped destroy the myth that there was no Communist espionage in this country and that, if there was, it did not involve nice people. And, of course, the man they hated most was the man who supplied the evidence and made it stick—Whittaker Chambers. Oh, no; they didn't want the Communist plot to succeed, if there was a Communist plot, but Chambers wasn't the man to expose it.

The story now comes around to the time when liberals, radicals, and Park Avenue Pinkos will have to make up their minds: Do they want the Communist conspiracy to succeed, or don't they? The day is at hand when they must admit that the gold brick they bought 20 years ago was a phony. It's time to stop trying to hawk it about the streets and upper-class cocktail bars as a genuine article. Chambers has contributed that much to history, and it is no good standing around and waiting for a nicer man to tell the story. The "nice men" have turned up in distressing numbers on the other side.

Lost causes are usually futile, but there are lost causes that can be defended in good faith and dignity. But what can be said of a lost cause like the belief that Russian-Communist dictatorship is "liberal," and that its spies and propagandists are proper subjects for "tolerance"? Not very much.

Mr. President, I should like to have the entire editorial placed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks, so that no part of it will be considered as having been taken out of context.

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

ERUDITE RADICALS CANNOT FORGIVE AN ANTI-COMMUNIST

From a recent letter by a New York man who, were it not for the horrid implications which have attached themselves to the word, might be described as an intellectual:

"Even now most of the college people I talk to react with shock and horror at the idea of a book by Whittaker Chambers. This includes many who have never been fellow travelers."

Now that Mr. Chambers has swung into his epic story, it may be that the intelligentsia will get some intelligence, but there is no reason to expect a mass conversion. The black-out of the supposedly responsible class on the issue of communism is an extraordinary historical phenomenon in mass emotionalism. Go back to 1937, when Stalin was staging the so-called trials of formerly trusted Bolsheviks and murdering thousands of dissidents and suspected dissidents with no trial at all. We are remembering one man; a scholar of deep conviction and conscience; a man who had joined in protest against what he believed to be the unjust convictions of Tom Mooney, Sacco and Vanzetti, the Scottsboro boys, and others. But when this man was asked how he explained the confessions of the old Bolsheviks and the murder of so many others, he replied, "There is no rational explanation except guilt."

Judge Webster Thayer was pilloried for his part in the trial of two Italian anarchists in a Massachusetts court, but if there were any American intellectuals who held Stalin to the rigorous standards which they expected of Judge Thayer, or the Governors of California and Alabama, they could be counted on the fingers of one hand.

Having accepted Russian communism as "good"—or at any rate as a system which was trying to do something for the ordinary man—American intellectuals were already equipped with blinkers which kept them from being critical of native Communists or receptive to the revelation that a Soviet fifth column had infiltrated our Government far toward the top. The American intellectual, who is usually also a liberal, had permitted himself to become messed up in his confused conception of tolerance and fair play. As Leslie A. Fiedler, writing on the Hiss-Chambers case in the August 1951 issue of Commentary, put it: "Lest the New Dealers seem 'Red-baiters' they preferred to be fools."

If the American intelligentsia hate Whittaker Chambers, it is because he tossed the bucket of cold water that shocked them out of the pleasant dream about Soviet Russia as a land where liberals skip about like carefree gazelles, improving man's hard lot by social engineering. Chambers squeezed communism down to the terrifying proportions of a vast military-and-political plot against the freedom of man. He also exposed the intellectual left wing as a herd of supercilious cream puffs. People who had believed that (1) the left was good and the right was bad, and that (2) the left was very, very good when embraced by college graduates in $100 suits, were out on a limb. It is always irritating to be exposed as a credulous idiot, particularly when you have been intolerably smug toward the Fascist beasts who saw the light before you did.

So, ever since the House Committee on Un-American Activities, through a series of lucky chances and solid researches, took the lid off the Communist underground in America, we have had the discouraging phenomenon of the anti-anti-Communists. They have sneered and sniped at anybody whose testimony help destroy the myth that there was no Communist espionage in this country and that, if there was, it didn't involve nice people. And, of course, the man they hated most was the man who supplied the evidence and made it stick—Whittaker Chambers. Oh, no, they didn't want the Communist plot to succeed, if there was a Communist plot, but Chambers wasn't the man to expose it.

The story now comes around to the time when liberals, radicals, and Park Avenue pinkos will have to make up their minds: Do they want the Communist conspiracy to

succeed, or don't they? The day is at hand when they must admit that the gold brick they bought 20 years ago was a phony. It's time to stop trying to hawk it about the streets and upper-class cocktail bars as a genuine article. Chambers has contributed that much to history, and it is no good standing around and waiting for a nicer man to tell the story. The "nice men" have turned up in distressing numbers on the other side.

Lost causes are usually futile, but there are lost causes that can be defended in good faith and dignity. But what can be said of a lost cause like the belief that Russian-Communist dictatorship is liberal, and that its spies and propagandists are proper subjects for tolerance? Not very much.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20), to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 7 discloses that when the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was discussing the matter of submerged lands he referred to a ruling which had been made by the Hague Tribunal. The Senator quoted from a subhead which reads:

United States official faces Tidelands case deadline in parallel decision.

There then appeared what I thought was some rather unusual language in the news story, as follows:

RECENT DECISION

The whole matter revolves around the recent decision of the International Court of Justice at The Hague concerning coastal islands in determining national boundary lines. The decision in the case between Great Britain and Norway was decided overwhelmingly in favor of Norway in such a manner as to upset all the prior contentions of the United States Justice Department in its attempt to take over the rich oil-bearing submerged lands of California, Texas, and Louisiana in the so-called Tidelands case.

This is what I think is unusual to be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 7, 1952:

Now, in Washington on February 20 a crucial hearing will start on the issue.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT STEP

What is the Justice Department going to do?

Will it swallow its pride and recognize, for example, the United States boundary along the outer rim of the Channel Islands of California, as it should do under the World Court decision, thus insuring the maximum national defense for this country?

Or will it try to ignore the World Court ruling and cling to a narrow definition of the national boundary as low-tide mark along the mainland, thus hanging on to its alleged ownership of submerged oil lands at Santa Barbara, Long Beach, Huntington Beach, and elsewhere?

As I say, it is unusual to ask the question on March 7 as to what the Government was going to do on February 20, some time before. Therefore, I thought it might be of interest to place in the RECORD what the Government had done, and what was a matter of public record, and what anyone could have found out long ago as a matter of public record.

I wish to refer to the opening statement of the Government in the case of United States against the State of California. When the special master begins to draw the lines which will decide what will be inland waters and what will be outside those waters in the open sea, that opening statement will be of extreme interest to a great many persons. It should serve to call attention to the fact that if we do not pass some type of interim legislation, and pass it fairly quickly, the special master soon will be drawing the lines along the coasts of California, Texas, and Louisiana, and then, by virtue of those lines being drawn, areas outside those lines will be appropriately ready for Federal leasing, and then we shall be in some conflicts.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I heard the Senator say that the land would be appropriately ready for Federal leasing. Of course, the Senator knows that no less than 6 months ago the Secretary of the Interior issued opinions to the effect that the Federal Leasing Act does not apply to any such land as that, and that he has no authority to lease it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I grant that, but I say that it would then be available, and it would be appropriate to proceed to lease it. If the Federal Government owns the land seaward of the line drawn by the special master, it is the responsibility of the Congress immediately to pass legislation which will permit that land to be leased.

There are those who think it was very poor law——

Mr. LONG. The Senator is not arguing that any department of the Government has the right to lease such land, is he?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I think it would be correct to say that. I say that there are lawyers who believe that the Federal Government does have the right. There are lawyers who believe that it was very poor law when it was held that the Leasing Act did not apply to this area of the public domain. I am not able to pass on the wisdom of that decision. I prefer to take the point of view which the Senator from Louisiana has just now expressed. I prefer to take the position that the Federal Government does not now have the power to lease this land under the present leasing law, and that the Congress of the United States, in furtherance of its obligations, should proceed to pass such legislation very promptly.

I did not intend to go into that question. I was only trying to illustrate that there is merit in the hard work which the junior Senator from Louisiana and some of the others of us have been trying to do in having a tidelands bill, a submerged-lands bill, and interim legislation considered by the Senate.

I do not care to clutter up the RECORD with all the things which were in the opening statement before the special master, because I do not think they are all of particular interest to us. While it might be of considerable interest to all of us, I do not think it is worth while, perhaps, to read the entire statement. However, I wish to read a little from what the representatives of the Government of the United States said on February 20, to which reference was made in a definite way on March 7. I quote now from the opening statement of the United States in the case of United States against the State of California:

Everyone recognizes, of course, that the criteria adopted by any nation in fixing its territorial waters must be consistent with the controlling principles of international law. We do not anticipate, however, that California will dispute that the position of the United States, on which the "boundary" we claim is predicated, is in all respects within the permissible limits announced by the International Court of Justice in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case, the judgment in which was issued on December 18, 1951. There can be no doubt whatever that the general principles and criteria adopted by this country are fully consistent with the controlling principles of international law, as announced and applied by the International Court.

I am going further, but I wish to digress at this juncture to point out that what the Department of Justice did was to say very plainly to the Court that there was nothing in the fisheries case which restricted in any way what the Government had tried to do with respect to the submerged lands. All the fisheries case said was that in reference to Norway, which has a rocky coast, and the rocks extend out into the sea, the areas claimed could be expanded beyond the 3-mile limit. If that is true, then the United States Government has the same permission, but there is nothing that would say that within the 3-mile limit the United States Government could not claim the land.

Quoting further from the opening statement of the United States:

In this connection, it is important to note that it is entirely irrelevant to the present proceeding that the United States could have made a more extensive claim to territorial waters than it has in fact chosen to claim. The Anglo-Norwegian fisheries decision makes it clear that each nation is free to choose for itself, within the limits permitted by international law, the base line for its marginal belt.

I stop there to say that if that can bring any comfort to the State of California, I do not know what it is. If the decision does make it clear that each nation is free, within the limits permitted by international law, to choose for itself the base line for its marginal belt, then the United States is free to start with a marginal belt at low-water mark. How that can bring any comfort to those who think we ought to start at a point 3 miles out to sea, I do not know.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator knows that the United States is probably the only Nation whose sovereignty does not extend both to inland waters and outside waters. The argument which we have heard on the floor of the

Senate is that the States own the beds of their navigable streams and their bays, rivers, and lakes, but that the Federal Government owns everything beginning at the boundary between inland waters and outside waters and extending from that point on out into the sea. Therefore we have a somewhat different question here when we approach the problem as to where the base line shall be so far as the marginal belt is concerned. In other words, where should we draw the line between inland waters and outside waters? If we were to apply the basis of international law, as accepted in the Norwegian fisheries case, naturally it would be much more favorable to the States than the Federal Government would want to concede. On the other hand, the Senator very well knows that the Government has more rights with regard to its internal waters, as against foreign nations, than it has with respect to the marginal sea.

Mr. ANDERSON. All I am trying to say is that the controversy over whether or not the Fisheries case has any bearing on the submerged lands cases seems to me to be a little far-fetched. I quite agree with the position taken by the United States Government in the California case when it argued, on February 20, 1952, that it is completely irrelevant whether the Government took all the land it could take, or took only a part of the area. Apparently that is all that can be drawn from the Fisheries case. From the Fisheries case it can be concluded that the United States Government, instead of claiming a 3-mile area, could go from the 3-mile area clear out to Santa Catalina Island, and perhaps beyond that to other islands.

It seems to me that whether the Government has taken all the area that could be taken is another question.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, the Senator from New Mexico knows, does he not, that the Solicitor General of the United States presented a brief before the International Court of Justice, urging that the problem off the coast of California was similar to that involved in drawing the inland-waters line off Norway?

In that connection, Mr. President, he had already told our committee that problems of international law were involved in this question. If the International Court of Justice had held that Norway had no right to extend its line around the outward islands off the coast of Norway, of course the Federal Government would have been able to say that, according to international law, the States had no rights in the Santa Barbara Channel.

That argument of Mr. Perlman's was brushed aside, and the Court said that a nation could claim all that area. So, in the Fisheries case, at least, the Federal Government lost in one of its efforts to expand its influence, as against the States.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not a lawyer, and I shall let the lawyers argue that point. The opinion of the United States was quite clearly announced. It was that under the decision in the Norwegian case we could expand our territorial waters farther than we had. However, the decision did not state that we must start out from any particular point in the marginal sea.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from New Mexico agree that if the International Court had accepted the argument of Mr. Perlman and laid it down as a delimitating factor, the Federal Government would have found it to be important, but that since the Court decided the case against the contention of Mr. Perlman, the Federal Government finds it makes no difference?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know about that.

I read further from the opening statement:

> The decision plainly does not hold that international law requires the adoption of base lines comparable to those claimed by Norway for its own unique coastal areas. The case is rested entirely upon the irrefutable fact that the United States has fixed its base line in accordance with the principles and criteria I have described. Its policy is based on its traditional recognition of the freedom of the seas.
>
> Counsel for California propose to introduce expert testimony with respect to international law and the usages of nations; other expert testimony with respect to the geologic, oceanographic, and other physical aspects of the segments of the coast in question; and testimony concerning the use and occupancy, both historic and current, of those segments of the coast. We believe—and at the proper time we shall raise the issue by timely objection—that all of this evidence is irrelevant because it deals not with the marginal belt actually claimed by the United States, but with an expanded marginal belt which California believes the United States could, and should, claim as against foreign nations. If the United States were presently claiming the external marginal belt advocated by California, the proposed testimony might be relevant. But the United States does not make such a claim, and we submit that California's proposed testimony has, therefore, no real place in this proceeding. Certainly, the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case does not stand for the proposition that a nation must draw its base line from rock to rock and include all large indentations and all areas of water between the coast and off-lying islands. The Court found only that it was permissible for Norway to draw its line in the way in which it had done, on the basis of the peculiarities of the Norwegian coast and the fact that Norway had asserted the right with the acquiescence of other nations over a long period of time. But neither Norway nor California can draw the line for the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator please tell us who does have the power to draw the line between the inland waters of the United States and the external waters of the marginal sea?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will answer the question to the best of my knowledge, realizing that it is dangerous to make a statement and then to have someone else come along and say something different. My guess is that since certain States are involved in litigation with the Nation, and a special master has been designated by the Supreme Court to draw the line, if the Supreme Court adopts the line drawn by the special master it will be the end of it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator from New Mexico agree with some of us that it is the function of Congress to determine by law what shall be claimed as the territorial waters of the United States, rather than the function of a special master, who has no standards whatever to guide him, except the views of some officials of the executive department; and that actually the Congress of the United States should determine what should be regarded as the boundary between inland waters and external waters?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; these States are in court, and Congress has failed to take the opportunity to make disposition of the subject. I feel about it somewhat as I feel about the question of who owns the water that is running down the Colorado River. My State is a party to the Colorado compact. California and Arizona cannot agree. Because they cannot agree, even though all the other States are perfectly willing to make disposition of the question, the matter should go to the Supreme Court for adjudication.

We tried to pass a bill which would have created a justiciable issue and therefore would have let the issue come before the Supreme Court. I think that if the Supreme Court acted on it and thus disposed of the water of the Colorado River we would find ourselves bound by the decision.

Similarly, the States of California, Louisiana, and Texas are involved in a legal dispute with the Government of the United States. The issue has been decided three times by the Supreme Court. The decisions are uniform. They are the only decisions which deal specifically with the question. In furtherance of a decision of the issue a special master has been appointed, and he is drawing lines. Some persons may not like the lines; and it seems to me the best way to avoid an early and unfortunate disposition of the question would be to pass an interim bill, thus allowing production to continue, and keeping alive the hope that in the 5 years provided in the interim bill it may be possible to reach a decision as to how much of the oil should be given to the States—whether all of it or none of it. I would perhaps be in favor of a substantial part of it going to the States. However, that will not satisfy the situation if the special master finishes his report and if the report is adopted by the Supreme Court, when no legislation is upon the books.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield further.

Mr. LONG. Is not the problem of determining what the base line should be—just as Norway determined this vast area as being its inland waters and therefore not open to English fishing boats—really a policy decision, which should be determined by the Congress of the United

States, rather than by the courts, inasmuch as the courts have no standards to go by?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it would have been better if the question had been determined by the Congress of the United States. But, in the absence of a decision by the Congress of the United States and in the presence of an issue over which there may be a jurisdictional dispute, I believe the case comes properly to the Supreme Court; and I believe that the decision of the Supreme Court will bind us, regardless of whether it would have been better for Congress to determine the question in the first place.

I still believe that it would have been better for Congress to determine it, and I would have preferred that course; but Congress has not demonstrated its ability to agree. That being true, I believe the question will have to go into court.

Some persons are greatly worried about the outcome of the issue before the Supreme Court. I should think that they would be able to see the tide of events marching steadily against them, and realize that when a special master draws the line along Long Beach, he may take the recommendation of the Justice Department that the extreme line farthest landward should be selected. There is another limiting line, as fixed in the Carillo case, which is far seaward of that line. There is an intermediate line which many feel might have been agreed to. However, the people of Long Beach were not satisfied with the intermediate line. I have predicted that in the end they may have a very limited area. That is the hazard of litigation.

Mr. LONG. What I had in mind was that, from the statement the Solicitor General made to us, he seemed to feel that it was his duty to claim as much as he could for the United States Government.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is generally a fairly good principle for a Solicitor General to follow. In a lawsuit, one begins by putting his best possible foot forward.

Mr. LONG. Accordingly the Government drew a line which actually came inside the breakwater and included half the area inside the breakwater at Long Beach. In that instance the Government's attorneys did not really claim that the Government owned all the area up to that point, but they said they would not concede that the Government did not own it, thus leaving the matter to be determined by the court.

So I understand that a possible explanation is that the Government of the United States does not really claim that it owns all the area up to that line.

Nevertheless, it seems to me this matter calls for a policy to be decided by the Congress, rather than by one Government agent or another who might be willing to claim this land for the United States Government. It seems to me the Congress should fulfill its constitutional obligation by legislating in this case, and in doing so should prescribe a standard by which it will be possible to determine what are inland waters.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I have offered my amendment to the amendment which has been submitted by several other Senators. My amendment to that amendment provides that the Congress shall determine the boundary between the inland waters and the external waters.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Louisiana will recognize that at the hearing it was suggested that the limits of Long Beach might be at a point very substantially seaward of that line, and that Long Beach thought it owned the area clear out to Huntington Beach.

Of course, if there is no compromise in such contests, unfortunate results sometimes follow.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Although this line is only what might be called a temporary one, is it not true that even in drawing the line the Government agreed that all the oil wells now in that harbor or that bay belong to and are a part of the Long Beach holdings? Is not that true? In drawing the line, the Government included every oil well in Long Beach Bay, and all those wells were admitted to be the property of and in the ownership of the city of Long Beach. Is not that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe I should comment briefly on my understanding of the Fisheries case: It is my understanding that in that instance Mr. Perlman, the Solicitor General of the United States, filed with the special master a brief in which Mr. Perlman said the California case presented a situation very similar to that in the Anglo-Norwegian controversy. I believe he said that California's claims and Norway's claims were similar, but Mr. Perlman placed great emphasis on the position taken by Great Britain.

After Great Britain lost that case, Mr. Perlman said the decision was not at all important and not at all relevant.

THE SITUATION IN KOREA

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield to me, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield for that purpose?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, let me suggest to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that before he presses his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, I should like to proceed for about 5 minutes to discuss a question not related to the unfinished business.

Mr. LONG. Very well; then I withhold my suggestion.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, at this time I wish to read an editorial which appeared last night in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C. The reading of the editorial will take only a few minutes.

There is nothing in the editorial which thoughtful or informed persons will consider to be new. I believe the editorial simply restates the existence of a situation which has confronted our Nation and our allies for more than a year. The editorial states that the Allied forces are not to be given the encouragement or the authority or the weapons required to reach a military decision in Korea.

Certainly there is nothing new in that declaration, Mr. President. The fact is that in late December 1950—approximately 14 months ago—the Allies decided that the seeking of an armistice was to be imposed on the fighting forces in Korea.

The only purpose I have in reading the editorial is to remind others throughout the Nation of a sad situation which has existed for many dreary and uninspiring months.

The editorial reads as follows:

DEAD END IN KOREA

It may be that Gen. Van Fleet is correct in his opinion that the Chinese Communists, despite numerical superiority in men, weapons and planes, will not launch a major offensive in Korea this spring. From the point of view of saving lives, it may be hoped that this estimate of the situation proves to be right. But if the Chinese do not attack, and if—as has been authoritatively stated—we lack the strength to carry the fighting to them, how do we propose to get any kind of a decision in Korea?

As long as the talks at Panmunjom continue, there is presumably some hope of a negotiated settlement. It is a slim hope, however, and it seems to be getting slimmer every day. Certainly the Chinese and their North Korean associates have given little indication that they really want an armistice.

There was, perhaps, implicit recognition of this in a speech prepared last week for delivery to a Philadelphia audience by John M. Allison, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. Most of the address was devoted to the diplomatic business of looking for silver linings and putting the best possible face on a very bad situation throughout the Far East. But tucked away in the speech was one seemingly significant paragraph.

Mr. Allison said that we do not propose to widen the scope of the war. "It is up to the Communists," he declared. "If they want to widen the conflict and engulf the world in a terrible war, then they must be the ones to do it."

It is not at all likely that, in saying this, Mr. Allison was speaking only for Mr. Allison. Presumably it was a considered statement of policy, and if so, it means that we do not propose to carry the war to China even if the truce negotiations fail.

Some influential members of the administration have believed and have said privately, that we ought to enlarge the war if the truce talks collapse. They had in mind an attack on China's internal communications with a view to crippling and perhaps destroying the ability of the Chinese to wage war. But this view evidently has been overruled. Whether because of doubt as to our capabilities, in deference to our allies, or for some other reason, the advocates of restraint seem once again to have prevailed.

There are arguments to be made for this policy. But whatever the arguments, it is a policy which leads to a dead end in Korea. We cannot win the war there. Neither can we withdraw. The truce negotiations are getting nowhere and we are not willing even to try to coerce the enemy into accepting a reasonable settlement. And now the Communists have been officially notified that if

the talks break down we do not propose to do anything about it.

That, as a policy, is little better than no policy at all. For in the best of circumstances, it means that the Eighth Army is to be stranded in Korea for the indefinite future. That, to be sure, does not widen the conflict. But it does result in a situation which public opinion in this country is not apt to tolerate for long.

The editorial ends, Mr. President, with a statement of opinion that the dead end in Korea represents a situation which public opinion in this country is not apt to tolerate for long. I wonder what the editorial writer meant. The Nation has already tolerated for months and months the purposeless situation in Korea. The situation there is basically no different today from what it was more than a year ago. Our political conduct in Korea gives one reason to believe that the administration will tolerate the existing situation for months to come. I share the editorial writer's concern. Persons like myself, in and out of Congress and the Government, have expressed and reexpressed that concern since 1950. I wonder how long it will be before public opinion demands that freedom find a street which is not barricaded by a dead end. Until freedom finds this street and fights to keep it clear, the dead end in Korea will grow ever higher with the bodies of the dead from many lands.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana wishes at this time to press his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, I yield to him for that purpose.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

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

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on Wednesday of last week the junior Senator from Washington advised the Senate of the United States of a letter which the Secretary of the Interior had written to the Governor of the State of Washington, under date of February 15, 1952. In this letter the Secretary assumed the authority and power to strip the State of Washington of its coastal submerged lands and resources. The Secretary of the Interior attempted to exercise this power against my State without benefit of any authority from the Congress of the United States and in the absence of a Supreme Court decision.

Before proceeding further, Mr. President, I wish to emphasize one point. Everyone appears to be in agreement that no final or lasting line of demarkation as between Federal and State rights has been established in the State of California. There is no doubt about this. In the California tidelands case the Supreme Court reached a decision in 1947, some 5 years ago, and the Court admitted, as I understand, its inability to determine a final line of demarkation as between the rights of the parties involved. The Court appointed a master whose responsibility it would be to study and then to recommend a final line of demarkation in California. No recommendations that I know of have yet been submitted by the master to the Supreme Court. Does it not, therefore, seem not only amazing, but actually preposterous, that the Secretary of the Interior has decided, on his own responsibility, on a line of demarkation in the State of Washington, when that State's rights have not yet been adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction? When we bear in mind, Mr. President, that no line of demarkation has yet been established in either of the States of California or Louisiana, it will make more illuminating several paragraphs which I wish to reread from the letter of the Secretary of the Interior to the Governor of the Sovereign State of Washington. In those several paragraphs, Mr. President, the Secretary of the Interior, who must know that no lines have been agreed on in those States which have been adjudged by the Supreme Court of the United States, says, certainly by strong implication, that no court decision is now or will be needed in the State of Washington, "for I, the Secretary of the Interior, will determine what rights, if any, are to be vested in the citizens of the State of Washington."

The paragraphs to which I make reference today, Mr. President, and which I have read on several occasions during the past week, are these. Said the Secretary to the Governor:

> We understand that the State of Washington has issued oil and gas permits and leases to private parties on submerged lands situated seaward of the line described above. Under the doctrine of the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases any such permits or leases are void, since that area has always been and is now outside the scope of the leasing power of the State of Washington or its agencies.
>
> With respect to any such oil and gas permits or leases, we would appreciate being advised of the names of the permittees or lessees, their addresses, the dates of issuance, and the areas covered.

Mr. President, in all fairness I ask, What does the Secretary mean when he says that any such permits or leases are void since that area has always been and is now outside the scope of the jurisdiction of the State of Washington?

The point I seek to establish, so that every Member of the Senate may be keenly aware of it, is that no line of any character to differentiate between the rights belonging to the State of Washington and the Federal Government has ever been established by anyone other than the Secretary of the Interior. If by way of argument the Secretary of the Interior were permitted to determine the rights of the State of Washington, does it not logically follow that he could do precisely the same thing with reference to the sovereign State of Maryland, which is so well represented in this body by the Senator who is now presiding over the Senate [Mr. BUTLER]? It is not alone what the Secretary of the Interior could do, were he permitted so to do, to the State of Washington and the State of Maryland, but common sense and logic dictate that he could do precisely equal things to all the rights of all the sovereign States which go to make up our Union.

Mr. President, I have suggested to my colleagues that this doctrine of paramount rights, full dominion, and power, claimed by the Federal Government applies to every State in the Union and not alone to the States of Washington, California, Texas, and Louisiana.

Today, for a few minutes, I wish to spell out in greater detail the seriousness of the danger which this paramount-power doctrine threatens to the sovereignty and natural resources of each and every State.

We have all heard the wailing which pours out of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice to the effect that quitclaim tidelands legislation would be an unjustified gift to three selfish States at the expense of the other 45 States. I suppose that with the State of Washington now on the firing line, as the Secretary of the Interior attempted on the 15th day of February, 1952, to place it, along with California, Texas, and Louisiana, there are now four selfish States, instead of three selfish States, including my own State of Washington.

Mr. President, I hope that before the debates are concluded, there will be 48 such selfish States rising in righteous wrath to protect their sovereignty and constitutional rights. If they do not rise now and wipe out this vicious paramount-power doctrine, future discussions about States' rights are likely to be completely academic.

I urge each of my colleagues to look carefully at the slow and relentless growth of this paramount right doctrine. The States are being picked off just one or two at a time. In 1947 it was California. In 1950 it was Texas. Then it was Louisiana, and now, in 1952, it is the State of Washington.

How well I remember the doctrine applied and pursued so relentlessly and so successfully over too long a period of time by the late Herr Hitler of Germany. He pursued a philosophy easy to understand and tremendously dangerous in its implications. It was, "Separate and divide." On the basis of the record up to this minute, the application of that doctrine has sought to separate, first California, then Texas and Louisiana, and now the State of Washington, from the rest of the Union.

Mr. President, which State will it be tomorrow? Will it be Colorado, with her uranium ore? Or perhaps Utah or Idaho or Wyoming, with their metals, so essential to national defense? Whose turn

will it then be next year? Will it be Maine, perhaps, with her famous fisheries, or Florida, with her fabulous hotels built on reclaimed coastal submerged land?

I believe it proper this afternoon to endeavor to arouse a reasonable amount of interest among those representing inland States who heretofore have thought this tidelands issue was something which had nothing to do with their States.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. Of course, I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I note the Senator is speaking with respect to the Continental Shelf lands off the coast of his sovereign State. Does the Senator from Washington have anything to say about the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] which would erect the giant Hells Canyon Dam within the State of Idaho, and touching the State of Oregon, which dam would do away, in my opinion, with the private power industry of the State of Idaho, and in effect permit the Secretary of the Interior to be the czar of all electric power, at least a great portion of the electric power, in the Northwest? I should like to have the Senator's observation.

Mr. CAIN. I was on the floor of the Senate on a recent day when the junior Senator from Oregon addressed himself to the question of Hells Canyon Dam. Until the Senator from Oregon made his statement I was not aware that it was his intention to speak.

I may say that I do not know to what extent the Senator from Idaho is correct in his present contention, but the Senator from Oregon did arouse my natural curiosity, and I look forward to the coming hearing at which the question of Hells Canyon Dam in all its fullness will be thoughtfully explored by a committee of the Congress.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WELKER. It has been my observation that the remarks of the junior Senator from Washington in effect would suggest to the Senate and to the people of the United States that by his action the Secretary of the Interior is getting his foot in the door with respect to the oil and anything else there may be in submerged lands off the coast of Washington. If the Secretary of the Interior could open the door to controlling, even in a slight detail, the very essential public domain which the junior Senator from Washington feels, I think justly, belongs to the sovereign State of Washington, then, in the opinion of the Senator from Washington, would it not be just a little bit more dangerous, just a little bit more down the road toward socialization of the essential business and productive capacity of the great United States, to have the Secretary of the Interior get his foot in the door to a CVA or to a public power policy in the vast Pacific Northwest?

Mr. CAIN. There are two things I should like to say in response to the Senator from Idaho. The first is that he indicated that he thought the Secretary of the Interior had gotten his foot in the door in the State of Washington. I wish to make it very clear that what the Secretary of the Initerior did was to attempt to get his foot in the door, but his foot is presently not there, and, to the extent that I can prevent it, the Secretary's foot will remain where it belongs—on the outside.

With reference to the other portion of the observation made by the Senator, I should like to say that the question of public power in the State of Washington has been before that State for many, many years. It has been decided in that Commonwealth that private and public power interests can live, expand, and develop together harmoniously. Therefore, I have a double interest in protecting respectively the rights of both private and public power.

If the Senator from Idaho, with reference to his expression about Hells Canyon, was correct or could establish with me his feeling as being correct, I would strongly oppose any project by the Federal Government within the State of Idaho, if the Secretary had such authority, the purpose and result of which would be to destroy the legitimate right to an opportunity for private power. I would be against any group or any individuals who sought to destroy the respective rights of either private or public power as they prevail throughout the Pacific Northwest.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WELKER. I am sure the junior Senator from Washington appreciates that I desire to render the best service possible to the people of the State of Idaho and, through them, to the Nation.

Mr. CAIN. I am highly conscious of that being a fact.

Mr. WELKER. I am very much alarmed by the trend toward socialization of the power industry, and, now, it appears, of at least a portion of the oil industry. From a beginning with those industries, I should like to know why the Secretary of the Interior could not, then, go into the lead and zinc mines of the wonderful Coeur d'Alene district in the northern part of the State of Idaho. Then where would he go? Would he not be traveling down the road toward state socialism, as Great Britain has done, with the tragic results with which we are familiar? I am unable to see the line of demarcation or foretell where all this is going to lead us. I should like the advice and help of the distinguished Senator from Washington on that matter.

Mr. CAIN. In the remainder of my statement, I shall seek to establish as being true that if the Secretary of the Interior, without authority, is permitted to determine who is entitled to gas and oil rights within the State of Washington, he could most logically exercise a comparable degree of unwarranted authority and power in each and every other State of the Union. I think I am on sound ground, but one cannot be positive about it. I shall try to explain what a logical extension of the doctrine of paramount rights would accomplish, not only with respect to the oil and gas interests, which are the issues at stake in Washington, California, Texas, and Louisiana, but also with respect to the natural resources of the other 44 States.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, may I interrupt for one further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am most pleased to yield to my friend whenever he requests it.

Mr. WELKER. I am somewhat familiar with the problems of my neighboring State of Washington. I am wondering whether or not, if the Secretary of the Interior is permitted the broad authority which I feel he might have under the terms of the bill, he could then go into the fisheries industry and into the oyster beds of the State of Washington, and ultimately go into the whole economy, or at least a portion of the economy, of the sovereign State of Washington. Can the Senator from Washington enlighten me on that feature?

Mr. CAIN. I shall try, because I share the Senator's concern. I have, as best I could, committed to paper my reasons in support of the Senator's contention that an extension of the doctrine of paramount power would violate the rights of States with respect to all the natural resources within their geographical boundaries.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of the interchange between the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Idaho, first with respect to the effect upon fisheries of the pending legislation, I desire to ask the indulgence of the Senator from Washington to make it clear that the measure which is before the Senate contains a specific provision, section 9 of Senate Joint Resolution 20, as amended, which protects the rights of the coastal States with respect to fisheries. There is no attempt on the part of the sponsors of this proposed legislation to take anything away from the States.

SUPREME COURT RULING ON FISHERIES

I may add that the Supreme Court decided in 1948, in the case of Toomer against Witsell, that, as between the State and an individual, with respect to the fisheries, the State has unquestioned jurisdiction.

The sponsors of this joint resolution and the Federal Government, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice, insofar as they have been consulted with respect to the measure, are of exactly the same mind. There is nothing in Senate Joint Resolution 20, and nothing in the philosophy which underlies it, which in my opinion invades any rights to which the States can now lay claim. I wish to make that point clear.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield to me, I shall endeavor to reply to the Senator from Wyoming, inasmuch as I interjected the controversial matter.

Mr. CAIN. Permit me first to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that my quarrel runs not to the chairman of the committee or to his

associates on the committee. My present quarrel runs to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that.

Mr. CAIN. I have no reason at all to doubt the sincerity of a single word which the Senator from Wyoming says now or at any other time, because I shall always be convinced that he means precisely what he says.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I always endeavor to be candid and factual in whatever I say.

Mr. CAIN. But the point before us, in part, at any rate, is this: If a Secretary of the Interior, representing the administration, is so impatient and careless as to endeavor to determine a line of demarcation when such a line has not yet been established in those cases which have benefited from Supreme Court decisions, then there is simply nothing which that Secretary of the Interior and all others of like mind would not attempt to do. It is for that reason that the junior Senator from Washington seeks, as best he may, to give a logical interpretation of what an extension of the doctrine of paramount rights means to the average layman throughout the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate what the Senator from Washington has said. He talked with me on the floor of the Senate the day after he first inserted in the RECORD the letter from the Secretary of the Interior. I knew of his deep concern, and I felt that he was perfectly justified in expressing concern about the letter at that time. I have sought to obtain some explanation as to what brought about the letter. I expect presently to have a formal letter from the Secretary of the Interior to present upon the floor of the Senate.

SECRETARY ACTED TO PROTECT FEDERAL INTERESTS

In the meantime, let me say to the Senator that this is what I discovered: There is land in the State of Washington which belongs to certain Indians. Some of that land extends to the shore of the sea. I am advised that there came to the Secretary of the Interior only within the past couple of months or so information that an oil well had been drilled, or a lease for that purpose was sought, upon the Indian reservation. It became apparent that other wells had been drilled in tidewater areas on the open Pacific coast of Washington. There was danger that there might possibly be some drainage from the submerged lands which, under the Supreme Court decision, are held to be within the paramount jurisdiction of the Federal Government. It was for the purpose of protecting Federal interests in the lands beneath the open ocean, I understand, that the Secretary acted, and not at all for the purpose of putting his foot in the door, or asserting any extra jurisdiction.

Mr. CAIN. It is a very difficult and complicated problem, although there are several touches of lightness about it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If we could not put in a touch of lightness occasionally it would be a dreary world indeed.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am beginning to be impressed with what appears to be a fact. Each time the junior Senator from Washington makes reference to the letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the Governor of the State of Washington, or reads excerpts from it, the chairman of the committee offers another explanation as to why the letter was written in the first place.

I say in all good humor to my friend, the chairman of the committee, that on yesterday the Department of the Interior had not advised the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that the line of demarcation, as laid down in the Secretary's letter, was landward of certain oil leases now in operation on the shores of Washington State. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming, as of yesterday, read that letter in my presence, and did so most willingly, and it for the first time to the Senator's knowledge—not because the Department of the Interior had thoughtfully called up the Senator from Wyoming and had said so—indicated that the line of demarcation, which line I hold to be illegitimate, would without argument or discussion completely void rights which the State of Washington had assumed it has possessed for a great many years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think it should be clear in the RECORD that the Senator from Wyoming, like the Senator from Washington, has a great many things to do. I had no opportunity, after reading the letter into the RECORD, of calling upon the Secretary of the Interior.

I telephoned to the Secretary of the Interior and I asked him to look at the letter and to be good enough to write me about it. I am now advised that a letter from him is coming. What has been said about it, so far ar I am concerned, has been based upon the facts as they seem to appear.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I do not wish to labor this very unusual situation, but it does seem extraordinarily strange to me that, in full knowledge of the fact that Senate Joint Resolution 20 was to come before the Senate, after it had benefited from long weeks of hearings and thought and study by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior did not take the chairman of the committee into his confidence and explain to him, so that the chairman could answer questions on the floor of the Senate, what action the Secretary of the Interior intended to take against the sovereign State of Washington. I am completely puzzled by that situation. I wage this attack from my point of view because, although I have all the trust that is required for the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I take it to be that the Secretary of the Interior would as ruthlessly run over the rights of the Senator from Wyoming as the Secretary of the Interior presently seeks to destroy what I believe to be rights of the State of Washington. I have no intention of permitting the Secretary of the Interior to do that to my good friend the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Washington for his concern.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for one more observation?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to clarify matters for my distinguished friend the Senator from Wyoming. As the Senator has observed, I was the one who injected into the debate the question of the fisheries and oyster beds. I did it because of my concern with respect to the pyramiding of big government, and the tendency, whether it be a bureau or a department, to go so far afield that private enterprise might well be usurped and done away with. I wanted to make that observation to my friend from Wyoming because I think it should be discussed in this debate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator from Idaho, and I share his concern about the expansion of big government. I have stated for years without number that unless we find a way to stake out the responsibilities and powers of great corporations with respect to their activities it will be difficult indeed to prevent the continued growth of big government. I am against big government. By every vote and every argument I have made on the floor and in committee I have sought to put restraints upon its expansion.

INABILITY TO CONTROL GIANT CORPORATIONS

However, I believe we must all recognize the fact that some private organizations are of a collectivist character, in that they are collective organizations of stockholders and workers. They operate throughout the length and breadth of the land. They operate in a stratosphere which is far above that in which we walk, breathe, and have our being, and which neither State legisiatures nor the Congress itself frequently is able to control.

I seek only to have regulation in the public interest, so that private enterprise and individual enterprise may continue undisturbed.

STATE CONTROL OF FISHERIES

Section 9, which we wrote into the joint resolution, reads as follows:

SEC. 9. The United States consents that the respective States may regulate, manage, and administer the taking, conservation, and development of all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life within the area of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, in accordance with applicable State law.

In that section we feel that we were giving complete recognition to the power of a State within the State's boundaries.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have listened with respect to the comments of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming which he has made against private groups that have collectivist tendencies. The Senator from Wyoming is against such groups. The Senator from Washington wishes to associate himself with his conferee in that respect. However, the Senator from Washington goes one step further. He is equally antagonistic to public groups which are possessed of what he conceives to be collectivist tendencies.

With all seriousness, I must return again and again to the letter of the Secretary of the Interior to the Governor of the State of Washington, and say that it evidences collectivist tendencies, because the Secretary of the Interior was undeterred by the absence of a court decision, and not the least interested in what a court was finally to determine with regard to the rights of the sovereign State of Washington.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Washington will yield I shall make only one additional comment.

Mr. CAIN. I shall be very pleased to yield to the Senator from Wyoming. In what remains of my remarks at any time that the Senator from Wyoming sees fit to interject an observation I shall welcome his doing so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Washington is very kind. I was merely going to observe that I really see nothing in the Secretary's letter that opens it to a charge of collectivist tendencies. The situation in which we find ourselves is that certain coastal States have been exercising governmental authority to lease lands submerged by the open ocean which the States claim.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And the Federal Government, under the decision of the Supreme Court in these three cases, has been held to have paramount power in those areas.

I have seen, and indeed have received, letters which asserted that the granting of leases by the Federal Government was somehow or other an aspect of creeping socialism; and in some instances those letters came from officials of States which themselves were granting leases.

NO CREEPING SOCIALISM

I confess that I see no difference between a State government's claiming ownership and granting leases and the Federal Government's doing the same thing. There is no creeping socialism in either one or the other.

With respect to the comment which has been provoked upon this floor by reason of the Hells Canyon Dam bill, members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will assure the Senator from Washington, I am confident, that the chairman of that committee on repeated occasions has stated that in his belief the time has come when the appropriate committees of Congress—and I think the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is one—should make a study of this very intricate and complex problem, so that we may preserve to individuals who desire it the opportunity to enter the field of power, and we should be very careful to see to it that that door of opportunity is not closed either by combinations of big power companies or by public power operations.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I thought I had made myself clear in saying to the Senator from Idaho, who gave rise to the question, that I was not properly informed regarding all the facets of the Hells Canyon Dam question, but that I, as the Senator from Wyoming has just expressed himself, am in complete opposition to either private or public groups which seek without justification to drive either one of the parties out of business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, we are getting down to agreement that we are opposed to either private or public monopoly in any field of endeavor where such monopoly is not essential.

Mr. CAIN. We have said that on repeated occasions.

Mr. President, I have no desire to badger, if that is the correct word, the distinguished chairman of the committee. However, I am reminded that a minute ago he said that, in his opinion, in the letter the Secretary of the Department of the Interior wrote to the Governor of the State of Washington, there was no evidence of a collectivist tendency.

My feeling about that matter is that if the Governor of the State of Washington and others in authority were so lax as to permit the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the intentions which he expressed so clearly in his letter of mid-February, the result would undeniably be collectivism.

Mr. President, the nationalization zealots in the Department of the Interior are, in my opinion, far too clever to tip their hand all at once. By slowly chewing up one State at a time, they are avoiding the explosion of public indignation that would logically follow any attempt to swallow in one giant gulp the natural resources of all 48 States.

These persons are playing a cautious and skillful game for tremendous stakes—control of the natural resources and wealth of the Nation. Their patience and skill would do credit to the masters of political corruption in the Kremlin, who also believe that the national government should own all natural resources everywhere.

What is this "paramount power" that the Interior Department claims to possess? We must not look for it in the Constitution or in laws passed by Congress. We shall not find it in either source.

Instead, we must look at the Supreme Court's tidelands decision against California. Perhaps others would be disturbed and moved to action if the doctrine created there were now being directly applied to their State and were undermining its constitutional foundation.

Under the Constitution, Mr. President, the Federal Government used to be required to condemn property it could not acquire otherwise for national purposes. That was fair, for the fifth amendment guaranteed the owners of such property due process of law and just compensation.

Under the strange and dangerous "paramount power" doctrine, this constitutional procedure is no longer required. All the Federal Government has to do is what the Secretary of the Interior is attempting to do right now to Washington, namely, merely to assert—that is all he has done; he has asserted—a claim of "paramount rights, full dominion and power."

At the moment the Secretary of the Interior has said that the right shall run to only two natural resources, gas and oil. What that Secretary may say tomorrow, I am not qualified to judge.

Using the State of Washington as an example, there has been no due process of law in the form of direct court action and there has been no offer of just compensation. Mr. President, just by the mere assertion of "paramount power," your State, too, might be stripped of any lands and natural resources for which the Interior Department happens to lust.

If you find this hard to believe, Mr. President, analyze the Supreme Court's decision. Minus the legal frills, it runs like this:

First. Fighting wars is the paramount responsibility of the Federal Government. States cannot fight wars alone.

Second. It is the Federal Government's paramount responsibility to protect the Nation from dangers incident to its location and from wars raged on or too near its coasts.

Third. To do this, it must have powers of dominion and regulation.

From this, the Court slides mysteriously into this amazing conclusion:

Whatever of value may be discovered in the seas next to its shores and within its protective belt, will most naturally be appropriated for its use.

In this age of air power and guided missiles, our military authorities tell us that no area in the United States is safe from attack. Our common sense concurs. No one would seriously contend that the Nation's protective belt is confined just to Washington, California, Texas, and Louisiana, or just to the coastal States alone.

Obviously, the Federal Government's paramount responsibility to protect the Nation applies to every square foot of land in the Nation; and going hand-in-hand with this paramount responsibility are the Federal Government's paramount rights, full dominion and power, which, according to the Supreme Court, enable it to appropriate whatever of value may be discovered within its protective belt.

Is it any wonder that dissenting Justice Frankfurter thinks this paramount power applies to uranium whether located in Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Wyoming, Kentucky, or Tennessee? Is it any wonder that dissenting Justice Reed thinks this confiscatory power extends to every river, farm, mine, and factory in the Nation?

Mr. President, I am not possessed of a legal background or a legal mind. These two Justices, Justice Frankfurter and Justice Reed, are. Before we make haste to take action on Senate Joint Resolution 20, I think we had better give considered thought to the dissents to the doctrine of paramount rights as written and expressed by Justice Frankfurter and Justice Reed.

Between the two, they have said and have restated that the confiscatory power inherent in the doctrine of paramount rights extends to every river, farm, mine, and factory, as well as to every square foot of land, whatever its character, throughout our Nation.

What other States have natural resources which the Interior Department might consider necessary, in the Court's

words, "to preserve that peace" which is the "paramount responsibility" of the Federal Government? To make sure that the rich oil deposits in California's submerged coastal lands would be taken over under this definition, the Supreme Court specifically mentioned that they might be the subject of a war.

I trust that my colleagues will share my concern when they learn what natural resources in their States the Secretary of the Interior believes are subject to his "paramount power." I hope the information I am about to offer will arouse the citizens of all 48 States to demand that the Interior Department's plan to confiscate their properties be stopped, and stopped fast, at this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point a list of some minerals in all of the States which has been compiled from official Interior Department records. These minerals are officially described by the Interior Department as "necessary for the welfare and security of the United States and a free world." Thus, they come within the scope of the Federal Government's "paramount rights, full dominion, and power" and are subject to Federal confiscation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

MAJOR MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES BY STATES

WYOMING

Oil in these fields: Big Sand Draw, Byron-Garland, Elk Basin, Hamilton Dome, Lost Soldier-Wertz, Frannie, Lance Creek, Oregon Basin, and Salt Creek.

Coal in these counties: Campbell, Carbon, Converse, and Sheridan.

NEW MEXICO

Oil in these fields: Eunice, Monument, Hobbs, Arrowhead, Vacuum, and Maljamar.

Copper ores in these districts: Central (including Santa Rita), Lordsburg, and Burro Mountain.

ALABAMA

Oil in all coastal submerged lands and the counties of Mobile, Baldwin, and Escambia.

Coal in these counties: Bibb, Blount, Jefferson, St. Clair, Tuscaloosa, and Walker.

ARIZONA

Copper and zinc ores in these districts: Copper Mountain (Morenci), Globe-Miami, Ajo, Pioneer (Superior), Mineral Creek (Ray), Verde (Jerome), Warren (Bisbee), Eureka (Bagdad), Big Bug, Pima, Old Hat, Cochise, and Aravaipa.

Copper and zinc ores in these mines: Copper Queen, Iron Cornelia, Inspiration, Miami, Castle Dome, Magma, Ray Mines, and Bagdad.

ARKANSAS

Oil in these fields: Atlanta, Schuler, Smackover, Magnolia, Midway, Stephens, McKamie, and Dorcheat-Macedonia.

Coal in these counties: Franklin, Johnson, Logan, Pope, Scott, and Sebastian.

COLORADO

Oil in these fields: Rangely, Wilson Creek, and Iles.

Zinc ores in the Eagle and Kokomo Unit mines and in these districts: Red Cliff, Ten Mile, California (Leadville), Upper San Miguel, Tomichi, Sneffels, and Animas.

CONNECTICUT

Oil in all coastal submerged lands.
Sand and gravel deposits.

DELAWARE

Oil in all coastal submerged lands.
Sand and gravel deposits.

FLORIDA

Oil in all coastal submerged lands.
Phosphate rock.

GEORGIA

Oil in all coastal submerged lands.
Cement.

IDAHO

Lead and zinc ores in these mines: Bunker Hill and Sullivan, Page, Star, Morning, and Sherman.

Lead and zinc ores in these districts: Yreka, Hunter, and Lelande.

ILLINOIS

Oil in these fields: Clay City, Louden, New Harmony-Keensburg, Sailor Springs, Salem and East Inman.

Coal in these counties: Fulton, Knox, Perry, Randolph, Williamson, Grundy and Will.

INDIANA

Coal and oil in these counties: Pike, Warrick, Clay, Sullivan, Knox, Daviess, Posey and Gibson.

IOWA

Coal in these counties: Marion, Mahaska, Wapello, Van Buren, Jasper and Monroe.
Cement.

KANSAS

Oil in these counties: Wabaunsee, Phillips, Rooks, Barton, Ellis, Stafford and Butler. The entire scope of these fields should be included: Trapp, Silica-Raymond, Kraft-Prusa, Bemis-Shutts, Burnett and Bloomer.
Cement.

KENTUCKY

Coal in these counties: Hopkins, Muhlenberg, Ohio, Webster, Daviess, Boyd and Clay.
Fluorspar in the counties of Crittenden and Livingston and including these mines: Blue, Commodore, Delhi-Babb, Keystone, Pigmy, Tabb No. 1 and Yandell No. 22.

MAINE

Marine life in all coastal waters and submerged lands including all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges and kelp.
Cement.

MARYLAND

Oil in all coastal submerged lands.
Marine life in all coastal waters and submerged lands including all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges and kelp.

MASSACHUSETTS

Oil in all coastal submerged lands.
Marine life in all coastal waters and submerged lands including all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges and kelp.

MICHIGAN

Iron ore in the Marquette and Gogebic ranges and including these mines: Mather, Maas, Geneve, Anvil - Palms - Keweenaw, Athens and Penokee.

Copper in these mines: Calumet and Hecla Consolidated, Quincy and Champion.

MINNESOTA

Iron ore in the Mesabi and Cuyuna ranges and including these mines: Hull Rust, Rouchleau, Mahoning, Monoroe-Tener, Sherman, Mountain Iron, Gross Marble, Walker, Kevin, Hill-Trumbell, Gilbert, Hill Annex, Pillsbury, Mississippi, Hawkins and Canton.

Manganese ore in the Cuyuna range.

MISSISSIPPI

Oil in all coastal submerged lands and in these fields: Tinsley, Mallalieu, Brookhaven, Cranfield, La Grange, Baxterville, and Heidelberg.

Natural gas in these fields: Gwinville, Baxterville, Carthage, Soso, Sandy Hook, Hub, Jackson, and Fayette.

MISSOURI

Lead ores in these mines: Federal, Leadwood, Mine La Motte, Bonne Terre, Madison, and Desloge.

Coal in these counties: Macon, Henry, Callaway, Bates, Barton, Vernon, Randolph, St. Clair, and Monroe.

MONTANA

Oil in these fields: Elk Basin, Cutbank, Big Wall, Kevin-Sunburst, Pondera, Ragged Point, and Regan.

Copper ores in these counties: Silver Bow, Park, Madison, Lewis and Clark, Cascade, Beaverhead, and Sanders.

NEBRASKA

Cement.
Sand and gravel.

NEVADA

Copper ore in these districts: Yellow Pine, Delano, Mountain City, Battle Mountain, Jack Rabbit, Pioche, and Robinson.

Zinc ores in these districts: Yellow Pine, Railroad, Ruby Range, Spruce Mountain, Eureka, Battle Mountain, Comet, Jack Rabbit, Pioche, and Tem Piute.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Sand and gravel.
Beryllium ore.

NEW JERSEY

Zinc ore throughout the State and including the Franklin and Sterling Hill mine.
Sand and gravel.

NEW YORK

Iron ore in these areas: Mineville, Lyon Mountain, Degrasse, Star Lake, and Oneida County.
Oil in all fields.

NORTH CAROLINA

Sand and gravel.
Talc and pyrophyllite.

NORTH DAKOTA

Coal.
Sand and gravel.

OHIO

Coal particularly in these counties: Belmont, Columbiana, Harrison, Jefferson, Muskingum, Noble, Perry, Stark, and Athens.
Lime.

OKLAHOMA

Oil in all fields, including Velma, Sholem-Alchem, Oklahoma City, Cement, Burbank, Cumberland, Cushing, and Seminole.

Coal in all counties, including Rogers, Okmulgee, Muskogee, Latimer, Coal, Haskell, and Tulsa.

OREGON

Sand and gravel.
Gold in the counties of Baker, Curry, Grant, Jackson, Josephine, Lane, and Union and including these districts: Canyon, Bohemia, Cracker Creek, and Green Mountain.

PENNSYLVANIA

Coal and oil.

RHODE ISLAND

Sand and gravel.
Graphite.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Cement.
Vermiculite.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Gold in St. Lawrence County and including these mines: Homestake, Portland, Dakota, Clinton, Two Johns, and Trojan.
Sand and gravel.

TENNESSEE

Coal in these counties: Marion, Grundy, Campbell, Claiborne, Van Buren, Sequatchie, and Scott.
Cement.

UTAH

Copper and zinc in these counties: Salt Lake, Juab, Tooele, Wasatch, Utah, Beaver, Summit, Washington, and Piute.

VERMONT

Asbestos in the Lowell area.
Copper in the Orange County area.

VIRGINIA

Coal in these counties: Buchanan, Russell, Tazewell, and Wise.
Cement.

WEST VIRGINIA

Coal in all counties, including: Harrison, Fayette, Barbour, Brooke, Mingo, Mercer, and Raleigh.
Oil in all fields, including Silverton field.

WISCONSIN

Sand and gravel.
Iron ore in the Gogebic district and including the Montreal Mine.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it will be noted that I have listed only two of the major minerals being produced in each State. In every case there are others importantly essential to national defense.

However, since the Federal Government has established a pattern of trying to confiscate only two resources—oil and gas—in the four States presently under attack, I assume the same pattern will carry through to the other States as they are attacked. If so, the Secretary of the Interior could argue with some logic that national defense is a burden common to all 48 States and should be shared equally by them.

Senate Joint Resolution 20, now before the Senate as a national defense matter, certainly does not distribute this common burden equitably. It singles out two resources—oil and gas—in only four States for permanent Federal control. It is discriminatory on its face.

Senate Joint Resolution 20 also would give congressional recognition to the strange and dangerous doctrine of "paramount rights, full dominion and power." Such congressional approval would give the Interior Department encouragement to proceed immediately with a Nation-wide program of collectivization and nationalization of all basic natural resources of all 48 States.

Because Senate Joint Resolution 20 appears to me to be discriminatory and dangerous, I oppose it as vigorously as I can. I hope my colleagues, in the interest of preserving constitutional guaranties protecting private property and States' rights, will also oppose it.

Senate bill 940, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and 34 other Senators, including myself, would restore the law to what it was before this deliberate attempt to destroy States' rights began. It also would immediately clear the way for the full resumption of oil development and production in the States' submerged coastal lands—something the States have demonstrated they can do more quickly, efficiently, and profitably than the Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to enact Senate bill 940 into law quickly, as a substitute, and over a Presidential veto, if that action becomes necessary. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE HELLS CANYON PROJECT

During the delivery of Mr. CAIN'S speech,

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I have heretofore addressed myself to the Senator from Washington with respect to certain features of the Hells Canyon bill. I want the Senate to know that I am trying to study that bill with particular interest, without partisan politics, and without a desire to be pressurized by any person, regardless of which side of the controversy he may take.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and following the remarks of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], a letter from Mr. Carl H. Swanstrom, attorney and counsellor at law, of Council, Idaho, dated March 8, 1952, and addressed to me. It sets forth the writer's philosophy with respect to the Hells Canyon project.

I may say to the Senate that Mr. Swanstrom is known to me to be a lifelong Democrat, a man who has taken an active part in the work of the Democratic Party within the State of Idaho. I appreciate his remarks to me as contained in this letter. They are the profound observations of a very learned man, who is thinking of the welfare of his country, rather than in terms of political or pressure philosophy. I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, and at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Washington.

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

COUNCIL, IDAHO, *March 8, 1952.*

DEAR HERMAN: I note by today's paper that Senator MORSE has introduced the Hells Canyon Act and accompanied it with an impassioned plea for its approval.

My notion about this project has not altered and I feel there are quite a number of folks here who were favorable to it when first proposed but now feel entirely different about it. That is something from a group of people living alongside such a gigantic project and who, reasonably, might be expected to profit most by it.

If there should come a time and place when the voice of a very small pebble from the folks back home might be heard to advantage, I would be glad to speak up. Before the high-powered public power advocates I might make a sorry witness but somehow I have always felt that sincerity of belief overcomes a lot of deficiencies in coping with that sort of stuff.

As I remarked in my former letter, we must start at home on projects of this sort, otherwise there can be no real merit in our roar about other follies committed farther away. Hells Canyon looks awfully attractive to people in certain businesses at nearby points and the immediate benefits during construction, or, possibly, from resulting tourist trade, blind them to the long-term picture of impossible Federal debt, to still further Government controls and to a one-man dictatorship of 90 percent of the electric power of the Northwest.

We have a very-small-business man here who has been red hot for the Hells Canyon project—(he bought up every lot in town he could get tied up)—and when I asked him if Federal control of power was such a wonderful thing for this area, why wouldn't it be even better to have Uncle Sam run the railroad, the sawmill, the bank and take over our farm and livestock industry as well, he had no answer except to say "Well, that's different," which is about as good an explanation as we can get from the boys who are leading the pack.

Best regards,

CARL.

PURCHASES OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS BY DES MOINES UNIVERSITY OF LAWSONOMY

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated January 31, 1952, addressed to Mr. Jess Larson, in which I requested information regarding a certain transaction in which his agency has been engaged.

I have been advised that the reply to my letter was prepared last Tuesday and was available for Mr. Larson's signature. I understand that a copy of the letter was submitted to a Democratic Member of the Senate on last Friday, and has been awaiting clearance in order that I might receive a reply to my letter.

I most respectfully ask Mr. Larson to expedite the clearance of the reply to my letter with the Democratic National Committee if he thinks that is necessary.

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

JANUARY 31, 1952.

Mr. JESS LARSON,
Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LARSON: I understand that the Des Moines University of Lawsonomy, Des Moines, Iowa, has purchased a substantial amount of surplus war materials at the usual educational institution discount.

Please furnish me with a list of the sales which have been made to this institution, including a list of the materials, the total cost to the Government, the sales price, and the percentage discounts allowed, along with the net amount received by the Government.

Who are the operators of this university, and is the material being used by the university strictly for education purposes?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I inserted in the RECORD a letter dated January 31, which I addressed to Mr. Jess Larson, whom I criticized for not forwarding more directly to me his reply.

Since that time I have received the reply, which was sent to me by special messenger.

I wish to express to Mr. Larson my appreciation and at the same time to express the hope that in the future replies will come more promptly.

I request that this statement be printed in the RECORD following the statement I made earlier this afternoon regarding this matter.

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

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington D. C., March 7, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: As I advised you by letter of February 6, 1952, I directed my Compliance Division to obtain the information you requested concerning surplus property acquired by the Des Moines University of Lawsonomy, Des Moines, Iowa.

The Compliance Division has completed a check of the records of War Assets Administration and has determined that disposals were made to this institution on 7 documents numbered 3106355, 3106356, 3106357, 3106358, and 4780865, 4780920, 4780928. Photostat copies of these documents are enclosed, and it is believed they reflect all the data you requested, with the exception of the acquisition costs and the net amounts received by the Government. This information is furnished you in an additional enclosure.

You will observe that discounts of 40 percent and 95 percent were granted this institution on its purchases. These discounts were allowed as the result of the assignment of certification symbol 13–F–28 to this institution by the Educational Agency for Surplus and Excess Property of the State of Iowa, indicating that the Des Moines University of Lawsonomy was eligible to purchase surplus property at a discount.

In December 1948 the War Assets Administration was advised by the county attorney of Polk County, Iowa, that this school had been denied tax exemption as a nonprofit educational institution by the local authorities, although it had been exempt from Federal income tax by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Inquiries were then initiated to determine the qualifications of the university to purchase surplus property at discounts allowed educational institutions.

During the course of this inquiry Public Law 152 was enacted transferring compliance responsibility in such cases to the Federal Security Agency which, I am informed, has been conducting an investigation to determine the manner in which the university utilized the surplus property. It is my understanding that the Federal Security Agency has referred its findings to the Department of Justice for such action as may be necessary to protect the interest of the Government.

I trust this information is sufficient for your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JESS LARSON,
Administrator.

Breakdown of purchases made by Des Moines University of Lawsonomy, Des Moines, Iowa, from War Assets Administration

Sales Document	Item	Acquisition cost	Total acquisition cost	Net amount received by Government
3106355	1	$12,454.00		
	2	1,275.00		
	3	280.32		
	4	280.32		
	5	485.70		
	6	735.00		
	7	6,790.00		
	8	7,993.00		
	9	217.80		
	10	6,827.50		
	11	1,300.00		
	12	581.38		
	13	7,726.00		
	14	8,864.01		
	15	1,033.40		
	16	16,358.44		
	17	7,398.57		
	18	$7,398.57		
	19	7,067.54		
	20	2,290.00		
	21	8,218.00		
	22	2,905.00		
	23	4,955.00		
	24	6,982.00		
	25	4,701.54		
	26	14,379.10		
	27	8,562.10	$147,959.29	$1,764.76
3106356	1	2,900.00		
	2	484.02	3,384.02	83.69
3106357	1	2,903.00		
	2	2,903.00	5,806.00	38.86
3106358	1	1,500.00	1,500.00	48.90
4780920	1	25,135.00		
	2	2,445.00		
	3	2,445.00	30,025.00	340.38
4780928	1	445.00		
	2	6,798.00	7,243.00	74.10
4780865	1	8,500.00	8,500.00	2,129.40
		Grand total acquisition cost	204,417.31	4,480.09

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the appropriate committee.

The bill (S. 2839) to continue beyond June 30, 1953, authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1, the Housing Act of 1949, approved July 15, 1949, is hereby amended as follows: (a) In the first sentence of section 511 immediately following the phrase "July 1, 1951" strike the word "and" and insert at the end of the sentence just before the period a comma and the language "and such additional sums on and after July 1, 1953, as the Congress may from time to time determine." (b) At the end of section 512 just before the period insert a comma and the language "and to make additional commitments on and after July 1, 1953, for additional contributions aggregating not more than $2,000,000 per annum." (c) In section 513 just before the last semicolon insert a comma and the language "and such further amounts on and after July 1, 1953, as the Congress may from time to time determine."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the bill I have introduced proposes to amend and extend certain sections of Public Law 171 of the Eighty-first Congress. That law for the first time provided a housing program for farmers. The program was established on a rather experimental basis, for only three fiscal years, and we provided that appropriations might be made to carry out the commitments during those three fiscal years. That has but one more fiscal year to run. Therefore, I have felt it essential that this Congress take action to extend it, in order that proper authorizations may be made, so the purpose of the bill which I have introduced is to extend that law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an explanation of exactly what the bill I have introduced seeks to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTIONS 511, 512, AND 513 OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Section 511 of the Public Law 171, Eighty-first Congress, approved July 15, 1949, authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as the Congress might determine for the purpose of making loans under Farm Housing Title of certain specified amounts on and after July 1, 1949, July 1, 1950, July 1, 1951, and July 1, 1952. These provisions constituted the basic authority for annual appropriations. There is no provision constituting such authority for appropriations after the fiscal year 1953 for additional loans for farm housing and other farm buildings.

It is the purpose of the amendment to section 511 to provide the necessary basic authority for annual appropriations for the continuation of the loans for farm housing and other farm buildings under this act.

In connection with loans made under section 503 of the act, the Secretary is authorized to make commitments for contributions, in the form of credits on borrowers' notes, under certain specified conditions. This authority is described in terms of authority to execute contribution agreements aggregating not to exceed certain specified amounts on and after July 1, 1949, and July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952, respectively. There is no authorization to enter into agreements after the fiscal year 1953 for contributions in connection with section 503 loans. The proposed amendment would make the authority for contribution agreements permanent legislation.

Section 513 of the act constitutes the basic authority for appropriations to the Secretary of Agriculture when necessary to match the credits made on borrowers notes under section 503 so that the Secretary of Agriculture will be in a position to repay his obligation to the Secretary of the Treasury on borrowings under section 511. Section 513 also authorizes the appropriations of certain specified sums for grants under section 504 (a) and for loans for temporary improvements and for enlargement and development of farms under section 504 (b). This authorization is limited to specific amounts for the fiscal years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953. There is no authority for appropriations for the purposes of section 513 after the fiscal year 1953. The proposed amendment would provide such basic authority.

The provision in section 513c, for such further appropriations as may be necessary, covers only administrative expenses, technical services, and research, but it is in the nature of permanent authorization for annual appropriations for such purposes and needs no extension.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the

Senate to the fact that in 2 years of successful operation farmers have obtained under this law approximately 11,750 loans, aggregating $53,115,000. In my State of Alabama, 580 loans have been made, totaling $2,650,000. It has not only been good for the farmers, but it has also proved a sound financial operation.

Speaking again of the experience within my State of Alabama, 98 percent of the farmers in that State who have obtained these loans have met their payments, and the other 2 percent are, on an average, less than $200 in arrears. I believe that any businessman will agree that this is a very fine financial record.

The program is intended for farmers who cannot obtain loans from banks and other lending institutions. With a 4 percent loan for a period as long as 33 years, a farmer is able to build a new home or to modernize his old one, and to construct new farm buildings, in order to make his farm more profitable.

We have long had an effective housing program for urban areas. The farmer ought to have the same privileges under Federal housing legislation as the city dweller. The first farm home loan in the United States under this law was made to a young man, a veteran of World War II, living in Jackson County, Ala. It was my pleasure to be present at the closing of that loan. Veterans, especially, have benefited under the program. They are receiving nearly 40 percent of all the loans which are being made.

Mr. President, according to the 1950 census, there is a critical need for the farm-housing program. The census reported that more than one-fifth of America's 6,500,000 farm dwellings are in a dilapidated condition. More than three-fourths of all farm houses lack hot water, private bath, and toilet facilities.

I could go on and enumerate many other deficiencies in housing on the farms. In speaking of slum areas we nearly always think of them as applying only to urban areas, but we have but to look at the census figures to realize that some of the most critical housing needs are in farm areas.

Mr. President, the law has been in operation nearly 2 years, and it has operated well; it has been highly successful. I believe it should be extended as a permanent part of our over-all housing program, and it is for that purpose that I have introduced the bill, S. 2839.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20), to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wyoming if he accepts the amendment which I offered?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I stated to the Senator earlier in the day, I should be very glad to accept the amendment with the modification which the Senator suggested.

Mr. LONG. We were unable to agree on that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thought the Senator and I had agreed that it would be a very helpful thing, in view of the accumulation of work upon all Members of Congress, if we had the benefit of the work which has been done by the special master appointed by the Supreme Court to take evidence. I should be very happy to accept the amendment if it were preceded by a statement to the effect that when the special master's report shall have been received by the Supreme Court and his recommendations shall have been made, Congress shall then act, adopting the language of the Senator's amendment. I should be very happy to accept it in that form.

Mr. LONG. I would be willing, provided we can anticipate the master's recommendations being made some time soon. The master has been 4 years hearing the case.

CONGRESS' POWERS TO DELIMIT BOUNDARIES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We can make a legislative record here, indicating with absolute clarity that the amendment should not be interpreted as inhibiting the right of Congress to act whenever it pleases. It is a legislative matter, and I have no hesitation in saying that even without the Senator's amendment the Congress has the power and can delimit the seaward boundaries.

Mr. LONG. Congress has the right to determine the marginal limits and where the lines are by which those limits can be determined. If any branch of the Federal Government has a right to determine what the boundaries should be, it is the Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator, but the trouble is that the determination of these boundaries involves a great deal of technical knowledge, engineering surveys, coast and geodetic surveys, and all that sort of complex, technical knowledge which it is impossible for Congress to have before it and consider at this time. If the special master is doing that, we might as well have the advantage of his work. I shall certainly be very glad to accept the amendment with that slight modification.

Mr. LONG. The matter would be in conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. LONG. I shall be glad to modify my amendment in accordance with the Senator's idea. The only point I had in mind was that I do not believe that Congress should necessarily wait in the event that years of additional work are necessary on the part of the master.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think there is nothing in the proposed amendment which the Senator proposes to offer to the amendment I have offered which would prevent Congress from acting any time within its judgment.

Mr. President, the amendment which the Senator from Louisiana sent forward to the desk reads as follows:

In the appropriate place, insert the following language: "*Provided*, That the seaward boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the several States shall be established by the Congress of the United States by legislative enactment."

If we can modify it to this effect:

Provided, That when the special master's report in the case of the *United States* v. *California* shall have been received and his recommendations shall have been made to the Supreme Court, then the seaward boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the several States shall be established by the Congress of the United States by legislative enactment.

Perhaps that should be changed just a little, to say:

Provided, That when the report of the special master in the case of *United States* v. *California*, with respect to the seaward boundaries of the inland or internal waters of California, shall have been received and his recommendations made to the Supreme Court of the United States, then the seaward boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the several States shall be established by the Congress of the United States by legislative enactment.

Mr. LONG. An amendment in that form would prevent Congress from acting until the special master had concluded his work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then let us add the following words:

But this provision shall not be construed as a limitation upon the legislative power of the Congress.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall withdraw my amendment, to avoid further confusion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let it not be said that the Senator from Wyoming was unwilling to compromise.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I withdraw the call for a quorum.

Senators who have come to the floor of the Senate have discussed with me the proposal which I desire to make, namely, that the pending amendment may now be adopted by the Senate subject to the order that if any Member of the Senate on Wednesday or Thursday desires to ask for its reconsideration it may be so ordered, and the matter will be treated de novo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the quorum call? The Chair hears none, and the order for a quorum call is rescinded, and further proceedings under the call will be suspended.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, has the Senator from Wyoming accepted the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have told the Senator from Louisiana that I shall be very happy to accept that amendment in the form in which I last dictated it to the reporter.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. For the information of the Senate, may we have the reporter read the amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will ask that the reporter come to the floor and read the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana withdrew his amendment, did he not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Chair is correct. The Senator from Louisiana withdrew his amendment, but while the quorum call was proceeding I discussed the matter with him and told him that I would be very happy to accept the amendment, and he agreed to it. So, on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana and myself, I offer the amendment as I have dictated it to the reporter.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. As amended by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland request the reading of the amendment?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. As I understand, tomorrow we are to have a special order of business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is why I specified Wednesday or Thursday in my proposal. On either day the matter may be reopened.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In other words, under the rules of the Senate, the matter may be reopened on either of the next 2 days of actual session following the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LONG. Will the Chair have the amendment, as modified, read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not have the modification at hand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent that since the reporter who took the dictation is not now on the floor and the transcription is not available, it may be possible for the Senator from Louisiana and myself to agree to any modification of the language as dictated which may appear to be essential.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming to be permitted, as the Chair understands, to confer with the Senator from Louisiana——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the request is included in the original unanimous-consent request, anyway.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I withdraw any objection I may have had to the amendment as dictated by the Senator from Wyoming? I did not hear it at the moment, but I am sure the Senator dictated it in substance as we agreed on it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to with the modification he has specified. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment, as modified, is agreed to.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming that the amendment be open to reconsideration on request of any Senator?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that request is not necessary now, since the rule is that the amendment may be reopened at any time within the next 2 days. If the language is not satisfactory, if it does not express the thought of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Wyoming, we shall have no difficulty in modifying it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that it would require unanimous consent for the amendment to be reconsidered.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to under those considerations.

AMENDMENT OF MINERAL LEASING ACT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when a Senator introduces a piece of proposed legislation he never can be sure what the response will be. On the 25th of February I introduced a bill, Senate bill 2723, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act.

On February 28, 1952, the Independent Petroleum Association of America, in its report No. 631, commented on that legislative suggestion. It commented, I think, a little unfairly. It commented certainly in a spirit which prompts me to say a few words about it. It referred to the fact that the bill had been introduced, and said:

> The bill also proposes to repeal the provisions of the present law waiving the second- and third-year rentals.

Those who are familiar with the procedure realize that an applicant, when he makes his application, pays 50 cents, which is supposed to cover the first and second-year rental. He was never billed for the third-year rental by virtue of provisions now in the law. That, to be sure, is changed in the proposed legislative suggestion which was made to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Congress of the United States. That change was made at the suggestion of many people who think it is time to take a look at the situation and decide whether there should be 2 years in which rental is not paid.

I have no private opinion about it one way or the other. It is included solely for the purpose of permitting the committee considering it to see if conditions have changed in recent years. The reason for that is that in the beginning, when people made application for oil and gas prospecting permits, sometimes as much as a year or a year and half was required before the permit was acted upon.

Naturally it was unfair to require a person to pay rental while the Government was delaying approval of his lease or prospecting permit.

Now it takes but 6 weeks. Therefore it seemed logical to me to ask the question whether or not that provision should be reviewed.

The report of the Independent Petroleum Association of America stated further:

> It is understandable that some resentment is felt at the recent New Mexico lottery held by the Interior Department. The bill does not prevent such lottery; on the other hand, it legalizes such procedure at the election of the Secretary.

I suggest, Mr. President, that that is a pretty bad distortion, which an honest man would not make. The bill does not legalize any such thing. It permits the Secretary to continue what he is now doing, but it is no new grant of power to the Secretary.

My interest in this matter arose when I tried to point out to the Department of the Interior officials that I did not think the lottery which they conducted in New Mexico was the best example in the world of how well the Department of the Interior could administer the submerged lands off the coast of the United States if they ever acquired them. I suggested that it might be better if the Department of the Interior would give those of us who had been trying to support the Department a little ground for support, instead of conducting that type of lottery.

The answer of the Department of the Interior, and a truthful answer it was, was that under the law it had no option; that if they had had a law which would have permitted them to sell these leases at competitive bidding, they could have used it, but under the law they could do nothing else than what they did.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator's bill provide that the royalties which the Government can obtain shall be limited to 12½ percent, as the law stands at the present time, for prospects which have not been at all developed or proven?

Mr. ANDERSON. It provides that it shall be not less than 12½ percent.

Mr. LONG. It might then be possible for the Secretary to obtain more for the Government, might it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; and I think there may be instances in which the Secretary should obtain more for the Government. After all, the lands he was leasing had been regarded as oil lands. It is true that there had never actually been any oil found there, because potash was being developed, and this country badly needed the production of potash. Therefore, as a measure of protection to potash the oil companies were not permitted to come in and sink their drill holes and destroy the potash fields. An agreement has been worked out under which we feel sure that those who are prospecting for oil will so conduct their operations that they will not destroy the potash.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe that the Senator's bill is a very much needed improvement to the Mineral Leasing Act. Off the State of Louisiana we have found that when companies are able to bid competitively, a company which might not be able to put up as much money will offer to give the State a much higher percentage of the return from oil. I believe that in the long run it would be found that a smaller cash consideration, but a larger percentage of the minerals to be derived from production, would be in the interest of the Government and would bring the Government substantially more money.

It is urged by some that such a policy could be carried to such an extreme that perhaps a person might give the Government 75 percent of any oil or gas or other minerals produced, and keep only 25 percent for himself. Perhaps it might be carried too far, but certainly, within reasonable limits, I believe that the Government should look into the possibility of receiving a better return, in the interest of the Government, by receiving a higher percentage royalty than the one-eighth which has been the limit up to this time.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that while it was contemplated in this legislation to continue the 12½ percent on leases with respect to lands which were not known to be oil lands, it was the expectation that when we entered the hearing before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this suggestion, which has been made previously several times in the committee by the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators, could be afforded an opportunity for examination. If there is no reason to change the law, if conditions have not changed, we should not alter it. But some of us have noted that the potentates of some of the lands lying to the east are getting half the profits from oil. I do not know whether that is right or wrong, but I believe that it would be well to take a look at the situation. That was the sole purpose which I had in mind. However, I do not think it is right to say that the bill legalizes a lottery, when the Secretary of the Interior had to have a lottery under the present law, and himself said that he could do nothing else.

I am a little surprised that this sort of a statement should be made by the Independent Petroleum Association of America:

> This proposal has implications of serious consequences. It changes the concept of the Federal Government as the trustee for public lands for the benefit of the citizens to that of landlord.

I should like to have the man who wrote that tell me where, in the few simple words of the bill, he finds anything which "changes the concept of the Federal Government as the trustee for public lands for the benefit of the citizens to that of landlord."

The report continues:

> It tends to remove the competitive element for oil exploration of oil on the public lands heretofore furnished by the thousands of individual citizens of the United States and leaves such activities to be enjoyed only by large collections of wealth such as is possible only in large corporations.

I submit that that is as farfetched as it could be. It so happens that I have always believed, and always will believe, in affording opportunity for small individuals and small independent operators to prospect for oil. The strange thing is that the man who signs this report knows that to be a fact. He says:

> It makes possible the gradual closing down of operations for oil on the public lands such as was done in the late twenties by withdrawing the public lands from leasing.

I say that it is regrettable that an institution which considers itself to be reputable should have anyone in its employ who will say that that is the purpose of a piece of legislation which clearly is not within its intendment at all.

I stated at the time the bill was introduced that my primary purpose was to make it possible for the Secretary of the Interior, in cases in which lands had been withdrawn and held a long time, until the development of oil was relatively sure, to lease such lands by some method other than by the type of lottery conducted in Santa Fe, N. Mex., several months ago. Nearly everyone agreed that that lottery was a bad thing. Yet when someone tries to correct the situation the Independent Petroleum Association of America indulges in that sort of propaganda.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. During the past several years while I have been a Member of this body both the junior Senator from Louisiana and other members of the Louisiana congressional delegation have put a considerable number of insertions in the RECORD which indicated that the State of Louisiana had been able to get far more in leasing State lands than the Federal Government had been able to obtain in leasing Federal lands. All that the Federal Government could get was 50 cents an acre and one-eighth of the royalty interest, whereas with competitive bidding the State of Louisiana has been getting twice that much. It has been getting as much as $10 and $20 an acre and one-sixth of the royalty interest.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Louisiana knows that when that was done by the State of Louisiana it did not close down oil operations all over the United States.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator from New Mexico will find that in some cases it even accelerated production.

Mr. ANDERSON. The report of the Independent Petroleum Association goes on further and says that this bill, S. 2723, which I introduced—

> would enable the few large oil companies now holding great concessions in foreign countries to use the benefits from these concessions to out-bid the American individual citizen and withhold from development our own lands while we would be forced to buy our needed oil supplies from those few companies at terms dictated by them.

Mr. President, sometimes I wonder how far the decency of men will let them go, when they put out filth of that nature reflecting on an individual who is not trying to destroy the oil industry but is trying to help it in every way he can.

The report goes on to say:

> Through the provisions of this bill we would make possible a world monopoly of oil where a few companies could determine the future of our defense program as well as our domestic economy.

Mr. President, when I read that I realized that I was apparently doing things which the eminent lawyers for the great oil companies had never been able to do. In other words, apparently, I had been setting up a world monopoly for oil. We know that under decisions of the Supreme Court oil companies have been broken up under the antimonopoly section of the law. Yet here, by a few words which give the Secretary of the Interior authority to require competitive bidding, in instances which I had clearly explained, it is charged that I was doing something that no one else had ever been able to accomplish. I am deeply appreciative of the compliment, but I do not care about the type of publication in which it was made.

The report goes on to say:

> The changes in the operation of our public lands made possible by this bill are so great as to be of concern to every American citizen.

Then the report proceeds to list the names of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, such as my colleague the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], with the hope that people may write to the members of the committee and acquaint them with the dastardly provisions of this proposed legislation.

Further on the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] comes into his own. I am happy to be associated in such distinguished company. It says:

> An organization, operating under the name of "Public Affairs Institute," of Washington, D C., has just released a booklet for distribution entitled "Tax Loopholes," by HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United States Senator from Minnesota.

It tells how bad his material is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but I want the Senator from Minnesota to know that he is under some suspicion, because this document says:

> The illustrations are full of half-truths and misconceptions of facts on which the conclusions are based.

I want the Senator from Minnesota to know that anything he says I will take with full knowledge of this statement in Mr. Brown's report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was not exactly moved by the passage which the Senator from New Mexico has read. It appears that the editor of the report is, with reference to proposed legislation, perhaps the best expert at half-truths of anyone I have ever met. So perhaps I should reexamine my argument on depletion allowance.

However, the reason I rose was to say that copies of the little booklet which has been referred to are available. It should

be made a matter of public notice that the Public Affairs Institute has been kind enough to supply me with several copies of the pamphlet, and that they are available to my colleagues and their relatives and constituents.

Mr. ANDERSON. The point I was getting to was the last sentence of this document. It says:

> The unfortunate effect of such articles is to foul with prejudice and malice the atmosphere in which these problems of an essential industry must be studied.

I suggest that when the general counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America says what he has said about a bill which I have introduced, knowing my general attitude toward the industry, knowing how I have stood on the question of leases for a long time, knowing of his own personal knowledge that I could hardly have recommended the type of legislation to which he refers, I realize that the unfortunate effect of such statements is to foul with prejudice and malice the atmosphere in which these problems of an essential industry must be studied.

Mr. President, I have had some convictions on the question of depletion allowance. I think I understand how it operates. I must say that I believe that in this report which the general counsel for the Independent Petroleum Association of America has written, he has made more difficult the task which Senators have in defending the depletion allowance.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe that the Senator from New Mexico will find that very few members of the Independent Petroleum Association will seriously argue that it will in anyway injure the independent oil or gas industry if everyone were to bid on a competitive basis for Federal leases. I believe that members of the association who will sit down with the Senator from New Mexico will concede privately to him that it would not hurt them to bid on leases competitively instead of acquiring them in an easy way by means of which they get leases for a small fraction of their actual value.

Mr. ANDERSON. In this bill it was not my intent to require competitive bidding on these leases. I recognize that there are a great many men who feel that it is extremely unwise to do so, but there was no other way that I could find to get before Congress this question which the Secretary of the Interior had dealt with. He said he could not do anything but hold a raffle or a lottery in the case of known oil lands, which did not actually constitute a developed field, and that he would welcome some legislation which would permit him to use his discretion.

I recognize the bill goes further than that. I am not unable to read it. However, it goes further than that, so that when we hold hearings on it we can decide how we want to limit it, what we want to do, and what restrictions we want to impose.

If the representative of the Independent Petroleum Association had come before the committee he would have been treated with more decency and courtesy than he has accorded to me, and I would have given him a chance to make his opinion known.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course the distinguished Senator from New Mexico knows very well that seismographic and other equipment now being used in exploration have been so developed that it is now much easier to predict where oil may be found than when the Mineral Leasing Act was passed, and that prospecting for oil is not so speculative as it once was.

Mr. ANDERSON. I not only want to agree with my friend the Senator from Louisiana, but I want to say that Congress has recognized that fact. The original leasing act was passed in 1920. It was sponsored largely by a former United States Senator from my State, A. A. Jones, who had been an Assistant Secretary of the Interior prior to his coming to the Senate. He knew a great deal about the public lands of the West. He was recognized as a lawyer familiar with the public land problems, and he wrote into the law provision for a prospecting permit.

As a result, it was not necessary to obtain a lease; by paying a very small sum of money, one could obtain a prospecting permit on 2,560 acres of land which he thought contained coal, oil, or other materials. I recall that because in the year 1921 I filed a prospecting permit on 2,560 acres of what I thought was coal land, and which subsequently proved to be coal land. I recognize that the investigations which developed that it was coal land would not have been made but for the provisions written into the act in 1920.

However, times move along. In 1935 and in 1946 we again changed the law in those two instances, and eliminated the provision for prospecting permits. We did so because of the very things to which the junior Senator from Louisiana has referred, namely, the use of the seismograph and the many other scientific instruments and the use of aerial photographs, many of which are fitted together, and all of which make it possible to have an opportunity to judge whether oil may lie beneath a certain geological formation.

All those things have made it more possible for people to do well with leases at this time. I have said repeatedly that I do not wish to stop that leasing process.

I believe that when the Federal Government has withdrawn an area, and when, because of other developments—for instance, a search for a mineral or some other material—there is positive indication that oil exists beneath that land, even though there is not an oil well in that part of the country, the Secretary of the Interior should be allowed to take competitive bids on it for the benefit of the Nation. I am amazed that the Independent Petroleum Association of America, or at least one of its officials, thinks differently regarding that matter.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF THE BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will consider the reorganization plan for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a recent editorial entitled "The Senate's Big Opportunity." The editorial appeared in the Washington Evening Star, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE SENATE'S BIG OPPORTUNITY

After all the shouting at the Capitol over the scandals in the Internal Revenue Bureau, there is something incongruous in the hedging that has been taking place on the Senate side over the administration's plan for cleaning up the Bureau. The demands for Executive reform brought, among other actions, a Presidential proposal for a sweeping reorganization of the tax-collection agency in line with recommendations of the Hoover Commission. But that proposal had as one of its main provisions the freeing of the collection system from the pressures and temptations of political patronage. That was the hitch. Senators have never been enthusiastic, as a group, about relinquishing any patronage rights. It is not surprising that the reorganization plan, after House approval, has met with trouble in the Senate Executive Expenditures Committee.

President Truman's urgent request to the Senate for approval of the plan followed indications that the bill might be held up for further study by the committee. A refusal of the Senate to accept the reorganization plan now would kill it for this session. If there is no adverse vote in the Senate before March 14, the plan automatically will become operative. To reject the proposal now in favor of further study would be a delaying action that would be inconsistent with senatorial cries for prompt revenue reforms. If the critics of the President's plan had something better to offer, their warnings against too much haste in reorganization could be justified. But no better plan than that calling for removal of collectors from politics has yet been produced.

The pending plan, as Revenue Commissioner Dunlap has pointed out to the committee, embraces the main points of the Hoover Commission's programs and of other groups which have studied the Bureau's defects. Mr. Dunlap has answered effectively a number of questions raised by opponents of the plan—but it is an open secret that the main bone of contention is the proposed substitution of civil-service selection of collectors for political appointments.

The President's latest message in support of the legislation has the effect of placing responsibility for effective house cleaning at the Internal Revenue Bureau on the Senate. If the Senate blocks this chance to place the tax-collection agency on a merit basis, its outcries over corruption and inefficiency in the Government will take on a very hollow ring.

RACIAL EQUALITY—EDITORIAL FROM LIFE MAGAZINE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently there was published in Life magazine—I believe it appeared in its most recent issue—an editorial entitled "The Shengs and Democracy." The editorial refers to a gentleman of Chinese ancestry who, while living in the United States, encountered a great deal of diffi-

culty in the exercise of what he considered to be natural rights and legal rights as a resident of this country.

I commend a reading of the editorial to every Member of this body. I think it will provoke a reawakening in regard to some of the difficulties existing in sections of the country other than the South, where similar difficulties are all too often referred to. The editorial discusses the situation in the West, in my section of the country, and in the East, where persons of various nationalities and of various racial origins have done much to advance the welfare and progress of the Republic.

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

THE SHENGS AND DEMOCRACY

Mr. Sing Sheng placed a bet on American democracy and lost it. In Asia they will, therefore, be asking whether American democracy is worth betting on. It still is.

Sheng, a United States college graduate and a former Nationalist Chinese intelligence officer, is an airline mechanic in south San Francisco. He wanted to buy a small house for his growing family in Southwood, a suburb near the airport where he works. When he learned that some of the all-Caucasian residents of Southwood did not want a Chinese neighbor, he proposed that the question be put to a vote. To all residents he wrote: "We think so highly of democracy because it offers freedom and equality. America's forefathers fought for these principles and won the independence of 1776. * * * Do not make us the victims of false democracy. Please vote for us." The other side was summed up by a builder who said, "People must stick together to protect their property rights." Sheng lost, 174 to 28, with 14 abstentions. Said he bitterly, when the votes were counted, "I hope your property values will go up every 3 days."

The response to the Sheng case has been strong and Nation-wide. Other cities have offered him a job and a home. There is a move in south San Francisco itself to make amends. Since Sheng's original purpose was not to put democracy on the spot but simply to find a better place to live, the outcome for him is likely to be satisfactory. That is one minor count for American democracy.

Another is the fact that Sheng could have moved into the Southwood house if he had wanted to make an issue of it. The restrictive covenant is legally unenforceable; so says the Supreme Court. But Sheng made what he calls a "gentleman's agreement" to abide by the outcome of the balloting. In other words he tactfully asks more of our democracy than law can provide. He asks what the United States at present merely aspires to, namely complete absence of prejudice between man and man.

In fact the people of Southwood were less prejudiced against Sheng than against losing money. The market value of group prejudice is the key to the segregation problem in the United States. During the last 10 years the United States has made revolutionary progress toward racial equality. If this progress continues, prejudice should eventually even lose its market value. It had better, for the national costs of discrimination are exceedingly high. Segregated slums yield only about 6 percent of the typical city's taxes, but use a third of its fire and almost a half of its police protection. The underemployment of Negro talents and skills is even more wasteful. According to the Urban League the total economic cost of discrimination in a city like New York is at least $1,000,000,000 a year.

This loss is at least as real as the one the calculating householders of Southwood think they have avoided. When we outgrow group prejudice in this country, the Southwood type of property loss would be inconceivable, and the present cost of discrimination will be turned into a big gain for all.

RECESS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we beseech Thee to guide, sustain, and encourage us in all the noble and worthy undertakings of this day.

May each new day be better than yesterday and prophetic of a radiant tomorrow as we strive to be coworkers with Thee and with one another in the great moral and spiritual enterprise of achieving blessedness for all mankind.

We penitently confess that there are times when the ideals which we cherish seem so visionary, the outlook for a finer social order appears so gloomy, our loftiest impulses are frustrated, and our hearts are filled with fear and foreboding.

Forgive us for allowing doubt and cynicism to find lodgment in our souls and for permitting any sinister thoughts and feelings to eclipse our faith, blur our hope, and extinguish our love.

May we be confident that we have not been created for failure but for victory and that in Thine own good time all Thy gracious promises shall be gloriously fulfilled.

In Christ's name we offer our prayers. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4645) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite A. Brumell," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. HENDRICKSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CLAIM OF ROBERT E. VIGUS

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MARCH 10, 1952.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on March 10, 1952, the Clerk received today from the Secretary of the Senate the following message:

That the Senate has passed without amendment House Concurrent Resolution 203, entitled "Concurrent resolution requesting the return of the enrollment of H. R. 3219 and the reenrollment thereof."

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

PREVENTING ILLEGAL ENTRY OF ALIENS

Mr. CELLER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally.

PROTEST AGAINST HIGH TAXES IN VIEW OF WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a letter from one of my constituents about taxes. This letter could have been written by any constituent in any part of the United States to any Congressman. I will read it:

THE ASHLAND GAZETTE,
Ashland, Nebr., March 8, 1952.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Treasury Department,
United States Government.

GENTLEMEN: Even though I am required by law to pay income tax for 1951 and make a declaration of tax for 1952, I wish to hereby declare that I do so under protest.

This protest is registered because of glaring Federal Government corruption and immorality, which has resulted in waste and extravagance such as the world has never known before. There are thousands of examples of waste of my money and that of all other American taxpayers. They stem directly from the scandals and investigations of Government bureaus, Armed Forces procurement and foreign aid, but to try and list them is not the purpose of this letter. It is enough to know that they exist.

However, I do wish to go on record that, under the present circumstances, I protest the payment of this money which means so much to me and my family, but apparently means nothing to the Government of which I am supposed to be an integral part.

According to instructions from your department a social-security tax has now been imposed upon practically all self-employed persons. Webster's Dictionary gives the full meaning of the word "impose" and as a free American citizen I do not appreciate being imposed upon.

In closing, please understand that all of us are willing to support by taxes the normal functions of government.

Yours very truly,

M. C. HOWE,
Owner and Publisher.

ARMY PROCUREMENT AND SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATTERSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FORMULA FOR PRICE DECONTROL

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a measure which proposes to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 by providing legislative standards for the suspension of price controls. When the test of the standards is met, decontrol would be mandatory.

Two basic requirements shall be determining: First, the material or commodity is by its nature not susceptible to speculative buying; second, not more than 10 percent of the total national output of the material or commodity is purchased with Federal funds for defense purposes.

Mr. Speaker, an example of the purposes of this amendment is the removal of price ceilings on crude petroleum. An unrealistic price ceiling has been imposed upon crude-oil production, with the result that the industry has been depressed. It has only been through outstanding and unparalleled expansion that the industry has been able to overcome threatened shortages and meet all requirements for civilian needs as well as for defense efforts. The need for further expansion of oil-producing facilities of this Nation is recognized by those in responsible positions. Because of the extreme essentiality of oil to the modern military machine, the accomplishment of the required expansion program is of utmost importance to the Congress and the American people and is entitled to the greatest consideration.

In contrast with the sharp increases which have occurred in the price of almost every other commodity of our economy during the past 4 years, crude-oil prices have not advanced since 1947, even after Korea.

It is peculiar to the oil industry that controls have a depressing effect upon expansion and discovery of new reserves, and only by the minimum exercise of Government controls and regulations can the oil industry be encouraged to meet the demands made upon it for national defense and civilian use called for by the Petroleum Administration for Defense.

Mr. Speaker, I am including a more complete statement on this subject in the Appendix of the RECORD.

APPROPRIATION FOR SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, several Members have called my office this morning to inquire about the action taken by the Committee on Appropriations in deleting all funds for the Small Defense Plants Administration which is the only independent agency in Government that can be of any help to small-business firms of this country.

I have advised each and every one of them who called me this morning that yesterday I made the statement that when the supplemental appropriation bill is before the House tomorrow, I will offer an amendment restoring the funds so that the Small Defense Plants Administration can do something for small business. I think it is about time that the membership of this House decide one way or the other whether or not they want to help small business. We have been doing a lot of talking about it for the past 2 or 3 years. We will have a chance now to live up to our promise to small business tomorrow when we vote for continuation of the Small Defense Plants Administration.

INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee I call up House Resolution 539.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the second, third, and fourth paragraphs of House Resolution 390, Eighty-second Congress, are amended to read as follows:

"The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and extenuating circumstances both before and after the massacre of thousands of Polish officers buried in mass graves in the Katyn Forest on the banks of the Dnieper River in the vicinity of Smolensk, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which was then a Nazi-occupied territory formerly having been occupied and under the control of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"Upon completing the necessary hearings, the committee shall report to the House of Representatives (or the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session) before January 3, 1953, the results of its investigation and study, together with any recommendations which the committee shall deem advisable.

"For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member."

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 539 amends the original resolution creating the Katyn Investigating Committee House Resolution 390. This amendment gives permission to the Congress to conduct hearings outside of the United States.

Since the Katyn committee was authorized by Congress, a great deal of testimony and essential evidence has come to the attention of the committee from both within and without the borders of the United States. Before Congress adjourned last September, the committee heard the testimony of Lt. Col. Donald B. Stewart. It was unanimously agreed at that time by the members of the committee that further hearings would be resumed after Congress reconvened in January. In the meantime, the counsel and office force of the committee were busy preparing for the hearings.

On Monday, February 4, the committee held hearings for several days of the following witnesses: Father Leopold Braun, A. A., New York, N. Y.; Henry Clarence Cassidy; John Doe; Marion (Mike) Gawiak, Port Colborne, Canada; George Grobicki; Tadeusz Romer, former Polish Ambassador to Russia, Montreal, Quebec, Canada; Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr.; Col. J. B. Gielgud.

The publicity given in this country and abroad to the testimony presented by these witnesses has brought forth a great number of potential witnesses from abroad in addition to the witnesses and testimony that the committee had already obtained. It is plainly evident that the results of the work of our committee has created a great reaction both behind the iron curtain and outside the iron curtain. For a considerable period of time the newspapers in Russia and the satellite countries refused to print any news regarding the Select Committee to Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre. This policy of silence on the Katyn massacre proceedings by the iron-curtain newspapers has changed radically. According to the Associated Press dispatch from Moscow on March 3, 1952, the Russian paper, Pravda, devoted 2½ columns to republishing the text of the conclusions reached by the hand-picked Russian committee which reported on the Katyn massacre in January 1944. Another Associated Press dispatch on the same date stated that the entire Polish press reprinted the same statement. The News Week magazine in its edition 2 weeks ago in the column entitled "The Periscope" made the following statement:

SCORE ONE

Insiders say the House inquiry into the Katyn massacre—the mass murder of Polish soldiers by either Russians or Germans—has scored a propaganda coup in satellite countries. The point is that the United States is probing a crime in which no Americans were affected—the best antidote to Red propaganda that the West has forgotten its former supporters behind the iron curtain.

In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A1539, is reprinted an article from the New York Herald Tribune of last Sunday, setting out the fact that "the inquiry into the death of the Polish soldiers in the Katyn Forest worries the Russians."

I hope that all Members of Congress read this article by Robert L. Moora in Sunday's Herald Tribune.

Without taking up the time of the Congress reviewing the testimony which has already been presented at committee hearings and the fact that all Members

are familiar with the remarks made on the floor of the House during the last month concerning Katyn, I believe that the adoption of this amendment giving authority to our committee to record the great amount of testimony from this international crime which is available in London, Paris, and Berlin is highly essential and very necessary to combat the psychological warfare which the Soviets are so experienced in waging.

The Rules Committee reported out House Resolution 539 unanimously.

I wish at this time to call the attention of the Congress to a press release which was issued by the Embassy representing the present Polish Government in Washington.

At this point I incorporate in my remarks the exact press release issued by the Polish Embassy on March 3, 1952, at 6 p. m.:

POLISH STATEMENT ON MADDEN COMMITTEE

The Polish Government issued on February 29, 1952, a statement on the Madden committee of the United States House of Representatives. The text, translated from the Polish, follows:

"For several months American propaganda has made an effort to publicize the spectacular sessions of the so-called special committee of the House of Representatives in the Katyn case. The staging of this farce and the unleashing of a campaign based upon it, the provocative aim of which is evident, are links in a general United States Government propaganda plan which in turn is part of aggressive preparations for war.

"Behind the scenes of this campaign stand the notorious protectors of neo-Hitlerite revenge aims, the enemies of peace, democracy and the Polish people, such as Mr. Arthur Bliss Lane, who while holding the position of Ambassador of the United States in Warsaw, did not hesitate to take a personal part in the organization of actions directed against the Polish State and its independence and who, since his return to the United States, has specialized in vile slanders against Poland and the U. S. S. R.; such as, also, a member of the special committee, Mr. O'KONSKI, who during World War II was connected with nazi agencies in the United States.

"The appointment of the special committee coincides with the appropriation by the United States Congress of $100,000,000 for diversionist-espionage activities in other countries, among them Poland. It is a component part of that criminal action aimed against the peace of the world.

"The extermination in Katyn of thousands of Polish officers and soldiers was the work of Nazi criminals who, in addition to the Katyn crime, committed hundreds of similar crimes on Polish and Soviet soil. The Katyn crime was one link in the Nazi campaign aimed at the physical extermination of the Polish people and consistently carried out during the occupation. The Katyn crime was the work of those Nazi genocidal criminals whom American authorities today are releasing from prison and whose services they engage for the preparation of new crimes against the Polish people and against all peace-loving nations.

"From the start the Polish people, who have had first-hand experience with Nazi methods of slaughter as applied to Oswiecim, Majdanek, and many other death camps in Poland, never had any doubt whatever but that the monstrous Katyn crime was the work of Nazi gangsters. The lies of Nazi propaganda were ultimately exposed as such by evidence accumulated and incontestably established in the presence of Polish representatives by a special Soviet commission for the establishment and investigation of circumstances surrounding the shooting by Facist German invaders of Polish officers who were prisoners of war.

"The whole world passed judgment on the Nazi murders of Katyn, just as it judged all their monstrous crimes in concentration camps and in thousands of cities and villages of occupied Europe.

"Genocide goes hand in hand with provocation. In 1943 Goebbels tried to make use of the bodies of Nazi victims for a monstrous provocation against the Soviet Union, whose army at that time was smashing the Nazi war machine.

"In 1952 those involved in the mass murder of war prisoners in Korea, much like those Nazis who prepare for a new criminal world war, try to revive the Goebbels trick. By renewing the Katyn provocation, they seek to divert the attention of the nations of the world from the reconstruction of a neo-Hitlerite Wehrmacht as an American tool against world peace.

"As far back as 1943 Nazi propaganda, obediently supported by the reactionary London clique of Polish émigrés, was unsuccessful in misleading world opinion or the opinion of the Polish people. Even the very authors of this provocation, Goebbels and Frank, could not help admitting that their provocation had found no echo in the Polish nation. So much less does the new version of this provocation in an American edition find an echo now. Those who suppose that this provocation will attain any of its aims are deluding themselves. The murderers of Korean children and women will not succeed in concealing the guilt of the Nazi murders of Katyn, nor in rehabilitating them for the purpose of exploiting them for new crimes.

"The Polish people look with loathing upon the attempts of American ruling circles to use poisoned weapons inherited from Goebbels, attempts aimed at obliterating the traces of Nazi crimes and at base incitement against the peoples of the Soviet Union, who bore the main burden of the fight to rout naziism. Every Pole regards with outrage and contempt these calumnies and provocations, these cynical attempts to prey upon the tragic death of thousands of Polish citizens suffered at the hands of Nazi murderers.

"The Government and the people of Poland condemn most sharply this provocative action of the United States aimed against peace-loving nations, against those nations which suffered most from Nazi invasion and Nazi crimes."

This propaganda release from the Polish Embassy breaks all precedent as far as flagrant violations of diplomatic rules and time honored Embassy procedure is concerned. This release is nothing more than brazen communistic propaganda issued almost under the shadow of the Capitol dome. The insulting text of the Polish Embassy press release proves conclusively that the Katyn investigation is exposing and damaging the Soviet imposed regime in Poland. The preliminary Communist attempts to silence all news and comment about the investigation have failed. This press release propaganda is not only an insult to the Katyn committee, but an insult to this Congress and the Government of the United States. It has been chosen as the weapon for counteracting the effect of the investigation on the enslaved Polish people.

We know that millions from various nations and races have been massacred, murdered and burned in ovens during the last 15 years by both Stalin and Hitler. We know now that both savage dictators and their henchmen have been guilty of tortures, mass murders, genocide and other international crimes. Hitler and most of his henchmen have paid the penalty for their deeds. The hearings on the Katyn Forest murders are unfolding the fact slowly but surely that the Katyn massacres were but a small part of the well-organized effort of mass human extermination. Mass murder and genocide is part of the felonious process used by Communist dictators to subjugate nations and races in their mad drive for world conquest.

Communist propaganda emitting from the Polish Embassy in Washington is a brazen example of the Communist influence in bankrupting the moral fiber and respectability of human beings.

At the Polish Embassy in Washington, we have men who no doubt are descendants of valiant and heroic Polish ancestors. Their ancestors have fought for the freedom of Poland back through the centuries. What would their ancestors say if they knew their sons were conniving to cover up the facts of the massacre of 14,000 Polish soldiers in the Katyn Forest?

If the Poles at the Embassy in Washington had not sold the honor of their Polish ancestry for a mess of communistic pottage, they would be aiding our committee to uncover the true facts of the Katyn massacres instead of operating as a Kremlin tool to conceal the real murderers.

When our committee meets next week, I am going to recommend that we ask the State Department to demand an apology from the Polish Ambassador to the Congress of the United States for the insults contained in the above press release. If the apology is not forthcoming and the Polish Embassy in Washington does not cease from being a communistic propaganda outpost of the Kremlin, the State Department should insist that the present Polish Ambassador be recalled at once.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman referred to a press release issued by the Polish Embassy here in Washington. That is the present Communist regime in Poland?

Mr. MADDEN. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Indiana that at the Nuremberg trials the Communists, representing Soviet Russia, blocked the investigation of the Katyn murders. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The committee is going into the procedure of the Nuremberg trials.

Mr. RANKIN. Some months ago the Michigan delegation invited me down to hear a very distinguished man who, I believe, is now president of a great military academy in the United States. He had just come back from Poland. His statement was to the effect that the people of Poland were reduced to slavery of the most beastly character, and that

a little gang of Yids at the top were in complete control.

The Polish are not running the Polish Embassy in America. That same element of Yiddish Communists has control in Russia, in Czechoslovakia, and in every other Communist country in Europe.

I hope when you go over there you will not only investigate all the angles of these atrocious Katyn outrages but that you will investigate the so-called Nuremberg trials.

Let us not leave this question to embarrass the American people for a hundred years to come.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a reasonable doubt in the mind of the gentleman from Indiana or any other members of the committee, based on the testimony of former Ambassador Lane and others, that the Russians are not guilty of this massacre?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The testimony so far taken before our committee preponderantly reveals that the Soviets committed these mass murders at Katyn.

I may say further that a formal invitation was sent by the committee to the Russian Embassy here to come and testify and present before the committee whatever evidence the Russians had. They very abruptly and insultingly rejected our invitation. However, I will say that our invitation is still open if they have anything to offer in regard to these mass murders.

Mr. GROSS. Why this trip to Europe to hold further hearings?

Mr. MADDEN. The Soviet propaganda behind the iron curtain states that the Nazis committed the murders. I have a list of about fifty very important witnesses in the London and Paris and Berlin areas.

Mr. GROSS. Well, what does the committee propose? What can be done about it? If it is clearly demonstrated that the Russians carried out this massacre, what do we do about it then?

Mr. MADDEN. I think we have accomplished a great deal in overcoming Russian propaganda behind the iron curtain. The enslaved people are learning the true facts, misrepresentation in Communist propaganda is being exposed. I have broadcasted regarding the evidence presented to this committee on four different occasions over the Voice of America. I know other members of the committee have also talked on the Voice of America. I think this committee has contributed an avalanche of material already in overcoming Communist propaganda.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I inquire of the gentleman from Indiana what has been done to broadcast the facts through the Voice of America, and over Radio Free Europe.

Mr. MADDEN. I have spoken four times on the Voice of America. I know other members of the committee have spoken over the Voice of America and on Radio Free Europe. In fact, yesterday the gentleman now addressing you from the well talked for 10 minutes on the Voice of America.

Mr. BUSBEY. Are the transcripts of those broadcasts available for Members of the Congress to read?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, certainly.

Mr. BUSBEY. Where would we obtain copies of them?

Mr. MADDEN. At the Voice of America offices.

Mr. BUSBEY. When does the committee contemplate going to Europe to hold these hearings?

Mr. MADDEN. We talked to the Speaker of the House in regard to that, and the Speaker suggested that we should go during the Easter time when there will be a 10-day Easter recess. So we aim to go at that time.

Mr. BUSBEY. I notice on page 2 of the resolution, it states "upon completing the necessary hearings, the committee shall report to the House of Representatives or the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session, before January 3, 1953." Is there not a possibility that the committee could report to the Clerk of the House, or the House itself before January 3 of next year?

Mr. MADDEN. We have a great deal of testimony to take not only across the water, but here in this country after we come back—if the committee cannot make a full report, we aim to make a partial report before the Congress adjourns in July. The complete report will be made before this Congress expires January 3, 1953.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I ask when that partial report is contemplated, if the gentleman from Indiana can give us any indication?

Mr. MADDEN. I could not say right now, but we aim to make a partial report before the Congress adjourns which may be possibly July or sometime thereabouts.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the House should understand that no member of this committee desires to express an opinion of guilt or innocence before all of the evidence which is available to us, has been heard. While what the gentleman has said is true, nevertheless we are willing to hear both sides, if they wish to be heard, and for that reason the invitation was sent to the Russian Government here in Washington.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and in accordance with permission granted me, I include the following letters:

LOS ANGELES TIMES,
WASHINGTON BUREAU,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1952.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: When I read the enclosed insulting press release from the Polish Embassy I wondered whether freedom of speech and freedom of the press ought not be curtailed for some of the Red embassies.

Of course, I have fought, and will continue to fight, censorship, whether in our own Federal agencies or in foreign countries.

I am sending this letter and the Embassy statement to you because it makes me so angry that the Communists are taking such an advantage of American hospitality that I want to be certain you don't miss it.

On several occasions I have been on the verge of notifying the Polish Embassy to stop sending me their propaganda, most of which I put in the wastebasket in its virginal condition, but I have reconsidered because I realize their stuff shows the Commie party line and a reverse iron curtain won't benefit this country.

This latest defamation of your committee seems to me, however, to be so offensive that the State Department might be asked to move. I wonder if the Secretary should not call the Ambassador to his office and ask why, how come, is this your attitude, etc., and possibly suggest that some retaliative steps might be taken.

Having grown up in a New England mill town, I have many Polish acquaintances dating back to grade school. I am sure they would resent this attack on the Congress of the United States. I have informed Mr. Einhorn in the Embassy's press office that I, as an American citizen, resent such insulting use of their diplomatic privileges.

I hope you will call this press release to the attention of the House, if not to the State Department. While I may not agree with your political views, I surely think that a congressional committee chairman should be allowed to proceed with a duly authorized inquiry (whether or not I think it justified) without being attacked in this fashion. If you think I could be of help, I'll be glad to write some comments for you.

Very truly yours,

WARREN FRANCIS.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESS GALLERY,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1952.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Member of Congress From Indiana.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As an accredited newspaper correspondent to the Congress I am the recipient of unsolicited literature from many different sources. However, I have never received such insulting trash as the enclosed press release.

I am sending it to you because it refers to the committee bearing your name.

I am a veteran newspaperman, rather hard boiled, and during my forty-odd years as a professional observer of political events I have seen a great deal. My epidermis, therefore, has lost much of its sensitiveness.

However, the enclosed press release got my goat and I decided to pass it on to you, though you probably have seen a copy of it.

For the life of me I cannot understand how we can tolerate in our midst, to be so grossly insulted by representatives of a foreign power?

Have we grown so cowardly as to allow an Embassy to issue insulting communications against the elected representatives of our people?

I cannot imagine—and I am convinced—that our diplomatic agents abroad would never stoop to such violations of common decency, expectorating insults against their hosts?

I call upon you to take up the challenge of the Polish Embassy and since you have been the target of their insults I count upon you to take up this matter with the State Department.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN L. DEBALTA,
Senate Press Gallery.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I can confirm everything the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has said in his opening statement on this resolution. We have taken considerable testimony. One thing that might be added to what has been said is that the two American officers he mentioned were two American officers captured by the Germans in Africa and held as prisoners of war. They were taken by the Germans under guard to see these graves in the Katyn Forest in Russia. Both of those men have reported to our Government and testified before our committee. Naturally, they were not very friendly to the German Government after having been prisoners of the Germans for 2 years and 2 months before they were taken to these graves. I am satisfied the report they made was not a colored one in any sense favorable to the Germans. They simply reported what they saw. One thing more should be added to what the gentleman from Indiana has said in regard to this matter, and that is that when this committee was set up under the resolution passed last year, you conferred upon this committee, I mean the House of Representatives, a responsibility which, in my judgment, is a very important one. It is our duty to return to our Government a report of what we find from the evidence, which will be submitted, and which has already been submitted. I certainly would not care to sign my name to a document of such importance, and which may have far-reaching effects, without having the privilege of hearing all the evidence available either for or against the question presented. The subject of the massacre in the Katyn Forest was taken up at the Nuremberg trial, but no conclusion was reached. I understand that both sides, the Germans and the Russians, submitted three witnesses, then the entire matter was dropped. No conclusion whatever was reached. Nothing further has been done. Here we have a subject from what little we now know about it, which has shocked the civilized world.

I cannot conceive of any more atrocious or inhuman act being committed by any government, whether German or Russian, than the massacre in cold blood of these 15,000 or thereabouts, Polish officers. They were many of the leaders of an entire army of a nation of 30,000,000 or 35,000,000 people. Certainly civilization does not want to let pass without anything being said or any protest being made to such a crime. We cannot simply shrug our shoulders and let it pass by as if it did not concern us. Let the civilized world know who is responsible for this act and let the chips fall where they may. For the reasons stated, I feel that this resolution should be adopted. I am ready and willing to do my duty. I know it will not be a pleasant task. It is a gruesome matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I think the gentleman will probably remember the despatch that came from Europe only a week or ten days ago which proved the tremendous impact the work of this committee has had upon people behind the iron curtain. Every newspaper in Poland behind the iron curtain, and Pravda and other Russian papers, devoted several pages of their paper last week to answering the charges made before our committee. This proves the tremendous impact the work of this committee has already had on the iron curtain countries. Am I correct?

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that there is another matter that needs investigation by Congress very badly, and that is the so-called Nuremberg trials.

We are today divided in this House because of the persecution of the Southern States, not during the Civil War, but during the dark days of reconstruction, such as the trial of Dr. Mudd, and the trial and execution of Captain Wirtz, who was in charge of a Confederate prison.

An ex-Federal soldier from the State of Michigan who faced the firing line of Pickett's charge at Gettysburg, and who was in that prison, James Madison Page, in his book called The Truth About Andersonville, a Defense of Captain Wirtz, says that the hanging of Captain Wirtz was one of the greatest outrages in all history.

The Nuremberg trials, which are charged up to the United States, and which were participated in by Russia, are going to rise up to haunt the American people for generations to come, unless they are investigated and cleared up.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, the chairman of this committee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of this committee, and other members for the task they have assumed. I hope this resolution will be unanimously approved and that this important committee may go abroad on this most important mission. It is important because they are going to seek the truth, as the gentleman from Michigan has stated.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Can the gentleman advise this House whether any other nation in the world is going to go into this inquiry? Or will this be just an inquiry by a committee of this Congress?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman, because I cannot speak for any other government. I only hope that once we have taken the lead in this important matter others of our allies will follow our path.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I ask one further question: When the findings of the committee have been printed and announced what do we do then?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will be glad to answer that question in just a moment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is a very important question.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I agree with the gentleman, and I will deal with it perhaps in an extension if I do not have time to do it now.

I first became interested in the gruesome matter of this Katyn massacre in 1949 in the city of Berlin. At that time I was investigating our propaganda efforts over the radio and otherwise to the people behind the iron curtain. I was told by American officers time and again that there could be no doubt whatever that this atrocious affair was committed by the Soviets. Every indication, every evidence, pointed to that conclusion. It is quite understandable that the Communist leaders would try to shift the blame to the Nazis. I have no brief for the Nazis whatever, but I am sure this committee representing this body will endeavor to find the truth so that it can be used to indict the guilty parties.

The films showing the exhuming of the bodies leave no doubt that it was the Soviets who perpetrated this outrage.

Why is it important to determine this truth? Because we have in our hands a weapon as powerful as the atomic bomb, and that weapon is the truth. In using the truth of this Katyn massacre of these 12,000 or more brave Polish officers we will be wielding a weapon that will literally pulverize the propaganda of the Soviets. I firmly believe that Stalin and the Politburo are more fearful of being exposed by such investigations as this and their propaganda branded for the falsity that it is, than they are of all our armies, navies, and air corps that we are building up. For the results of this investigation will drive a wedge between them and the people they have enslaved.

Now, to answer the gentleman who asked the question, what do we do, what use can we make of this material? May I say that we can make the best possible use of it by broadcasting the facts, by asking our allies to broadcast the facts, in regard to a regime so merciless as to murder in cold blood 12,000 Polish officers, who had been told that if they would surrender their lives would be preserved to permit them to fight for their freedom.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Suppose this committee finds that the Germans did it?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the committee finds that the Germans did it, they should so report.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Where do we go from there?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, we could use the same propaganda. But I am not disturbed in regard to who did it. All the facts that have been turned up so far indicate the Soviets did it.

According to the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Michigan, they and the other Members are going there with open minds. I think it is time to continue by every means possible to drive this wedge between the people behind the iron curtain in Poland, Czechoslovakia and all of these other enslaved countries, and those who have enslaved them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] said he was convinced that the Russians perpetrated this crime. The gentleman says they are going over there with an open mind.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am convinced they are, too, but I dare say that the gentleman from Indiana would change his mind if the evidence warranted it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Can the gentleman advise the House what this is going to cost the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot. I will have to leave that to the committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. One other question, if the gentleman will permit. Reference was made by the gentleman from Indiana to a number of witnesses who are in Great Britain and Europe. Am I correct in my assumption that other nations of the United Nations are also interested in this investigation?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes; I am quite sure they are. I personally talked to some from behind the iron curtain in the fall of 1949 that I hope this committee will call in and talk to.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Are these witnesses nationals of nations belonging to the United Nations?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have not consulted with the members of the committee on that one point.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I may say to the gentleman that some of the witnesses are in a group of international experts who had the opportunity to examine the graves and who did make a report at one time. Some of them are nationals of various countries in Europe that have never had the opportunity to present their findings before a committee of this sort.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Has any effort been made to get the governments to which those witnesses belong to send them over to this country at their expense rather than call on the American taxpayers to spend the money of this country for a committee to go over there?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. A question was asked about the request of funds for this investigation. As I recall, the original request was made to the Committee on House Administration, which handles the contingent funds of the House, and of which I am a member, for $20,000 when this committee was authorized. I believe the request now is for an additional $100,000 to continue the investigation. Does the gentleman know whether that is true or not?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not know.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I may say to the gentleman that I made this request in the resolution but I had not consulted the committee at the time because the Speaker informed me that if the committee went it would be during the Easter recess. So I hurriedly drew the resolution and made that request, but upon consulting the members of the committee I find it would be far less than $100,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution providing for an investigation of the Katyn massacre in Poland contemplated an expenditure of not to exceed $20,000 for a thorough investigation by a committee appointed by the Speaker and such investigation to be made here in Washington. The terrible massacre is an event that occurred about 10 years ago, and the investigation was ordered or authorized last September. Now the resolution provides for enlarging that investigation, permitting it to be made any place in the world, so far as I can determine, both inside and outside of the United States, and at a cost not to exceed $100,000. One hundred thousand dollars is what this committee now wants. House Resolution 556 asks for $100,000 from the contingent fund for enlarging this investigation. Already there has been spent as much or more money by the Eighty-second Congress for investigations as any Congress in the history of the United States. Not since the adoption of the Constitution, I think, has any Congress spent more for investigations than this Congress has spent, and the resolution comes before us to enlarge this investigation of a massacre that occurred in a foreign country 10 years ago, to the extent of $100,000. I have not heard any of the speakers say what is to be accomplished by this investigation, even if the guilt is fixed on some individual or upon some country.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know whether the gentleman heard me or not, but I am going to appear before the Committee on House Administration next week, and the cost of this investigation will be far less than $100,000. I had not previously informed the committee of the details of the expenses in connection with a trip of this kind.

Mr. LECOMPTE. In reply to that I will read the resolution. The resolution calls for $100,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, but when I appear before the Committee on House Administration I will inform them that the cost will be less.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is the gentleman willing to have the Committee on House Administration determine how much they think you should have?

Mr. MADDEN. No; then it comes up before the House.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is the gentleman willing to have the Committee on House Administration amend his resolution?

Mr. MADDEN. No; that will come up before the House after the Committee on House Administration handles it. This does not deal with money at all.

Mr. LECOMPTE. But your resolution was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. MADDEN. This resolution just deals with the authority to go abroad.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I understand that, but House Resolution 556 is before the Committee on House Administration, and asks for a maximum of $100,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is the gentleman willing to have the Committee on House Administration investigate and determine what, in the judgment of that committee, is enough for that investigation?

Mr. MADDEN. And then recommend that to the House? Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It has to pass the House, of course.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; but it will not be $100,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. But the resolution asks for that.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; but it will be less.

Mr. LECOMPTE. If the committee reduces it, but your resolution calls for $100,000.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. STANLEY. As I understand, the gentleman is addressing himself to House Resolution 539 at the moment.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. Does the gentleman note that this resolution provides for investigation within and without the United States?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes. Originally it was just within.

Mr. STANLEY. Does the gentleman recall that the original resolution for investigation confined such investigation solely to the United States?

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is what I am trying to make clear, and the original resolution was practically unanimously approved.

Mr. STANLEY. Was it the gentleman's understanding that with the amount of money authorized by the Committee on House Administration in the original resolution, that that would be a sufficient fund for the complete investigation?

Mr. LECOMPTE. That was the understanding, that $20,000 would take care of the whole investigation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not know how much money should be spent on this investigation, but I am certain the gentleman recalls that in the recent testimony before the committee in regard to appropriation bills, there was appropriated approximately $100,000,000 to be used for refugees from behind the iron curtain, or people residing in the iron curtain countries. That was a propaganda move on our part. To my mind of thinking that $100,000,000 has made Uncle Joe Stalin squeal louder and longer than the millions and billions of dollars that we have spent for military expenditures.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman has had his time, and I cannot yield any more. We have spent fabulous amounts of money for propaganda, European aid, the Voice of America, Marshall plan, and other efforts to help Europe.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wish my colleague from Iowa would pursue the question of what is expected to be accomplished by the spending of $100,000 in a continuation of this investigation.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thought we were going to have a full report on the investigation for $20,000. That was the original estimate. Now it appears we will not get any report from the committee for the time being.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman, I am sure, could not make an analysis of the ultimate results of such an investigation, because the chairman has not been able to explain clearly the purposes and the real objectives to be accomplished by it.

I would like to also say, if I may, that some of those refugees, to which the gentleman from Missouri has referred, coming from behind the iron curtain out into Western Europe and into the United States are undesirable, and I am wondering if in the future we may wish they were back from whence they came. The damage they may do in the free world where they have the greatest possible advantages may cause a regret on the part of those who supported that proposition.

I wish the gentlemen of this committee would make a complete and full report on their investigations as originally authorized within the United States, and then perhaps they can make a case for further investigation. As it is, I cannot believe that another $100,000 should be spent for the purposes which have been presented in this debate.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. An investigation in Europe by a committee of Congress occupying a considerable period of time, could go far afield and could excite some international feelings.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, it just happens that, as the committee knows, I am not planning to make the trip abroad, if such a trip is made.

I have taken the floor because some Members have asked what is the purpose of the committee and what can be done, assuming it comes to some conclusion.

I did not hear all of the talk of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] but I assume he pointed out that, first of all, there has never been any definite conclusion by any impartial body as to who perpetrated this crime. At the time the crime was discovered it was known that either Russia or Germany had done it. Germany had investigated and made certain conclusions. Russia had its investigation and it made certain conclusions.

I am satisfied that no one in this body would want to have any action taken on the basis of conclusions that were made by the two countries that were accused of having perpetrated this crime. I think that is one of the reasons why this committee was established, so that at least as far as the people in the United States are concerned, and as far as history is concerned, there will have been a determination by some body that would be considered to be fair and impartial and objective in its approach. So historically there certainly is good reason to try to establish that.

Secondly, as I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] pointed out, and I do not know about this because I have never been behind the iron curtain, but those people in our Government who are entrusted with the responsibility of seeing what establishing the truth may do to help spread democracy and to help defeat communism, tell us that the work of this committee already has had tremendous effect in a moral sense. It is proof, as one witness said, that the United States has not forgotten this dreadful crime but is doing its best to expose the criminals.

There are other reasons. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] asked a question to which I should like to give one additional answer, at least. Again, this is on my own in the sense that I took this step without the knowledge of the committee. I do not know whether the committee happens to approve or disapprove of this. However, some weeks ago when the committee was formed I got in touch with President Truman. I pointed out what the committee was going to do and that there never had been any impartial investigation.

I said that I believed that after the committee turned in its report, whatever it might be, there would then be a good basis for this country to ask the United Nations to determine finally in an over-all sense, in a United Nations sense, who had perpetrated this crime and what action should be taken, because after all this was a crime against humanity. It was not simply a crime against the United States or one nation. It was a crime against humanity. I felt that this country should take the leadership in asking the United Nations to do that.

I also felt the President would be on much more reasonable ground if, in making his move, he could state that this country had not gone off half-cocked in any way but, on the other hand, had made a careful and impartial investigation and, as a result of that, there was ground for the United Nations to take further action if the United Nations saw fit to do it.

There are many other reasons, but time will not permit me to go into them at this time.

In view of one question that was asked of some other speaker, I want to say this, too. Many weeks ago I wrote to every single doctor who had appeared on a commission that was established by Germany in its investigation of this crime. Those doctors are abroad; they are not in this country. I have received letters from two or three of those doctors, pointing out what their conclusions might be.

As you may know, at least those Members who have studied the matter, the Russians claim the German commission doctors were forced and coerced into their findings, and there was duress and undue compulsion. The Germans claim the same thing about the Russian commission.

It was for that reason that I wrote to these doctors, pointing out that if that might have been true at one time, either when Germany had control of them or when Russia had control of them, that was not true at the present time, apparently. No doctor is now under the control of Germany or subject to coercion by the Nazis. I wanted to know if their opinion now was the same as it had been in any document or report they had filed or they had signed.

I received answers from two or three of those doctors, but there are still a great many more doctors over there who for one reason or another have not seen fit to engage in correspondence and give their views that way. Perhaps they will later but, although several weeks have elapsed since I wrote to them, they still have not answered.

I have mentioned this because, as I have pointed out, what I say may be considered somewhat unbiased, because I do not plan to go to Europe.

I only have time to mention one other reason. Certainly this last reason is of vital importance and, as far as at least this reason is concerned, it should be a committee from this Congress that conducts this phase of the Katyn investigation.

It is this: At least two reports about the massacre were turned into the Government by American officers. At least one of those reports disappeared and charges have been made about the reason for its disappearance. Those charges directly concern this Congress because they may involve personnel and departments or agencies of the United States Government. They must be investigated fully, and the facts brought to light. This committee is going to do that regardless of where the trail may lead.

It has been charged that the Government of the United States tried to cover up certain features of the Katyn massacre. Is there not a duty on the part of this Congress to investigate such charges? Certainly the truth of that matter has never been established by any official body. It is imperative that that be done.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the Katyn massacre should be thoroughly investigated. It is one of the most important questions that has yet come before the Congress of the United States in this world-wide contest between Yiddish communism and Christian civilization.

It was one of the most beastly atrocities in all of the history of mankind. Every report shows that the murder of those thousands of helpless Poles was committed by Communist Russia; and that later when the so-called Nuremberg trials were going on, the Russian member, or members, blocked any investigation by that court of the outrageous murder of those ten or fifteen thousand helpless Polish victims.

The same element that controls Russia also controls Poland. They have reduced the Polish people to abject slavery, and this outfit down here, that calls itself the Polish Embassy, does not represent the Christian people of Poland.

Kosciusko would turn over in his grave if he could press back the veil that hides us from that mysterious realm where he has "taken his chamber in the silent halls of death," and see the way that gang of Yiddish Communists are treating the people of Poland, his own country, for which he so valiantly fought, and for which he gave his life, and realize that they have lost entirely that freedom that "shrieked when Kosciusko fell."

Permit me to call your attention to an atrocity committed by Communist Russia against the Christian people of the Ukraine that is more beastly, if that is possible, than the Katyn massacre.

When the Communists took over the Ukraine they reduced those people to a condition of abject slavery, the like of which humanity had never seen. They not only took their land and their homes away from them, but they allotted them small plots to cultivate and levied rental tributes that barely left them enough to sustain life.

In 1933 they had a crop failure in the Ukraine, and that Communist gang in Moscow went down and took away all they made. That left the people of the Ukraine without anything at all on which to survive, and millions of them, men, women, and children, among the best Christian people in Europe, starved to death in their own homes.

Hon. W. C. Bullitt was Ambassador to Moscow in 1933, and when he appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities a few years ago, I asked him about this horrible incident. I am going to quote a small portion of his testimony in order that you may have first-hand information of the greatest outrage ever perpetrated against the people of any country. Here are some of the questions and answers:

Mr. RANKIN. The people in the Ukraine are among the best people in Europe?

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Yet they went in there and took everything they made and starved, you say, five or six million of them to death?

Mr. BULLITT. Three to five million.

Mr. RANKIN. Men, women, and children starved to death, eating, in their frantic misery, the bodies of their own children, of their own families; that is correct, isn't it?

Mr. BULLITT. I am extremely sorry to say that I actually have two photographs of a father and mother and the skeleton of the child they had eaten, which were taken down there in the Ukraine.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is what I am trying to bring out.

Mr. BULLITT. I still have two photographs of that. There is nothing more horrible.

Mr. Speaker, can anybody who reads that testimony of the ruthless starvation of from three to five million Christian men, women, and children be surprised at the beastly murder of these ten or fifteen thousand helpless Polish victims in the Katyn Forest?

Remember that the same Communist government that perpetrated the ruthless starvation of these helpless people also had at least one representative on the Nuremberg court, who blocked the investigation of this horrible outrage.

I am supporting this resolution for the reason that I want this committee to make a thorough investigation, not only of the Katyn massacre but of the Nuremberg court that probably perpetrated more outrages than any other organization of its kind that ever sat.

We people in the South have for almost 90 years protested against the trial, execution, or imprisonment of ex-Confederate soldiers by tribunals that have long been condemned by the people of the entire Nation. Yet, here we have an instance in the Nuremberg trials where the losers only were tried and where representatives of the government that perpetrated one of the greatest crimes in history sat in judgment, condemned, and hanged German soldiers, civilians and doctors, 5 or 6 years after the war closed.

As has been pointed out, some of them were convicted and executed under ex post facto laws, or laws that had been passed, or regulations that had been adopted, after the alleged offenses had been committed.

Lord Maurice P. Hankey, a member of the upper house of the British Parliament, in his recent book on Politics, Trials and Errors condemns in no uncertain terms those Nuremberg trials. He says that while Germans were tried and convicted for the invasion of Norway, that the British invaded first. It seems to have been a race, as General Forrest once said, of who could "get there first with the most men."

Lord Hankey points out the fact that the precedents set by these Nuremberg trials are likely to plague the civilized world for generations to come with the doctrine that "only a lost war is a crime." Lord Hankey quotes Field Marshal Montgomery, who commanded the British forces during World War II, as saying that "the Nuremberg trials made the waging of unsuccessful war a crime, for the generals of the defeated side would be tried and then hanged."

If this country should ever lose a war—which she is likely to do some day, if she continues to fight other people's battles all over the world—then God save America. A Nuremberg court would probably hang the President, every member of his cabinet, as well as the Members of both Houses of Congress, to say nothing of the generals, admirals, and others on down to the buck privates, as well as the officials in the various States, probably including every member of the State legislatures, doctors, and other civilians.

As I said, they would not stop at the generals, but they might make their executions so sweeping as to destroy the people of the entire country, or starve them to death, as was done in the Ukraine.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this resolution, in the hope that the committee will not only complete the investigation of the Katyn massacre but will also investigate the Nuremberg court, in order that we may correct, as far as possible, the terrible errors that were committed by that tribunal, under the pressure of Communist influences, and charged up to the United States.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I made the inquiry a few moments ago as to what we would do when this committee reported its findings. I made it in all seriousness and was not being facetious in the slightest.

This matter worries me. I am tremendously concerned about the advisability of sending a committee of the American Congress to another continent to be trekking around acting as judge and jury over an offense with which we had nothing to do whatsoever and over which we really have no authority. Such a mission is unprecedented and is fraught with danger. We had better go slow.

We had better consider most carefully what our objective is and which no one seems to really know before we vote to send a committee of this Congress to another land to be inquiring into something in which we had no part whatsoever.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER].

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur in what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] said. As a representative of four southwestern counties in Pennsylvania, I represent many thousands of American people of Polish descent. They are a great people, and they are known for their integrity, their love of freedom, and their love of truth. I speak for them when I offer this suggestion: That if we are interested in the truth with regard to this Katyn massacre I wonder if it might not be a better idea for us to finance an independent investigation rather than to attempt to conduct one of our own. As

the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] said, we do not accept the investigation of the Germans, we do not accept the investigation of the Russians in this matter, because we consider them prejudiced. I would hate to go over and make an investigation of my own and consider myself entirely unprejudiced in this matter. I therefore suggest that it might be a reasonable conclusion that if we are interested, as I know everyone is interested in this matter, should we not finance an independent investigation rather than attempt to conduct it with our own personnel?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SITTLER. I yield.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does not the gentleman feel that the free peoples of the world everywhere would be glad to accept the word of Members of the American Congress in regard to this matter and give full faith to their findings?

Mr. SITTLER. I may say to the gentleman that I believe the free peoples of the world are inclined to accept the word of Members of the American Congress but it is not the free peoples of the world we have to convince; it is the people behind the iron curtain to whom the gentleman referred in his speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SITTLER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the peoples of the earth are willing to accept our leadership and our statement on these numerous things why are we making such slow progress in holding old friends and gaining new friends through all this evidence we have produced?

Mr. SITTLER. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has answered the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] far better than I did.

(Mr. RANKIN and Mr. SITTLER asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I may say in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that already the work of this committee had done more to combat and to expose insidious Communist propaganda not only behind the iron curtain but beyond the iron curtain than any move that has been made so far to my knowledge. We must bear this fact in mind, that the Soviets have already during the years intervening since these massacres, sent propaganda to the satellite countries that this Katyn massacre was the work of the Nazis. Since this committee started holding hearings, through radio broadcasts, conversations, whisperings, and so forth, the underground behind the iron curtain, and especially in Poland, has already become active in finding out what evidence has been produced regarding the real perpetrators of the killing of the 14,000 Polish officers at Katyn. That in itself has done more to stifle and curtail Communist propaganda than any one thing, I believe, that has been done.

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. SITTLER. I do not disagree; I did not say that the investigation should not be made; I asked only whether the results of the investigation might not be better presented with a great deal more force by a neutral group than by representatives of the one agency which stands between Russia and the domination of the world.

Mr. MADDEN. In answer to that let me say that the Katyn committee was created by this Congress last September and is the first and only so-called neutral group or committee that has ever investigated this massacre.

In answer to the gentleman who spoke a while ago regarding the original request of the committee, when this committee was created last September we did not have any idea of the avalanche of evidence that would be presented to this committee in its consideration of the Katyn massacre. I hold in my hand the names of dozens of essential witnesses across the water who can cast factual light upon these Katyn killings. By permitting this committee to gather this evidence, more will be done to expose the fallacies and the insidious, false propaganda that is going on behind the iron curtain and also outside the iron curtain than any one thing that can be done. It will expose all these lies, insinuations, and false propaganda that have been going out of Moscow about the Katyn massacres for the last 12 years.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Did I understand the gentleman in his remarks to say that the committee had concluded in their own mind that the Soviet people were responsible?

Mr. MADDEN. No, no; I said the preponderance of the evidence presented to the committee so far indicated that the Soviets had committed these massacres.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Now, then, the gentleman says that the Soviets have propagandized the satellite nations to impress upon them that the Nazis did this?

Mr. MADDEN. And other nations, too.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Why has not this country propagandized those satellite nations with information that the Russians did it based upon the findings that you have already made?

Mr. MADDEN. That is what we are doing. As I stated in my opening remarks, we have spoken over the Voice of America on a number of different occasions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to see why there should be any opposition to this particular resolution. It seems to me it is a natural one to follow the original resolution creating this special committee.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania refers to an independent means of investigation. Certainly I do not know of any more objective opportunity for investigation than by a committee of this body and the Members who comprise the special committee.

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SITTLER. I believe the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] responded to the inquiry of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] by saying that the report they now have has already been used as a basis for speeches on the Voice of America programs.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Will the gentleman ask a question? I only have 3 minutes.

Mr. SITTLER. I only want to ask this question: In view of the gentleman's answer to the gentleman from Texas that we are already propagandizing the governments behind the iron curtain, stating that the Russians are responsible for this atrocity, how can Members of this House be in the position of going over to Poland seeking "the truth." Supposing they discover the Nazis are to blame. Where does that leave our Voice of America which the gentleman from Indiana has just said is now blaming Russia on the basis of the committee's preliminary report?

Mr. MCCORMACK. It seems to me that in order to complete the investigation this committee should be given the authority to go abroad. There are many witnesses abroad, undoubtedly, who can give pertinent evidence to the investigation. Unfortunately, it is a matter that occurred some years ago in another land, Poland, and there are undoubtedly many witnesses over there, or a number of witnesses at least, that it would be important for this committee to make inquiry of in order to ascertain the information which will enable the special committee to make its final report to this House.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], chairman of the special committee, has said that the evidence is preponderantly in the direction of the Soviet Union being responsible for this terrible crime against humanity. That is not their finding now and they cannot make their finding until all the evidence that is available is obtained. It seems to me that this resolution is a natural follow-up of the resolution which created the committee originally.

As I stated, it is rather difficult for me to understand why there is any objection to the adoption of the pending resolution at this time. The position taken by my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] would have applied to the original resolution rather than the resolution which is before the House at the present time. This special committee should be given the opportunity and should be empowered by the House to go abroad to complete its investigation in order to make a definite, complete report to the House.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to inquire of the chairman of the special committee what possible authority this Congress has to vote to authorize the chairman to issue subpenas outside the United States, which is clearly provided in this resolution?

Mr. MADDEN. We do not intend to issue subpenas because the testimony that will come in before the committee will be voluntary testimony.

Mr. NELSON. We are, however, voting authority to subpena in this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Only within this country.

Mr. NELSON. According to the bill, it is for authority to subpena outside the United States also.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, there may be an American citizen that we might want to subpena, but we do not at this time plan to do that.

The SPEAKER. The answer to that is that it is in the original resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 164, nays 156, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—164

Allen, Calif.	Ford	Miller, Calif.
Anfuso	Fulton	Miller, N. Y.
Angell	Furcolo	Morano
Armstrong	Garmatz	Morgan
Aspinall	Gavin	Morris
Auchincloss	Gordon	Multer
Ayres	Gore	Norrell
Bailey	Graham	O'Brien, Ill.
Bakewell	Granahan	O'Hara
Baring	Granger	O'Neill
Barrett	Green	O'Toole
Bates, Ky.	Greenwood	Patterson
Bates, Mass.	Hagen	Perkins
Bennett, Fla.	Hale	Philbin
Bennett, Mich.	Hart	Polk
Bentsen	Havenner	Poulson
Blackney	Hays, Ark.	Preston
Boggs, Del.	Hays, Ohio	Price
Bolling	Heselton	Priest
Bray	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Brehm	Holifield	Rankin
Brooks	Holmes	Reams
Burnside	Howell	Rhodes
Bush	Irving	Ribicoff
Canfield	Jackson, Wash.	Richards
Carrigg	James	Riley
Clemente	Jenkins	Rodino
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Corbett	Jones, Mo.	Rooney
Cotton	Karsten, Mo.	Saylor
Crosser	Kearns	Scott,
Curtis, Mo.	Kelley, Pa.	Hugh D., Jr.
Dague	Kelly, N. Y.	Seely-Brown
Davis, Wis.	Kerr	Shelley
Dawson	King, Calif.	Sheppard
Dempsey	King, Pa.	Sieminski
Denny	Kirwan	Springer
Denton	Klein	Steed
Devereux	Lane	Stigler
Dondero	Lanham	Thompson, Tex.
Donohue	Lesinski	Tollefson
Dorn	Lind	Trimble
Eaton	Lyle	Van Zandt
Eberharter	McConnell	Vinson
Elliott	McCormack	Vorys
Ellsworth	McCulloch	Vursell
Evins	McDonough	Watts
Fallon	McGregor	Wickersham
Feighan	McGuire	Wier
Fenton	Machrowicz	Wigglesworth
Fine	Mack, Ill.	Withrow
Fisher	Mack, Wash.	Wolverton
Flood	Madden	Yates
Fogarty	Mansfield	Yorty
Forand	Meader	Zablocki

NAYS—156

Abbitt	Fugate	Nelson
Abernethy	Gary	Nicholson
Adair	Gathings	Norblad
Albert	George	Ostertag
Allen, La.	Golden	Passman
Andersen, H. Carl	Goodwin	Patman
	Grant	Patten
Anderson, Calif.	Gregory	Pickett
Andresen, August H.	Gross	Poage
	Hand	Redden
Andrews	Hardy	Reed, Ill.
Arends	Harris	Reed, N. Y.
Baker	Harrison, Nebr.	Rees, Kans.
Beall	Harrison, Va.	Robeson
Beamer	Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Fla.
Beckworth	Hébert	Rogers, Tex.
Belcher	Herlong	Ross
Berry	Hess	St. George
Betts	Hill	Schenck
Bishop	Hoeven	Schwabe
Boggs, La.	Hoffman, Ill.	Scrivner
Bolton	Hoffman, Mich.	Scudder
Bonner	Ikard	Shafer
Bosone	Jarman	Simpson, Ill.
Bow	Jenison	Sittler
Bramblett	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Brown, Ga.	Johnson	Smith, Miss.
Bryson	Jonas	Smith, Va.
Buffett	Jones, Hamilton C.	Smith, Wis.
Burdick		Spence
Burleson	Jones, Woodrow W.	Stanley
Busbey		Taber
Butler	Kearney	Talle
Byrnes	Keating	Teague
Carlyle	Kilburn	Thomas
Chelf	Kilday	Thompson, Mich.
Chenoweth	Lantaff	
Chiperfield	LeCompte	Thornberry
Church	Lovre	Vail
Colmer	Lucas	Van Pelt
Cooper	McCarthy	Velde
Crawford	McIntire	Wharton
Crumpacker	McMillan	Wheeler
Cunningham	McMullen	Whitten
Curtis, Nebr.	McVey	Williams, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	Mahon	Williams, N. Y.
Deane	Martin, Mass	Willis
DeGraffenried	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
D'Ewart	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Tex.
Dolliver	Miller, Nebr.	Winstead
Elston	Mills	Wolcott
Engle	Morton	Wood, Idaho
Forrester	Mumma	Woodruff
Frazier	Murray, Tenn.	

NOT VOTING—112

Aandahl	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray, Wis.
Addonizio		O'Brien, Mich.
Allen, Ill.	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Konski
Barden		Osmers
Battle	Halleck	Phillips
Bender	Harden	Potter
Blatnik	Harvey	Powell
Boykin	Hedrick	Prouty
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	Radwan
Brownson	Heller	Rains
Buchanan	Herter	Ramsay
Buckley	Hillings	Reece, Tenn.
Budge	Hope	Regan
Burton	Horan	Riehlman
Camp	Hull	Rivers
Cannon	Hunter	Roberts
Carnahan	Jackson, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Case	Javits	Roosevelt
Celler	Judd	Sabath
Chatham	Kean	Sadlak
Chudoff	Kee	Sasscer
Clevenger	Kennedy	Scott, Hardie
Cole, Kans.	Keogh	Secrest
Combs	Kersten, Wis.	Sheehan
Cooley	Kluczynski	Short
Coudert	Larcade	Sikes
Cox	Latham	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	McGrath	Staggers
Delaney	McKinnon	Stockman
Dingell	Magee	Sutton
Dollinger	Marshall	Tackett
Donovan	Martin, Iowa	Taylor
Doughton	Merrow	Walter
Doyle	Mitchell	Weichel
Durham	Morrison	Welch
Fernandez	Moulder	Werdel
Gamble	Murdock	Widnall
Gwinn	Murphy	Wood, Ga.

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Burton with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Sheehan.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Mitchell with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Battle with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Case.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Magee with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Short.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Chudoff with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Budge.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Stockman
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr Cox with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Phillips.
Mr Moulder with Mr. Potter.
Mr O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Hull.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Hunter.
Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Riehlman.

Messrs. HOLIFIELD, MILLER of New York, and ANGELL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN and ENGLE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 206, nays 115, not voting 111, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—206

Adair	Bentsen	Crumpacker
Allen, Calif.	Bishop	Curtis, Mo.
Anderson, Calif.	Blackney	Dague
Andresen, August H.	Boggs, Del.	Davis, Wis.
	Bolling	Dawson
Anfuso	Bolton	Deane
Angell	Bramblett	Dempsey
Arends	Bray	Denny
Armstrong	Budge	Denton
Aspinall	Burdick	Devereux
Auchincloss	Burnside	D'Ewart
Ayres	Busbey	Dondero
Bailey	Canfield	Donohue
Bakewell	Carrigg	Dorn
Baring	Chelf	Eaton
Barrett	Chenoweth	Eberharter
Bates, Ky.	Chiperfield	Elliott
Bates, Mass.	Church	Ellsworth
Beall	Clemente	Evins
Beamer	Cole, N. Y.	Fallon
Belcher	Corbett	Feighan
Bennett, Fla.	Cotton	Fenton
Bennett, Mich.	Crosser	Fine

Fisher	King, Pa.	Rankin
Flood	Kirwan	Reams
Fogarty	Klein	Reece, Tenn.
Forand	Lane	Reed, N. Y.
Ford	Lanham	Rees, Kans.
Fulton	Lesinski	Rhodes
Furcolo	Lind	Ribicoff
Garmatz	Lyle	Rodino
Gavin	McCarthy	Rogers, Colo.
George	McConnell	Rooney
Goodwin	McCormack	Ross
Gordon	McCulloch	St. George
Graham	McDonough	Saylor
Granahan	McGregor	Schenck
Granger	McGuire	Scott,
Green	McVey	Hugh D., Jr.
Greenwood	Machrowicz	Scudder
Hagen	Mack, Ill.	Secrest
Hale	Mack, Wash.	Seely-Brown
Harrison, Wyo.	Madden	Shelley
Hart	Mansfield	Sheppard
Havenner	Martin, Mass.	Sieminski
Hays, Ohio	Mason	Simpson, Ill.
Heselton	Meader	Smith, Kans.
Hess	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Wis.
Hinshaw	Miller, N. Y.	Springer
Hoffman, Ill.	Morano	Stigler
Holifield	Morgan	Thompson,
Holmes	Multer	Mich.
Howell	Nicholson	Tollefson
Irving	O'Brien, Ill.	Trimble
Jackson, Wash.	O'Hara	Vail
James	O'Neill	Van Pelt
Jenkins	Ostertag	Van Zandt
Johnson	O'Toole	Velde
Jonas	Patman	Vorys
Jones, Ala.	Patterson	Vursell
Karsten, Mo.	Perkins	Wickersham
Kearney	Philbin	Wier
Kearns	Phillips	Wigglesworth
Keating	Poage	Wilson, Ind.
Kelley, Pa.	Polk	Withrow
Kelly, N. Y.	Poulson	Wolverton
Kerr	Preston	Yates
Kilburn	Price	Yorty
Kilday	Priest	Zablocki
King, Calif.	Rabaut	

NAYS—115

Abbitt	Gathings	Norrell
Abernethy	Golden	Passman
Albert	Gore	Patten
Allen, La.	Grant	Pickett
Andersen,	Gregory	Redden
H. Carl	Gross	Reed, Ill.
Andrews	Hand	Riley
Baker	Hardy	Robeson
Barden	Harris	Rogers, Fla.
Beckworth	Harrison, Nebr.	Rogers, Tex.
Berry	Harrison, Va.	Schwabe
Betts	Hébert	Scrivner
Boggs, La.	Herlong	Shafer
Bonner	Hill	Sittler
Bosone	Hoeven	Smith, Miss.
Bow	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Va.
Brehm	Ikard	Spence
Brooks	Jarman	Stanley
Brown, Ga.	Jenison	Steed
Bryson	Jensen	Taber
Buffett	Jones, Mo.	Talle
Burleson	Jones,	Teague
Bush	Hamilton C.	Thomas
Butler	Jones,	Thompson, Tex.
Byrnes	Woodrow W.	Thornberry
Carlyle	Lantaff	Vinson
Colmer	LeCompte	Watts
Cooper	Lovre	Wharton
Crawford	Lucas	Wheeler
Cunningham	McIntire	Whitten
Curtis, Nebr.	McMillan	Williams, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	McMullen	Williams, N. Y.
DeGraffenried	Mahon	Willis
Dolliver	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Tex.
Elston	Mills	Winstead
Engle	Morris	Wolcott
Forrester	Mumma	Wood, Idaho
Frazier	Murray, Tenn.	Woodruff
Fugate	Nelson	
Gary	Norblad	

NOT VOTING—111

Aandahl	Carnahan	Dollinger
Addonizio	Case	Donovan
Allen, Ill.	Celler	Doughton
Battle	Chatham	Doyle
Bender	Chudoff	Durham
Blatnik	Clevenger	Fernandez
Boykin	Cole, Kans.	Gamble
Brown, Ohio	Combs	Gwinn
Brownson	Cooley	Hall,
Buchanan	Coudert	Edwin Arthur
Buckley	Cox	Hall,
Burton	Davis, Tenn.	Leonard W.
Camp	Delaney	Halleck
Cannon	Dingell	Harden
Harvey	Magee	Rivers
Hays, Ark.	Marshall	Roberts
Hedrick	Martin, Iowa	Rogers, Mass.
Heffernan	Merrow	Roosevelt
Heller	Miller, Nebr.	Sabath
Herter	Mitchell	Sadlak
Hillings	Morrison	Sasscer
Hope	Morton	Scott, Hardie
Horan	Moulder	Sheehan
Hull	Murdock	Short
Hunter	Murphy	Sikes
Jackson, Calif.	Murray, Wis.	Simpson, Pa.
Javits	O'Brien, Mich.	Staggers
Judd	O'Konski	Stockman
Kean	Osmers	Sutton
Kee	Potter	Tackett
Kennedy	Powell	Taylor
Keogh	Prouty	Walter
Kersten, Wis.	Radwan	Weichel
Kluczynski	Rains	Welch
Larcade	Ramsay	Werdel
Latham	Regan	Widnall
McGrath	Richards	Wood, Ga.
McKinnon	Riehlman	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Burton with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Doyle with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Short.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Hedrick with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts
Mr. Battle with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Case.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Horan.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Hull.
Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. IKARD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed to extend their remarks on the resolution just passed, and I also ask unanimous consent that two letters, one from one of the attorneys of the Los Angeles Times, and one from a member of the Senate Press Gallery, Mr. Stephen L. Debalta, may be incorporated in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 562), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That EARL CHUDOFF, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

PREVENTING ILLEGAL ENTRY OF ALIENS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that the conference report on the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally, has been filed in the House and will be called up Thursday next.

I make this announcement to give as much advance notice as possible so the Members will be advised and may govern themselves accordingly.

TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONDUCTING CERTAIN PERSONNEL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 555, providing for the consideration of S. 2077, a bill to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on

the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of my time, 30 minutes, to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the bill made in order by this resolution is a Senate bill, S. 2077. It provides that the Civil Service Commission shall conduct the original personnel investigations, investigations that heretofore and presently have been and are being made by the FBI. Mr. Hoover, Director of the FBI, has recommended this legislation. However, if anything derogatory is uncovered the FBI will then take over the investigation.

The bill provides further that the FBI shall continue to check its files on fingerprints of all applicants; further, that when the Atomic Energy Commission, the Mutual Security Administration, or the State Department certifies certain positions as having high sensitivity, then the FBI will make a complete investigation in all instances.

Mr. Speaker, so far as I know there is no opposition to this measure.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution makes in order consideration of the bill S. 2077.

I think it would be worth while at this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact, which was considered by the Rules Committee in bringing the bill to the floor for consideration, that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, has advised us of his approval of this legislation. He said in his statement to the committee that the trend toward piling more minor investigation work on the Bureau has been accelerated during recent Congresses and the enlargement of the Bureau's activities in this respect has necessarily resulted in a diversion of much of its energies and facilities from the pursuit of its primary responsibilities of detecting and apprehending violators of Federal laws, discharging its assignments with respect to espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities, and rendering such other vital services as may be required of it by congressional and Executive directives.

It seemed to the Rules Committee that it was quite in order for the Congress, in light of the statement by the Director, to have an opportunity to reconsider the actions taken in the enactment of previous laws and change our directive so that the personnel investigations called for in several acts may be transferred to the Civil Service Commission. The pending rule making in order the consideration of S. 2077 was therefore brought to the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's statement in connection with Mr. Hoover is absolutely correct. On several occasions one of his assistants has been up to see me, Mr. Hoover having sent him, urging the passage of legislation of this type because it was taking up so much time of the FBI that the work of their special agents was being diverted from the essential work of the FBI to investigations that could be taken care of elsewhere, as Mr. Hoover's assistant said, could be well taken care of by the Civil Service Commission.

I have in my hand a letter addressed to me, dated March 6, in relation to S. 2077. The bill is designed to transfer routine personnel-type investigations from the FBI to the Civil Service Commission. I quote as follows:

I was very much heartened by the action of the Rules Committee today and I know that you will do all within your power to bring the bill before the House of Representatives.

That is a letter from J. Edgar Hoover himself showing clearly that he supports the bill now before the House.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to proceed out of order.)

BOOST MINIMUM WAGE ON UNITED STATES TEXTILE CONTRACTS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the United States Government is partly responsible for the widespread unemployment in New England textiles.

How?

By failing to push up wage rates to conform with those prevailing in this industry as it can and must do under the terms of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act.

When the Government buys woolen and worsted goods for the Armed Forces or for any Federal use it is not supposed to let out such contracts to those companies which pay their workers less than the current minimum wage. This level is determined by the Secretary of Labor.

But this has not been brought up to date to reflect actual and improved wage rates.

No one can possibly maintain that the prevailing rate is to be measured by a few mills paying substandard wages.

The average should follow the pattern set in the North, where the majority of the mills in this industry are located. Only 13 percent of woolen-worsted products are manufactured in the South, 21 percent in the Middle Atlantic States, and the majority or 58 percent, are made in New England.

Therefore, the minimum should be jacked up to meet northern standards.

The average hourly earnings of workers in the American Woolen Co., are $1.607. The CIO and AFL are seeking a minimum of $1.26 throughout the industry. In southern mills, hourly earnings range from 98 cents to $1.35 per hour.

These figures do not reflect differences in work assignments. Southern competitors have an advantage that totals more than 40 cents per hour in wages and fringe benefits.

Obviously, when the Government lets out contracts to the southern mills, on the basis of the lowest bid, and by neglecting to raise the floor of wages paid by those mills so that they will correspond to the higher minimum paid in the North where most of the industry is located, it is violating the prevailing rate requirements of the Walsh-Healey Act.

The Government, therefore, by ignoring present realities, is falling down on its job of redetermining the minimum, which means scaling it upward, and then complying with the law as it is required to do.

The fact that southern mills are operating according to the letter but not the spirit of the law, because the minimum is outmoded and economically unjust, is no excuse. They are taking advantage of a technical loophole that is dead wrong. It is a shabby practice when this Government is guided in its present procurement policy by the lowest common denominator, set not by the average, but by a definite minority of this basic industry.

We have seen how the Office of Defense Mobilization changes its position as capriciously as a weather vane on the issue of channeling contracts to distressed areas, directed neither by equity nor a regard for economic necessities, but pushed from pillar to post by political pressures.

The city of Lawrence, in Massachusetts, which is the heart of the woolen-worsted manufacturing industry, is suffering from wholesale and critical unemployment, which the United States Government cannot seem to comprehend.

Lawrence, it has been decided, is a distressed area, and entitled to get Government contracts on a negotiated basis, except for textiles.

Which is like saying, "We are going to give you first aid for your pernicious anemia by draining off some more blood."

The issue of an upward adjustment in minimum wages for textiles on Government contracts to meet 1952 actualities is a happy change from the on-again, off-again indecision of the ODM.

We are dealing here with a law. One whose intent and mandate is clear.

The Secretary of Labor has indicated his awareness of the situation.

It is for us to make certain that this law and its implementation is not relegated to the side lines to gather gray dust.

The Walsh-Healey Act has hiked wage rates on drugs, paints, and varnishes.

Woolen-worsted textiles next.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest men I have ever met, respected by countless thousands throughout the country who knew him, and who had a wide circle of friends in the city of Washington, August C. Backus, Jr., of Milwaukee, Wis., died on March 6, 1952.

The life of my late friend, who was very close to me, was not only a noble

one, but a constructive one in the interests and progress of his city, his State, and our Nation.

After his admission to practice law in 1900, he was appointed by the then Gov. Robert M. La Follette, Sr., to brief labor laws for the Department of Labor and Industrial Statistics of the State of Wisconsin.

He continued thereafter in the service of the State of Wisconsin by prosecuting a large number of cases of child labor law violations.

He quickly gained experience which with his unusual ability and knowledge of the law constituted the foundation for the outstanding career that laid ahead for him.

From 1901 to 1905 Judge Backus was chairman of the International Child Labor Commission, in 1904 representing Wisconsin at the International Congress on Child Labor at the St. Louis Fair.

He later became assistant district attorney of Milwaukee County, and in 1909 district attorney. In 1910 he was named judge of the municipal court, serving in this judicial position until 1924.

In the performance of his judicial duties, Judge Backus made an outstanding name for himself.

It was while serving in this judicial position that he presided over the celebrated case of John Flammang Schrank, who shot in an attempt to kill President Theodore Roosevelt on October 22, 1912.

His greatest contribution while judge was his humane consideration of juvenile delinquency, and the important part he played in the establishment of the probation system in Wisconsin which spread throughout the country.

He served as a judge until 1924, after which he was publisher of the newspaper the Sentinel in Milwaukee, serving in this capacity until 1930. Thereafter, until his death, Judge Backus was general counsel of the Schlitz Brewing Co., of Milwaukee.

In this capacity he visited Washington many times during the past 20 years, during which period we came to know each other, and from which meetings a close friendship developed between us.

Judge Backus was deeply interested in education, and for many years taught criminal law at Marquette University, and also served as chairman of the advisory board and trustee of the medical school.

Throughout his life he took a deep interest in the welfare of boys and girls, as well as being a leader in charitable, educational, and patriotic activities in State and Nation.

As has well been said of Judge Backus, the achievement for which perhaps he was best known was the fathering of the adult probation system, which has been the means of saving many thousands of first—and even later—offenders from prison and giving them a chance for rehabilitation.

He developed this system when he was municipal court judge. Nearly all, if not all, of the States have since followed his original idea. For some years Judge Backus spoke in various States advocating the establishment of this humanitarian and progressive system which has brought a new life and happiness to countless of thousands of persons and their immediate relatives.

Judge Backus was truly one of God's noblemen.

His passing on is a great loss to his family and his many friends. His death is a personal loss to Mrs. McCormack and myself.

Wisconsin loses one of its finest sons; America, one of its substantial, constructive, and outstanding citizens.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time on the rule because I realize that during the general debate which follows the time available will be short, and I deem this is a very important matter.

The proponents say that all they are going to do under the bill S. 2077 is transfer certain preliminary examinations from the FBI to the Civil Service Commission. Those preliminary investigations are in reality security investigations. I quote from testimony given by Mr. Ramspeck, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission:

> These facts, however, should not lead to the erroneous conclusion that the security investigations which this bill proposes to transfer are unimportant or in any sense routine.

I have explicit confidence in Mr. Hoover and the FBI. It is because I have that confidence in them that I desire that they retain the authority to perform these initial security investigations because I deem them very important.

In addition, the extra cost that will be shouldered onto the Federal Government by reason of this transfer is quite a considerable sum of money, according to the testimony given before our committee. The FBI at the present time have 1,700 investigators doing this work. If they continue this load, by 1953 this number will be increased to a little over 2,000. However, we find that, if the load is transferred to the Civil Service Commission, there will be an increase in 1953 to 3,600 employees.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. The gentleman mentioned the fact that the FBI are now devoting 1,700 agents to the work of investigating the applicants.

Mr. WITHROW. Of making these preliminary security investigations; yes.

Mr. VELDE. Was there any testimony to the effect that any of the agents would be fired if this bill passes, and thus reduce the appropriation necessary for the FBI?

Mr. WITHROW. I do not recall all the testimony, but to my knowledge they probably would be absorbed by those retired or filling vacancies. I do not think there would be any substantial reduction in the FBI force of investigators by reason of this transfer.

Mr. VELDE. I am sure there would not. I would hate to see such a thing. I want to say this, too, to the gentleman, that I agree with a great majority of the Members here that the FBI is a very efficient, probably the most efficient agency of our Federal Government, and I believe they are more qualified to continue the investigations as they have in the past, having the machinery already set up, and it would be much more efficient than to transfer to the civil-service agency. I believe Mr. Hoover, with his great administrative capacity and ability, could arrange a separate department in his own Bureau to take care of these investigations, and do the work a great deal more efficiently and much more cheaply than by transferring the work.

Mr. WITHROW. I think that would be very desirable.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I think the RECORD ought to show at this point the gentleman who has just engaged in colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE], is a former FBI agent with considerable experience.

Mr. WITHROW. I did not know that. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for referring to that. I want to say I have made a number of these investigations myself while I was in the Bureau. I do not know how they are being handled now, but none of the agents particularly cared for a loyalty check of a Government employee or of a prospective employee. I must say I think possibly that is the reason Mr. Hoover is anxious at the present time to get rid of these investigations. As I said before, I think he is more qualified, and the FBI is more qualified than any other agency of the Government, to handle this, and I think they should continue to handle it if it is at all possible.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as to the additional cost, it is quite considerable because I do not believe you can figure in terms of 1952 because the full load will not be transferred to the Civil Service Commission until 1953. So, I believe, that we should figure in terms of the amount of additional money we will spend in 1953 to get the proper yardstick. Then, what does it cost the FBI? What is the per unit cost for one of these security investigations at the present time? Mr. Nichols, when he testified before the Civil Service Committee on this bill, and Mr. Nichols is the representative of the FBI, testified that the unit cost ranges from $150 to $222 a case, or a probable average of about $200 a case. We turn to the testimony of Mr. Ramspeck, who is Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. He said it is estimated that it will cost between $225 and $250 to process a case. In other words, according to Mr. Ramspeck's own testimony, it will cost at least $25 more to process every case under the Civil Service Commission, if those duties are transferred to them. In the light of the additional testimony

that there will be a case load of 82,000 in 1953—82,000 multiplied by $25 makes almost $1,250,000. Then, when you figure in addition to what Mr. Ramspeck says that he is going to charge the several departments not $225, which is the cost of the per unit investigation, but is going to charge the departments $250, which is $25 more than the actual cost of the investigation, it makes an additional load for 1953 of about $2,500,000, and that is the saving if we keep it under the FBI where it is at the present time.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not particularly in a loyalty investigation, it is of any use to the FBI that they already have extensive files on Communist activities, and therefore are in a position to check personnel loyalty matters much more efficiently than some agency that does not have all the information right within their own bureau.

Mr. WITHROW. I think it would be of distinct advantage. Let me say there that the FBI at the present time has organizations all over the United States. The Civil Service Commission has regional offices less extensively spread throughout the country with the result that these investigations may be carried on by the FBI much better than they can be by the Civil Service Commission. It might be well to add at this time that Mr. Hoover, when he sent his letter to the Commission in nowise dealt with the cost of this transfer. The testimony clearly shows that not only would it be more efficient to have it in the FBI, but it would be very, very much less expensive.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman, of course, knows that because of the high regard this Congress and the American people hold for J. Edgar Hoover and his Federal Bureau of Investigation, this Congress has been very liberal in furnishing the funds requested by the FBI for additional personnel to do the important job which they have to do. If this bill is made law, it will cost millions of dollars just to make this transfer, the transfer of the books, the accounts, and all the things that go with such a change in administration in addition to the additional personnel costs involved.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time to take matters pertaining to the security of our Nation out of the hands of an organization such as the FBI in which the American people have complete confidence and turn it over to another agency of Government in which the American people do not have as great confidence as they do in the FBI. I think the bill should be sent back to committee for further study of the whole matter. This is a question concerning the security of our Nation. If the FBI needs more investigators, this Congress will furnish them, I am sure of that, and I am sure the American people would feel more secure if the job of loyalty and security checks are made by the FBI than if made by any other agency of Government.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the gentleman. Let me say in conclusion that there is a divided opinion in the committee on this. If my memory is correct, the vote was something like 12 for reporting it out and 7 against, so there is an honest difference of opinion as to whether or not this should be transferred in view of the additional cost that will be incurred by reason of the transfer.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], earlier in the day was talking, as I understood him, about requiring the Civil Service Commission to discharge employees unless they paid what he said were their honest debts. The reason I take this time is to ask the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service if civil service employees are not subject to garnishment, attachment, and execution?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. They are not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I can see, then, what is bothering the gentleman from Texas. Can the gentleman from Tennessee tell me why that is so, why the civil-service employees should be placed in a special class, why they should be exempt from civil process? Why should not their pay be subject to garnishment and other writs the same as that of an employee in private industry?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Because the States do not have the right to attach or impound Federal funds; for that reason the wages of Federal employees are not subject to garnishment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand that is so unless the Federal Government consents, but why should not the Congress permit creditors to have the same remedy against civil service employees that they have against employees in private industry?

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. If the statement of the chairman of the Civil Service Committee is correct, I wonder why we took the time of the House on yesterday to raise the exemption from garnishment on civil-service employees from $100 to to $200 a month?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; will the gentleman tell us the answer to that very pertinent question?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is a local situation entirely within the District.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then why should not creditors who reside in the State of Michigan, for instance, have the same right to garnishee the wages of civil-service employees as do creditors in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yesterday we were legislating for all the people of the District of Columbia and not for the Federal employees of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why did we legislate yesterday for creditors in the District of Columbia? Why should not creditors in the States have the same consideration?

Mr. MILLER of California. We were acting yesterday in our capacity as the administrators or lawmakers for the District of Columbia and doing just what the Legislature of Michigan or the Legislature of California or any other State has done with respect to the citizens of those States. We were not speaking, and we did not change in any way by what we did yesterday the matter of garnishments against Federal employees in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. With all due respect to the gentleman may I say: The gentleman says we were acting yesterday for the District of Columbia. The Congress was acting yesterday, as I understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it not generally against public policy to make the salary or wages of any governmental employee, whether State, municipal, or Federal, subject to garnishment? I know that in my own State the State employees are not subject to garnishment. There seems to be a long history of public policy not to make those employees subject to garnishment, probably because of the time that would be involved in filing answers and in trying to keep up with the legal processes that would be served. As I recall it, that is generally true.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That may be a public policy, but to me it does not seem fair to legislate in favor of the creditors of the District of Columbia, then shut out the creditors in the States. I cannot see why we should create a special haven or heaven or city of refuge, or whatever you want to call it, for people who are under civil service and get their checks from the Government here in Washington but do not have to pay their grocery bills, even a funeral bill. They would not have to pay the undertaker if they did not have any other property except a Government check. I cannot justify that. Why extend a special remedy to creditors of the District and deny it to creditors of the States? Maybe it is all right, maybe it is some New Deal policy that you just should not pay your debts if one lives some place outside of Washington.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the

consideration of the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2077, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, S. 2077, was unanimously approved by the other body on last January 24. Your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service recommends favorable action upon the measure without any amendments.

The purpose of the legislation is to transfer from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the Civil Service Commission the responsibility of conducting initial personnel investigations of applicants for employment in certain agencies pursuant to the following statutes:

An act for the development and control of atomic energy, an act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, a joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, an act to provide for the reincorporation to the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, an act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations, an act to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through economic, financial, and other measures, a joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization, a joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, an act to promote the progress of science, an act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense.

In those agencies affected or covered by these statutes which I have just enumerated there are about 13,000 employees. The majority of the employees are in the Atomic Energy Commission.

This legislation was sent to the Congress by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation through the Department of Justice. The legislation has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

The bill provides that if there is any derogatory information uncovered by the Civil Service Commission, involving the loyalty of anyone being investigated, immediately the Civil Service Commission shall turn the investigation over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a full field investigation. Here is how the bill reads on that subject:

Provided, That in the event an investigation made pursuant to any of the above statutes as herein amended develops any data reflecting that the individual who is the subject of the investigation is of questionable loyalty, the Civil Service Commission shall refer the matter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of a full field investigation,

The bill provides further:

That, if the President deems it to be in the national interest, he may from time to time cause investigations of any group or class which are required by any of the above statutes, to be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation rather than the Civil Service Commission:

The bill also provides that—

A majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of Mutual Security, or the Secretary of State, as the case may be, shall certify those specific positions which are of a high degree of importance or sensitivity, and upon such certification the investigation and reports required by such provision or by any other laws shall be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation rather than the Civil Service Commission.

So, in the case of the Atomic Energy Commission, all the applicants for employment in positions which are highly sensitive or classified will be certified, I am sure, by the Atomic Energy Commission to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a full field investigation, just as the provisions of this legislation require.

This bill will relieve the Federal Bureau of Investigation of a tremendous amount of workload now attached to these personnel investigations of applicants for employment under these statutes and will permit the FBI agents to concentrate and devote more time to law-enforcement activities, and espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities. It is estimated that there will be around 88,000 personnel investigations of applicants for employment under this bill made each year. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is very eager that this legislation be passed. I think you will agree with me that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is the greatest and most effective investigative body in the world, and I think you will further agree that there is no greater or finer American than the Director, J. Edgar Hoover. All of us are justly proud of the wonderful work of Director Hoover and his FBI agents.

It was the gentleman from Iowa, I believe, who said, "Well, it might be or could be that the Department of Justice prompted J. Edgar Hoover to request this legislation."

Here is a personal letter to me from Director Hoover:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I deeply appreciate the sentiments expressed in your kind letter of February 7, 1952, and the consideration which the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is presently giving to the passage of legislation which would transfer the responsibility for making personnel types of investigation to the Civil Service Commission.

Unfortunately, I will not be in Washington on the occasion of the next meeting of the committee on February 26; otherwise, I would be most happy to appear before the committee. In view of the urgent necessity from our standpoint to secure the relief which S. 2077 would give us, I would like to urge that the committee take the matter up on February 26 as scheduled even though it will not be possible for me to attend your session on that date since I will be out of the city.

Faced with a mounting case load in December 1950, I urged the Attorney General to seek legislation which would relieve us from making personnel types of investigation. At the same time we discontinued making such investigations for several other agencies of Government which we had been making as a matter of cooperation on a reimbursable basis for some period of time.

In view of the growing international tension, the prosecutions which have been initiated against Communist Party leaders which, for practical purposes have forced the Communist Party underground, and the potential threat of the Communist Party to the security of the United States, it has been necessary for us to detail more and more manpower to handle internal security investigations.

Experience has demonstrated that an agency such as the FBI is at its highest peak of efficiency when it is kept mobile and does not become too large.

I do not believe that an organization such as the FBI should have the function of making so-called personnel types of investigation although, under the proposed legislation, the FBI will continue to make name checks, loyalty investigations and, in the event any information is obtained by the Civil Service Commission in its investigation reflecting disloyal activities, the matter will then be referred to the FBI to make a full field investigation. In addition, the act as enacted by the Senate authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of Mutual Security, or the Secretary of State, whichever the case may be, to call upon the FBI to investigate highly sensitive positions.

I was also compelled by another consideration to urge the Attorney General to seek this legislation—

So you can see that Director Hoover is the one that urged the Department of Justice to present this legislation to the Congress. I call your attention especially to what follows, because this is highly important and significant—

namely, should the present emergency become more tense or should the underground organization of the Communist Party embark upon an active program of sabotage, I am sure you can appreciate that all of our energies would of necessity have to be directed to meeting this threat. While there is still time, it is my considered judgment that the best interest of the United States can be served by equipping the Civil Service Commission to handle personnel types of investigation. As a practical consideration, the Civil Service Commission is already handling personnel types of investigation for other equally sensitive agencies and it would appear that in the interest of uniformity and good administration, the Civil Service Commission should be empowered to handle this type of investigation.

I sincerely hope that the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will give favorable consideration to S. 2077 at their meeting on February 26 in order that the matter may be put before the House of Representatives at the earliest possible date.

My time has expired, and I am sorry that I cannot yield for questions. This is deserving legislation in the interest of our national security, and I hope that it will be speedily passed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I was one of the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service who was thoroughly against this bill for reasons which have been more or less brought out in this afternoon's discussion; that is, I have always been a profound admirer of the work of the FBI under J. Edgar Hoover. I therefore felt that it was unfortunate that the investigations of personnel matters should be turned over from this great organization, this great branch of our Government, in which we all have such confidence, to the Civil Service Commission. I therefore spoke against the bill in these terms in committee.

Afterward, when I returned to my office, I received a letter from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover himself. In this letter he thanked me for my remarks, and said that he was glad to know that I had such confidence in the Bureau. However, he pointed out to me that it was important in his own eyes that this bill should pass, that routine checks should not have to be made by the specialists of the FBI. There are not many of them, they are highly trained, and they should be reserved and kept for the loyalty check-ups.

As the chairman has told you briefly, those loyalty check-ups will still be left to the FBI when it is necessary for them to go into them.

I then brought up the question which seemed to me very obvious, why not increase the personnel of the FBI so that they can take care of these routine check-ups, which they admitted they can do in a more economical and I believe more efficient way. Mr. Hoover's reply was that he does not want the Bureau to get any larger.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield with pleasure to the expert on these matters.

Mr. VELDE. I thank the gentlewoman.

The gentlewoman mentioned the increase in size of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and I believe Mr. Hoover in his letter to Mr. MURRAY mentioned the fact that he did not want his organization to become any larger.

We as Members of Congress must look to the over-all Government organization. Can the gentlewoman deny that this will increase the over-all bureaucracy of our Federal Government, while it does decrease, of course, the necessity for increase of personnel in the FBI?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I quite agree with the gentleman on that. That is true, and it is perhaps deplorable. On the other hand, I would hate, and I know the gentleman would hate, to see the FBI in any way brought down to a lower point of efficiency than it is at the present time. We want to keep the FBI a little bit above, and a little bit more on a pedestal than other agencies of the Government. The FBI is an elite corps, if you will. Perhaps you do not like to hear that term used on the floor of the House of Representatives, but that is exactly what it is, and I am very much afraid that if we do increase its size, the same thing will happen to the FBI that has happened with every other agency of the Government, and that is it will become a great, big, sprawling bureaucracy over which Mr. Hoover will not have the control that he now has, and the personnel will not be able to do the high type of work, and high-type loyalty investigations for which they are primarily needed.

Mr. VELDE. Of course, the FBI has over the past 10 years gained a reputation due to the fact that it has been making these investigations. They have installed the procedure. They have the personnel to do it. As a general practice beginning FBI agents are first sent out in the field, and they handle these routine, or more or less routine, applicant investigation. I can see no reason why they should not continue to handle them in the same manner, and, if possible, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] said, increase the appropriations for them so that they may hire more agents to handle this matter. I personally feel it is a great deal more important to investigate an applicant for Government employment before he becomes an employee, and to find out whether or not he is subversive, than to investigate him after he gets into the Government.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Of course, may I say to the gentleman, he is repeating all the arguments which I have brought out. On the other hand, and I am sure that there again the gentleman will agree with me, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, himself, has probably forgotten more on this subject than any of us will ever know. I think we have to depend on certain experts, and on their advice in all these matters. I would certainly want to do what Mr. J. Edgar Hoover thinks best for his department.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that these investigations did not start until 1946, so the Bureau has not had them too long, and also that the Bureau would still continue to make the checks against its files. They would still continue to make the routine checks against its files, and against its files of fingerprints on all of these people so we are not decreasing that part of the work.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The gentleman is completely right on that. Any difficult case or any loyalty case would be brought to the FBI.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. VELDE. The gentleman mentioned that these applicant investigations started in 1946. When I entered the FBI in 1942, we were making applicant investigations at that time. They had been made prior to that time also. Of course, as the years have gone by the load has increased with regard to that, but they started a long time ago.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman knows that we are talking about these investigations which were transferred to the FBI under the several appropriation bills as they were brought in here.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that the Civil Service Commission has on several occasions at least cleared individuals as security risks, and after they had cleared them, we learned that they were not good security risks? Also is it not true that any person who has been investigated and cleared by the FBI has stood the test as to being a good security risk, and none of them have been questioned? So why should we take a chance now to change that?

These young FBI agents are starting in on the job, and are learning their job by investigating these applicants. As they continue their work, they advance and become more qualified. So, we have an opportunity here as we leave this work with the FBI for the young FBI agent to start in where they should, and that is at the bottom, and to learn their business from the bottom up. If J. Edgar Hoover wants more money, and needs more personnel, certainly this Congress will give it to him.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am sure they will. I agree to a certain extent, but I must also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Mr. Hoover does not want more money, and does not want to enlarge the force that he already has and controls. He wants to keep it a small, very perfect, and very compact force, on which he can rely for the truly important things. A great many of these personnel checks, frankly, are very unimportant, the gentleman must realize that. There are hundreds of them. We will have 3,000,000 Federal employees on the Federal payroll in the executive branch very soon.

Mr. JENSEN. Why should we change and scrap the old system, and start off on a system of which you are not sure?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Well, only for the reason that we have a great expert in the matter, Mr. Hoover, himself who is in favor of this.

Mr. JENSEN. I know, but we have the American people to satisfy; and they will not be satisfied, I am sure, by taking these responsibilities away from this great man and this great organization and handing them over to another agency of the Government, and especially some agency that has had a questionable reputation in several instances.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. But does not the gentleman believe that the American people have the greatest confidence in Mr. Hoover?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. And would certainly take his word over and against that of even the distinguished Congressman himself.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, indeed; indeed the American people have great respect for J. Edgar Hoover. No one has greater respect for him than I.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I know that, I am sure of that; and that is the feeling of most Americans.

Mr. JENSEN. But one of his men called at my office and asked me to be for this bill. That does not mean that I am going to be for the bill, because as I see it, the bill is wrong.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I have the utmost sympathy for the gentleman, but I still think that Mr. Hoover must have had some good reason for writing the letter he did to our committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like at the inception of my remarks to pay my respects to and state my esteem for the FBI and for Mr. Hoover personally. As a matter of fact, the high esteem in which I hold the organization and his administration is another reason why I am against the bill that we have before us; why I believe the FBI should continue to handle this tremendous responsibility as a part of the investigation program of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, S. 2077, which would transfer certain personnel investigations from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the United States Civil Service Commission, passed the Senate on January 24, 1952, and has now been reported to the House from its Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. There was practically no debate in the Senate and only very brief hearings were held by the House Committee. Before I discuss the reasons why I oppose this bill, it would be well to make sure that we are all talking about the same thing.

Between 1946 and 1951, the Congress gave to the Federal Bureau of Investigation the statutory responsibility for personnel investigations in what are called sensitive agencies. The specific statutes involved are:

Atomic Energy Act of 1946, Sixtieth Statutes, page 755.

Greece-Turkey aid, Sixty-first Statutes, page 103.

Relief assistance to war-devastated countries, Sixty-first Statutes, page 125.

Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act, Sixty-first Statutes, page 780.

United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, Sixty-second Statutes, page 6.

Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Sixty-second Statutes, page 137.

World Health Organization, Sixty-second Statutes, page 441.

International Labor Organization, Sixty-second Statutes, page 1151.

National Science Foundation Act of 1950, Sixty-fourth Statutes, page 149.

Office of Civil Defense, District of Columbia, Sixty-fourth Statutes, page 438.

Section 510 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, Eighty-second Congress, approved October 10, 1951.

Under the terms of these acts, the FBI is responsible for conducting the investigation of all personnel of the agencies concerned, including all applicants for employment. The President's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty recommended that these investigations be carried on by the FBI rather than through the regular channels established in connection with the Federal employees' loyalty program. Their reason, which was accepted by the Congress and which I believe was valid, was that the FBI was set up all over the United States to develop more efficiently and quickly cases involving loyalty or security.

S. 2077 as reported to this House would give to the Civil Service Commission full responsibility for the conduct of personnel investigations in the agencies covered, but with the following very important exceptions. First of all, whenever the Commission's investigations developed any information reflecting questionable loyalty, the case would be transferred to the FBI for a full field investigation. Secondly, if the President deems it to be in the national interest, he may cause investigations of any group or class to be made by the FBI rather than the Civil Service Commission. Thirdly, a majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of Mutual Security, or the Secretary of State would certify those specific positions which are of a high degree of importance or sensitivity and the investigation of them would then be undertaken by the FBI instead of the Civil Service Commission.

There are three important questions which must be asked about every proposed reorganization in the Government. Will the proposed change result in greater efficiency in operations or in improvement of the service to the people of the country? Will the change bring about a decrease in costs? And finally, we must ask how the proposed set-up will fit into the over-all organization of the Government and how it will affect other units of the Government. I find that S. 2077 fails to provide an affirmative response to any of these questions.

EFFICIENCY AND IMPROVED SERVICE

Let us ask, first of all, whether S. 2077 would result in greater efficiency or in improved service to the agencies involved or to those persons who are seeking employment in the agencies. As I noted a minute ago, this transfer proposed by S. 2077 is only a partial matter. The FBI would continue to check all applications for employment through its fingerprint and other files. It would add the fingerprints of the applicants to its own files. In case the Civil Service Commission turned up any derogatory information, the FBI would have to make a full field investigation, anyway. There would be certain positions in the Atomic Energy Commission, the Mutual Security Agency, and the State Department which would be handled by the FBI. I have heard no estimate of how many positions this will involve, only that the number would be decided by the heads of those three agencies. In addition, the President would be authorized to add certain groups to those to be investigated by the FBI rather than by the Commission.

The FBI would not be able to eliminate completely the staff which it now has to handle these personnel investigations. The representatives of the FBI failed to indicate at the hearings before our committee just how much of their present staff they intended to retain on the same duties they are now performing. As a matter of fact, the impression was given that all 1,700 FBI employees now assigned to this particular type of investigation would no longer be needed and could be transferred to other functions within the Bureau. I must challenge any statement of this nature. It is my belief that a substantial proportion of the present staff of the FBI now assigned to the type of personnel investigations under discussion would have to be retained. In addition, there would be the time-consuming and unnecessary transfer back and forth between the Bureau and the Civil Service Commission of all these cases. Some of the cases, of course, might go back and forth several times. In the meantime, the agency and the applicant would be forced to sit and wait as patiently as they could.

There are a number of other factors to be considered in connection with the efficiency of this investigative function. First of all, the FBI has been doing that sort of thing for many, many years, and I am sure that every Member of the House will agree that they have been doing a fine job. They have an experienced, smoothly operating staff. They have developed over the years many sources of information, some of them of a confidential nature. The Civil Service Commission has not in the past enjoyed the general reputation for efficiency which the FBI has earned. We all hope that under the chairmanship of Robert Ramspeck the Commission will reach that level, but I fear that throwing this burden on the Civil Service Commission at the present time would have a paralytic effect. At the present time, the Commission has approximately 4,000 employees. Chairman Ramspeck has estimated that nearly 3,000 additional employees would be necessary to put the provisions of S. 2077 into effect. In other words, the staff of the Commission would be almost doubled within a period of 6 months, a process which would put a tremendous strain upon the administrative machinery of the Commission. There is a very real danger that the other functions of the Civil Service Commission would be overshadowed and would suffer as a result. If that happened, the whole executive branch would feel the adverse results.

One factor of some significance in regard to efficiency is that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has 52 field offices scattered all over the United States while the Civil Service Commission has only 14 regional offices. More travel would be required if the Civil Service Commission took over and more time would be lost in traveling. More investigators per thousand cases would be required as a result. Securing adequate office space and equipment for the greatly expanded staff would also pose a problem for the Commission and the General Services Administration.

The bill provides that the Commission would have 180 days in which to take over from the FBI. Mr. Ramspeck in his

testimony before the committee stated that it would take from 14 to 16 weeks before a new investigator could get into production and it would be another 8 weeks before he could be expected to really earn his salary. In other words, the Commission would require 6 months to develop a staff at all comparable to that of the FBI. Of course, as a practical matter, the Commission will not be able to recruit all its new investigators immediately, so that it would be probably at least a year before the Commission's staff could be recruited, trained, and in full production. It would be quite understandable if the job performed by the Commission during the first few months was somewhat less than satisfactory. The question then becomes whether or not we can afford to take the risk of allowing some disloyal persons to slip into the agencies concerned, even though the jobs to which they were appointed might not be in the supersensitive category. In my own mind, the answer is clear—we should not take any such risk.

Were S. 2077 to be adopted, there would be unavoidable duplication of administrative and staff functions between the FBI and the Commission. There would be the question of who is to decide when a case is to be returned to the FBI for a full field investigation. Would not the FBI then have to go back over all the ground already covered by the Commission?

It is my understanding that the Commission would set up the investigator positions at grades GS–7 and GS–9, with salaries ranging from $4,000 to $5,000 at the entrance level. Presumably, at this salary level many of the applicants for the job would be young men recently out of college or law school. There is then the problem of either getting exemption from the draft or UMT, or else facing a tremendous rate of turn-over.

COST

The failure of S. 2077 on the grounds of efficiency alone is sufficient reason for its rejection. But there are other equally valid reasons why we should not transfer these investigations from the FBI to the Civil Service Commission. One of the best of these reasons is the fact that it would be more expensive. According to Chairman Ramspeck, the Commission would require 2,970 additional employees, of whom 1,980 would be investigators and 990 would be clerical employees. Contrast this with the FBI which employs 975 investigators and 737 clerks to do the same job. Even if all the present employees of the FBI who are assigned to this type of investigation were to be transferred to the Commission, 1,200 additional employees would still be required. But, the FBI has no intention of transferring its employees to the Commission. As I have already pointed out, many of them will be needed in their present jobs, since the FBI would continue to do a lot of the work even if S. 2077 were passed. The rest are needed on other investigations being conducted by the FBI. I do not dispute the Bureau's need for these employees. In all probability, strengthening the FBI's staff for investigation of espionage and subversive activities is one of the wisest moves we could make at this time. The fact remains, however, that there will be 2,970 more people on the Federal payroll as a result of the passage of this bill. Proponents of the measure argue that there will be no additional cost since, under the terms of the bill, the agency which requests the investigation will be required to pay for it. But, I ask you, do not the funds with which the agencies will make payment also come out of the Federal Treasury? Any way you look at it, there will be 3,000 additional Federal employees, receiving salaries amounting to some $13,000,000 a year.

The Civil Service Commission has estimated that its operation of the program would cost the American taxpayers $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1953. Of this sum, $7,000,000 would be spent for training and other costs. Examinations for the investigators would have to be administered to an estimated 4,000 people all over the country. Additional office space and equipment would have to be secured. As I have already noted, the cost for travel would be greatly increased since the Commission has only 14 field offices as compared with 52 for the FBI. Compare the $20,000,000 the Commission says it would require for fiscal year 1953 with the $10,000,000 the FBI is spending on the program for fiscal year 1952. Even were FBI costs to increase for fiscal year 1953, they certainly would not come anywhere near $20,000,000. The Civil Service Commission readily admits that its unit cost, especially during the early months or years of operating this investigatory program, would be higher than that of the FBI. The Commission would charge the agencies at the rate of $250 a case, while the FBI handles some cases for only $150 apiece.

EFFECT ON OTHER UNITS

Having noted that S. 2077 would cost us double what we are presently paying, I would like to make a few observations about the effect the bill would have on the Federal Government as a whole. First of all, it would further scatter and disintegrate the investigative function which is already so widely scattered throughout the Federal Service. This measure would require us to set up a new organization on a Nation-wide scale when we already have an outstanding organization set up on a national scale for all types of investigative cases. If the FBI were inefficient or inept in the performance of its duties, there might be some reason for establishing a rival national organization. But the FBI has carefully and painstakingly built for itself a reputation for efficient operation in the best interests of the Nation.

There are thousands of investigators in the various agencies of the Federal Government which handle their own cases. I wish I could be more specific, but so far as I have been able to determine no one knows just how many persons are concerned with investigatory functions. For instance, every agency has persons concerned with the Federal employees' loyalty program. Many of these persons give only a part of their time to this work and it is extremely difficult to determine just how many persons we should say are connected with the loyalty program. Personnel investigations of one sort or another are carried on by all other agencies, and major investigatory programs are carried on by such units as the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Central Intelligence Agency. In any event, the investigative function is widely scattered. S. 2077 only adds to the confusion already existing.

Earlier in my remarks I noted that there was a very real danger that the Civil Service Commission would be overwhelmed if this new load were thrust upon it. I want to make it plain that I have every confidence in Chairman Robert Ramspeck, the other members of the Commission, and the staff of the Commission. I am sure that they are making every effort to give us an improved system of Federal personnel administration. But I do not want to have them smothered by a tremendous new program which they are not equipped to handle. Should that happen there could be deleterious effects in every agency of the Federal Government. We would do far better to assist and encourage the Commission in improving the programs for which it is already responsible than to give to it new responsibilities which it is not eager to assume.

SUMMARY

Let me sum up for you in just a few words my reasons for opposing the adoption of S. 2077 which would transfer personnel investigations from the FBI to the Civil Service Commission. In the first place, I do not think we should change an established organization unless it can be proved that the new arrangement leads to increased efficiency, provides better service to the interested public, reduces costs, or is in the interest of other units of the Government. The measure which we are now considering fails on all these counts. It does not lead to increased efficiency. On the contrary, it splits between two agencies a function which is now being satisfactorily conducted by one of those agencies. It does not reduce the time lapse during which the applicant and the agency must wait for clearance. It would put a tremendous administrative burden on the Civil Service Commission which might result in damage to the other most important programs of the Commission. Due to the field office organization, transfer of functions would make necessary more travel and thus require more investigators per thousand cases. It would be well over a year before the Commission could even approach the level of efficiency now attained by the FBI. The cost of operating the program in the Civil Service Commission would be double the cost in the FBI for fiscal year 1953. Federal employment would be increased by nearly 3,000. The costs of recruiting, training, and equipping these new people would be large. The unit cost per case would rise were this bill to be adopted. Finally, there is no advantage to other units in the Federal Government, and there is a very real danger that all of them will be adversely affected should the Civil Service Commission be required to assume this bur-

den, thus necessarily neglecting its other functions to some extent. For these reasons, I urge that you reject S. 2077.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there anything in the RECORD to show that the FBI will discharge 2,000 of their personnel when the additional 3,000 are employed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. JARMAN. No; it is my understanding, and I quote from memory of the hearings before our House committee, that there would be no saving on that basis. We asked specifically if the FBI investigators who are now doing this work would be cut off the payroll. They stated that in all probability most of the investigators would be used by working them into the over-all program of the FBI.

Mr. DONDERO. That means we would add 3,000 immediately to the Federal payroll.

Mr. JARMAN. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Am I right, however, in this, that representatives of the Bureau of Investigation gave us to understand that these men who are now doing this routine work are needed in other places for security reasons? In other words, they are going to need most of them to take care of security problems of the country rather than having them continue these routine cases; is not that about right?

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; that is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think that is the reason they are not being discharged.

Mr. JARMAN. I certainly would favor adding to the personnel of the FBI whatever is necessary to do the job.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement because he is one of those who himself was an investigator, and a very important one, during the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WITHROW. I think there is a misunderstanding. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] spoke in terms of the FBI having 3,000 men doing this work at the present time, when, as a matter of fact, they have 1,700 men doing this work at the present time.

Mr. JARMAN. Well, I have in that connection 2,191 employees, which includes both investigators and clerical help doing the work.

Mr. WITHROW. But the gentleman from Michigan had in mind that the FBI at the present time has 3,000 men doing this work. They have not.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman made the point it would certainly add to the Federal payroll, which I think is substantiated by every bit of the testimony of Chairman Ramspeck. I am sorry I do not have the opportunity to read it in full.

Mr. DONDERO. That is what I have in mind, we would be increasing the payroll.

Mr. JARMAN. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I sincerely hope you will consider this bill in terms of the millions of dollars of unnecessary expenditure to set up this new investigation agency, with less effectiveness and less efficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]

Aandahl	Gwinn	Murdock
Addonizio	Hall,	Murray, Wis.
Albert	Edwin Arthur	Norblad
Allen, Ill.	Hall,	O'Brien, Mich.
Anderson, Calif.	Leonard W.	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Halleck	Patman
Barden	Harden	Patterson
Battle	Harris	Potter
Beall	Harvey	Poulson
Blatnik	Hébert	Powell
Bolling	Hedrick	Radwan
Boykin	Heffernan	Rains
Brooks	Heller	Regan
Brown, Ohio	Herter	Riehlman
Brownson	Hillings	Rivers
Buchanan	Hinshaw	Roberts
Buckley	Hope	Rogers, Mass.
Burton	Horan	Roosevelt
Camp	Hull	Sabath
Cannon	Hunter	Sadlak
Carnahan	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hardie
Case	Javits	Sheehan
Celler	Judd	Short
Chatham	Kean	Sikes
Chudoff	Kee	Spence
Clevenger	Kennedy	Springer
Cole, Kans.	Kersten, Wis.	Steed
Combs	Kluczynski	Stigler
Cooley	Lantaff	Stockman
Coudert	Larcade	Sutton
Cox	Latham	Tackett
Crosser	McCarthy	Taylor
Curtis, Mo.	McGrath	Walter
Dawson	McKinnon	Weichel
Deane	Marshall	Welch
Dempsey	Martin, Iowa	Werdel
Dingell	Merrow	Whitten
Dollinger	Miller, Nebr.	Wickersham
Donovan	Mitchell	Widnall
Doyle	Morris	Wood, Ga.
Durham	Morrison	Woodruff
Fernandez	Morton	Yates
Gamble	Moulder	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 306 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 16 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know when I have encountered so much misunderstanding with reference to a piece of legislation as I have in the last couple of hours in respect to this particular bill now before us. I would like to direct your attention to the fact that this legislation does not deal with all of the employees in the Federal Government. It affects only a small percent. They are not all the most important at that. When you get the matter all sifted down you are dealing with only 15,000 out of over 2,500,000 jobs.

This matter of the FBI conducting complete examinations of Government employees was enacted into law under amendments to appropriation bills. This is one reason that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations, is disturbed about this matter.

At the outset perhaps this may be regarded as a question of policy. I am not one of those who would want to relieve J. Edgar Hoover of responsibilities that he ought to assume, but the FBI, as I understand it, was established not for the purpose of making investigations of Government employees excepting with respect to security and loyalty.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have only a few minutes, but because the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois, a former official and member of the FBI organization wants to ask me a question, I yield to him.

Mr. VELDE. I just wonder if the gentleman knows whether or not the change of FBI personnel over to the Civil Service Commission is in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report? Was anything mentioned in the Hoover Commission report on that?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not to my knowledge. I do not know of any recommendation in the Hoover report with respect to this particular matter. We are not relieving the FBI of its responsibility of examining into these cases with respect to loyalty or security. But may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that if we are going to adopt the policy of going into details with respect to the general qualifications of those in the Voice of America, foreign assistance, internal and world health organizations, Greece-Turkey aid, civil defense and so forth, then to be consistent the FBI should examine all of the qualifications of employees in our big defense agencies where people by the hundreds of thousands are employed.

Mr. VELDE. Will the gentleman agree this will increase the number of personnel involved in investigations instead of decreasing them?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman asked that question a while ago. That may be possible because J. Edgar Hoover and his assistants insist they need these agents who have been selected, trained, and qualified to conduct security investigations. They are going to be needed for much more important jobs than going out and making these preliminary and detailed investigations of those who are employed in the smaller jobs in the Government. According to testimony

submitted to the Committee the situation in this country has become such that almost every one of these men who are now trained and employed with the FBI, distinguished and qualified men, as is the gentleman from Illinois who is now asking questions, are needed for more important services than going along and examining detail that are not related to loyalty or our security. Do not forget that under this bill the FBI will continue to conduct loyalty and security investigations as they are doing now.

This Congress has over and over again expressed its confidence in J. Edgar Hoover and his work. Someone has intimated, and it was only an intimation, that J. Edgar Hoover may not have asked for this legislation. You may be assured the legislation would not be here if he were not, himself, supporting it. His personal letter on this point should settle that question.

I think the opposition is making a mountain out of a mole hill when you consider the comparatively small number of employees affected by this legislation. I agree that many examinations and investigations made by the Civil Service Commission or other agencies are not as good as they ought to be, but they are not affected by this legislation. If you want legislation to provide the FBI is to take over completely the examination of all these agencies, that is something else. That is a question of policy. But these have come in one at a time since 1948. They are not all the most important agencies in Government, but they do require time and effort and energy of men who are qualified to do more important things than make these preliminary investigations. Under this bill the FBI will continue to handle the investigations insofar as loyalty and security are concerned.

Mr. VELDE. I think the gentleman has very well stated his case and agrees with me that the general investigative staff of the Federal Government will be increased. Does the gentleman not agree with me that it would be better to have this increase in the investigative staff be under J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI, whom we all trust and admire and respect, than under any other Federal agency that is untried and untested?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Again I will answer the question by using almost the words of Mr. Hoover himself, who says that this is really outside of his area, that it is outside of his general field of investigation and he does not feel that his agency ought to be doing this kind of work when they have more than they can do in handling the thing for which they were originally assigned and for which their men are trained.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, who has given this matter a great deal of thought and study.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover is very emphatic on what he wants.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I definitely agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I read from his letter?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Because of lack of time I would rather he would ask a question, however I yield for his comment.

Mr. CANFIELD. In his letter does not Mr. Hoover stress the point that as this communistic threat develops he and his department will have to be devoting themselves to other directions, and he wants this job done by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is eminently correct in his statement. That is exactly what I tried to say a moment ago, that he has so much to do, and things of so much greater importance, and that responsibility is likely to grow even more important than it is this afternoon. He should not be using his time and energy and his assistants making little and detailed preliminary investigations. Let him devote his attention to the loyalty and security problems.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, who was also in a very responsible position dealing with security matters during his time in the military service. I am informed he rendered outstanding service to his country in investigatory work. I know too he would do a good job if he were now with J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. JARMAN. I will ask the gentleman why the FBI cannot set up a special personnel branch in the FBI, with perhaps FBI agents who are less trained, lesser specialists than the regular FBI agents to handle the personnel investigations which are routine, and perhaps even pay them less?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would say to the gentleman, if you are going to adopt that policy, then do it for other agencies but not pick out these smaller agencies we have listed here. Let us do it for the whole Government while we are about it, if that is the policy. I have gone into this as carefully as I could. I agree that I am supporting this bill to a considerable degree because of the views of the man who heads the FBI and in whom this House has great confidence. I feel that it is for the good of the country that this legislation be adopted. Do not misunderstand me. I find just as much fault, or criticism as many of the Members of the House with respect to the manner in which the investigations are being conducted by the agencies of our Government. They are not complete nor thorough in many cases. I hope to discuss that matter rather fully and completely later on. But they are not under this legislation. You are not saving money for taxpayers by opposing this bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I do not know what the reaction is in regard to other Members of the House, but I have followed the work of J. Edgar Hoover over many years. I have talked to so many people in regard to him, and their faith seems to be practically unlimited in J. Edgar Hoover, and because of that I would be inclined to follow his suggestions here in regard to placing this rather trivial load upon his shoulders as compared to the larger work which he has to do. I think if there is any objection here on the floor it is because of their confidence in J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his comment.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, one of the important members of our committee.

Mr. GROSS. What is trivial about a loyalty check, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. REES of Kansas. There is nothing trivial about it, of course not. Nobody, neither the FBI nor anybody else, is being relieved of his responsibility on loyalty checks. I think the gentleman well knows or should know that the FBI will continue to check the question of loyalty and security in these agencies which are comparatively small and employ only 15,000 persons out of 2,500,000 jobs.

Mr. GROSS. That is one of the reasons I am opposed to this bill, the duplication in it, which the gentleman is admitting here.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman is opposed to duplication, he certainly ought to support this bill. That is one reason why he ought to be in favor of this legislation. Over in Agriculture and Commerce, the War Department, the Navy Department, and others, they are checking their own employees, but over here, you say, J. Edgar Hoover's group is supposed to do all investigations. Of course the FBI will continue to.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I note the gentleman emphasizes some of the other agencies that are transferred by this act. However, the chairman of the committee stated that the one that was influenced the most by this legislation was the Atomic Energy Commission. In a commission whose activities are so secret that not even the Members of Congress are permitted to ask how they spend the money, why are we taking the check away from the FBI and giving it to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman will examine the bill, he will find there an amendment whereby they check 30,000 of them completely for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. BUDGE. The people of this Nation will feel that if it is not important enough for the FBI to do it, it is not important enough to be done.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I repeat that the FBI will continue not only to examine the question of loyalty and security of the 30,000, and make complete investigations, also applicants for approximately 5,000 other positions.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. With respect to the Atomic Energy Commission, if that Commission certifies that such positions are of an important nature, the FBI will carry on an investigation under that provision?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the Commission may from time to time certify such positions?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly.

Mr. COLE of New York. To whom does the Commission certify?

Mr. REES of Kansas. To the FBI.

Mr. COLE of New York. Or to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; to the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to loyalty.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then I can understand that if the Commission feels that all of its positions are of such critical importance that an investigation by the FBI must be had in the national interest, the Commission can accomplish that by certifying those positions?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It may do so.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this legislation primarily because it has the recommendation of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. I am one of those who has approved, in the past, the transfer of responsibilities of Govenment personnel investigations to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I did so with the belief that the efficient way in which the Bureau was administered was our best assurance that this inportant function of exploring the background of Government employees could thus be done most effectively and economically.

In the Eightieth Congress I introduced legislation, which passed the House, which would have provided by legislation procedures for loyalty investigations of Federal employees. As the Members know, the present loyalty program of the Government is carried out pursuant to an Executive order. It was my view and it subsequently has been proved wise and expedient, that questions of Federal employees' loyalty must be resolved in favor of the Government.

At the time my bill was introduced and approved by the House, this was one of the basic differences between my bill and the policy of the Government with respect to loyalty investigations as it was carried out under the Executive order.

Recently, a firmer and more realistic policy has been adopted whereby the Loyalty Board has been directed to resolve questions of doubt with regard to Federal employees' loyalty in favor of the Government. I have always felt, and still do, that procedures relating to this important program should be spelled out in legislation.

The responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with regard to the Federal employees' loyalty program remains unchanged under this bill. In fact, the bill provides some legislative authority and guidance for the policy whereby a Federal Government agency conducting personnel-type investigations shall refer these investigations to the Federal Bureau of Investigation where there is derogatory information indicating questionable loyalty.

This bill spells out the requirement now made by Executive order that in the investigations which will be transferred by this bill, whenever there is developed any data reflecting that the individual who is the subject of the investigation is of questionable loyalty, the Civil Service Commission refer the matter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of a full field investigation. Further, in the conduct of these investigations, the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation will be searched to determine if there is any derogatory information. I have been informed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that in the event derogatory information is developed at that point, the Bureau will retain jurisdiction of the case and immediately conduct a full field investigation.

I should like to point out to the Members the fact that there is a much wider area in our Federal Government in its conduct of personnel type of investigations where we should develop a similar legislative directive and that is in the thousands of personnel-type investigations conducted by the various departments and agencies.

I want to emphasize that we are here dealing with only a very small group of Federal employees—a group wherein Congress, in the past, has made investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation mandatory by statute. The total employment of the agencies covered by transfer represents only about 8 percent of the total Federal employees. In the remaining 92 percent the investigations are being conducted on a wholly unrelated pattern.

Recently there has been a trend toward farming out these personnel-type investigations by contract to credit agencies similar to a procedure carried on during the war. In my judgment, and I raised this question in the hearing, the whole field of personnel type of investigations should be explored so that Congress may be informed as to exactly what the situation is so that a policy can be stated.

I urge the House to approve this legislation, first, because prompt action is needed to relieve the Federal Bureau of Investigation from a burdensome case load of investigations of a type somewhat unrelated to their primary mission, which is to safeguard the internal security of the United States. The record will show that the internal security work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has increased 531 percent since 1947.

Secondly, consistent with my policy of following the recommendations of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover with regard to legislative requirements concerning the work of his agency, I concur in his recommendation favoring this bill.

Third, I cannot help but appreciate that we are here spelling out, at least in one area, the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the field of Federal employees loyalty.

Fourth, we are making a start, at least, in a program which I hope eventually will result in uniform procedures for the personnel type of investigation being conducted throughout the Government. There will also be opportunity to save a great deal of manpower and also save a substantial sum of money for the taxpayers of this country.

This will result in an improvement not only by uniformity but also will avoid a duplication of investigations and an undue harassment of persons who are being contacted from many Federal sources where someone has given their names as references on applications filed with a number of different agencies.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably absent from the House in the voting on House Resolution 539, to investigate the Katyn Forest massacre. Had I been here I would have voted for the investigation.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, all of us here appreciate the excellent work Mr. Hoover has done. He is asking us to help him so that his organization will not be bogged down with the type of investigation of which he is asking to be relieved. He does not want to be a part of a retail credit investigating organization.

No other agency of the Government is equipped with the facilities and trained personnel required for the fulfillment of the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to the detention and apprehension of criminals and the control of espionage, sabotage, and other subversive activities. Mr. Hoover is just asking us to relieve his men of the type of investigation covered by this bill, so his men may have the time to attend to the work the Congress of the United States assigned to him and his men. He has done his best, and we are proud of the record he has made. He wishes very much to be relieved of these other activities that he thinks are trivial or nearly so, trivial as compared with the major work that has to be done.

These times are so very important in the history of the world that he needs his men to be used to do the type of job his bureau was established to do. In view of present world conditions, then, it is likely that the responsibilities of the Bureau of Investigation in the field of internal security will continue to increase tremendously, requiring the assignment of additional personnel to this type of work and resulting in a reduced number of persons and facilities being available for applicant-type investigations.

Actually, it was never intended that the Federal Bureau of Investigation should be utilized for such personnel or applicant-type investigations. Such investigations more properly fall within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

I wish you would note these increasing case loads that I am giving you. This

will show you very clearly in statistical form why Mr. Hoover is asking for this relief.

On July 1, 1950, there were 58,671 cases. On January 1, 1951—notice this is just a short time, a half year—indicative of the urgent need for this legislation is the fact that on July 1, 1950, the Federal Bureau of Investigation had a total of 58,671 pending investigative matters, while on January 1, 1951, only 6 months later, it had 114,595 pending investigative matters, an increase of over 95 percent.

You can see the reason why this is so important. No good executive wants to constantly get further and further behind in his investigations where he has these men out investigating trivial matters, and here are major matters that have to be investigated. No good executive wants that type of thing to happen.

On July 1, 1951, again 6 months later, the Federal Bureau of Investigation had a total of 125,276 pending investigative matters. Moreover, of 344,599 investigative matters received by the Federal Bureau of Investigation during the 6 months from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, 139,022, 40 percent were applicant-type investigations directed by acts of Congress such as those to which reference has been made above.

Notice 40 percent of the work. You have changed the whole idea of the FBI, and changed it so much until 40 percent of a new type of work was dumped into it, and allowed to interfere with the work that the Congress of the United States has established for Mr. Hoover, and his excellent FBI to perform.

From January 1, 1951, to July 1, 1951, 431,061 investigative matters were received by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of which 200,951, or 46.6 percent, were applicant-type investigations. It should be noted that the figures for applicant-type investigations do not include investigations conducted under the loyalty program.

It is, therefore, urged that legislation be enacted relieving the Federal Bureau of Investigation of its responsibilities for conducting applicant-type investigations by transferring those responsibilities to the Civil Service Commission. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, of course, would continue to check against its files the names and fingerprints of applicants for Federal appointment, and furnish any pertinent information thus discovered. The Bureau would also receive for its files the fingerprints of all persons applying for positions in the executive branch of the Government. Under this plan the Federal employee loyalty program would be uniformly applied to all agencies, and the Bureau would continue to perform all of the functions, including the making of full field investigations, required of it by that program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything on this bill, but there have been so many FBI experts talking about it, that I thought I would like to give my version of it. When we passed the McCarran bill, a great many Republicans thought I had lost my head entirely because I voted against it. But I told you then in a speech I made that you were going to drive these Communists underground, and when you did, it would take twice the amount of energy to find out what is going on than it would if you left them out. That is what the Congress did. It drove the Communists, every Communist in the United States underground, and Mr. Hoover is trying to find out where they are. Everyone of these 900 people who are now working on this preliminary work are needed in the FBI to ferret out the activities of the Communists in this country. You know very well my views on that—that I think the first line of defense in America is right here in the United States. It is not in England or across the seven seas. It is right here. When conditions get bad enough in the United States, the Communists will be here without coming by boat. They are potentially here now. This is important work to find out what this underground organization is doing in America. Do you want to take Mr. Hoover's energy away from him? These 900 men he says he is now using on this preliminary work are trained men. I see them sitting around here in this Congress. They are trained. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] is a trained investigator. If he is not in the Congress, he is in the FBI, and if he is not in the FBI, he is in Congress. Do you want the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] sitting in his office, putting out preliminary reports on these employees of the Government like I do in North Dakota? We have a few of them who have passed examinations from North Dakota. The FBI comes to me and asks about their loyalty. Well, all I give them is the background, and I am giving the truth.

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

Mr. BURDICK. I mentioned the gentleman, and of course I have to take care of him.

Mr. VELDE. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. Does not the gentleman agree that if these investigations are necessary, and I think we will all concede they are, even though it might be considered by some to be trivial investigations, J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI are just as qualified to handle them and to administer the handling of these functions as any other department of the Government?

Mr. BURDICK. I knew the gentleman would ask a question that would have to be answered "Yes."

If you want to get the FBI so top-heavy, so lopsided that it will be the biggest agency in the Government and be incompetent in all things, you can do that; but if you want it to be a special agency of highly trained personnel to do what is necessary to be done at this time in the history of our country, do not load them up with so many unnecessary burdens.

When I certify any one of these Federal employees they need go no further, for I would not certify anyone whom I did not know or who I did not know was worthy. I know him, I know his father, I know his mother; and that is as far back as we need to go. That should be the end of it. What is the use of running to the FBI and having them do the same thing? For they will not find anything different than I reported. Why not let some other agency of the Government do 97 percent of this preliminary work?

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

Mr. BURDICK. Certainly.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman know that the Civil Service Commission says it will take about 3,000 more employees in the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BURDICK. That is right; I think so.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman also know that the FBI clearance has always been 100 percent perfect and that the Civil Service Commission clearance has been bad in many instances? If the FBI needs more help we will give them more help.

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

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. VELDE. That might be very true. The gentleman mentioned the McCarran-Wood bill as being responsible for driving the Communists underground in this country. The gentleman might be right on that.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, am I right or not?

Mr. VELDE. Will the gentleman agree with me that it is more important that the FBI check these applications for employment and thus weed them out before they get into Government than to have to investigate them as security cases after they get in?

Mr. BURDICK. But about 97 percent of them do not need any investigation, and the 3 percent that get in will still be investigated by the FBI and can be investigated before they are employed.

Mr. VELDE. But some would never get there.

Mr. GROSS. Could not that be ascertained by the Civil Service Commission by using a 3-cent stamp?

Mr. BURDICK. You can let the FBI do this if you want to but if they use their force of trained men on this then we will have to give them more men; that is all.

Mr. JENSEN. I am in favor of it.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am 100 percent in favor of the bill. I think that in voting for it we should keep in mind the fact that there are two different types of investigation about which we are talking: One type of investigation is nonsensitive; the other is the sensitive type. Regardless of what agency is concerned, the sensitive type of job to be filled will be investigated by the FBI; the nonsensitive will be investigated by the Civil Service Commission. We all know that it is rather ridiculous for us to have to give a full FBI investigation to a mailman who delivers mail on a city beat, or to a county agent out in some agricultural district, to give

him a full FBI investigation the same as you would to a person that is going to handle highly restricted data in a sensitive agency such as the CIA or the Atomic Energy Commission.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I prefer not to; I have only 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I want to speak particularly with reference to the Atomic Energy Commission and say that the bill retains all the safeguards that are necessary for the Atomic Energy Commission to obtain full FBI investigation of all those people who are in sensitive work or who have access to restricted data of the Atomic Energy Commission. It will however be relieved of the obligation to require a full FBI investigation of those people who are working for contractors, building these immense projects such as the one at Savannah, Ga., which have nothing at all to do with secret construction. That work is merely putting in the streets, building the houses for personnel, building the buildings wherein secret machinery will later on be installed. The employees who install the secret machinery and who operate secret type of machinery will have the full FBI investigation. But at the present time some sixty or seventy thousand construction workers and other types of low-grade labor—and in speaking of low-grade labor I mean low-grade from the standpoint of being low in the wage scale or low from the standpoint of having access to security data—the FBI will be relieved of spending their valuable time and their valuable trained personnel in investigating these people who are no loyalty risk to our country.

I think all of us appreciate the tremendous prestige and the high qualifications of the men in the FBI. We should leave them free to do the work of that Bureau, where their work will do most for the security of the United States. We should relieve them of a lot of this routine work concerning the labor type of employees or the lower class of employees in the Government who do not have access to secret data or restricted data, and let them do the job which is the most valuable for them to do for the security of our Nation. I am heartily in favor of this bill and I hope it will be passed.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from California does not want the House to believe that every applicant for a mail carrier's job is investigated by the FBI? Surely the gentleman does not want that to stand.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Practically every Government employee is now investigated, and I can give you plenty of instances of people who are in no more security work than a mail carrier being given a full time investigation by the FBI. It is silly and ridiculous. We are not so scared in this country of communism that we are going to hide under the bed and require ditch diggers to have a full FBI investigation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very sensible bill and I certainly commend the committee for bringing it to the attention of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, has the rule been adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. A long while ago.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the bill open to amendment now?

The CHAIRMAN. We are considering it under general debate.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of confusion has crept into this discussion. There has been a lot of apprehension expressed here as to what this bill is going to do. I have listened to the debate very closely and in my opinion I have wondered what I could tell the membership that has not been said. So I thought I would go back to part of the "bible" of the hearing and read from the letter of the man who all have paid great tribute to this afternoon, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Hear his words and on that I think we can rest our case.

I read from a letter to the chairman of this committee by J. Edgar Hoover in which he expressed regret that he could not appear personally before the committee. Starting with the third paragraph Mr. Hoover states, and I ask your attention to these words:

> Faced with a mounting case load in December 1950, I urged the Attorney General to seek legislation which would relieve us from making personnel types of investigation. At the same time we discontinued making such investigations for several other agencies of government which we had been making as a matter of cooperation on a reimbursable basis for some period of time.

I call your attention to and want to underline the words "I urged the Attorney General" to do this.

Further quoting from Mr. Hoover's letter:

> In view of the growing international tension, the prosecutions which have been initiated against Communist Party leaders which, for practical purposes have forced the Communist Party underground, and the potential threat of the Communist Party to the security of the United States, it has been necessary for us to detail more and more manpower to handle internal security investigations.

I would like to call attention to his next sentence, and remember this is J. Edgar Hoover speaking:

> Experience has demonstrated that an agency such as the FBI is at its highest peak of efficiency when it is kept mobile and does not become too large.
>
> I do not believe that an organization such as the FBI should have the function of making so-called personnel types of investigation although, under the proposed legislation, the FBI will continue to make name checks, loyalty investigations and, in the event any information is obtained by the Civil Service Commission in its investigation reflecting disloyal activities, the matter will then be referred to the FBI to make a full field investigation. In addition, the act as enacted by the Senate authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of Mutual Security, or the Secretary of State, whichever the case may be, to call upon the FBI to investigate highly sensitive positions.

We surrender nothing.

Further quoting:

> I was also compelled by another consideration to urge the Attorney General to seek this legislation; namely, should the present emergency become more tense or should the underground organization of the Communist Party embark upon an active program of sabotage, I am sure you can appreciate that all of our energies would of necessity have to be directed to meeting this threat. While there is still time, it is my considered judgment that the best interest of the United States can be served by equipping the Civil Service Commission to handle personnel types of investigation. As a practical consideration, the Civil Service Commission is already handling personnel types of investigation for other equally sensitive agencies and it would appear that in the interest of uniformity and good administration the Civil Service Commission should be empowered to handle this type of investigation.

Mr. Chairman, I join you in paying tribute to J. Edgar Hoover, and I call your attention again to the fact that the words that I have read are his and not mine. They come directly from and express the considered judgment of J. Edgar Hoover.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 10 (b) (5) (B) (i) and (B) (ii) of the act of August 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 755), entitled "An act for the development and control of atomic energy"; section 1 (2) of the act of May 22, 1947 (61 Stat. 103), entitled "An act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey"; section 1 of the joint resolution of May 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 125), entitled "Joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war"; section 3 (e) of the act of August 5, 1947 (61 Stat. 780), entitled "An act to provide for the reincorporation to the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes"; section 1001 of the act of January 27, 1948 (62 Stat. 6), entitled "An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations"; section 110 (c) of the act of April 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 137), entitled "An act to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through economic, financial, and other measures necessary to the maintenance of conditions abroad in which free institutions may survive and consistent with the maintenance of the strength and stability of the United States"; section 2 of the act of June 14, 1948 (62 Stat. 441), entitled "Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor"; section 3 of the act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1151), entitled "Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the constitution of the International Labor Organization instrument of

amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States"; subsection (c) of section 15 of the act of May 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 149), entitled "An act to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes"; section 3 (e) of the act of August 11, 1950 (64 Stat. 438), entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an office of civil defense, and for other purposes"; and section 510 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, are amended by striking therefrom, wherever they appear, the words "Federal Bureau of Investigation" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Civil Service Commission": *Provided*, That in the event an investigation made pursuant to any of the above statutes as herein amended develops any data reflecting that the individual who is the subject of the investigation is of questionable loyalty, the Civil Service Commission shall refer the matter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of a full field investigation, the results of which shall be furnished to the Civil Service Commission for its information and appropriate action: *Provided further*, That, if the President deems it to be in the national interest, he may from time to time cause investigations of any group or class which are required by any of the above statutes, to be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation rather than the Civil Service Commission: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 10 (b) (5) (B) (i) and (ii) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and section 510 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended by this act, a majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of Mutual Security, or the Secretary of State, as the case may be, shall certify those specific positions which are of a high degree of importance or sensitivity, and upon such certification the investigation and reports required by such provisions or by any other laws, amended by the first section of this act shall, in the case of such positions, be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation rather than the Civil Service Commission.

SEC. 2. The transfer of investigative functions hereinbefore provided for shall be effectuated during the period commencing with the date of the approval of this act and terminating 180 days thereafter, it being the intent of the Congress that the said transfer be effectuated as expeditiously within that period of time as the Civil Service Commission shall consider the facilities of that Commission adequate to undertake all or any part of the functions herein transferred: *Provided, however*, That investigations pending with the Federal Bureau of Investigation at the expiration of the 180 days shall be completed in due course by that Bureau and reports thereof furnished to the Civil Service Commission for its information and appropriate action.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any way the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for investigations of espionage, sabotage, or subversive acts.

SEC. 4. In order to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act, appropriations available to the departments or agencies, on whose account investigations are made pursuant to the statutes amended by section 1 of this act, shall be available for advances or reimbursements directly to the applicable appropriations of the Civil Service Commission, or of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the cost of investigations made for such departments or agencies.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, since I made reference to the remarks of Chairman Ramspeck, of the Civil Service Commission, when I spoke under general debate, I would like, without yielding, because of the time element, to continue with what I think the House should hear and consider before casting a final vote on this important bill.

Bear in mind that this is the agency that will assume the investigation load if we pass this bill. It will take it over from the FBI.

Chairman Ramspeck, in part, says this:

It is estimated that the Civil Service Commission will assume a workload of approximately 82,000 cases. A workload of this magnitude will require that the Commission employ approximately 1,980 additional investigators and 990 additional clerical personnel, or a total of 2,970 additional employees. Mr. Chairman, as an indication of the magnitude of the job being transferred to the Commission under S. 2077, if it is passed, I would like to point out that the Commission now employs a total of approximately 4,000 employees to carry out all of its functions. * * *

The investigation of the large number of applicants necessary to provide for the selection of 1,980 new investigators will greatly tax the resources of our present investigative staff. Our present staff of 275 investigators must absorb this work in addition to their present heavy load. Besides carrying on our current investigative work this staff will be called upon to investigate perhaps as many as 4,000 candidates for investigator positions and assist in the training of the 1,980 selected.

Bear in mind this paragraph that I read you on the money involved in making this change. Chairman Ramspeck says this as to the financing of the program:

We estimate that it will cost between $225 and $250 to process a case. Assuming a workload of approximately 82,000 cases for the fiscal year 1953, the total cost of making the investigations will be about $20,000,000.

I interpose at that point just this comment: That the FBI has allocated the sum of $14,000,000 to do exactly the same amount of work, a difference of $6,000,000.

I continue Chairman Ramspeck's statement:

It is estimated that we will incur expenses of $7,000,000 for training and costs of actual production prior to the time we can expect to start recovering these costs from the various agencies. * * *

On the basis of the best information we have at this time we believe that the initial amount of the revolving fund should be established at $8,000,000. We think that we can finance the security investigation program, including organization costs, with that amount.

He says that the program can be financed with a revolving fund of approximately $5,000,000, once it has been established as a going operation.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, bear in mind the increased cost per case of investigation and the over-all tremendous increase, not in thousands but in several millions of dollars that this change would entail. I sincerely hope that you will keep this in mind when you cast your vote on this bill. I had the distinct impression when I heard Mr. Ramspeck testify before our committee that he was not sold himself, and his statement to the committee did not sell me on the justification for making this change at greater expense and less efficiency.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the crux of the matter on this proposition that I oppose comes from the fact that the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission has asked for a revolving fund that he estimates may be $8,000,000 and can eventually be reduced to about $5,000,000. That is about the difference in the cost of making these investigations. The thing they do not tell you is that if you leave this with the FBI, with the new duties imposed on it by the conditions Mr. J. Edgar Hoover anticipates in his letter, that his organization will have to expand to pick up the load. There will be some increased cost because of the expanding of FBI, of course; there will be an increased initial cost to the Civil Service Commission in picking up this load.

If you read the testimony in the hearings you will see that Mr. Joseph Winslow—and those of you who know personnel work respect Mr. Winslow, as a former member of the Bureau of the Budget and now Assistant Executive Director of the Civil Service Commission, for his fine knowledge of this subject—tells you that this cited cost of $250 will decrease with time. That is about the maximum to shoot at with a new agency. As they become more proficient that will go down. He tells you also in here that there have been cases where the FBI has charged far less or far more, depending on the type of case that is investigated.

Mr. Chairman, I think again the whole crux of the matter is this: It reverts back to where you are going to have the work done, whether you are going to keep the FBI mobile and small enough to be efficient or whether under the guise of false economy you are going to demagogically wish upon Mr. J. Edgar Hoover work that he tells you he does not want and work the very nature of which will impede the proper functioning of his agency.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, certainly there are two questions that are not in dispute. One is our admiration for the efficiency and integrity of J. Edgar Hoover. The other is the same feeling for our former colleague, Mr. Ramspeck, who heads the Civil Service Commission at this time.

Apparently this legislation is proposed because Mr. Hoover does not want to extend his activities, and I gather, too, from the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] that Mr. Ramspeck is not anxious for the job. It will cost something like $6,000,000 more money if the task is given to Civil Service. Of course, Civil Service will not always be under Mr. Ramspeck, so just as an illustration of what has happened before, permit me to give you a little information from a hearing, not that I know

anything about it—I am just reading it—that was held in 1947, when Mr. Mitchell was President of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Flemming was on the Commission, Miss Frances Perkins was the other member of the Commission. At that time they were on the Commission, and appeared as witnesses. The Civil Service Commission at that time had a file of 750,000 cards about civil-service employees; and others who were not Federal employees. You will be surprised to know, they had on those cards the names of Congressmen, of Senators and of Senator's wives.

Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY] that his name was not one of them, but my name was, as were the names of other Members of the House and Senate.

Permit a repetition: They had the names of Congressmen, Senators, and Senators' wives who were not Federal employees. They had all kinds of reported information about them. They were about to make a sound recording so that some politicians who had access to that special secret file could use the gossip to get some of the Members in the next election.

So we had the Commissioners up, or they came up, before a committee; and do you know where they got the information they had on those cards? It is in the record here. Here it is. Note, they got it from a law firm in New York named Mintzer & Levy, 39 Broadway, New York City.

Some of those cards had on them the word "Nazi"; some the word "Communist"; both referring to Senators and Congressmen. That is what they had at that time. The Commissioners all said that they did not know that file was in existence. They testified the investigations were made by individual investigators. Somebody who had a job apparently because there was nothing else to do had gone out and somewhere got some more names and then collected a lot of information or, more accurately, gossip and rumors, about those individuals whose names they picked up either from the press or anywhere and everywhere. After some Members of a House committee had seen some of the cards, the committee asked that the cards be produced or committee members be permitted to examine the file.

The Commission said, "We will not let you look at those files." The congressional committee asked again if they could have a look at what was in them. Then the President took a hand, and, under date of October 21, 1947, denied the committee the right to examine the file.

Do not forget, the Civil Service Commission's investigators got many of these names and this information from this New York firm of attorneys which was working for the Anti-Defamation League and other organizations.

Permit me to quote from the report—page 2:

It appeared from some of the index cards that considerable material had been transcribed from the private files of Mintzer & Levy, a firm of lawyers having offices at 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (hearings, p. 4).

Material transcribed from this source by the Civil Service Commission was cataloged under a special warning as follows:

"The above was copied from the marine loyalty suspect list of the subversive files in possession of Attorneys Mintzer & Levy, 39 Broadway, New York City, room 3305. Their files were made up in cooperation with the American-Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League. The source of this information must not be disclosed under any circumstances or be quoted. However, further information concerning the above may be obtained by contacting the offices of Mintzer & Levy."

There is no evidence to indicate that such material was checked, verified, or in any way tested before being transferred to the official files of the Civil Service Commission.

Quotations on some of the cards relating to various Members of the House and Senate were in these words (hearings, pp. 17–25):

"Nazi.

"See files at Friends of Democracy, Inc.

"Addressed the first convention of the National Lawyers' Guild, February 20–22, 1937.

"Various issues in organization file."

It was the purpose of the committee's investigation to ascertain, first, by what authority hearsay information—which might reflect upon the reputation of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and persons who were not applicants for Federal jobs—was collected and maintained, not only in the office of the Commission in Washington but in its several regional offices as well.

You see what had happened? These individual employees of the Civil Service Commission, without the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission or anyone else in authority, just grabbed a lot of names, collected some rumors, some gossip, put it on cards, and then when Congressmen wanted to find out what was in that file, the House committee was told by the President that it could not examine the file even though it carried the names of some Members of Congress as either Nazis or Communists.

A letter reading as follows was sent to the President:

OCTOBER 8, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Hearings held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments disclosed that there was in the possession of the Civil Service Commission a file containing statements bearing upon the views, opinions, and activities of certain-named Senators, Senators' wives, and Congressmen.

Members of the Civil Service Commission appeared before the subcommittee and stated the Commission had no authority to obtain such information, nor to maintain such a file. The members of the Commission voluntarily stated the information would be removed from the files. They also stated that prior to the matter being called to their attention on Friday, October 3, they had no knowledge that such a file existed, and that they had no knowledge of its contents.

Reliable information has come to the subcommittee that a permanent, sound record was to be made of this information which statements, in the file disclosed, were obtained from various organizations, some of which are admittedly subversive, and a number of which are unreliable.

The subcommittee asked for a subpena to be issued calling for the production of this file insofar as it contains statements relating to Members of Congress. The request contained in the subpena was refused by the Commission on the ground that the file was confidential and its disclosure could only be obtained by an Executive order.

The subcommittee also asked that a member of the committee, or its representative, or a representative of Congress, be permitted to go through that portion of the file which carried statements as to Members of Congress. This request was refused on the grounds above stated.

Will you kindly issue an order authorizing the Commission to open this file to the inspection of a committee member or their representative.

Faithfully yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN, *Chairman.*

The President replied:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 21, 1947.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I have your letter of October 8, 1947, with respect to a certain file of the Civil Service Commission. Your letter states that the Commission has refused to make this file available to your committee.

I am advised that these records were maintained by the Civil Service Commission on a confidential basis. There is nothing in your letter which would indicate that the Commission was not justified in classifying them as confidential nor am I justified in overruling the Commission on the facts presented by your letter.

I believe that it is in the public interest to keep Civil Service Commission records confidential, in the absence of a compelling reason to the contrary in a particular case. In the circumstances presented, I do not believe that I should interfere with the Commission's refusal to make these records public.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Transfer this power to the Commission and the investigators of the Civil Service Commission can go out and rake up all the rumors and charges they can find or imagine, put them on the record, dish them out for political purposes, and then when a congressional committee comes along and attempts to stop the use of that false, vilifying report, recording, or the circulation of that kind of information, the President may say, as he said before, that it was none of a congressional committee's business. They can vilify us, they can slander us, they can, as they did, misuse us and abuse us, make a record of vilification for political purposes, use their slanderous, libelous rumors and gossip.

They can put it in their files down there as official and turn it over to the political supporters of the administration and we are not permitted to show its falsity. We learn what it is when it is printed. I am not telling you what may, might, or could happen under civil service. I am telling you what did happen. For myself, I want no more of it. Moreover, you should know what happens when an agency investigates itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOW: After line 2 on page 5, add a new section to read as follows:

"All findings, records, and reports made or compiled by the Civil Service Commission under this act shall be made available to the committees of the Congress upon the request of such committee."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is germane. In checking the bill itself, we find we are considering acts having to do with the control of atomic energy, assistance to Greece, the joint resolution providing for relief and assistance to people of countries devastated by war, and the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and many other such items. It seems to me from the bill itself in setting up this agency, Congress has a right at the same time to say that the records and findings of the committee that is being set up now should be made available to the committees of the Congress when the committee so requests.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FORAND). The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Ohio has offered an amendment to the bill S. 2077. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] makes a point of order against the amendment on the grounds that it is not germane. The Chair has examined both the bill and the amendment, and can see no good reason for the claim that the amendment is not germane, and for that reason overrules the point of order.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan who has just preceded me, I think, has made a splendid argument as to the reason why this amendment should be adopted. Those of us who have in the past been associated with committees of the Congress in attempting to carry out the will of the Congress in their mandates to us to secure information and to file proper reports in Congress, have run across a denial many times of the agencies to permit us to use material which the Congress is entitled to have.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take my full time to discuss this matter, for I feel every Member of the Congress is familiar with the difficulties we have in trying to carry out the duties that we have imposed upon us. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have always felt that there is a very sharp line of demarcation between the legislative and administrative branches of Government, and I think it is well to keep that line of demarcation. This to me is an encroachment on the administrative branch of the Government. We have heard all about the people whose names are on these lists. They might be there, and I assume they are. I think other names have been bandied about by people in Congress and out of Congress; that also is deplorable, and I know that you agree with me. But let me point out to you that it is going to be costly to set up the necessary facilities and personnel to supply the data to the Congress when, as, and if it might be requested. It would always have to be kept up to date or an agency would be subject to a great deal of criticism. I believe the tendency has been away from demanding participation in the executive branch of Government by the legislative. I think this is poor legislation, and I hope it is voted down.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the people throughout the breadth and length of the United States will be glad to learn that there is one agency of Government and a man heading that agency here in Washington in whom every Member of Congress has confidence: I refer to the FBI and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. But I think there are some things that need a little clarification, some statements that have been made during debate on this bill.

Under this bill, if it passes, everyone seeking employment in any agency of the Federal Government will be checked; the FBI will check their files to see if there is a card with derogatory information on the individual; they will check fingerprints; and if they find anything derogatory in their file they will make a full field investigation on the individual. The purpose of the bill is to relieve the FBI of this tremendous load of checking the thousands and thousands of employees on whom it is not necessary to have loyalty or security checks, letting that be done by another agency of Government.

I am glad to hear some of the Members arguing against this bill on the ground of economy. I think I am as economy-minded as any man in the House; at least I was one of a few who was given a hundred percent voting record for economy last year by the survey of State councils of the chambers of commerce. It has been pointed out that additional expense will be put on the Civil Service Commission if this bill passes; that is probably true. But the way to get economy is not to put this additional load on the Civil Service Commission, but to eliminate some of the agencies of Government altogether or at least cut them down by 50 percent, get rid of unnecessary personnel, get rid of a part of this bureaucracy that has been built up in the Federal Government.

As to the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], I think there are many reasons why this amendment should be adopted. There are thousands and thousands of individuals in hundreds of agencies of the Government who have access to the loyalty and security files of individuals, while not a single Member or a single committee of Congress, the duly elected representatives of the people, have access to them. You have heard a lot from constituents and from colleagues here on the floor about directives of the President keeping this information from the regularly constituted committees of Congress and from Members of Congress. If you mean what you say in the cloakrooms, if you concur with the constituents who have written you on the subject, and if you want to retrieve some of the powers to yourself that have over the years been given to the executive branch of the Government, you will support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Yes, I am as familiar as any of the others with this whole Civil Service Commission set-up. We went into the matter in the Eightieth Congress when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] was chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and the loyalty boards in the various departments of the Government and the Loyalty Review Board in the Civil Service Commission were set up. If the Civil Service Commission had carried out its responsibilities as it should have, we would not have had so many Communists, fellow travelers, and disloyal people in Government. If we are going to let President Truman and Dean Acheson make decisions on loyalty and security of individuals after the various agencies, including the FBI, have spent millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money on this work, then we had better eliminate the entire program.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson and President Truman are making a mockery and fraud out of the so-called loyalty program set up to rid the Government of employees who are of questionable loyalty and security risk. With every passing day I am becoming more convinced that they are more interested in saving face than they are in dismissing these questionable characters. Either the Secretary of State and the President are unwilling or unable to purge the Government service of persons of questionable loyalty.

The newspapers of Wednesday, March 5, 1952, carried a story to the effect that Secretary of State Dean Acheson announced he had overruled the findings of the State Department Loyalty and Security Board that Oliver Edmund Clubb was a security risk. If this were the complete story, Secretary Acheson's statement would hardly be worthy of comment, but the admission of Mr. Acheson was apparently made from fear that the State Department's appropriations for the coming fiscal year might meet some opposition.

The State Department on February 11, 1952, announced:

> After Mr. Clubb's case was processed through the loyalty and security channel of the Department he was cleared on both loyalty and security and restored to active duty on February 8.

Let us start at the beginning. Last June Mr. Clubb was suspended by the State Department pending a decision as to his loyalty to the very Government that had employed him since July 1, 1928. Mr. Clubb appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on March 14, 1951, August 20, 1951, and again on August 23, 1951, and was questioned about his visits to the office of New Masses in New York City, and his association with Agnes Smedley, Philip Jaffee, Frederick V. Field, Owen Lattimore, and others.

On February 12, 1952, the State Department announced that Mr. Clubb was "absolutely cleared" on all loyalty and security grounds and restored to duty the previous Friday—February 8. Mr. Clubb resigned February 11, 1952.

In an appearance before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on Feb-

ruary 27, 1952, Owen Lattimore, longtime friend of Clubb, proclaimed that he, John Carter Vincent, John Stewart Service, and Oliver Edmund Clubb had been made the victims of hysteria. This outburst from Mr. Lattimore prompted Senator FERGUSON to charge that Clubb had been cleared by Secretary of State Acheson after the State Department Loyalty and Security Board had found against him.

On February 28, 1952 Secretary Acheson told a reporter, "I won't talk about the case."

Several days later Deputy Under Secretary of State Carlisle Humelsine appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee. When asked about the Clubb case Mr. Humelsine was evasive. When requested to produce the documents in the Clubb case Mr. Humelsine excused himself on the grounds that an executive order forbade him to give the Senate access to loyalty files. Mr. Humelsine was warned that unless he complied with the request the Appropriations Committee might have to refuse to consider the Department's appropriation. Mr. Humelsine then referred the matter to the Secretary of State with the result that Mr. Acheson admitted that he had reversed his loyalty and security board and cleared Mr. Clubb.

What is the result of Mr. Acheson's unusual action? Mr. Clubb was suspended in June of last year and restored on order of the Secretary of State in February of this year. During that time he rendered no service to the Government, yet the result of Mr. Acheson's action in overruling his loyalty and security board means that Mr. Clubb collects his full salary for all the time he was suspended and for which he rendered no service.

That is but one point worthy of comment. Another is the manner in which the Clubb case was handled by the State Department. On February 11 the State Department announced that Mr. Clubb had been fully cleared. Such an announcement could only be interpreted as meaning that Mr. Clubb had been cleared by the State Department Loyalty and Security Board.

The State Department announcement was nothing more than a calculated attempt to deceive the public, an announcement tainted with dishonesty. What could have been the reason for Secretary's Acheson's refusal to reveal the true facts? Could it have been that he made a deal with Mr. Clubb to reinstate him on condition that he immediately resign, having in mind that the loyalty review board might consider the Clubb case in the same light as the John Stewart Service case? Or could it have been that Mr. Acheson felt duty bound to reverse his loyalty and security board for fear that the decision of the board would lend support to the oft-repeated allegations of the junior Senator from Wisconsin that the State Department was infiltrated with pinkos of all shades?

Whatever the reason, the word for it is dishonesty. One thing Mr. Acheson has evidently not learned and that is he must deal honestly and candidly with the public. It took the courage of a Member of the United States Senate to expose what apparently is the answer to the question as to why the State Department has not released a single employee under the present Government employee loyalty program.

On December 12, 1951, the Loyalty Review Board reversed the decision of the findings of the Loyalty and Security Board of the State Department in the case of John Stewart Service, and dismissed him on the grounds of questionable loyalty. After which, Mr. Service appealed to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, to reverse the findings of the Loyalty Review Board. This appeal to the President by Mr. Service has been on Mr. Truman's desk for 2 months. Why does the President hesitate to back up his Loyalty Review Board which he set up to pass on just such cases as John Stewart Service, especially after spending millions and millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to establish these procedures?

If the President is sincere in what he has been telling the people regarding his intentions to rid the agencies of Government of people of questionable loyalty and security risk, why should he have to hestitate a single day in refusing to consider Mr. Service's appeal to him?

I have, on many occasions over a long period of years, called attention of the Members of Congress to my doubt of the sincerity of both the President and Secretary of State regarding many cases. The way the Service and Clubb cases have been handled only tends to substantiate my opinion. If we are going to let the Secretary of State or the President overrule boards which have been set up to pass on these matters, I, for one, do not believe we should squander the taxpayers' money any longer on these programs unless they get the cooperation they deserve from the executive branch of the Government.

From my own personal investigations I am satisfied that panels sitting in judgment on loyalty cases, in most instances, where individuals who have been named by Senator JOE MCCARTHY are involved do not arrive at their conclusions on the evidence in the files, but rather by throwing every possible road block in the way of Senator MCCARTHY'S charges being substantiated. It is my opinion that the members of the panels are not resolving the cases in favor of the Government but against Senator MCCARTHY. Is it any wonder that I say that by the record I still insist that the way the President and the Secretary of State are permitting the loyalty investigations to be conducted and determined is a fraud and hoax upon the public.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak on the bill which I think is an undesirable one and I will make some remarks about that a little later. For a few minutes I desire to speak upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Personally, I do not believe an amendment of this character is necessary. The Congress has through its subpena power and its investigative function the right to obtain documents from the executive branch of the Government at all times without passing any law. The President has raised the question with respect to various committees by instructing subordinates in the executive branch of the Government not to give papers and documents to committees of the Congress and sometimes has ordered those documents to be transferred to his own personal possession. The Congress up to this point has not pressed the issue.

This question is not a new one. It is a question of extreme delicacy involving the separation of governmental powers under our constitutional system. Some time the question will have to be faced. I hope it will be faced squarely by the Congress and that we will not back away from it. Up to the present time the question has been avoided by both the executive branch of the Government and the Congress, but at some time it will have to be presented to the courts for decision.

May I remind the House again that when President Truman was chairman of the Truman committee of the Senate I served as assistant counsel to that committee. He caused subpenas to be served on the Attorney General of the United States at least twice, and I believe three times. At that time he was forthrightly upholding the power of the Congress. On both occasions he got results from the Attorney General of the United States and secured possession of the documents that the Truman committee desired. I would like to see the Congress have the same courage and regard for its own powers today as the present President of the United States had when he was a Member of the Senate.

With respect to the bill itself, let me say that I was rather surprised to hear the comments of those who have said that the only reason they are voting for this bill is because J. Edgar Hoover has asked them to do so.

No one admires J. Edgar Hoover more than I do. I have had personal contact with his investigators and former investigators in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I have high regard for their excellence in investigative work.

I say to you that the greatest compliment this Congress could pay J. Edgar Hoover would be to say, "Good and faithful servant, you have done this job well. Keep on doing it."

I disagree with those who regard this as a trivial matter and argue that these routine personnel checks are of no importance. It is far more important to check before you put someone on the payroll than to make all kinds of checks afterward, then remove an employee because of disloyalty.

Some time ago it was reported in the press that it cost the Government Printing Office $500,000 to get rid of a civil service employee, in litigation through the various courts.

The time to check applicants for employment is before they have ever been

put on the Federal payroll. I tell you that is extremely important. Their tendencies toward subversion and disloyalty can be checked as well as their competence and qualifications to perform the job they seek. That investigation should be performed by competent investigators. We have passed laws to require it.

The officials who handle the extremely broad powers that we have been turning over to the executive branch of the Government in the past few years need to be checked for their competence and their loyalty to this Government. We should keep them out in the first place rather than checking them afterward and finding them disloyal. I regard these personnel checks as extremely important.

Now, on the matter of cost, the FBI is doing this with 1,700 employees, including some 900 investigators, at a cost of $10,000,000. Chairman Ramspeck, of the Civil Service Commission, very clearly indicates in his testimony he is not prepared or equipped to do this job. That Commission has only 275 investigators. It will be required to nearly double its present force of employees of 4,000 by adding 3,600 more. Mr. Ramspeck estimates it will cost the Civil Service Commission $20,000,000 a year. That Commission will do the personnel checks out of 14 branch offices, whereas the FBI has at present in its employment over 15,000 employees working out of 52 branch offices.

It is apparent why the cost is going up. The Civil Service investigators are going to have to travel all over the country, whereas the FBI can use its branch offices in existence today.

This job is an investigative job. The FBI has proved its competence in this field. Let us not disturb the situation. If we do, we will not only increase the cost to the American taxpayer, but we will run the risk of getting a lot of disloyal and incompetent employees in the Federal Government in these very critical positions, in the Atomic Energy Commission, foreign aid agencies, and other important Federal activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee), there were—ayes 96, noes 74.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 555, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and, the Chair being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 91, noes 78.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WITHROW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WITHROW moves to recommit the bill S. 2077 to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirteen Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 86, nays 233, not voting 113, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—86

Adair	Cunningham	Nicholson
Albert	Curtis, Mo.	O'Hara
Andersen, H. Carl	Curtis, Nebr.	Osmers
	Davis, Wis.	Phillips
Andresen, August H.	Dolliver	Poulson
	Dondero	Prouty
Angell	Ford	Reed, Ill.
Auchincloss	George	Schenck
Ayres	Golden	Schwabe
Baker	Gross	Scrivner
Bakewell	Hill	Scudder
Beamer	Hoeven	Shafer
Belcher	Hoffman, Ill.	Smith, Kans.
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Wis.
Berry	Jarman	Steed
Betts	Jenison	Taber
Bishop	Jensen	Talle
Blackney	Kearns	Thompson, Mich.
Boggs, Del.	King, Pa.	
Bolton	LeCompte	Vail
Bray	Lovre	Velde
Budge	McDonough	Vorys
Buffett	McGregor	Vursell
Bush	McIntire	Wharton
Butler	McVey	Wickersham
Byrnes	Mack, Wash.	Williams, N. Y.
Chenoweth	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Church	Meader	Withrow
Cotton	Morris	Wood, Idaho
Crawford	Nelson	

NAYS—233

Abbitt	Aspinall	Bentsen
Abernethy	Bailey	Boggs, La.
Allen, Calif.	Baring	Bolling
Allen, La.	Barrett	Bonner
Anderson, Calif.	Bates, Ky.	Bosone
Andrews	Bates, Mass.	Bow
Anfuso	Beckworth	Bramblett
Arends	Bender	Brehm
Armstrong	Bennett, Fla.	Brooks
Brown, Ga.	Hart	Ostertag
Brownson	Havenner	O'Toole
Bryson	Hays, Ark.	Passman
Burdick	Hays, Ohio	Patman
Burleson	Hébert	Patten
Burnside	Herlong	Patterson
Busbey	Heselton	Perkins
Canfield	Hess	Philbin
Carlyle	Hinshaw	Pickett
Carrigg	Holifield	Poage
Chelf	Holmes	Polk
Chiperfield	Howell	Preston
Clemente	Ikard	Price
Cole, N. Y.	Irving	Priest
Colmer	Jackson, Wash.	Rabaut
Cooper	James	Ramsay
Corbett	Jenkins	Rankin
Crosser	Johnson	Reams
Crumpacker	Jonas	Redden
Dague	Jones, Ala.	Reece, Tenn.
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.
DeGraffenried	Jones, Hamilton C.	Rees, Kans.
Delaney		Rhodes
Denny	Jones, Woodrow W.	Ribicoff
Denton		Richards
Devereux	Karsten, Mo.	Riley
Donohue	Kearney	Robeson
Dorn	Keating	Rodino
Doughton	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Colo.
Eaton	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Fla.
Elliott	Kerr	Rooney
Ellsworth	Kilburn	Ross
Elston	Kilday	St. George
Engle	King, Calif.	Sasscer
Evins	Kirwan	Saylor
Fallon	Klein	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Feighan	Lane	
Fenton	Lanham	Secrest
Fernandez	Lesinski	Seely-Brown
Fine	Lind	Shelley
Fisher	Lucas	Sieminski
Flood	Lyle	Simpson, Ill.
Fogarty	McConnell	Sittler
Forand	McCormack	Smith, Miss.
Forrester	McCulloch	Smith, Va.
Frazier	McGrath	Spence
Fugate	McGuire	Springer
Fulton	McMillan	Staggers
Furcolo	McMullen	Stanley
Garmatz	Machrowicz	Teague
Gary	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Gathings	Madden	Thornberry
Gavin	Magee	Tollefson
Goodwin	Mahon	Trimble
Gordon	Mansfield	Van Pelt
Gore	Martin, Mass.	Van Zandt
Graham	Miller, Calif.	Watts
Granahan	Miller, Md.	Wheeler
Granger	Miller, N. Y.	Whitten
Grant	Mills	Wier
Green	Morano	Wigglesworth
Gregory	Morgan	Williams, Miss.
Hagen	Morton	Willis
Hale	Multer	Wilson, Tex.
Hand	Mumma	Winstead
Hardy	Murphy	Wolcott
Harris	Murray, Tenn.	Wolverton
Harrison, Nebr.	Norrell	Yorty
Harrison, Va.	O'Brien, Ill.	Zablocki
Harrison, Wyo.	O'Neill	

NOT VOTING—113

Aandahl	Doyle	Latham
Addonizio	Durham	McCarthy
Allen, Ill.	Eberharter	McKinnon
Barden	Gamble	Marshall
Battle	Greenwood	Martin, Iowa
Beall	Gwinn	Merrow
Blatnik	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.
Boykin		Mitchell
Brown, Ohio	Hall, Leonard W.	Morrison
Buchanan		Moulder
Buckley	Halleck	Murdock
Burton	Harden	Murray, Wis.
Camp	Harvey	Norblad
Cannon	Hedrick	O'Brien, Mich.
Carnahan	Heffernan	O'Konski
Case	Heller	Potter
Celler	Herter	Powell
Chatham	Hillings	Radwan
Chudoff	Hope	Rains
Clevenger	Horan	Regan
Cole, Kans.	Hull	Riehlman
Combs	Hunter	Rivers
Cooley	Jackson, Calif.	Roberts
Coudert	Javits	Rogers, Mass.
Cox	Judd	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Kean	Roosevelt
Dawson	Kee	Sabath
Deane	Kennedy	Sadlak
Dempsey	Keogh	Scott, Hardie
D'Ewart	Kersten, Wis.	Sheehan
Dingell	Kluczynski	Sheppard
Dollinger	Lantaff	Short
Donovan	Larcade	Sikes

Simpson, Pa.	Thomas	Widnall
Stigler	Vinson	Wood, Ga.
Stockman	Walter	Woodruff
Sutton	Weichel	Yates
Tackett	Welch	
Taylor	Werdel	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Lantaff with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Barton with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Short.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Case.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Battle with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Heller with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Chatham with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.
Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Werdell.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Hunter.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Hull.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Stigler with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana, Mr. HAGEN, and Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PROUTY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the serious and radical nature of the proposal to abolish the Small Defense Plants Administration should be made absolutely clear to all Members. Here is what it means: It is my opinion that any Member of this House who votes to liquidate the Small Defense Plants Administration, whether he intends it or not, thereby casts his vote against at least 95 percent of the business enterprises in his district. By killing this agency, or by not appropriating it enough money to do its job, we will be denying the small-business men of our districts and the thousands of people who work for them the representation they must have if they are to survive and prosper under the adverse effects of the mobilization program.

Duplication has been charged. Whatever real duplication had been in existence was avoided when the President issued an Executive order transferring the procurement and financial assistance functions of the Office of Small Business, NPA, Department of Commerce, to SDPA. The truth is that SDPA performs functions no other agency is equipped to do, wants to do, or has yet done.

In the short time this agency has been in operation, and despite the limitations of a meager appropriation, it has made definite progress in safeguarding free enterprise under the defense effort and has evolved sound programs for the future. I will review those accomplishments in a moment. First, it is necessary to review a little history.

The Small Defense Plants Administration was created by unanimous vote of Congress. Not the least consideration in Members' minds was the record of the Smaller War Plants Corporation during World War II. As the legislation finally turned out, SDPA was created almost in the image of the SWPC, although not in all respects. Nevertheless, it was a reasonable facsimile.

The new agency was created on July 31, 1951. The Administrator of the agency, the Honorable Telford Taylor, took office on October 19. No funds were available until November 1, and even then the paltry sum of only $350,000 was appropriated to finance the agency until June 30, 1952. This required that SDPA sternly limit itself to no more than $50,000 a month. There could be no thought of making use of the $50,000,000 revolving fund authorized for SDPA in the Defense Production Act, because to this day not one dime of that fund has been appropriated.

Despite these handicaps, the agency has begun to function with considerable effectiveness. Now, it is just possible that its very effectiveness is the cause of this cynical attempt to abolish it. Nevertheless, small business looks to SDPA as its good right arm and, as I have intimated, we are going to hear from small business if we adopt the Appropriations Committee's recommendations in this matter.

Now, what has SDPA been authorized to do? What has it done already? What is it doing now? What is it planning for the future?

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION FUNCTIONS

The act gives the administration five broad functional areas. They are: First, procurement, including assistance in obtaining prime and subcontracts and acting itself as prime contractor whenever we give it any portion of the $50,000,000 revolving fund; second, assistance in obtaining scarce materials; third, financial assistance, including help in obtaining loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; fourth, consulting with other agencies in formulating regulations on materials and other matters; fifth, provision of technical and managerial information.

MUST REVERSE TREND

Many small concerns must get defense business or die. But the Munitions Board concedes that the percentage of military contracts going to small business concerns, already deemed by Congress to be unsatisfactorily low last year, is still dropping. To reverse this trend, SDPA is negotiating with the armed services to install its representatives in major military contracting offices in order to screen proposed procurement and, jointly with military officers, to earmark business to be restricted to small concerns. A similar procedure employed by the Smaller War Plants Corporation in World War II was credited by the Army service forces with having more than doubled the small business share of procurement between 1943 and 1945. This is no ill-conceived plan; it worked during the last war and it will work now.

The agency also gives advice and assistance to hundreds of small companies, helping them to find defense business, enabling them to be placed on bidder's lists, contacting local procurement officers on their behalf, and giving them technical assistance.

WANTED BY SMALL CONCERNS

In this connection, it is interesting to note the results of a survey conducted among small-business men in February by Trilane Publications, Inc., publishers of the Government Procurement Daily Bulletin. No less than 84.8 percent of the small-business men replying to the questionnaire said they believed SDPA could be of serious value to their firms. Ninety-one percent of them regarded the agency so highly that they expressed a desire to have an SDPA branch office established in their area.

In addition, SDPA has been certifying small-business concerns as competent to perform specific contracts, and procurement offices are directed to accept such certification as conclusive. Partly through this device, Congress intended to break the vicious circle whereby small concerns could not obtain contracts if they lacked financing and could not obtain financing unless they had contracts.

SDPA likewise is working with large prime contractors to encourage and assist them in placing more subcontracts with small concerns. It has also recommended to the Renegotiation Board changes in its proposed regulations to authorize favorable consideration of prime contractors who subcontract substantial quantities of defense work to smaller firms.

SDPA has also been directed by Congress to make a complete inventory of the facilities of small-business concerns available for defense production. It has been agreed among all Government agencies concerned that full and sole

responsibility for this inventory rests with SDPA, and the agency has made remarkable progress in carrying it out.

RECOMMENDS LOANS

SDPA is authorized to recommend to RFC loans to small-business concerns engaged in national defense or essential civilian work. This lending authorization enables qualified small concerns to obtain financial asistance which would be refused under every other authority. Over $60,000,000 worth of loan requests have been received and the volume of applications is increasing steadily. Over 20 small-business loans have already been recommended by SDPA to RFC and more are on the way.

SDPA has also made a study of the regulations of the Defense Department governing the granting of V-loans, and found that the procedures being followed do not adequately reflect Congress' purpose of assisting small business to participate in the defense effort, and has urged specific changes in these regulations.

In the field of controlled materials, SDPA has its people on all the important committees of DPA and NPA, checking every action to make sure small business gets a fair break. This has been going on since last November. The share of allocated materials granted to many small concerns has been cut well below their break-even point. Through the joint efforts of SDPA and NPA, a special small-business hardship account was established to supplement low materials allocations of small concerns. SDPA is represented on the panel administering this program.

SDPA has recommended to DPA changes in the procedures whereby certificates of necessity for accelerated tax amortization are granted, so that small concerns will secure a better break in this program and be able to maintain their competitive position. Representatives of both agencies are now cooperating to develop procedure to accomplish this purpose.

UNDER ONE ROOF

SDPA has set up a "one stop" office, where representatives of small concerns running into difficulties under the defense program may be assisted. Hundreds of such firms have been aided in this way. SDPA has lifted from Members of Congress a large part of the burden of dealing with the problems of their constituents under the defense program. One of the main purposes of this legislation was to centralize in one place the responsibility for handling small-business problems. With even a portion of its authorized revolving fund, SDPA could greatly expand its program of technical and managerial assistance.

NO DUPLICATIONS

Now, what about this charge of duplication? It is totally false, as I shall show. As I said, some of SDPA's activities did, at the outset, cover the same ground as some of those of the Office of Small Business of NPA. The President issued an Executive order transferring these duplicated functions to SDPA. They included, among other things, aid to small business in procurement, financial assistance, and managerial bids.

There is no duplication between SDPA's lending activities and those of any other agency. The authority under which they recommend loans to RFC is different from, and broader than, any other provision of law.

There is no duplication in the SDPA program of having representatives in major contracting offices, even though the military may have small-business specialists in the same offices. SDPA representatives are the only ones responsible to an authority whose sole purpose it is to assist small-business concerns in the defense effort. Even if the responsibilities were the same, which they are not, it is no more illogical to have two men, one representing small business and the other the military, screening the possibilities of helping small business in procurement than it is to have 9 Justices of the Supreme Court, 435 Members of the House of Representatives, or 3 men arbitrating an issue. This is nothing but representation for the interests concerned.

In summary, it is only through SDPA's efforts that the viewpoint of small business will be adequately reflected in these matters. This is not duplication, but a recognition by Congress that small business needs an advocate.

I had hoped and believed, as had many of my colleagues, that this issue was resolved upon passage of the small plants amendment to the Defense Production Act. Congress then decided unanimously that all the expressions, in a dozen statutes of pious hopes that small business would get a better deal would never bring that result about. Neither would the promises of other Government agencies whose main responsibilities lie in other fields. It was therefore found necessary, just as in World War II, to establish an agency devoted solely to preserving small business as an essential element of our free-enterprise system. A handful now propose that this unanimous decision be reversed. I am sure this House has the wisdom not to let it happen.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, on the vote earlier today, on the resolution relating to the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee Investigation, I was detained elsewhere on official business, but had I been present I would have voted "yea."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SISTERSVILLE, W. VA.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I wish here to give a very fascinating history of Sistersville, W. Va., a beautiful and historic spot, a place that offers vast opportunities for industrial expansion.

When George Washington journeyed down the Ohio River in 1770, he pitched camp about halfway in the Long Reach on the west side of the river. It is across from the spot where the town of Sistersville, W. Va., now stands.

It is no wonder that Washington was impressed with the beauty of the Ohio, for the 20 miles in the area of Sistersville are among the most beautiful in the United States.

The Indians wanted the country back and fought for it until 1802, when they lost the battle for the fort in Wheeling. A number of Indian relics have been found in the vicinity.

Sistersville was settled in 1810 by Charles Wells, a farmer from Baltimore County, Md., who raised 22 children there. In 1815 Charles Wells died and Sistersville was laid out in lots by Sarah Wells McCoy and Dililah Wells Grier, his seventeenth and eighteenth children. It derived its name from the joint ownership of the two sisters, the only town by that name in the United States.

Shortly before the Civil War a 51-man company of soldiers called the Sistersville Blues was organized, most of whom, according to the records of the times, were six feet tall or over. The ladies of the town made their flag and everyone was very proud of the company.

The war, however, broke it up, with 21 of the men serving on the Southern side and the rest serving with the Union Army. For many years there was bitter feeling among the old comrades. The vicinity was in northern territory, but many of the residents were southern sympathizers. A number of them fled South to serve in the Dixie armies.

One of these, Charles P. Russell, a prominent lawyer, was associated with Jefferson Davis, as his counselor when Mr. Davis was tried for treason. Sistersville was also the home of the Honorable Abraham Dickenson Soper, chairman of the Wheeling Convention which organized West Virginia as a State.

During this time, the only transportation to Sistersville was supplied by river steamboats. In 1884, the B. & O. Railroad was built bringing trains to the town.

The thing that brought about the real expansion of Sistersville, however, was the discovery of oil in 1891 with the drilling of the famous Pole Cat Well, first producing oil well in the region. Discovery of the well opened up the Sistersville pool, one of the country's richest fields, famous as the only field ever found in which water was on top of the oil. The Pole Cat pumped water more than

a year and a half before it began producing oil commercially.

With the opening of the Pole Cat a real western-type boom descended on Sistersville. It suddenly sprang from a rural village of about 300 to a boom mining town of 15,000. Houses were torn down to make room for drilling derricks. Shacks and tents were thrown together to help house the people, and houseboats lined the river banks on both sides for a mile along the river.

The town was wide open. Saloons and gambling houses flourished. Theaters sprang up. One of the most popular entertainers was Ben Turpin, later to become the famous cross-eyed entertainer of the movies.

At one point there were 50 different oil companies operating in the Sistersville field. They drilled 2,500 oil wells. When the Standard Oil interest got control, and it was learned how to separate the salt water from the oil, the field was finally stabilized. By 1912 things had settled down. The boom was over.

Since that time Sistersville has become a staid family community. It has a reputation of being one of the cleanest cities in the country and a few years ago had the largest bank deposits per capita of any city its size in the United States.

One of the great advantages of Sistersville is that it is above high water mark, safe from flood damage when the mighty Ohio runs amuck. It is located on West Virginia and Ohio major highways placing it on direct routes to the Great Lakes, the eastern seaboard, the Shenandoah Valley, Sky Line Drive, Columbus, Cincinnati, and the West.

This location plus the presence of coal, salt brine and cheap electric power make it one of the most desirable spots in the United States for industrial expansion.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, someone has decreed the execution of the Small Defense Plants Administration. I do not want to be a party to the crime. In reporting the deficiency bill to the House last Friday no funds were allowed this Administration, which means in effect the House Committee on Appropriations is denying the $850,000 requested to carry on the activities of the Administration for the balance of the current fiscal year. This means the death of the Small Defense Plants Administration, which was created on July 31, 1951, when, by unanimous action of the Congress, section 714, establishing the agency, was added to the Defense Production Act.

It was the express intent of Congress that small-business concerns be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution to the defense program; that small business be maintained as a vital part of the national economy. The SDPA was established as an agency with no primary function or interest than the preservation and promotion of small-business enterprises. Accordingly the Congress provided that SDPA shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government.

The three principal functions of the small-business agency, as prescribed by Congress, are to see to it that, first, small business gets its fair share of the defense contracts it can handle; second, that it receives a fair share of critical materials; and, third, that it gets the financial assistance needed to participate effectively in defense and essential civilian business.

A precedent for SDPA was the Smaller War Plants Corporation of World War II. This agency was able to assist small business to make an invaluable contribution to the war effort and our ultimate victory in that conflict.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is talking about something the small people in this country are very much interested in. I am certainly glad to know of his particular interest because he is on the Appropriations Committee and his help will certainly be worth a lot in the cause.

Tomorrow, I understand from talking to the gentleman a few minutes ago, an amendment will be offered to restore this amount of money together with the $10,000,000 revolving fund. I hope it receives the same bipartisan support that the passage of the bill received.

This bill has the unanimous endorsement of the Committee on Small Business, both Republicans and Democrats, the unanimous endorsement of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and it passed the House of Representatives unanimously, with not a single vote against it. I certainly hope that amendment is adopted tomorrow. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from New Jersey is giving the amendment his vigorous support, because he has always been with the little man, the small people, and I know that he will be helpful in this cause.

Mr. CANFIELD. I appreciate what the gentleman from Texas has just said, because that revolving fund of $10,000,000, which is one-fifth of the amount authorized by law last year, is the lever which this administration can use to enter into prime contracts, if necessary, which would be subcontracted by the agency to small concerns. Since any such funds used by SDPA for prime contracting would come back to the Government when contracts are completed, the revolving fund must not be confused with appropriations for operating expenses. The revolving fund is the guaranty SDPA can offer small business that it will not be forgotten when the Pentagon resorts to the brush-off so familiar to thousands of little fellows doing legitimate business in the United States.

Mr. PATMAN. That is exactly right, and the fact that they have the power to take these prime contracts means they will not even have to take them at all. That happened before, and the Government could save money by setting up this agency as the over-all agency, as intended, and cut down on other small-business agencies in the different agencies—in other words transfer them to this one and save a great deal of money in that way.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman from Texas is familiar with the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. A report was filed by this committee just a few days ago. The chairman of the committee is the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'MAHONEY. The report contends that in our appropriation-committee approach this year, we could cut the President's budget $10,000,000,000 but at the same time this Committee on the Economic Report went out of its way to emphasize that the funds for the Defense Plants Administration should be left untouched.

Mr. PATMAN. I happen to know something about that. I think you will find that the recommendation is that other small-business agencies be transferred to the SDPA except where a small skeleton crew, we will say, is necessary to maintain normal relationships. In other words, they are recommending that the other small-business groups be included under the SDPA.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The gentleman realizes that a brick wall is only as strong as the small bricks that go in to make it up?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I congratulate our distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, for the speech he has made. The speech was very sound, and the gentleman is absolutely correct. The small-business men of this country comprise a powerful segment of our national economy. It is of vital importance at all times particularly in the emergency which confronts that they not be squeezed out. The agency to which the gentleman has referred has done admirable work in connection with looking after the interests of small business of America. With the funds appropriated, they will be able to do far more effective work. Again I want to congratulate my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, in the remarks that he has made today, and on the position that he has taken in connection with this important matter.

Mr. CANFIELD. I appreciate the observations made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I wish to say that I do not think we are going to have any trouble tomorrow in restoring the funds for the regular operations of the agency.

The fight tomorrow will come over the revolving fund, which as I have said before, is the lever which that agency needs to prod the Pentagon into giving contracts to small business. In passing, let me quote John E. Orchard, of Rutherford, N. J., who is an aluminum fabricator. He says this agency is a red-tape cutting organization which has helped him and hundreds of New Jersey small-business men.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a recent issue of Business Week dated February 16, 1952, with a featured article captioned "Small business versus the Pentagon." This article goes on to say:

Telford Taylor, boss of SDPA, wants aides to sit in on every military procurement bill. The brass is not amused at the idea of carrying on its business in a goldfish bowl, but Taylor has Congressional backing in his fight to get the same concessions for small plants that they finally won in World War II.

That is the issue to be resolved on the floor of the House tomorrow: Whether Taylor and this administration still have Congressional backing in this fight.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Do I understand from the remarks that the gentleman has made that we have not provided for the Small Defense Plants Administration a single solitary dime of this $50,000,000 revolving fund which we authorized when we passed the act last year.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true, and the administration is now asking for $10,000,000 to enable them to do the job that they say is necessary at this time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The point I wanted to make is that the operations of the Small Defense Plants Corporation to date has been without those funds which we impliedly promised when we passed the act last year.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. ELLIOTT. And if the report of this committee is adopted by the House tomorrow this agency will be killed completely?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true except there will be some funds for liquidation.

The gentleman has referred to the passage of Public Law 96 last year. As the gentleman knows, this administration was set up under the Defense Production Act and this item was unanimously approved by this House. It was in that act, of course, that we authorized the $50,000,000 pool or revolving fund to help this administration promote the cause of small business.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I wish the gentleman would consider putting in that part of the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of last Saturday, wherein it recommends that other small-business groups and agencies be transferred to SPDI. That was put in there for the obvious purpose of making the SPDI a one-stop agency; in other words, an organization under one roof where the small-business man could put his problems in the lap of a representative, and the representative would do the running around if any running around was to be done; then he would not have to go from one place to another. I think that is such an excellent recommendation in that resolution that I hope the gentleman will consider putting it in his remarks.

I again congratulate the gentleman on his remarks. He is one of the ablest Members of this House, and I appreciate the fact that he is standing up for this group that needs support right now.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman. I shall make further reference to the report tomorrow.

In closing, I desire to say this approach was extremely helpful to small business in my area during World War II and my people are being helped today by the new SDPA. Its Administrator is anxious and determined that the hundreds of concerns and thousands of workmen that make up small business in America are going to get their just share of defense work. Its people are courteous and cooperative. They sense a challenge and they are doing a job.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MANPOWER REGIMENTATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the reason it was impossible for me, by my vote on UMT, to please everyone is made clear by a letter from a loyal, conscientious, Christian woman, who wrote:

I am at a loss as to what to say, as I belong to the American Legion Auxiliary, which is very much in favor of the passage of these bills; but I also belong to a church which is very much opposed; so I think I will just leave it to you.

I am sure you have only the greatest good of our country at heart and will vote as you think best.

I pray God will direct your vote in the way which is best for all of us.

Using the information available, giving consideration to the hundreds of communications received, using my judgment, my vote was cast against UMT as presented.

Most respectfully—yes, and with great humility—permit me, nevertheless, to suggest that some who urged me to vote for this bill did not realize the purpose of the program of which it is but a part.

Of course, no one wants anyone sent to war—or, for that matter, into any civilian activity—without adequate training.

Legislation now on the books permits the conscription of men desired by the armed services. It permits the armed services to hold and train those men, not only for 6 months, but for as long a period as may be needed.

UMT as voted upon would not go into effect as long as the present selective-service legislation is in effect. No one suggests we repeal selective service while we are at war.

During debate I asked the chairman of the committee handling the bill when those affected by it would begin training. He repeated that neither he nor anyone else knew. So why the hurry?

THE PROGRAM

The program of which UMT is but a part is one to give the administration control for 8 years over the lives and activities of every young man and woman—and get that word "woman"—as he, or she, reaches the age of 18 years.

It is said "That is not true. Women are not included."

The bill as presented to the Armed Services Committee—and that is the bill on which the vote was taken—read:

SEC. 105. (a) Persons shall be inducted into the corps.

The word "trainee" was defined as:

SEC. 102. (c) "Trainee" means a person actually inducted for training.

True, the committee amended the bill by striking the word "persons" and substituting "male persons" as the definition of a trainee.

But those amendments were not in the bill when the vote was taken. To prove that, I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 4, page 1864:

Mr. ABERNETHY. Do I understand, then, that the vote to follow will occur on the bill as reported to the House, including the committee amendment?

The SPEAKER. It does not have any committee amendments.

Then, after the vote was taken, to make the situation clear, the Speaker, referring to his previous ruling said—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 4, page 1864:

However, the Chair should have gone one step further, if he had understood the gentleman entirely, and said that the bill that would be voted on at that time was the bill as originally introduced and referred to the Committee on Armed Services without the amendments adopted by the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee of the Whole, because those amendments of the committee to the bill as originally introduced were not reported to the House by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

The Chair wanted to make that statement before the final vote was announced so that all Members could understand the exact situation and be allowed to change their votes if they so desired. The bill is now before the House as originally introduced.

Two Members changed their votes; one from "nay" to "yea" and one from "yea" to "nay."

The original bill shows just what the President, Mrs. Rosenberg, and those who go along with them, intend to give the country—regimentation and socialization.

MORE THAN MILITARY TRAINING

While many of those supporting the bill thought and argued that it was a simple bill for universal military training, that is not the program.

If anyone knows the purpose, Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna Rosenberg, who appeared with Secretary of Defense Marshall, does. She said:

Now, there are, of course, some men who will not be able to go into the Armed Forces on any practical basis because they are incapable of meeting the minimum physical, mental, and moral qualifications, and here

we get away at this point from the universality of the plan. * * *

At this moment the President has no plan which we want to submit—which he wants us to submit for these numbers—relatively small numbers—of men.

It is his concept and that of the Department of Defense that this must be a universal program and that every man physically and mentally and morally capable of performing a service, either in the military or outside, must perform that service. (Senate hearings, p. 51.)

Note the following:

Senator JOHNSON. Next question is: Under a USM Act, what nonmilitary programs would be provided for individuals who are not physically or mentally qualified for military service?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. That is a program that the military has nothing to do with. That is the program where there are men who are not qualified for military service. The President will have a program. We will not. We will have a program for the limited-service men in the military.

Senator JOHNSON. But as you testified originally, there will be such a program although it will not be administered by your Department; is that right?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. I have been given to understand that the President is contemplating the formation of such a program. Just when, I cannot say. * * *

Senator JOHNSON. * * * the committee would like to have any information that can be obtained bearing on that general subject before it presents its bill to the full committee and to the Senate. What is or is not done by that group may have considerable bearing on the outcome of the whole picture.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Senator, there will be no more than about 150,000 men, as we showed you, in that class; and I will try to obtain the information for you as to when you can expect it. (Senate hearings, p. 148.)

* * * * *

Then we said that there would probably be another 100,000 or 150,000—it may even go a little higher—who could be used for some type of national service, but could not be used by the military. (Senate hearings, p. 193.)

In brief, the adoption of UMT would have given the administration authority to take into the military service for a period of 8 years, every young person, male and female, as he or she reached the age of 18 years.

It was also the further purpose of the administration—and Anna Rosenberg, the President's appointee, so stated—to make all those who were not physically or mentally fit for military service, as they reached the age of 18 years, wards of the Government and assign them to such service as the administration might direct. If that is not regimentation, what is it?

That such was the purpose of the administration was recognized by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, when he testified that the bill "smacks of national service legislation which not one of us would want to see replace the voluntary free labor which has so successfully served the Nation in previous periods of peace and war."

The purpose of the bill and of the program of which it was a part, was shown by the hearings to be a move by the administration to, for a period of 8 years, obtain absolute control over the lives and the activities of our youth.

It is futile to talk about endeavoring to either carry the "four freedoms" throughout the world, or to help free nations, or a free people, by the expenditure of our dollars, our natural resources, or our manpower, if we impose 8 years of involuntary servitude upon our youth as they reach 18. By so doing, we lose our own freedom.

Does anyone who understands the situation, expect a Member of Congress to vote for such a program?

History shows that every nation which adopted universal military training, except Switzerland and Sweden, failed to remain at peace or continue prosperous. War and, ultimately, defeat was the fate of all.

There are many other reasons, some carried in the communications sent me and voiced during the 5 days' debate, which show the futility of the program, the ruinous effect of such a program upon both our citizens and the Nation.

Believing the bill—and the program of which it was a part—to be destructive in its nature, I had no hesitancy in doing my utmost to defeat it. I have no regrets.

FEDERAL PROBLEMS VITAL TO CALIFORNIA—MY VIEWS AND VOTES ON IMPORTANT ISSUES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the 1951 California State Legislature has reapportioned the Nineteenth Congressional District. The new district has approximately half a million residents. It is the largest in population of California's 30 congressional districts. It has an irregular shape, extending from a point west of South Pasadena in a southeasterly direction to the Orange County line near North Long Beach. In the Nineteenth District are found the cities and communities of: Downtown Los Angeles, Monterey Park, Montebello, Norwalk, Artesia, Elysian Park, El Sereno, Lincoln Heights, Boyle Heights, City Terrace, East Los Angeles, Montebello Park, Montebello Gardens, Rivera, Los Nietos, Santa Fe Springs, and Hawaiian Gardens.

For the past 10 years I have had the honor of serving most of the present district as their United States Representative. I welcome the opportunity of serving the people in the new areas which are now a part of the new Nineteenth Congressional District.

Since I was first elected in 1942, I have maintained a competently staffed local office in the approximate center of the congressional district. I have done this at additional personal expense in order to serve the people of the Nineteenth District more quickly and more efficiently.

This local office has answered thousands of requests by phone and letter and has brought congressional services as near as your local phone and neighborhood. My Washington office has likewise served the people of the district promptly and efficiently on the thousands of requests necessarily processed on the Washington level.

I am proud to report that I have had very few complaints on the promptness and efficiency of congressional services. This is indeed gratifying, as both my office staff and I have tried sincerely to serve our constituents to the best of our ability.

Every 2 years a Member of Congress comes before his constituents for reelection. This is well. The job of being a Congressman involves important and grave responsibilities to the people. Whether democracy will live or die depends upon the peoples' representatives. Your responsibility is to elect or reject your Representative every 2 years.

Therefore it is not enough to render competent and efficient service on routine requests. A Member of Congress must stand up and be counted on every type of legislation.

My record of attendance is excellent and I have never dodged a vote or evaded an issue. In every public appearance in our district I have invited questions on my voting record and my position on vital public problems.

I believe it is my duty to inform my constituents as to my position and vote on the important issues of the day. I have therefore caused to be printed at my personal expense a statement of my convictions on several important subjects.

The list of course cannot be complete due to lack of space, but I will be glad to answer any question or letter on any subject which is not covered and is of particular interest to a constituent.

THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR EXPERIENCE AND COMMITTEE SENIORITY

The longer a Representative serves in Congress the more valuable he becomes to his constituents. He gains needed experience in the complicated field of legislation. As the years go by he moves from low man on a committee of 27 members to the top of the committee in responsibility and prestige. He attains seniority. He becomes chairman of important subcommittees, holds hearings on legislation, and conducts investigations of Federal agencies. He becomes experienced in debate and in handling bills on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Having served 10 years in the House, I have attained high seniority—next to the chairman—on two important committees, the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives on Atomic Energy, and the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I am also a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which has jurisdiction over our international legislation. I am chairman of two subcommittees, the Subcommittee on Atomic Energy Legislation and the Subcommittee on Reorganization, which considers the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Each new Member of Congress must attain experience and seniority before he can represent his constituents really efficiently and effectively. A Congressman must learn through experience how

to serve his constituents effectively in processing veterans problems, in helping his local business firms in their contacts with the Federal Government. He acquires the ability to appear before other committees of Congress to advocate or oppose legislation affecting his district. He also learns how to support appropriations for flood control, parks, harbor improvements, and other projects.

REDUCTION OF TAXES

Can taxes be reduced by curtailing the expenses of Government? The answer is "Yes." Taxes can be reduced by eliminating present Federal services or by eliminating waste wherever it exists, or by a combination of both.

It has been proved very difficult to eliminate Federal services which our citizens have come to regard as necessary. An example was the order of the post office cutting home mail deliveries from two to one per day. I received thousands of letters protesting this curtailment of service. The same protest occurs when any service is eliminated. However, the elimination of waste in Government expenditures is worthy of continuous study and investigation.

The Hoover Commission pointed out in their 1949 report many instances of waste, duplication, and inefficiency. They made many recommendations to cure this waste evil.

The Committee on Executive Expenditures, of which I am the subcommittee chairman, has taken the lead in putting the Hoover Commission recommendations into effect. We have secured legislative consideration of 37 Presidential reorganization plans of which 28 have become law. In addition to these plans, I have voted for 46 laws to improve the efficiency of Government operations. The Citizens' Committee on the Hoover Report has stated that over 55 percent of the 300 or more recommendations in the report have been put into effect, leading to savings of over $2,000,000,000 annually.

MAINTAINING A SOUND ECONOMY

Serious domestic and international problems during the past 10 years have made necessary the building of our military strength and caused our taxes and national debt to increase sharply. The alternative during the years between 1940 and 1945 would have been surrender to Hitler and since the end of the war, the alternative would have been to surrender the free world to communism. We could not accept either of these alternatives and retain the freedoms inherent in the American way of life.

Our great job has been to meet these totalitarian threats and at the same time maintain a decent standard of living for our people at home. We have, in the main, succeeded. We defeated the Hitler axis. We have stopped the growth of communism in Europe and here at home. We have maintained full employment. We have increased greatly our production of consumer and military goods. Some price inflation has occurred but the standard of living, as expressed in actual increased consumption of consumer goods, has improved. Corporate net income and individual net income, after taxes, is higher than it was in the prewar years.

I shall continue to fight inflation of prices and do all in my power to increase the purchasing power of the consumer's dollar.

WATER, THE LIFEBLOOD OF CALIFORNIA

The one indispensable factor in the continuing welfare of every citizen of California is the maintenance of an adequate water supply. Our underground water supply level has lowered from near the ground surface to a depth of several hundred feet in the last few years. The Mulholland Aqueduct from Owens Valley is totally inadequate and we are now dependent on water which is pumped through the Metropolitan Water Aqueduct from the Colorado River 475 miles away.

During the past few years a dispute on water rights has been bitterly waged between California and Arizona. We believe that legislation introduced by Arizona and now pending in the Congress will jeopardize California's claims to a substantial amount of Colorado River water.

Together with the other California Congressmen of both parties I am vigorously defending our water rights.

FLOOD CONTROL

The flash floods, such as those recently suffered by many of our communities in the Los Angeles watershed, are a continuing threat to life and property. The Nineteenth Congressional District in particular is traversed by the Los Angeles, Rio Hondo, and San Gabriel Rivers. All of these rivers are important diversion channels for flash-flood waters which accumulate between the mountains and the ocean. In 1941 Congress passed an enabling bill for $350,000,000 for southern California flood-control projects. Actual appropriations of $120,000,000 have been made of these Federal funds, to aid the citizens of our communities in their fight against these disastrous floods.

I have appeared many times before the Appropriations Committees of Congress and testified in behalf of these appropriations which are so necessary to preserve life and property.

TIDELANDS OIL FIGHT

The State of California for many years has been receiving millions of dollars in royalties from oil pools which lie off shore and below the ocean waters adjacent to our coast line. The State of California has used these funds for the purchase of public beaches, parks, and recreational facilities for the people of California. The Federal Government has, in recent years, claimed rights to these offshore oil deposits, claiming Federal ownership of submerged lands.

I have joined with other California Congressmen in the fight to maintain California's right to these offshore oil royalties.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Our rapidly increasing population has provided industrial workers and therefore more consumers for industrial products. Wartime defense expansion on the Pacific coast gave impetus to our industrial development. The location of defense industries and the allocation of defense contracts have been a constant concern of California Congressmen.

I have, together with my California colleagues in Congress, vigorously fought for the establishment of steel, aluminum, shipbuilding, aircraft, rubber, machine tool, and many other industrial facilities in southern California. We have also been successful in insisting that large defense contracts be allocated to the West instead of to eastern and southern areas. This has helped immeasurably in the growth of our southern California industrial plant, and the employment at good wages of thousands of our citizens.

INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

During the past 10 years we have fought and won World War II against the totalitarian regimes of the extreme right.

One of our allies in that fight against the common foe was Soviet Russia. When the war was over, the Soviets joined with us in forming the United Nations. We had every reason to believe that all nations were tired of war and would proceed to build a peaceful world. Time and events have proved that the Soviet Union was not sincere. This totalitarian nation of the extreme left has violated every principle of international equity.

We are now faced with the aggressive force of communism throughout the world. We are fighting this ideology on both the economic and the military fronts. Our economic aid to free nations in Europe and Asia is for the purpose of strengthening their domestic economies and building their military strength. We are succeeding although the task is difficult and progress sometimes seems too slow. As the free world becomes stronger the danger of political or military success of communism becomes less.

The struggle of the 16 member nations of the United Nations against the Chinese and North Korean Communists may not be fully understood by many Americans. It is essentially a struggle to preserve the United Nations reason for existence, that is, collective international action against aggression. Unless the principle of collective action against aggression is established firmly among nations, we can never establish peace in the world. It is the only chance to stop Communist aggression. That is why we are fighting in Korea.

I have voted for economic and military aid for our allies in the United Nations and I have supported our own military appropriations to make our own Nation strong in the fight to preserve our freedom and liberties.

GRAFT IN GOVERNMENT

Approximately 2,500,000 citizens are Federal civilian employees. Of this number a few hundred have betrayed their trust and committed dishonest acts. It is obviously unfair to charge that this great body of Federal employees is corrupt and dishonest. There is absolutely no excuse for dishonesty in government or anywhere else. Betrayal of public

trust is reprehensible and should be exposed and punished immediately.

My own Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has continuously investigated Government agencies and exposed inefficiency and dishonesty. We recently secured House of Representatives approval of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 to reorganize the Bureau of Internal Revenue abolishing the political offices of collectors of internal revenue and replacing them with civil-service employees. We believe that this change will relieve the collectors of political pressures and insure a more responsible and honest administration of our tax-collection agency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a statement.

Mr. MORANO in two instances and to include editorials in each instance.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include a letter received by him from a minister regarding taxes.

Mr. HOEVEN and include an article from the February issue of the Farm Journal.

Mr. COLE of New York and include a short editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MANSFIELD and include a speech by Secretary Chapman in honor of the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN.

Mr. PATMAN and include a statement at the end of today's business concerning the Small Business Plants Administration appropriation which will come up tomorrow.

Mr. BRYSON and include a radio transcript.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. LYLE) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include a recent speech.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include an article.

Mr. BROOKS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANGER and to include an editorial.

Mr. LESINSKI.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHELLEY and to include two items of extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of New York in three instances and to include two resolutions and an editorial.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

Mr. REECE of Tennessee and to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. STEED and to include a magazine article.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 664. An act to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," and for other purposes; and

S. 1345. An act to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LANTAFF, for 4 days, on account of committee business.

Mr. GREENWOOD (at the request of Mrs. KELLY of New York), for an indefinite period, on account of death in family.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. HOWELL), for the week of March 10, 1952, on account of official business.

Mr. DOYLE, indefinitely, on account of committee business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1238. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to equalize certain benefits between and among members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1239. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of an experimental drydock to the Junior Midshipmen of America under authority of section 1 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 897; 34 U. S. C. 546f), pursuant to section 6 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 898; 34 U. S. C. 546k); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1240. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the fourth report regarding the Yugoslav emergency relief assistance program, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 897 (the Yugoslav Emergency Relief Assistance Act of 1950), for the period from September 15, 1951, through December 15, 1951 (H. Doc. No. 392); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

1241. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Tan Yap Eng or Tan Eng, file No. A-9537742 CR 34140, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference. S. 1851. An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally (Rept. No. 1505). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3098. A bill to amend sections 1331 and 1332 of title 28, United States Code, relating to amount in controversy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3166. A bill to amend the act approved June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U. S. C., sec. 869), entitled "An act to authorize acquisition or use of public lands by States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes," to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5577. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Inc., of the State of Wisconsin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 363. Joint resolution to provide for the presentation of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Henrik Kurt Carlsen, master, steamship *Flying Enterprise*; without amendment (Rept. No. 1507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4671. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jack Bravo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 6984. A bill to grant foster children dependency status for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 6985. A bill to amend section 402 (f) of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6986. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for

other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, and to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, for the purpose of prohibiting loss leader sales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 6987. A bill to provide for the award of certain public contracts to bidders from areas of very substantial labor surplus where their bids do not exceed by more than 5 percent the most advantageous bids submitted from other areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6988. A bill to provide an extension of time for claiming refund or credit of overpayments of income tax with respect to sales of livestock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 6989. A bill to amend the act of May 31, 1940, entitled "An act to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes," so as to require the inclusion of certain stipulations in contracts for carrying the mails by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6990. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 6991. A bill to amend section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 6992. A bill to require the payment of prevailing wage rates to employees of contractors under contracts with the Post Office Department for transportation of mail by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6993. A bill to provide that the Postmaster General shall furnish flat-top stools for post-office clerks who perform the duty of distributing mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6994. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide more effective price support for milk and other dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 6995. A bill to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 6996. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters and supervisors in the field service of the Post Office Department by eliminating the effect of the $800 ceiling imposed in the salary schedules in the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 204, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 6997. A bill to extend to certain naturalized citizens of the United States the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 6998. A bill to amend the act of May 31, 1940, entitled "An act to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes," so as to require the inclusion of certain stipulations in contracts for carrying the mails by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6999. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act with respect to the amount of active service which certain former members of the Armed Forces of the United States and its allies who are inducted under such act may be required to serve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas (by request):

H. R. 7000. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue and require licenses for the recreational use of land, improvements, and facilities in national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 7001. A bill to amend section 13 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, with respect to the exemption provided thereby for persons employed in connection with the operation or maintenance of irrigation systems; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 7002. A bill to equalize certain benefits between and among members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. R. 7003. A bill to provide for the distribution of funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 7004. A bill to provide for a lapel button which may be worn by persons who served in the Armed Forces during the national emergency which began June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RICHARDS (by request):

H. R. 7005. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 7006. A bill to provide that the procedural limitations placed upon the conveyance of certain restricted Indian lands belonging to members of the Five Civilized Tribes shall apply only to Indians of the full blood; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of certain material relating to Indians, as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 563. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the laws pertaining to veterans, enacted during the Eighty-second Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 7007. A bill for the relief of Domenico DiColandrea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 7008. A bill for the relief of John Cotton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 7009. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Franklin Yarlott; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 7010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kayoko Kumai Tamaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 7011. A bill for the relief of Ralston Edward Harry; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 7012. A bill for the relief of Victoria Clita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7013. A bill for the relief of Clara M. Briggs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York (by request):

H. R. 7014. A bill for the relief of Hiroki Hollopeter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 7015. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 7016. A bill for the relief of Joseph Arthur Parent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7017. A bill for the relief of Konstance Alsine Marie Parsons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 7018. A bill for the relief of William and Helen Kobielski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7019. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kuty; 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:

623. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the Racine (Wis.) Taxpayers Association Inc. to decrease Federal spending for the fiscal year 1953 by deleting from the budget all expansion and proposed new programs by eliminating all nonessential activities and by adopting the remaining recommendations of the Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

624. Also, resolution adopted by the Southeastern Wisconsin Taxpayers Associations' conference at Watertown, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to reduce the Federal spending program proposed for fiscal 1953 to an amount consistent with public ability to pay, without additional taxation and without increasing the Federal debt, and proposing that this be done by elimination from the program all new, proposed, expanded, and nonessential activities and by adoption of the Dirksen amendment and the remaining recommendations of the Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

625. By Mr. THORNBERRY: Petition of Miss Nova Mae Scaff, Mrs. Ernest Linder, Mrs. George Gregg, Mrs. C. A. Rice, Mrs. Rosa Varner, Miss Fay Atkinson, Mrs. T. E. Whitley, Mr. A. K. Ross, Mr. Ernest Linder, Mr. C. A. Rice, Mr. and Mrs. E. O. Carmosin, Mr. and Mrs. C. L. Lawrence, all of Travis County, Tex., urging enactment of the provisions of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

626. By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN: Resolution No. 23, approved on February 4, 1952, at the plenary session held by the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico, containing the final declarations of the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico after that body had adopted a Constitution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in accordance with the terms of Public Law 600 of the Eighty-first Congress as approved July 3, 1950; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.