

Albert M. Ellison
Rodolfo R. Enderle
Jerry L. Ewing
Thomas R. Fadell
Harry W. Farris
John C. Featherstone
Rudy V. Fimbres
Ralph D. First
Joseph P. Flemming
James F. Garvin
Donald L. Gaut
Paul F. Geerlings
William J. Geiger
Richard O. Gillick
Thomas P. Goggin
John F. Gould, Jr.
Raymond H. Graham
Bryce R. Graves
Thomas N. Greer, Jr.
D'Wayne Gray
Thomas F. Gray
Claudius J. R. Grey
William J. Hallisey, Jr.
Carl D. Hamilton
Francis W. Haskins
William K. Hayden III
Robert A. Haydock
Francis J. Heath
George L. Heidkamp
William R. Henley
Harold P. Henrie
John G. Hoffman
Richard F. Hopper
LeRoy L. Hoyde
Genaro Huerto
Richard H. Humphreys
Barry W. Jackson
Edward C. Johnson
James P. Johnson
Richard C. Johnson
Richard E. Johnson, Jr.
Gordon S. Jones
Robert F. Jones
Robert W. Jones
Jack D. Jorgenson
Thomas M. Kelly
Charles E. Kilduff
William J. Knowles
Alfred B. Lang
Edward A. Lanning
Robert L. Larzalere
Robert L. Leathers
George S. Le Crone
Dean L. Levi
James K. Lippert
Homer L. Litzenberg
III
Harry L. Loflin, Jr.
Donald J. Loughlin
Daniel F. Lynch
Robert L. McCarthy
Donald G. McCaslin
Angus G. MacDonnell
Carroll C. McDuffie
Robert J. McKee, Jr.
Earle A. McKeever II
George S. McIsaac
Walter J. McManus
Arthur A. Macy
Howard C. Marchand
William Q. Martin
Roy C. Megargel

The following named to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Willis E. Bean
Urban J. Bender
Weldon G. Browne
Thomas G. Byrne
Joe W. Cloud
John F. Costa
Harold E. Daniel
Louis E. Doucet
Wilbur R. Drake
Rollin H. Flournoy
Gale R. Green
William J. Green, Jr.

Richard T. Metcalfe
William A. Meyer
Robert L. Middlekauff
Robert L. Milbrad
Robert B. Milner
Donald L. Moloche
Eugene R. Monson
Robert S. Morgan
David W. Morrill
John D. Murray
Roger B. Neilson
David L. Nelson
John M. Nielsen
Karl W. O'Connor
Richard C. Partridge
David R. Pefley
Bob K. Peterson
Carl D. Peterson
Richard G. Peterson
Rhys J. Phillips, Jr.
Thomas M. Pickford
Frank L. Pilar
Paul P. Pirhalla
James R. Plummer
George R. Rainoff
Donald J. Rendall
Joe O. Replogle
William W. Rogers
John C. Rowett
John A. Ryan
Richard G. Scheide
Fredreck R. Schumacher
John E. Seitz
Ronald T. Shawhan
Arthur B. Shilan
Billie D. Simpkins
Richard L. Sklar
Silvio J. Spigolon
Carlton J. Spring, Jr.
William E. Starbuck
Thomas H. Staton
Robert A. Stewart
Donald Stiggers
Richard D. Taber
James G. Tarr
Robert M. Taylor
Joseph P. Till
Thomas L. Tobin
Theodore S. Topalian
James P. Turner
Jack L. Underwood
David L. Upshaw
Richard P. Van Dyke
Lawrence A. Van Gorder
Louis D. Volpp
Donald H. Wahl
Henry Waterkamp
Gordon "K" Webb
Benjamin F. Weems
III
Karl H. Wegner
Albert P. Weiner
Frank K. West, Jr.
Sherman E. Wheeler
David H. Will
Earl L. Williams
Justin Williams
Roger L. Williams
William C. Wilson
William C. Wood
George L. Yaney

Frank O. McClendon, Jr.
Charles E. McKay
Kenneth D. Mayfield
Robert E. Meyer
Orville K. Owen

The following named officer to the grade indicated in the line (aviation) of the Navy:

ENSIGN

Edward V. Laney, Jr.

The following named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Reinelda E. Vickey

LIEUTENANT

Mary B. Bucher

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Irvie L. Reese.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Robert E. Wolfard
John F. Mundy, Jr.
Roland P. Amateis, Jr.
Roy M. Wimer
Robert F. Hornbeck
Roland J. Frappier
Edward J. Geissler
Thomas L. Wakefield

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Donald H. Reaume
Harold R. Brock
Joseph F. Hallameyer
Robert B. Matson
Glenn D. Jones
George H. Drinkwater
Oscar J. Jahnsen, Jr.
William J. Spinella

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 14 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Henry C. Williams, Atmore.
Roy L. Nolen, Jr., Montgomery.
Charles O. Mason, Jr., Pine Hill.

KANSAS

Hazel H. Stoehr, Murdock.
Florian L. Zeller, Paxico.
Sara L. Becker, Vermillion.
Mary A. Mallams, Weir.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert F. Oliver, New Milford.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

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

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

Our Father God, Thou hast ordained that in the leadership of the nations the

care of the many must rest upon the shoulders of the few. We beseech Thee, give understanding, humility, and charity to those who in Thy name and for the Nation's sake are entrusted here, in this Chamber of legislation, with the power of governance. Save us from inner friction, from narrow partisanship, from the pursuit of selfish, personal goals which weaken the influence and impact upon a broken world of this land of liberty which may be, in Thy providence, if it keeps the faith, the last best hope for the healing of the nations. When day by day we have done faithfully the work Thou hast given us to do, in quietness and in confidence may we leave the result to Thy unerring judgment, knowing that in the annals of the centuries even the wrath of man may be made to praise Thee. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 14, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

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

On March 12, 1952:

S. 2394. An act to repeal the 10-percent surcharge on postal cards; and

S. 2458. An act to correct a typographical error in Public Law 204, Eighty-second Congress, relating to assistant superintendents in the Motor Vehicle Service of the Post Office Department.

On March 14, 1952:

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 1851. An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally; and
H. R. 3219. An act for the relief of Robert E. Vigus.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that, as in legislative session, Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION ACT 1952—GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 107)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the legislative branch, Government Printing Office, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION—JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 108)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental appropriation, in the amount of \$4,357,648.58, to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, for the period from July 1, to December 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

MID-DECADE CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929, 46 Stat. 25, 13 U. S. C. 216, relating to mid-decade census of agriculture (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN REIMBURSABLE CHARGES AS DEBTS AGAINST CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of his order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a survey of the Postal Sav-

ings System, dated September 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 8

"Resolution commending the Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Federal Congress for its action taken in investigating the legal proceedings involving water rights brought by the United States Attorney General against the residents of Fallbrook, Calif., and vicinity; urging the Federal Congress to give prompt consideration to H. R. 5368 in the forthcoming session of the Congress and to prevent further Federal encroachments of this kind; and condemning the action taken by the United States Attorney General

"Whereas the Attorney General of the United States has recently instituted legal proceedings to deprive 14,000 citizens of Fallbrook, Calif., and vicinity of the use of water from the Santa Margarita River, on the theory that when the United States Government acquired Camp Pendleton, across which this river flows, it acquired all of the river's water; and

"Whereas the right of such citizens to use water from this river has been long established by the laws of the State of California; and

"Whereas the action of the United States Attorney General is clearly an attempt to assert a paramount right of the Federal Government to this water, in complete derogation of the laws of the State of California and the rights of the citizens of California under the laws of that State; and

"Whereas a subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Federal Congress has investigated this matter and has reported in parts as follows:

"Nothing which developed indicated the necessity or any good reason for bringing suit involving thousands of defendants with trifling or nonexistent water claims. No useful purpose is being served by securing a legal and encyclopedic definition of water rights down to the last bucketful. It can be concluded that the legal theorists in the Attorney General's office have unnecessarily put the Federal taxpayers to great expense and the local people to great provocation and legal expense for no practical reason whatever"; and

"Whereas it is apparent that the action of the United States Attorney General illustrates a greedy officialistic and bureaucratic desire to extend the Federal power in direct violation of the sovereignty of the State of California and the rights of its citizens under the laws of that State; and

"Whereas despite the report of the committee, the United States Attorney General has stated that the litigation would continue and that only an order from the entire Congress would compel him to drop the suit; and

"Whereas House bill 5368 has been introduced in the present session of the Congress, designed to require a division of the water involved between the Government and the citizens and to forbid further Federal encroachment; and

"Whereas the Michigan State Senate deems the action of the United States Attorney General in this situation to be a threat to

the rights of every citizen of the United States to the use of water and other natural resources, as are guaranteed such citizens under the laws of the several States, which action must be condemned, as well as any similar future attempts to extend the Federal power in derogation of the rights of citizens derived from the laws of the several States; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Michigan, That the action of the Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of the Federal Congress, in investigating the encroachment by the Attorney General of the United States on the rights in water of the citizens of Fallbrook, Calif., and vicinity, given such citizens under the laws of the State of California, and in introducing H. R. 5368 as a means of quieting the vexatious litigation instituted by the United States Attorney General against these citizens, is deemed highly commendable; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Michigan does urge the Congress of the United States to give prompt consideration to H. R. 5368 in the forthcoming session of the Congress and to be ever vigilant in the consideration of ways and means of preventing further encroachments upon and violations of the rights of citizens of the United States guaranteed such citizens by the laws of the respective States in which they reside; and be it further

"Resolved, That the action of the United States Attorney General is hereby vigorously condemned; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate to all Representatives of this State in the Federal Congress; to the Speaker of the United States of Representatives; to the President of the United States Senate; to the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Federal Congress; to the Governor of the State of California; to Jim Wayman, Ed Berg, and Carroll Huscher, all of Fallbrook, Calif.; to the First Methodist, Christian Science, and Baptist churches of Fallbrook, Calif.; to the United States Attorney General, and to both houses of the Legislature of the State of California."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing a single purchasing and surplus property disposal department for the armed services and to provide that supervisory personnel employed by the Federal Government be not awarded extra compensation or additional rating principally by the reason of a large number of employees under supervision.

"Whereas it is evident that the course of world affairs necessitates a large expenditure of money for equipment and supplies for the Armed Forces and that economy dictates that such purchases be made as inexpensively as possible; and

"Whereas the Federal Civil Service Commission presently classifies supervisory Federal personnel, in part, by reference to the number of employees so supervised, which system tends to enlarge the scope of Federal employment and is not conducive to the principles of economy or efficiency: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to enact the necessary legislation to create a single department charged with the purchase and procurement

and surplus property disposal of all of the supplies and equipment required by the Armed Forces of the United States. That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to enact the necessary legislation so as to provide that supervisory personnel in the Federal service do not receive additional civil service credit and rating and the attendant additional salary principally by reason of the fact that such personnel have under their supervision a large number of employees, and that efficiency ratings be made the principal factor in the determination of promotions; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be immediately forwarded to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member from Colorado of the Congress of the United States.

"GORDON ALCOTT,
"President of the Senate."
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

The petition of Mrs. Martha E. Hamilton, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide increased pensions for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by St. Petersburg Townsend Club, No. 1, and senior citizens of Pinellas County, at St. Petersburg, Fla., favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

The memorial of Mrs. Fred Knecke, of Garnaville, Iowa, remonstrating against the appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a meeting of more than 1,000 farmers—essentially cotton farmers—of the State of Arkansas, at Moscow, Ark., relating to a stabilized price for cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii, favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the return of the military reservation embraced by Fort De Russy, in Waikiki, to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Mothers' Club of Public School No. 77, Queens, Ridgewood, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to strengthen the antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of House bill 5693, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu, relating to the filling of vacancies existing in the Circuit Court of the First Judicial Circuit of the Territory of Hawaii, by the appointment of new judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Kailhi Business Association of Honolulu, Hawaii, endorsing the American citizenship of residents of Kailhi, Honolulu, T. H.; ordered to lie on the table.

PROTEST AGAINST IMPORTATION OF INFECTED MEAT FROM CANADA—MEMORIAL OF GREEN LAKE COUNTY, WIS., FARM BUREAU

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning from Conrad L. Naparalla, organization director for the Green Lake County Farm Bureau a memorial adopted at a bureau meeting the other night remonstrating against the importation of meat from lands which

have been infected by the dread hoof and mouth disease. I ask unanimous consent that the memorial be printed in the RECORD, including the signatures, and that it thereafter be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, including the signatures, as follows:

GREEN LAKE, WIS., March 13, 1952.
SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We believe that all Mexican and Canadian meat from foot-and-mouth diseased areas should be barred from entry into our country. Please do everything in your power to keep us free from animal and human disease by strict laws and control of further products flooding our markets.

Mr. and Mrs. Willard Murray, Ripon, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Ed Lichtenburg, Berlin, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Emil J. Schilf, Ripon, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Joe S. Steeps, Berlin, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Eric Kloe, Ripon, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Schmuhi, Markesan, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Ben Elvers, Markesan, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Liefko, Ripon, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Arlo Pitcher, Green Lake, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Leo Page, Berlin, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Edw. Hazlewood, Ripon, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Carl O. Dumdie, Berlin, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Edward Grusczyński, Ripon, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Nuldebradt, Ripon, Wis.

GOVERNMENT EXPANSION AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on Monday, March 3, the junior Senator from New Jersey addressed the Senate on the subject of Government Expansion at the Federal Level.

In support of his observations there was inserted in the body of the RECORD a resolution of the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Ocean County, N. J., which, as Senators know, is a county unit of government, and a communication from the Governor of New Jersey, with supporting memoranda, all pointing to the problems which are created at the State and local levels of government when the Federal Government expands its land acquisitions beyond its needs.

This morning I received from the Honorable Thomas A. Mathis, former State senator from Ocean County, N. J., a very impressive appeal accompanied by further resolutions directed to precisely the same problems which constituted the subject matter of my remarks of March 3, 1952. I ask unanimous consent that these further resolutions be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and appropriately referred, in the hope that the whole matter of land acquisitions may have proper study and consideration.

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

Whereas this committee has been advised that the War Department, or some other agency of the Federal Government, proposes to take by condemnation a very large and

substantial part of Jackson Township, Ocean County, N. J.; and

Whereas we have been advised that the lands so proposed to be taken constitute valuable privately owned farm lands, a number of dwellings, State of New Jersey Fish and Game Reservation; and State of New Jersey Wild Life Sanctuary; and

Whereas while this committee realizes it is necessary that the Federal Government acquire sufficient lands for defense purposes, it believes that sufficient vacant and unimproved lands in the immediate neighborhood can be acquired without causing the financial losses to this municipality by the taking of such substantial part of improved properties, and that the vacant and unimproved lands which the Government could take for its purposes would serve the Government as well; and

Whereas the Federal Government and its War and Navy Departments have previously taken large areas of this municipality and adjacent municipalities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Township Committee of the Township of Jackson, in the County of Ocean, as follows:

1. That the Federal Government, War Department, and any other interested Federal agency, be and hereby are respectfully requested to take as little land as possible in Jackson Township and to desist from taking valuable farm land, improved properties, State reservations and sanctuaries, particularly in this municipality.

2. The township clerk shall forthwith send a certified copy of this resolution to each of the following:

(a) Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH, United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

(b) Hon. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

(c) Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.

(d) Hon. Thomas A. Mathis, Toms River, N. J.

Whereas it has been reported to this board that the War Department or some other agency of the Federal Government proposes to take, by condemnation, a very large and substantial part of Plumsted, Jackson, and Manchester Townships in this county;

Whereas this board realizes the necessity of the Federal Government acquiring sufficient lands for defense purposes, it realizes that the Government proposes to take such substantial parts of said municipalities as will cause the townships to be weakened financially by the loss of substantial areas of territory and cause a great hardship to the persons residing in said areas proposed to be condemned;

Whereas large portions of said lands are valuable farming lands, particularly in Plumsted Township, and are needed for agricultural purposes and further that there are other vacant and unimproved lands in this county which could be taken and used for the same purposes without damaging anyone or causing any undue hardship; and

Whereas, the Federal Government and its War and Navy Departments have previously taken large areas of said municipalities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Ocean, as follows:

1. That the Federal Government, War Department, and any other interested Federal agency be and they are hereby respectfully requested to take as little land as possible in our county and to desist from taking valuable farm land and improved properties, particularly in Plumsted Township and Jackson Township, Ocean County, N. J.

2. That the clerk of this board shall forthwith send a certified copy of this resolution

to the War Department and to Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, our Congressman and to our United States Senators, the Honorable ALEXANDER SMITH and the Honorable ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON.

Whereas this committee is informed that the United States Government contemplates taking a large area in Plumsted Township, about 75 percent of which is good tillable farm land and which constitutes about 10 percent of our taxable valuation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee opposes any such taking of property in Plumsted Township; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Hon. Thomas A. Mathis, our Congressman JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, and the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Ocean County.

This is to certify, that at a special meeting of the Township Committee of the Township of Plumsted, in the county of Ocean, held on the 26th day of February 1952, a resolution, of which the foregoing is a true copy, was adopted.

Witness my hand, this 27th day of February, 1952.

KENNETH POTTER,
Chairman.
HOWARD S. ASSON,
Township Clerk.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, to the people of New Jersey, this is a matter of deep concern, as it should be to the people of every State in the Union. I know it must be of deep concern to the people of Illinois. Unless it is curbed, the trend toward overexpansion in Federal land holding may come back to haunt us many times.

LETTER AND RESOLUTIONS OF CALIFORNIA STATE SOCIETY, NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from Mrs. Ruth Apperson Rous, corresponding secretary of the California State Society of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

This letter transmitted to me copies of resolutions unanimously adopted by the California society at its forty-fourth State conference on February 15, 1952, at Los Angeles, Calif.

These resolutions concern, respectively, communism, Communist literature, socialism, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, world government, and the United Nations Organization.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mrs. Rous' letter, together with the resolutions in question, may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter and resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

Ordered to lie on the table:

CALIFORNIA STATE SOCIETY,
DAUGHTERS OF THE
AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
Santa Monica, Calif., February 26, 1952.
Mr. PAT McCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCARRAN: The enclosed resolutions were unanimously passed by the

California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution at the forty-fourth California State conference on February 15, 1952, at Los Angeles, Calif.

We respectfully call your attention to the resolutions and earnestly hope that they will receive your favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) RUTH APPERSON ROUS,
Corresponding Secretary.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION ON COMMUNISM

"Whereas shocking disclosures, both by State and Federal Investigating Committees, have exposed the alarming extent of infiltration of Communists, communistic activities and propaganda, influencing every facet of the daily lives of the people of this country; and

"Whereas communism is a godless ideology, dedicated to the overthrow of this country by any means best suited to its purpose; and

"Whereas no group with this declared purpose should be granted the status of a political party through which the promotion of communism can be furthered; and

"Whereas the subterfuge and devious methods used by the advocates of communism to influence the thinking of people of this country, is conclusive proof that the denial of such status would send this ideology underground: Be it

Resolved, That the Forty-fourth Conference of the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, recommends to the President of the United States, the State Department, the Congress of the United States, and any other agency of the Government dealing with this matter that a study be made of appropriate means to accomplish the outlawing of communism as one of the bona fide political parties of the United States, and immediate action taken thereon; and

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, California Members of the Congress of the United States; and any other agency of the United States dealing with this matter and to the resolutions committee of the Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution."

"RESOLUTION ON SOCIALISM

"Whereas thinking people realize that the United States has traveled well along the road toward socialism; and

"Whereas many powers now delegated to the Federal Government do not in themselves constitute socialism, but add up to a Socialist government; and

"Whereas Federal aid to education, Federal housing, socialized medicine, control of electrical power through the ruse of conservation projects, control of the Federal Reserve Board, and major Government holdings in the country's banks, control of credit and Government controls of all kinds, would add up to a Socialist United States; and

"Whereas in a socialistic state the people become the servants of the state, and the state becomes all powerful; and

"Whereas socialism would cost the citizens of the United States their treasured freedoms and independence: Be it

Resolved, That the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, petition the Congress of the United States to make an over-all survey of the above-proposed legislation, controls, and Federal powers, and oppose all measures which would infringe on amendment 10 of the Constitution of the United States which provides 'that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.'"

To the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"RESOLUTION ON COMMUNIST LITERATURE

"Whereas the Soviet Embassy in Washington has mailed an attractive propaganda magazine called the U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin, a semimonthly, to public school libraries and professional organizations of teachers for the past 3 years; and

"Whereas in California a newsletter called The Repeal, urging repeal of the Levering Act, which requires a loyalty oath of all State and local government employees, has been mailed unsolicited to various educational groups; and

"Whereas the Post Office officials say they have no authority to bar communistic propaganda from the United States mail: Be it

Resolved, That Congress be requested to amend the law prohibiting fraudulent and salacious literature to include 'Communist propaganda' from the use of the United States mail; and

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the California Members of the Congress of the United States and to the resolutions committee of the Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION ON UNESCO

"Whereas the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization is furthering a campaign to destroy the integrity of our tax supported schools by indoctrinating the teachers and, through the teachers, the children, with the idea that their first loyalty is to a world government, and that they must think of themselves as world citizens; and

"Whereas UNESCO advances the un-American doctrine that the prime function of education must be that of capturing the minds of our children at the earliest possible moment for the cause of political world government; and

"Whereas there has been established by law a United States National Commission for UNESCO which has already completed a study of American world history books in use in our schools with the intent to revise these books, deleting all terms and references which would instill patriotism and love of our country in the minds and hearts of our children, and

"Whereas \$600,000 has been given by the United Nations to UNESCO for the writing of a History of Mankind, the Development of Peoples, and

"Whereas there are four men branded as atheists on the editorial committee, and

"Whereas, this book and the revised history books will be subverting the minds of the children of the United States only a few years hence: Be it

Resolved, That the forty-fourth conference of the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, opposes with every means at its command this diabolical corruption of American child minds and of the school system to which they are entrusted; and

Resolved, That the members of the California State Legislature and our California Representatives in the Congress of the United States be petitioned to make immediate investigations into UNESCO activities, including a survey of the United States Commission for UNESCO; the State Department UNESCO staff; the United States Office of Education."

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"RESOLUTION ON WORLD GOVERNMENT

"Whereas there are now many well-organized movements, both within and without the United States, for the promotion of a world government; and

"Whereas there is a planned program for use in the schools of the United States, first

to break down loyalty to our country's traditions and institutions, and second, to inculcate ideas of world citizenship and world government in the minds of school children, beginning in the kindergarten; and

"Whereas, world government may be achieved by devious and diabolical means, such as an Atlantic Union, Covenant of Human Rights, Genocide Convention, UNESCO program; and

"Whereas by such federation the United States would lose its sovereignty, the constitutional rights of its citizens would be abrogated, and our men and resources and our very lives would be at the mercy of a representative majority of such a world government because on the basis of proportional representation the United States would have only a minority vote: Be it

Resolved, That the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention assembled this 15th day of February 1952, reaffirm its unqualified opposition to world government; and

Resolved, That we oppose any world government plan, Atlantic Union, Genocide Convention, Covenant of Human Rights, and the reeducation of our children for world citizenship as being steps toward world government; and

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the California Members of the Congress of the United States and to the resolutions committee of the Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution."

"RESOLUTION ON THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

"Whereas the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, has previously endorsed the ideal of the United Nations as a means of amicably settling world difficulties and disputes; and

"Whereas the United Nations Charter has treaty status in the United States, which takes precedence over the Constitution of the United States or any of its provisions; and

"Whereas the United Nations is evolving into an international federation whose laws, whose fiscal policies, and whose police actions are subject only to that organization, and are slowly and surely destroying the sovereignty of this Nation and drawing us into a world government: Be it

Resolved, That the California State society, Daughters of the American Revolution, petition the Congress of the United States to (1) resume its constitutional powers of legislation in relation to taxation, treaties, and declaring war; (2) stand firm against further encroachment upon the rights of the American people by opposing the proposed Genocide Convention, the Covenant of Human Rights, the Atlantic Union, and that part of the Japanese Treaty which deals with the United Nations Covenant of Human Rights;

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to make thorough investigation of the implications inherent in United Nations actions with the purpose of either (1) repudiating measures which encroach upon the sovereignty of the United States, or (2) withdrawing from the United Nations;

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of resolutions of the Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution."

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

S. 470. A bill for the relief of Gloria Wilson (Rept. No. 1311);

S. 869. A bill for the relief of Marie Cafalaki (Rept. No. 1312);

S. 1037. A bill for the relief of Wai Hsueh Tan, Mrs. May Jane Tan, Robert Tingsing Tan, and Ellen Tan (Rept. No. 1313);

S. 1422. A bill for the relief of Jerry J. Lencioni (Rept. No. 1314);

S. 1679. A bill for the relief of Stephen Grove (Rept. No. 1315);

S. 2210. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Seidenberg (Rept. No. 1316);

S. 2294. A bill for the relief of Carl Himura (Rept. No. 1317);

S. 2551. A bill for the relief of Eugene Richard Sushko (Rept. No. 1318);

S. 2611. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 1319);

H. R. 827. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas (Rept. No. 1320);

H. R. 1406. A bill for the relief of Calce-donio Tagliarini (Rept. No. 1321);

H. R. 1828. A bill for the relief of Maria Szentgyorgyi Mayer (Rept. No. 1322);

H. R. 1831. A bill to admit Luigi Morelli to the United States for permanent residence (Rept. No. 1323);

H. R. 1857. A bill for the relief of James Yao (Rept. No. 1324);

H. R. 2923. A bill for the relief of Adelaide Reyes (Rept. No. 1325);

H. R. 3374. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lourdes Augusta Pereira Ladeira Rose (Rept. No. 1326);

H. R. 4010. A bill for the relief of William Grant Braden, Jr. (Rept. No. 1327);

H. R. 4268. A bill for the relief of Elvira Zachmann (Rept. No. 1328);

H. R. 5347. A bill for the relief of Fusako Terao Scogin (Rept. No. 1329);

H. R. 5389. A bill for the relief of Ching Wong Keau (Mrs. Ching Sen) (Rept. No. 1330); and

H. R. 5558. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Krause (Rept. No. 1331).

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

H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Tsutsumi (Rept. No. 1332).

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

S. 2672. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Mueller (Rept. No. 1333).

MRS. CLAIRE PHILLIPS CLAVIER—REFERENCE OF S. 911 TO COURT OF CLAIMS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1324) thereon.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 293) reported by Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 911) for the relief of Mrs. Claire Phillips Clavier, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant: *Provided, however*, That the passage of this resolution shall not

be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States.

PROGRESS REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION (REPT. NO. 1310)

Mr. MAYBANK, from the Joint Committee on Defense Production, submitted, pursuant to section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act, Progress Report No. 14, relating to world supply, production, consumption, imports and exports of steel, copper, and aluminum, and domestic requirements and allocations, which was ordered to be printed.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HOEY, from the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), submitted a report of that committee on persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or for the committee for the month of January 22, 1952, to March 15, 1952, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 17, 1952.

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

TO THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 22, 1952, to March 15, 1952, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual and address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Louis W. Sornson, 407 Hamilton Ave., Silver Spring, Md.	Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C.	\$8,040

CLYDE R. HOEY,
Chairman.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 17, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1351) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina: S. 2872. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for postal transportation clerks, acting postal transportation clerks, and substitute postal transportation clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2873. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2874. A bill for the relief of Demitrious Vasilios Karavogeorge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 2875. A bill to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE relating to the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 2876. 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. McCARRAN:

S. 2877. A bill for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2878. A bill for the relief of Michael D. Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2879. A bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Ericsson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak briefly on the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

The bill (S. 2873) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, under the guise of cooperation for defense, an international cartel has been created for the purpose of allocating raw materials among the free nations of the world.

This is the International Materials Conference—IMC—created by the State Department last year at the urging of Prime Minister Attlee.

Originating with the United Kingdom, United States and France, the IMC now consists of a central group of 8 nations which, with its commodity subcommittees, govern the world distribution of raw materials to more than 40 nations.

This body now fixes the amount of copper, zinc, sulfur, nickel, cobalt, and newsprint we may consume, how much of our own production we may sell to ourselves, and how much we must deliver to other nations, according to a master plan.

The International Materials Conference has no statutory authority. It claims only powers of recommendation. Nevertheless, its dictates have the force of law in the United States because they are implemented by the allocation and price-control powers of the Defense Production Act.

This international control over our material resources and requirements through the mechanism of the DPA and the OPS has denied vital materials to American producers with the result that serious unemployment has already developed in many areas of the United States.

These same materials that would have kept American workers employed and American consumers satisfied have been diverted to foreign nations without regard to their contribution to the common defense effort and without any requirements that they be used in the production of defense equipment.

This is a situation which threatens to undermine the American standard of living by an international application of the Marxian doctrine of taking from those who have, and handing it out to others according to need. The IMC is the first step in a master plan to control and distribute the world's natural resources.

The Congress now has an opportunity to destroy this cartel by amending the Defense Production Act so that the powers granted for defense cannot be usurped by this unauthorized international group.

I first brought the International Materials Conference to the attention of the Senate on January 31, and at that time, I said that I shall introduce an amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1951 or any extension thereof to make it perfectly clear to everyone, including the State Department personnel, that no foreign nations nor their representatives shall in any way exercise any of the authority conferred by any act of this Congress.

The bill which I have introduced is designed to make it impossible for this administration to usurp the powers of the Defense Production Act for unauthorized purposes in the future.

NATIONAL LITERACY EDUCATION ACT OF 1952

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, earlier today, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], I introduced a bill (S. 2875) to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the bill together with an article, Literacy and the National Welfare, which I have written for the March 1952 issue of the magazine School Life, the official journal of the United States Office of Education.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Literacy Education Act of 1952."

FINDING AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(a) Whereas, according to the 1940 census, more than 10,000,000 of the adult citizens of the United States had completed fewer than 5 years of schooling and were accordingly to be accounted as functionally illiterate; and

(b) Whereas the United States was by reason of this widespread adult illiteracy deprived of the fullest use of its military and industrial manpower during World War II; and

(c) Whereas the lack of basic elementary education among these millions of citizens, both native and foreign-born, constitutes a continuing national problem of great magnitude and urgency in time of peace, as well as war, because it increases the amount of ill health and poverty, retards economic development, and impedes the personal growth and social contribution of citizens in a democracy; and

(d) Whereas the excessively high illiteracy rate in the United States and our programs for reducing it have a direct influence on our international relations; and

(e) Whereas the States are making progress in providing general elementary education for all their children, which will aid eventually in preventing the recurrence of illiteracy among adults;

(f) Now, therefore, it is declared to be the policy of the Congress in the promotion of the general welfare and in the interest of national security to assist the several States in speedily removing adult illiteracy in the United States by the establishment and maintenance of programs of basic elementary education for adults, for a period not to exceed 10 years, which period may be materially shortened by the speed with which such a program is established and the progress made by the States in their general elementary education programs.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this act—

(a) The term "State" means the several States and possessions and the District of Columbia;

(b) The term "basic elementary education" means education designed to develop the ability to read, write, speak, and understand the English language, to perform elementary arithmetical computations, and to understand the main features of our constitutional republican form of Government and of our American way of life, equivalent to the ability of the average person who has completed 4 years of schooling;

(c) The term "adult" means any person beyond the compulsory school age who is not enrolled in a regular full-time day school;

(d) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education in the Federal Security Agency;

(e) The term "State educational agency" means, as the State legislature may determine, (1) the chief State school officer (such as the superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of education, or similar officer); or (2) a board of education controlling

the State department of education; except that in the District of Columbia, it shall mean the board of education;

(f) The term "minority race" means any race or racial group which constitutes a minority of the population of the United States;

(g) The term "equitable apportionment" of the funds provided under this act for the benefit of minority races in a State which maintains by law separate schools for such races, means any plan of distribution which results in the expenditure for the benefit of such minority race, of a proportion of such funds not less than the proportion that the number of the functionally illiterate adults of such minority race in such State bears to the number of functionally illiterate adults in the total population of that State;

(h) The term "index of ability" means the percent that the State per capita income is of the national per capita income for the latest year available as reported by the Department of Commerce. The "inverse ratio" of the index of ability is obtained by subtracting the State index of ability from 200 percent.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4. In order to promote the development and maintenance by the States of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, the sum of \$5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the sum of \$10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for each succeeding fiscal year through June 30, 1961, the sum of \$15,000,000; and for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1962 and 1963, the sum of \$5,000,000. The funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to the States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner applications for funds as set forth in section 5 hereof for carrying out the purposes of this act.

STATE APPLICATIONS

SEC. 5 (a) In order to be approved by the Commissioner, a State application for funds shall—

(1) designate the State educational agency to be responsible for the administration, or for the supervision of the administration, of a program of basic elementary education for adults within the State;

(2) outline the State plan for a program of basic elementary education for adults which shall include provisions for the organization and conduct of classes for adult illiterates, for the training of teachers and supervisors for such classes, and for the fostering of research, experimentation, and demonstration in educational institutions or other approved agencies or organizations in cooperation with local public-school authorities of improved methods and materials for use in such classes;

(3) provide that the State treasurer or corresponding official shall act as custodian of funds made available to the State under this act and shall expend the same only on warrant of the State educational agency;

(4) provide that the State educational agency shall make reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require and give the Commissioner upon demand access to the records upon which such information is based;

(5) provide for the designation of a State advisory council of not less than seven persons representing the major interested groups to consult with the State educational agency in planning and promoting the State program of basic elementary education for adults; and

(6) provide, in States which by law maintain separate schools for minority races, for

an equitable apportionment of funds secured under this act for the benefit of such races.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State application for funds which complies with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 6. (a) Not less than 98 percent of the funds appropriated under section 4 of this act shall be distributed to the States in the following manner: Each State for which a State application under section 5 has been approved shall be entitled to an allotment from any appropriation made pursuant to section 4 of the sum obtained by multiplying (1) the sum which bears the same ratio to the total amount of such appropriation as the number of adults in such State who have not completed the fifth year of school, according to latest figures available as reported by the Bureau of the Census, bears to the total number of such adults in the United States, by (2) the inverse ratio of the State's index of ability. In the event the funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 4 of this act are insufficient to pay to all eligible States the amount of the Federal allotment to each such State, computed in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, the amount to be paid to each eligible State shall bear the same ratio to the amount of the Federal allotment to such States as such appropriation bears to the sum of the Federal allotment to all eligible States: *Provided*, That no State's entitlement shall be less than \$10,000. The Commissioner shall, before August 15 of each fiscal year, estimate the sum to which each State is entitled under this section during that fiscal year and shall thereupon certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated, reduced, or increased as the case may be, by any sum by which the Commissioner finds that his estimate for a prior year was greater or less than the amount to which the State was entitled for such year. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Commissioner, the amount so certified.

(b) Any funds paid to a State under this section and not expended for the purpose for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasurer of the United States. Sums allotted to a State for any fiscal year for the purposes of this act and unencumbered at the end of such year shall remain available to such State for the next fiscal year (and for such year only) in addition to sums allotted to such States for the next fiscal year.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT

SEC. 7. (a) This act shall be administered by the Commissioner under the supervision of the Federal Security Administrator and with the advice of an advisory council composed of persons representing the major interested groups. The Commissioner, with the approval of the Administrator, is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations and to perform such other functions as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided herein, nothing in this act shall be construed as conferring on any Federal officer or employee the right to exercise any supervision or control over the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods, or materials of instruction in any State with respect to which any funds had been or may be expended under this act.

(c) The Commissioner shall annually report to the Congress upon his administration of this act, including the progress made by the several States in the removal of adult illiteracy and any related matters.

[From School Life for March 1952]

Excerpts from

LITERACY AND THE NATIONAL WELFARE

(By HARLEY M. KILGORE, Senator from West Virginia)

I am pleased to have the opportunity to express my views on the problem of illiteracy to the Nation through the columns of School Life. My interest in the problem is of long standing. It goes back to the days when I, just out of the University of West Virginia, taught public school in my native State. Later, as judge of the criminal court of Raleigh County, W. Va., I saw at first hand many of the tragic results of illiteracy.

It will be remembered that in 1948, I introduced a bill in the second session of the Eightieth Congress to assist the States in the removal of the blot from our Nation. I again introduced a similar bill in 1949 in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. And it is my intention to continue to do everything in my power to solve this problem until the Nation is aroused to its importance and the Congress assumes its responsibility in the matter. The reasons for my interest are fundamental, and may be stated very simply and directly.

ILLITERACY SLOWS NATIONAL DEFENSE

Adult illiteracy is a serious problem to our defense authorities. The loss in manpower because of illiteracy during the last war is well known. The number of men rejected by the Selective Service System would have made 40 army divisions. Even today, with our limited mobilization, the military could do a much more effective and speedy job of preparation if they did not have to contend with the illiterates. It is estimated that approximately 75,000 male youths who are functionally illiterate (had completed fewer than 5 years of schooling) reach registration age each year, and that the corresponding number of females is approximately 50,000. Unless means are provided to lift this mass of undereducated youth to a level of functional literacy, and if we face all-out mobilization, the Defense Establishment will find itself saddled with the burden of training as was the case during the last war. To the extent to which this is necessary, it will, of course, divert the time and energies of the military from their primary task of defense.

ILLITERACY RETARDS ECONOMIC GROWTH

Our economic strength is an important link in our defense program. The industrial and agricultural activities which are at the foundation of our economic strength are becoming highly mechanized, requiring an ever-increasing amount of literacy. Lack of ability to read makes the illiterate a menace to himself and his fellows in industry and prevents the agricultural worker from benefiting fully from the services of Government bulletins, county agents, and other sources of helpfulness. The products of industry and farm are second only to manpower in our defense efforts. Anything, therefore, which impedes their flow, as does illiteracy, is an enemy within our ranks. It retards economic growth and development and should be stopped without delay.

Normally, when our economic establishment should be geared to the scientific and technological progress of our times, illiteracy is as much of a deterrent as in times of emergency. It is well known that industrial wages and farm income of individuals, communities and States rise in proportion to the rise in literacy. Retail sales also are closely related to literacy. The flow of interstate commerce, the interdependence of individuals and groups, and the elimination of geographical boundaries by modern transportation and communication facilities are more and more becoming matters of national concern. And anything which affects them,

as does illiteracy, becomes a national responsibility.

LITERACY PROMOTES SOCIAL PROGRESS

Social progress is dependent upon individual progress. One of the most important ingredients of this progress is the ability to use effectively the tools of modern communication. The ability to function effectively as a worker, as a citizen, and as a member of a family is a powerful contributor to the general welfare of society. And the extent to which an individual can communicate with his fellows and understand the printed page, to that extent will he contribute to social advancement. In order to do these things, a command of the skills of communication is necessary. This includes not merely the ability to read and write, but also the ability to speak and listen with discrimination. The complexity and tempo of our civilization make these abilities mandatory. Employers do not want illiterates because they cannot meet the exacting requirements of the average job. The duties of a citizen in a modern community today call for competencies which illiterates do not possess. The relationships among the different members of the family today call for knowledge, skills, appreciations, and attitudes which are almost impossible for the illiterate to acquire. If, therefore, the Nation's progress and welfare depend on the efficiency of its workers, the competencies of its citizens, and the wholesomeness of the relationship of its families, it follows that anything that will contribute to the achievement of these goals—as does literacy—becomes an urgent responsibility of the Nation.

ILLITERACY ENDANGERS DEMOCRACY

Democracy, more than any other form of government, calls for a literate population. Our founding fathers recognized this, however, they did not specifically provide for its achievement in the organic law. Nevertheless, the principle has been so generally accepted that we have established the most comprehensive system of free universal compulsory education found anywhere in the world.

Despite this fact, we still have millions of adult citizens who are illiterate, whose lack of education is a handicap to themselves, and causes them to become a drag on society and a potential menace to our democratic way of life.

In order to function effectively in a democracy, citizens must possess facts about many things and people. If they are to exercise the kind of independent judgment which our representative form of Government requires and are not to be unduly swayed by the rabble-rousers, and the bombardment of mass media, they must think clearly and discriminatingly about those things and people. They cannot think clearly and independently unless they can participate effectively in the arts and skills of communication which is functional literacy.

The extent to which the individual is the cornerstone of our democracy to that extent is it necessary that there be a high rate of literacy among all groups of our population, because, as I have often said, "talk about 'democracy' and 'our way of life' is largely unintelligible to illiterates."

The 1950 census data on illiteracy are not yet available. But according to the 1940 data, and the estimates of the Census Bureau in 1947, the problem is extensive and widespread. As I pointed out in my speech in the Senate on June 3, 1948, "the men and women in the United States who are now in the darkness of functional illiteracy are not all foreigners or Negroes, or members of other underprivileged groups. * * * Educators have long known that a grim percentage of our native-born white citizens have had little or no schooling." I also emphasized

in that speech a fact which is not generally known—namely, that illiteracy exists throughout the Nation.

LITERACY IS A NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

A national program of action is needed for several reasons: (1) It is needed to equalize the burden of education because many States are not able to support an adequate program of education; (2) since each State must contribute its share to the security of the Nation, it is the responsibility of the Nation to assure the effectiveness of that contribution; and (3) the magnitude and complexity of the problem require a concerted, coordinated, and frontal attack.

A national program of action such as I have been advocating will not only serve our own national needs, but will also contribute directly and indirectly to the strengthening of our international relations.

In the speech referred to earlier, I called attention to our contributions to the UNESCO program. Since that time we have contributed huge sums through ECA and point 4. A national program to eradicate illiteracy in the United States could help furnish the know-how in attacking the problem throughout the world. It is conceivable that such a program would also enable us to supply the many requests that come to us from other lands for teachers and leaders. The significance of this possibility is realized when it is recalled that practically one-half of the population of the world is illiterate, and that communism is making a strong bid for leadership of those masses. If we could thus give a needed emphasis on the human and social aspects of our aid to the world, in addition to our present emphasis on economic and military assistance, I am confident that it would pay handsome dividends—namely, greater faith in our humanitarian and democratic motives.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO ASSENTS OF CONTROLLED OR CONTROLLING STOCKHOLDERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2354) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF PERSONNEL OF UNIFORMED SERVICES—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5715) to amend sections 201 (a), 301 (e), 302 (f), 302 (g), 508, 527, and 528 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REVOCAION OF WATER CARRIER CERTIFICATES AND PERMITS UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2364) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke or amend, under cer-

tain conditions, water carrier certificates and permits, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO RESTRICTION OF AGRICULTURAL AND FISH EXEMPTION FOR MOTOR CARRIERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2357) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict the application of the agricultural and fish exemption for motor carriers; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

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

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

By Mr. CAIN:

Transcription of program entitled "What Is the Role of New Japan?" participated in by Senator SPARKMAN and Representative JUDD, of Minnesota, and broadcast on the American Forum of the Air on March 16, 1952.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Statement prepared by him and article entitled "Subsidy at a Profit," written by Peter Edson dealing with the Informational Media Guaranty Contract Service in the Mutual Security Agency.

Editorial entitled "Newbold Morris Strikes Out, Swinging," published in a recent edition of the Daily Plainsman, of South Dakota.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Editorial entitled "Freedom Unearned Breeds Chaos," published in the Arkansas Democrat of March 14, 1952.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Editorial entitled "We Change, and Why," relating to the St. Lawrence seaway, published in the Indianapolis News of January 30, 1952.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Article entitled "United States Employees Crowd Ships and Planes," published in the March 4 issue of United States News and World Report.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Article entitled "State Obtained Ancient Charter by Mere Chance," written by John Scotzin, and published in the Harrisburg Evening News of March 11, 1952.

Editorial entitled "It Is Congress' Duty, Mr. Morris," published in the Washington Observer of March 13, 1952.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Editorial entitled "The Democratic Process Triumphs in India, But a Cloud Appears," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 25, 1952.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

Editorial entitled "The Korean Stalemate," published in the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News of March 11, 1952.

By Mr. KEM:

Editorial entitled "Mr. Brannan's Barn Door," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 13, 1952.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

Letter and editorial on the subject of the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Article entitled "Russia Making Jets Even Better Than MIG-15s," written by Ansel E. Talbert, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 13, 1952.

MOVEMENT OF STORED GRAIN AND PROSPECTIVE WHEAT CROP—LETTER FROM G. F. GEISSLER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at about this season for the past several years our citizens in the wheat producing areas have become concerned about the movement of stored and loan Commodity Credit Corporation grain, and the prospective new wheat movement.

Last fall the winter wheat producing States planted an increased acreage, and present prospects indicate a very large crop. In Kansas approximately 15,000,000 acres of wheat were planted last fall, and my reports indicate that it has gone through the winter in very good shape, and has substantial subsoil moisture.

A number of grain dealers and elevator operators have expressed concern about the movement of this crop. If some immediate action is not taken, I have every reason to believe we will again be confronted with a boxcar shortage which will delay movement of the Commodity Credit grain, as well as some direct losses to our wheat growers, because of their inability to get the crop into storage facilities.

As I stated, this problem is not new, but it does seem to me there should be some solution to it. Certainly those of us who have had to deal with it had hoped that we might work out a program of staggered maturity dates on grain loans that would partially alleviate this problem.

During my 4 years as Governor of the State of Kansas, we held extensive hearings with representatives of farm organizations, grain dealers, the Department of Agriculture, and transportation agencies, and all were agreed that some action should be taken. In our efforts we had the finest cooperation from the Association of American Railroads, and I pay tribute to Ralph E. Clark of that agency. He personally went into the wheat harvest area and took charge of the boxcar movement. As one who had to deal with it very directly, I wish again to express my appreciation to Mr. Clark and the splendid group of assistants he has in the field.

Recently I again discussed this problem with him, and regret very much that present indications are we must go through the same ordeal again. My hopes for any solution of the problem before the coming harvest were greatly discouraged when I recently received a copy of a letter written by Mr. G. F. Geissler, Administrator of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to Mr. H. F. Easterling, general chairman, Southwest Shippers Advisory Board, Dallas, Tex.

As I interpret Mr. Geissler's letter, the Production Marketing Administration intends to continue using a substantial part of the boxcar supply to move old grain stocks during the period when the new crops are being harvested, rather

than to use these cars for the handling of the new crop grains.

I personally think it is more important to get the new crop grains under cover than to move the old grains which have been in suitable storage for long periods.

I am fully aware of the difficulty facing the Production Marketing Administration in regard to the movement of millions of bushels of grain following the maturity dates of the loans and the movement of the new crop within a very short time after they receive title to the stored grain.

I am taking this opportunity to call this matter to the attention of the Senate, as I am confident that next June my office, together with the office of every other Senator from the grain-producing area, will be flooded with requests for assistance in securing needed cars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a letter written by Mr. G. F. Geissler, administrator of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to Mr. H. F. Easterling, general chairman of the Southwest Shippers Advisory Board, Dallas, Tex.

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

MARCH 6, 1952.

Mr. H. F. EASTERLING,
General Chairman, Southwest Shippers
Advisory Board,
Dallas, Texas.

DEAR MR. EASTERLING: This is in reply to your letter of January 13, 1952, recommending that we advance grain loan maturity dates so as to permit the old crop to be moved out of storage prior to May of each year in order to eliminate the excess demand for rail transportation caused by moving the old and new crops during the same period.

We have received, over a period of several years, many requests for advancing, staggering, or retarding price-support program maturity dates. During periods of steady markets, producers want maturity dates retarded to allow them more time in which to take advantage of any rising market that may occur. For example, in the first 3 months of 1951, many requests were received from producers in the Southwest asking that the grain sorghum program maturity date be set back from 60 to 90 days. At the same time, we were receiving resolutions and letters from warehousemen and transportation groups asking for an advance in price-support program maturity dates.

When a program maturity date is established, or consideration is given to changing a program maturity date, all factors affecting all groups concerned must be carefully considered and weighed.

Warehouse storage rates under the uniform grain storage agreement provide for earning a full year's storage charges in the first 200 to 230 days after the date of deposit of the grain with the remainder of the storage year on free time. Because of this, warehousemen are anxious to ship commodities as soon as possible after this earning period ends. Transportation companies have established rates for all grain they carry regardless of when the grain is shipped.

The purpose of price support programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to assure the producer a fair price for his commodity. Maturity dates, as established, give producers as much time as possible in which to sell their commodities through the regular channels. The Commodity Credit Corporation does not want grain turned over to it unless trade channels cannot handle it. An advance of maturity dates would tend to

defeat this purpose by making a shorter marketing period for producers.

The staggering of maturity dates would not provide all producers with the same opportunity to sell their commodities through trade channels. Producers in an area with early maturity dates would not be in a position to liquidate their loans and dispose of the grain through the trade if market prices advanced during the latter part of the marketing year. Producers in the late maturity date area would be in a position to take advantage of any market increase caused by large amounts of grain being turned over to CCC in the early maturity date area, or market increases due to a later crop report in years of poor crop prospects.

One of the main causes for heavy demands on box cars during harvest time results from changes in methods of harvesting. With the use of modern farm machinery such as combines, the harvest period has been greatly reduced. The Department has attempted to assist in attaining orderly marketing to prevent congestion in transportation and markets by offering grain storage programs whereby producers can hold their commodity on the farm until such time as it can be moved to everyone's advantage. In 1949 a complete study was made of program maturity dates to establish the most satisfactory dates for all groups affected by the maturity date. As a result, the grain sorghum maturity date was advanced from April 30 to March 31, the soybean program maturity date was set back from April 30 to May 31, and the corn program maturity date advanced from August 31 to July 31. The advancing of the grain sorghum maturity date has made it possible to utilize available transportation facilities a month earlier.

While we realize that few, if any, programs are entirely satisfactory to all groups concerned, we believe, for the reasons stated above, that the advancing or staggering of maturity dates is not the practical solution to the transportation problem. We are always open to suggestions to improve programs that will be satisfactory to all groups involved, but, until such time as a better plan is developed, we do not think it advisable to change grain maturity dates.

Your very truly,

G. F. GEISSLER,
Administrator.

PROPOSED RETURN OF GEN. D. D. EISENHOWER

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, I am one of those who believe that the period of survival of the free world depends not only on the defense which we in the United States can raise, but also on the maintenance and strengthening of our alliances both in Europe and South America, and also in the Middle East and Far East. This is a program to which I am compelled to adhere by my reason, and which is, I believe, supported by logic. It is a program in which I very deeply believe.

Last week, at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I suggested to the committee that we might well consider inviting Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, General of the Army and Supreme Commander of NATO operations, to come home to testify upon the Mutual Security bills, on which we are now holding hearings. After some deliberation on that suggestion it was agreed to postpone further consideration until a later time.

I made the motion on the day the New Hampshire primary was being held, and,

of course, before the results of that primary could be known. I did so because I realized that any suggestion as to any action which General Eisenhower might take on any matter could be commented upon and interpreted as one which was motivated by partisan political considerations. I tried to avoid that as far as I could by making the suggestion before the New Hampshire primary results had come in. We held a meeting on Tuesday morning, while the balloting was still in progress.

The more I saw of the statements which were being made by Members of Congress and by other prominent citizens of the United States relative to what could be done with the mutual security program by way of cutting it and gutting it the more convinced I became that if the program was to be saved for the survival of the United States and of the free world, it was going to be essential for one of the chief architects of this policy, in which he so deeply believes, to return to tell the Foreign Relations Committee, the Congress, and the American people of the faith which I feel is in his heart, and the conviction which he entertains that only through maintenance of our alliance and our strength can we guarantee the survival of this Nation.

So I pointed out to the committee this morning that we had not before us the consideration of the Republican nominee for the Presidency; that we were not designed, tailored, and purposed to scheme on the division of delegates between any candidates in any convention; but that we were there to consider the proposal to appropriate \$8,000,000,000 of the money of the people of the United States for the purpose of implementing the NATO agreement. Our military authorities, including General Eisenhower, agree that this program is essential to the security of the United States. About three-quarters of the money would be spent through his command.

I was pleased to read yesterday the dispatches which came from Paris, one quoting General Clay to the effect that he felt certain that if General Eisenhower believed that his testimony was necessary for the proper presentation—nay, the achievement—of the program, he would be quite willing to come home. On the other hand, he was quoted as saying that if he believed that this action was motivated by some partisan purpose, he would decline the invitation. So I take this occasion to say to my friend of many years standing, to whom the American people owe so much, that there is no political motive of any kind behind my motion, but rather the conviction that General Eisenhower will really be embarrassed unless he comes home and supports the program. I see brewing in the Congress an effort so to cut the program as to make it inoperable, and make it a failure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

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

Mr. McMAHON. This morning the Foreign Relations Committee took a vote on the question of inviting General Eisenhower to return home, leaving to him, of course, the final decision. The vote was 6 to 5 against extending the invitation. On a motion to reconsider, although there was no roll call, I believe I can say that the vote to reconsider was unanimous. It was unanimously agreed that the question would be postponed and raised again, after we had heard from General Gruenther. That is the present status of the matter.

In justice to myself and the deep conviction which I feel regarding the essentiality of the mutual security program and the necessity and the great advisability of bringing to its support before the Congress and the people the man who, as much as any other, was responsible for its initiation a year ago in two appearances before the Congress, I thought it would be an act of statesmanship to see to it that we now mobilize the support which is essential to build the strength necessary to sustain the security and assure the survival of the people of the United States.

THE GENERAL WELFARE CLAUSE—SENATOR HOEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as a boy I recall that my grandfather frequently said: "the tendency of everything is to be more so." As applied to government the French political philosopher, Montesquieu, expressed the same thought when he said:

The corruption of any government generally begins with the corruption of its principle, and the duration of any given form depends upon the persistence in a given society of the particular principle which is characteristic of that form.

From my viewpoint one of the most unfortunate developments of the past 18 years was the adoption by President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the Hamiltonian view of the general welfare clause of our Constitution. He sold Congress on the view that under the general-welfare clause it had the right to appropriate for anything it saw fit so long as it piously inserted a preamble to the effect that what it proposed to do was for the general welfare. And while his original Court-packing plan failed, he finally succeeded in appointing a majority of the Court that concurred in his views with respect to the general-welfare clause.

As a result, the Congress of the United States, notwithstanding the levying of unprecedented taxes, has proceeded to spend our Nation to the brink of financial disaster and nothing now stands between our people and national bankruptcy except a resolute determination of the Congress to eliminate all unnecessary spending whether it be spending for those purposes which the Constitu-

tion authorized the Congress to finance or for the aid of specific groups which the founding fathers never contemplated that Congress would undertake to aid.

Through the years Southern States have sent to the Congress men imbued with the spirit of the founding fathers that the Federal Government was a government of delegated and therefore limited powers, with all other powers reserved to the sovereign States which united to form a more perfect union or to the people thereof.

Virginia is justly proud of the able and patriotic statesmen who through the years her sister State of North Carolina has sent to the Congress—men who believed in economy and efficiency in Government, Democrats who were loyal to the States' rights views of our party founders, Jefferson and Jackson. It was my privilege to serve for 14 years in the House with that noble Roman, ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON, whose decision to retire from public life at the end of his current term is regretted by all who know him. And it has been my privilege for the past 6 years to serve in the Senate with another outstanding statesman, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], who will be honored by his fellow citizens at a dinner in Raleigh, N. C., next Wednesday evening.

Representative DOUGHTON and the senior Senator from North Carolina, staunch advocates of a central government of limited power and of prudence in taxing and spending, are worthy heirs of that great North Carolinian, Col. Hugh Williamson, who was a member of the Philadelphia convention which framed the Federal Constitution in 1787.

Speaking against the enactment of the Codfisheries Act of February 1792, Williamson said that if Congress established the doctrine of granting bounties under the general-welfare clause, that clause, "in the hands of a good politician may supersede every part of our Constitution and leave us in the hands of time and chance." And with prophetic insight, he foresaw many projects for legislation that are now being advocated each year. He said:

If Congress can apply money indefinitely to the general welfare and are the sole and supreme judges of the general welfare, they may take the care of religion into their hands; they may establish teachers in every State, county, and parish, and pay them out of the Public Treasury; they may take into their own hands the education of children, establishing in like manner schools throughout the Union; they may undertake the regulation of all roads other than post roads. In short, everything from the highest object of State legislation down to the most minute object of police, would be thrown under the power of Congress; for every object I have mentioned would admit the application of money, and might be called, if Congress pleased, provisions for the general welfare.

* * * I, sir, have always conceived—I believe those who proposed the Constitution conceived—that this is not an indefinite Government deriving its power from the general terms prefixed to the specified powers, but a limited Government tied down to the specified powers which explain and define the general terms.

When the senior Senator from North Carolina goes to Raleigh next Wednesday to give an account of his stewardship, I hope that he will convey to the people of North Carolina the genuine appreciation of their neighbors in Virginia that North Carolina has sent to the Congress two such men as DOUGHTON and HOEY and that he will say to them that on both sides of the aisle in the Senate he has colleagues who realize how fundamentally right Col. Hugh Williamson was 160 years ago and who are firmly resolved that they shall stand at this session of the Congress against a type of spending that leads to disaster.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not more than 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] which related to one of the finest persons who has ever been a Member of this body. I refer to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. With his customary modesty the senior Senator from North Carolina immediately fled from the floor of the Senate when he heard the Senator from Virginia begin to praise him for his service and for his high qualities. He still remains absent from the floor.

Mr. President, since, like the Senator from Virginia, I shall find it impossible to be in Raleigh on Wednesday night, because of the fact that I had agreed to remain here on Wednesday to participate in an important hearing of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I wish to associate myself with the praise extended to the senior Senator from North Carolina by the Senator from Virginia, and also to say that one of the rarest privileges and pleasures which has come to me as a Member of this body has been that of being, from the beginning, a desk mate of the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina. I am sure I speak for all other Senators when I say that no Senator exceeds him in the high degree of respect in which he is held by every other Member of the Senate.

I think I also speak for every other Member of the Senate when I say that there is no Member of the Senate for whom we have deeper personal affection than we have for the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina. An outstanding lawyer of his State, he is perhaps the only member of the North Carolina bar who has litigated in every county of that great State. He has represented his great State most ably in the Hall of the House of Representatives and also in this body, the Senate of the United States. Between those two services, he rendered to his progressive State, as one of its greatest Governors, 4 years of constructive leadership in that executive office.

So I am sure that every one of us wishes to join with his distinguished fellow citizens of North Carolina next Wednesday night when they pay tribute to a magnificent American, who so ably,

conscientiously, and effectively has represented not only his great State but also the American Union as a whole in every position he has taken in this body during his distinguished service as a United States Senator.

**BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE
HEARINGS ON FHA AND VA MORTGAGE
LOAN PROBLEMS**

As in legislative session,

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to place in the RECORD three letters, one from the Bowery Savings Bank of New York, one from the Dry Dock Savings Bank, of New York, and a third from the Union Dime Savings Bank of New York City.

These letters were received after the hearings were sent to the printer. It was understood, during the round-table discussion which was held with certain bankers by the Committee on Banking and Currency that certain memoranda would be filled with the committee. Unfortunately, these letters arrived after the hearings had been sent to the printer. I believe that it is worth while to read these letters, in connection with housing legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

THE BOWERY SAVINGS BANK,
New York, N. Y., February 18, 1952.

Mr. JOSEPH P. McMURRAY,
Staff Director, Banking and Currency
Committee, United States Senate
Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: Sorry I could not get this to you before the end of last week, but was sort of laid low on Tuesday with virus X and was unable to comply with your request. However, for the benefit of the committee, here is an answer to your letter of February 13, 1952.

On the questions of inability of permanent mortgagees to operate in certain States, it would be well nigh impossible to set up a definitive listing of individual State requirements, disabilities, and restrictions upon out-of-State banking institutions investing in such States. Basically, such matters revolve around doing-business statutes of such States, together with the question of agency, taxation of investments within a State made by an out-of-State institution, and redemption provisions in connection with defaulted and foreclosed real estate mortgages. From experience it has also been found that attorneys differ as to opinions and methods of transacting business in the out-of-State territories. Based upon such opinions, restrictions, and disabilities, as I pointed out, there are certain States where the risk involved in doing business precludes certain institutions from participating in the permanent financing of mortgages. The local mortgage bankers' associations in certain States have been instrumental in having enacted enabling State legislation to permit limited qualification of out-of-State institutions to purchase completed mortgages in these States. In other States the matter is under consideration. Eventually, I believe, the matter will be straightened out in most instances. At the present we are able to participate in the Nation-wide mortgage market only subject to existing limitations, laws, and opinions.

It would seem to me that a resumé of the 3-day meeting with the committee would indicate that defense housing located in

relatively stabilized areas, not predominantly dependent upon a defense facility, can and will be financed by private mortgage lending institutions. Also, a certain portion of defense housing in other areas where permanent mortgage financing is available might well be served by such financing.

In Raymond Foley's testimony, he estimated the needs for defense housing as approximately 200,000 units. Based upon Home Loan Bank Board statistics, in connection with nonfarm mortgage recordings of \$20,000 or less from 1945 to 1951, the all-time high for average amount of all mortgage recordings was \$5,732 in August 1951. Using this figure, it would seem that the entire 200,000 units could be financed for \$1,146,400,000. (200,000 × \$5,732.) As pointed out, private financing will take care of a portion of this amount. If we assume that only 30 percent—\$343,800,000—of this amount will be privately financed, it would seem that the balance of \$800,000,000 would have to be made by FNMA. (In using 30 percent as an assumed figure for private financing, I believe I am being ultraconservative.) Of this \$800,000,000, FNMA already has set aside \$200,000,000 for the purchase of mortgages covering programed defense housing. Thus it appears that if it is anticipated that FNMA would be required to finance \$800,000,000 of defense housing, it could be done by increasing their appropriation by not more than \$600,000,000. As an appropriate measure, this amount initially might be substantially reduced—to say \$250,000,000—in order to gather some idea of what percentage of defense financing is to be done by private institutional investors.

From the discussion, the most critical area—in which funds for defense housing are apparently unavailable—was California. The following quotation from the fall 1951, issue of Housing Research, published by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, entitled "Metropolitan Mortgage Market: San Francisco," will undoubtedly throw some light upon the supply of mortgage funds available for housing in at least one major California area:

"The supply of mortgage-loan funds in the Bay area mortgage market is subject to rapid changes with changing market conditions and interest-rate patterns. This market is particularly sensitive to changes in bank policies because of their over-all importance in the market and their dominance of the construction-loan field. The current rise in interest rates has particular significance for the bay area mortgage market because of the broad participation by banks and insurance companies in bond and other investment markets. Insurance companies have been the last important institutional group to support the 4-percent VA rate. The rapid expansion in their loan portfolios in 1949 and 1950, their large backlog of pre-regulation X commitments, and the exercise of some moral suasion, in company with the rise in Government bond yields, have apparently caused a temporary withdrawal from the mortgage market in early 1951."

This situation not only has continued throughout 1951, but was further affected since March 1951, when the peg was pulled from under the Government bond market.

In assuming that only 30 percent of needed defense housing will be financed by private institutional investors, I am also assuming that the FHA and VA rates of interest will remain frozen. Much testimony, including my own, indicated that an increase in the rates would have a salutary effect upon the amount of private institutional funds which find its way into the mortgage market. In last Saturday's New York World-Telegram, Harold R. Bunce, financial writer, in an article entitled "Interest Hikes Hit at Savings Bonds," stated:

"The price of every type of money the Government borrows has risen sharply from

the frozen rates charged during and immediately following the war.

"The cost of 91-day money represented by Treasury discount bills had risen fourfold, from three-eighths to 1½ percent. From the shortest of Treasury security right on up to the longest marketable bonds, interest yields have risen progressively. Victory 2½'s sold on a 2.34 percent yield basis 2 years ago. Today the basis is 2.70 percent."

Interest yields, rising progressively during the period involved, certainly would indicate that guaranteed or insured mortgage investments at frozen rates and yields are placed in an extremely uncompetitive position in comparison to other investment opportunities. To a great extent, FNMA, which was created as a stand-by agency for mortgage funds not available in the private market, has been given powers on a direct competitive lending basis and, in effect, is acting as the prop to uphold unrealistically frozen interest rates. It is my belief that Congress intended that FNMA act only as a supplemental mortgage market. However, this primary purpose has changed with the change in the investment yield situation. Basically, the inherent dangers in FNMA as it is now constituted are threefold: first, an open market for secondary financing can well lead to overexpansion of mortgage operations in certain cases of institutions and mortgage companies; second, it provides a purchasing agency for mortgages at a price in excess of the free market price; and third, it provides a means of disposing of mortgage securities on which the rate of return is unfavorable, in comparison to going rate of return which can be secured on conventional loans in the mortgage market. Further, experience has proved that each time FNMA was close to running out of available funds, there was an accelerated flow of mortgages into FNMA for the purpose of getting in under the wire. A review of this situation should be undertaken at this time and administrative or legislative changes should be put into effect to limit FNMA to its original purpose, i. e., that of a stand-by secondary market.

One other matter which has bearing upon not only the mortgage market, but also the defense housing program, is the question of the relation of established rentals on programmed houses to total cost. Tom Coogan testified, I believe, that the difficulty with the programmed rental housing for defense was that scheduled rentals would not capitalize at anywhere near the cost required to erect such rental units. Inasmuch as about 50 percent of the programmed housing is rental housing, it would seem that, if the agencies involved cannot agree on rentals which would capitalize satisfactorily, almost half of the program would be on dead center within the agencies. Obviously, if such properties do not capitalize on the basis of net rentals to be received, mortgages could not be expected to assume the additional risks inherent in such a situation.

I hope these thoughts will be helpful, and wish to congratulate you and the committee on the excellence of the 3-day meeting and the results obtained.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY,
Harry Held,
Vice President.

DRY DOCK SAVINGS BANK,
New York, N. Y., February 18, 1952.
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I listened with interest to Bob Pratt on the subject of his testimony and that of other bankers before your committee last week and also read some

comments on it in the press here. He said he thought I should send you some of my views, as he doubted if they had been brought out in the testimony.

I for one do not think that the interest rates being offered are unattractive or unreasonable. Our bank has invested over \$100,000,000 in FHA and VA mortgages all over the Nation of which \$22,000,000 alone went into Wherry bill housing. We are pleased with nearly all our investments of this character and are continually increasing them at the present rates.

I believe that instead of increasing interest rates more thought should be given to making the investment itself appeal to new sources of capital and attract a greater percentage of asset investment in this media from those presently making it their major investment. At the same time, this appeal should be by means which would not be unwise or burdensome on the FHA or Treasury if it should ever come to that.

The large sources of investment funds are, of course, the insurance companies, the mutual savings banks, the savings deposits in commercial banks, the savings and loan associations, and the rapidly increasing pension trusts which in 10 years may well have greater assets than the savings banks or savings and loan associations.

At the present time pension trusts have made little, if any, investments of this type. The savings and loan associations committed, as they seem to be, to the highest possible dividend rates have, according to Federal Home Loan Bank statistics, placed a comparatively small percentage of their funds in FHA and VA loans because of the necessity of obtaining the higher rates which prevail on conventional mortgages. Unless these associations should reverse their policy, which seems doubtful, the demand I believe can be created must come from pension trusts, insurance companies, mutual savings banks, and commercial banks. Our problem therefore, is to attract pension trust funds to this media and obtain a greater percentage of asset investment from the insurance companies, savings banks, and commercial banks. I think my suggestion might well bring this about, and I have been encouraged by the response to it from the limited number of men in these investment fields with whom I have discussed it.

My suggestion is that the Congress authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator or the FHA Commissioner, whenever they find it difficult to find purchasers of insured mortgages under certain titles, to covenant that debentures received under these titles could be converted into 5-year 1½ percent or 2 percent debentures at the option of the holder. This is not original, of course, as it merely follows the plan devised by the Treasury last year for converting the 2½'s of '72 into nonmarketable 2¾'s which in turn could be converted to 5-year marketable notes. The response to the Treasury offer of the very same investors you want to attract to such an option in certain FHA debentures was remarkable. I also believe that over the span of years there will be little reconversion of these 2¾'s, nor will there be much of similar FHA debentures. I say this because it is the fear of having to meet sudden demands that compel us to keep a substantial short position and this permits it, but the crisis rarely arises. Even if it did such conversions should have no unfavorable influence on the FHA. The converted debentures would give an immediate saving in interest costs and in the 5 years before maturity the critical cycle would long since have passed. Under normal conditions, the debenture holder would prefer to hold and receive the higher interest rate. The volume of possible conversions would be quite limited in comparison to other Government debt out-

standing, so if interest rates on converted debentures were fixed, as I am sure they would be in consultation with the Treasury, there need be no unfavorable impact on the Government bond market generally.

From the FHA standpoint I do not think such a privilege would be objectionable. It would only be given when experience showed mortgages on properties of this character could only be sold to FNMA. If successful, FNMA would be relieved of this burden and might even be able to liquidate the mortgages it has already purchased or committed to purchase. The reason it is difficult to sell these mortgages to investors is the belief that cessation of the cold war, or other factors beyond our knowledge but well within the Government's, these projects could well become a total loss as far as mortgage investment is concerned.

Naturally we all prefer to buy mortgages we believe will not default or at least are in areas where only the normal changes in the economic cycle must be faced. However, this conversion feature in debentures would equalize this situation and may well attract the pension trust funds which are largely managed by men who are greatly attracted by short maturity investments. In 5 years, which is the shortest period the debentures would have to run, FHA would have ample time to liquidate the property and when the final loss were known to retire a large part of the debentures with the proceeds. If there were any large losses of this character it would be only because peace had become secure. In that event the savings in a few months because of the decreased cost of our Military Establishment and defense plants would more than offset all the losses.

As to the VA loans, I also believe the interest is fair. There is no trouble in placing them here in New York or other areas where there are ample investment funds whenever the builder is doing an honest job. We have over \$10,000,000 of VA loans in this area but reject many because we do not think the builder is giving value to the veteran. This situation will be cured to everyone's benefit when builders realize they can only get loans if they give value and not by VA offering higher interest rates for shoddy goods. This real problem in VA loans though is in the areas where there is not sufficient savings growth to meet the demand for mortgages. In such cases the loans have to be sold to us and serviced by a local institution for a fee which is usually one-half of 1 percent. This makes the yield unsatisfactory to us although a local VA loan is. I think this problem might well be solved if the local institutions in the areas needing investment funds would sell us their 4¼ percent FHA loans and service them at one-half of 1 percent which usually nets them a profit of one-fourth of 1 percent and keep all the VA loans themselves. Usually the VA loans are twice as numerous as the FHA so such an arrangement would give a community one-third greater mortgage funds than it generated from its own savings and the overall yield to the local bank or savings and loan association would be 4 percent. The VA loan is better for it to hold, as in the event of default it results in an immediate cash payoff and the funds can be reinvested at going mortgage rates. They have no problem of a loss if debenture values should be less than par when received for FHA mortgages. In these areas capital and surplus are usually limited so its impairment, even temporarily, should be avoided if possible.

Undoubtedly all this has already occurred to you but if any of it is new and you feel it offers a constructive solution, I am happy to have sent it to you.

With all good wishes,
Faithfully yours,

THURMAN LEE.

UNION DIME SAVINGS BANK,
New York, N. Y., February 25, 1952.

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on
Banking and Currency,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: Here is a suggestion you might consider in connection with your committee's deliberations of the FHA-VA mortgage-loan problem. It has nothing to do with interest rates. It is probably not new, but I think its adoption would make the FHA-VA single-family house loans considerably more attractive to institutional investors, and at not too great a cost to FHA or VA.

Briefly stated, it is to cloak future FHA-203 and VA-501 loans with the feature prevailing in the FHA-608's. To be specific, gave the mortgage investor the option, in case of default, of assigning the mortgage to FHA or VA at 99 percent (as against foreclosing, acquiring title to the real estate and subsequently conveying such title to FHA or VA).

It is generally recognized that a very considerable amount of available mortgage money is in the East. Also, that a substantial portion of such capital is represented by the savings banks of New York State. Such banks are permitted by the laws of New York to invest in FHA and VA loans on a Nation-wide basis. However, before acquiring loans on properties in a foreign state, the laws of the foreign state need to be examined to study the statutes relating to foreclosures and to ascertain if the laws permit a corporate lender coming into the State to do business in the State.

For example, we have acquired FHA-608 4-percent loans in States foreign to our own, but we would shy away from FHA-203 4½-percent and VA-501 4-percent loans in the same States. With the FHA-608's, we can assign the loan to FHA at 99 percent in case of default. In the case of FHA-203's or VA-501's, we would be required to foreclose, acquire the real-estate title, and thereafter convey title to FHA or VA. In such process the foreclosure period is exceptionally long in some States (as much as 18 months). Moreover, the holding of the real-estate title (even for 1 day) would (or could) subject us to the duty of filing franchise tax returns in such State and the payment of franchise taxes for "doing business" in such State.

The laws of many of the States seem to permit foreign corporate-mortgage investors to acquire and hold mortgages without qualifying to do business within such States, but the minute a foreign corporation holds title to real estate, it is something else again.

You understand I do not mean to imply that a long-term 4-percent yield is necessarily attractive (and such return on VA-501's becomes 3.5 percent after payment of 0.5 percent to a local agent to service such loans) but I do think the option to assign such mortgages to FHA or VA at 99 percent would make such FHA and VA loans much more attractive.

It goes without stating that the foregoing represent my personal views only.

Respectfully,

HERBERT WILLIAMS.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1938) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River

Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to 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, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, Mr. MORRISON, and Mr. REES of Kansas had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5317) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co. of Canton, Ohio.

The Senate resumed the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Philip Neville, of Minnesota, to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota, vice Clarence U. Landrum, retiring; and

Arthur J. B. Cartier, of Massachusetts, to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts.

CONVENTIONS WITH FINLAND RELATING TO DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive K, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, and Executive L, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the conventions, and the conventions, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the messages from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The messages from the President are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury. The provisions are consistent with policies approved by the Senate recently in connection with its consideration of tax conventions between the United States of America and a number of other countries.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 17, 1952.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) convention between the United States and Finland relating to taxes on estates and inheritances.)

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury. The provisions are consistent with policies approved by the Senate recently in connection with its consideration of tax conventions between the United States of America and a number of other countries.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 17, 1952.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) convention between the United States and Finland relating to taxes on income.)

TREATY OF PEACE WITH JAPAN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive A (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate now being in executive session, the Chair lays before it the unfinished business, the treaty with Japan, which is open to amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey obtained the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield to me for that purpose, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That may be done only by unanimous consent. If there is no objection, does the Senator from New Jersey yield for that purpose?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the unfinished business, namely, the treaty of peace with Japan, and the accompanying security pacts and to advocate their ratification.

BACKGROUND

As the background for my remarks I merely desire to state that one of the things which impressed me particularly during my trip to the Far East in 1949 was the very obvious yearning for freedom on the part of the people of Japan, China, Korea, Formosa, and the Philippines. The present difficulties in the Middle East and especially in the Far East are, in my judgment, largely the result of the unrest reflected in the yearning of the people to be free. I simply mention that because it seems to me that the prevalence of that feeling has much to do with the treaty we are considering today.

Mr. President, early in 1950, President Truman asked Mr. John Foster Dulles to undertake the negotiation of a peace treaty with Japan. As one of the first steps in the performance of that duty, Mr. Dulles requested the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to meet with him; and from that time on, those of us who were members of that subcommittee, which was composed of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] as chairman, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and myself, were in close touch with Mr. Dulles in his negotiations. I mention that because it is perhaps somewhat unique in the history of undertakings of this kind that the executive department, in this case represented by Mr. Dulles, should take the legislative department of the Government into its confidence. The result was that the program which was developed was the result of close cooperation between the executive and the legislative departments.

Of course, it is primarily the responsibility of the Executive to negotiate treaties, but in this important instance joint collaboration was insisted upon. During the year it took to prepare a treaty for signing at San Francisco, we had many conferences in the United States. In the meantime, some of us were not only in touch with far eastern

conditions, but also took the opportunity to travel abroad. It is to be noted that in July 1951, nine members of the Foreign Relations Committee, including the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and myself of the subcommittee, went to Europe to get a feeling in Europe of the progress being made toward collective security among the Atlantic Pact countries. When we returned, we were invited by Mr. Dulles to go to San Francisco as delegates to the conference which was called to sign the peace treaties. Thus we had the experience not only of living through the negotiations with respect to this peace treaty but also of having given immediate attention ourselves to problems in other areas of the world, especially in the Atlantic Pact countries. At the invitation of Mr. Dulles, who was returning to Tokyo following the signing of the treaty in San Francisco to take up certain matters with the Japanese Government, the Senator from Alabama and I, went with Mr. Dulles, in order to be in Tokyo for these discussions. We visited Hawaii, Japan, Korea, and Formosa, in order to be in a position to relate what was going on in those areas to the discussions of the Japanese Peace Treaty.

During the course of that visit I was again impressed, as were my colleagues, with the insistence of the people of Asia upon being free. That feeling was made very plain to us in our discussions with our friends in Japan. They wanted to be free and independent, and a part of the free Western World. There was in the Far East strong sentiment against imperialism and colonialism of any sort. We also had to consider our immediate problem in Korea. Thus, all of these various areas of the world had an important bearing on our consideration of the Japanese Peace Treaty. I merely mention this as background to indicate the atmosphere in which we found ourselves when we discussed the treaty with the leaders in Tokyo.

Already we have had a presentation of the treaty by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on the Republican side of the aisle has also spoken on the subject. I shall not review what they have said, but I reiterate their suggestions, which are urgently seconded by the committee, that the treaty be ratified promptly. I can conceive of no more serious consequences than those which would follow undue hesitation to ratify or failure to ratify the treaty, or the adoption of reservations which would damage its effectiveness.

In discussing the treaty, I desire to call particular attention, first, to the message of the President of the United States, submitting the treaty to the Senate. That message in annex 1, which appears in the document from the President, contains a splendid analysis of what the treaty signifies. The analysis is embraced in a speech made by Mr. Dulles on behalf of the United States delegation at the San Francisco confer-

ence, on September 5, 1951. In it Mr. Dulles reviewed first the Japanese treaty, and then, in subsequent annexes, the various security pacts which are presently to be considered. I consider this review by Mr. Dulles of such importance that I hope the Members of the Senate who are interested in this subject will be particularly careful to read it. It makes plain the spirit of the approach of those who negotiated the treaty.

While we were in Tokyo, we had the privilege, of course, of conferring directly with the important representatives of the Japanese Government concerned with this matter. I talked with Prime Minister Yoshida, who was the leader of the Japanese Government at the time, and who was the man whom we saw most frequently while we were in Japan. We met the president of the Bank of Japan who contributed a great deal to our understanding of the economic conditions in Japan and of what might be the effect of the termination of the United States occupation. We met representatives of the important Japanese newspapers. We also had the great privilege of lunching with the Emperor himself who showed the greatest interest in the treaty and in the relations between the United States and Japan.

On another occasion the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], Mr. Dulles, and I had the privilege of meeting with the Japanese Diet, and also had an extended session with its Foreign Affairs Committee. This gave us a relationship with those persons in Japan who were considering the same kind of problems that we consider here in the Foreign Relations Committee. These various conferences gave us intimate contacts which I value very highly, and I look upon those discussions as most important in creating a relationship between Japan and the United States which should be very valuable to us in the future.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] have pointed out many important features of the treaty, and I am going to limit myself in my remarks to some matters which strike me as being particularly worthy of emphasis.

The security pact with the Philippines was signed in Washington last year. Then there followed the security pacts with Australia and New Zealand, and, finally, the security pact with Japan which was signed in San Francisco. In light of the contribution which has been made by the Senators who have preceded me, I shall pass over them very briefly and devote my attention to certain other matters.

The Senator from Alabama and I felt, as members of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that it was important to visit Japan and the far-eastern area before the treaty was signed.

Last fall, after the signing of the treaty, but before the treaty came to the Senate of the United States for ratification, we felt that if we visited the Far East we would be better qualified to explain to our colleagues the significance of the treaty, and this new chapter, as

it were, in the relations between Japan and the western powers.

General MacArthur, in 1949, told me first-hand of the necessity for a peace treaty with Japan, and of the importance of its prompt negotiation. As a member of the Far East Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations I was kept informed on the progress of negotiations from their inception. In my conferences with Mr. Dulles I was able to help in the shaping of the treaty of peace during its formative stage. In my 8 years' experience in the Senate I have never been more closely associated with nor more fully informed about any treaty or agreement entered into by this country. It was a truly bipartisan effort, and one in which the executive and legislative branches cooperated fully. As one who was a member of the American delegation to San Francisco I am convinced that the interests of our people and of the world are conscientiously served by these treaties. They represent, I believe, a new stage, a new enlightenment, in the relations between nations. Rarely, if ever, have victorious powers accorded a defeated state the same forgiving generosity as has been shown Japan. I rejoice that they have done so. The treaties constitute a new and firm foundation on which we may build, if we are wise, a lasting peace in the Far East. They afford us an opportunity to go forward in the development of healthy and harmonious relations between the United States and its neighbors in the Pacific.

THE SPIRIT OF THE TREATY

An interesting fact which I desire to stress here is that a similar attitude to the one I have just expressed toward the treaties was shared by the majority of the delegates at the San Francisco conference where the treaties were signed.

I wish to quote just a very few brief statements made by some of the important delegates. Mr. P. C. Spender, of the Australian delegation, addressed the conference regarding the attitude of his country and said:

This treaty, sir, is both benevolent and magnanimous. Its like is not to be found in modern history. Its generous provisions are designed to bring Japan back into the family of free nations and afford her the great opportunity to play a full and useful part in it. It is a treaty not only of peace but for peace.

That is a very significant statement from a man who represented Australia, a country which had naturally been in great fear of Japan during the period of the Japanese military aggressions.

In the same vein the Ambassador of Colombia, Cipriano Restrepo-Jaramillo, said:

In consequence of our love of peace and liberty, I shall sign this treaty in the name of my Government. In doing so, I pray to God that Christian civilization may rule the world and that this instrument may constitute a sure step toward harmony among nations, so that humanity, free from anguish and fear, may orient its efforts along the path of common progress and the well-being of all the peoples of the world.

And Oscar Gans, Minister of Cuba, said:

Cuba does not agree with all of this draft treaty; but to negotiate is to compromise. In the relationships among states of an effective nature, none may find complete satisfaction for all of its ideas and interpretations. When compromise does not violate essential principles, it is our duty, in the light of solidarity among nations, to harmonize our interests with those of other nations. Inspired by this ideal, my Government is willing to sign this peace treaty.

Finally, Mr. President, I desire to quote from one delegate who impressed me particularly at the conference at San Francisco and who represented an area of the world which is very important to us and to Japan. I am speaking of J. R. Jayewardene, of Ceylon, who spoke in part, as follows:

We in Ceylon were fortunate that we were not invaded, but the damage caused by air raids, by the stationing of enormous armies under the southeast Asian command, and by the slaughter-tapping of one of our main commodities, rubber, when we were the only producers of natural rubber for the Allies, entitle us to ask that the damage so caused should be repaired.

Mr. President, this was in connection with a discussion of reparations, which question had been presented to the conference. Everybody had agreed that drastic reparations would not be in order.

We do not intend to do so, for we believe in the words of the great teacher whose message has ennobled the lives of countless millions in Asia, that "hatred ceases not by hatred, but by love." It is the message of the Buddha, the great teacher, the founder of Buddhism, which spread a wave of humanism through south Asia, Burma, Laos, Cambodia, Siam, Indonesia, and Ceylon, and also northward through the Himalayas into Tibet, China, and finally, Japan, which bound us together for hundreds of years with a common culture and heritage. This common culture still exists, as I found on my visit to Japan last week on my way to attend this conference; and from the leaders of Japan, ministers of state as well as private citizens, from their priests in the temples, I gathered the impression that the common people of Japan are still influenced by the shadow of that great teacher of peace and wish to follow it. We must give them that opportunity.

I have included in my remarks the quotation from Mr. Jayewardene because it brings to mind the great religious teacher in whom the people of the Asian countries believe, and because it is so much in line with the precepts of our own great Teacher, Jesus Christ, in His Sermon on the Mount.

So, Mr. President, I make this reference in support of this treaty, a treaty of reconciliation, a treaty aimed at associating Japan with the Western Powers who believe in freedom.

I now wish to summarize briefly the provisions of the treaty.

SUMMARY OF TREATY PROVISIONS

The preamble of the peace treaty places Japan on a footing of equality with all the other sovereign powers in the world. We could do no less with a proud and able people like the Japanese. The state of war is terminated. For that

we are all grateful. The territorial provisions are in keeping with the announced objectives of the Allied Powers during hostilities. That is as it should be. The bases for the security of Japan and the Far East are effectively provided. World peace needs these arrangements. The political and economic clauses are realistic and fair. Any other arrangement could only have led to discontent, disturbance, and default in Japan and thus to defeat of the purposes of the treaty. Such reparations as can be obtained are to be arranged and the peaceful settlement of disputes over the treaty is provided for. This is only equity. Finally, neither Japanese sovereignty nor the Japanese economy are subjected to any permanent restrictions. That is as it should be. The treaty is enlightened, fair, and far-sighted.

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in regard to the security treaties which accompany the pending treaty, although, as I said earlier, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Alabama, is going to deal with that subject more fully.

THE SECURITY TREATIES

As Senators well know, it is not only the treaty of peace that is before the Senate. There are also three security pacts, which are absolutely essential to our security, as well as that of the Far East. To have given Japan her freedom without some force with which to guard and protect her would have been an empty gesture, if not a fraud. These security arrangements provide Japan and her neighbors with a unique but strong system of protection.

The security treaty with Japan is calculated to provide Japan with a military force sufficiently strong to protect herself against both external aggression and any riots and disturbances instigated from abroad.

Of course, we are faced with the difficulty of Japan being left defenseless. The fact of her rearming conflicted to a certain degree with the provisions of her constitution, which provide against any further rearmament. However, there had to be found here a middle ground, because Japan could not be left in a vacuum, without any security whatsoever. That is why I say the security treaty with Japan is calculated to provide Japan with a military force sufficiently strong to protect her against both external aggression and any riots and disturbances instigated from abroad.

In order to insure that there shall be no future embarrassing situations comparable to those which attended the Anglo-Japanese alliance in the early twenties, a mutual security arrangement has been simultaneously and correlatively entered into between the United States, Australia, and New Zealand. This treaty provides the basis for a broader security organization in the Pacific area. Finally the United States has entered into a security treaty with the Philippine Islands which is a logical employment of our other joint defense arrangements with the Philippine Government.

We are now asked to advise and consent to the ratification of all four treaties. These treaties will all be before us, Mr. President, and I hope will be ratified during this week. I am convinced that, given the present condition of the world, they are essential to our interests and our security. The Senate has been advised that these defense measures anticipate the eventual creation of a more comprehensive security arrangement. Thus, in a sense, while the treaty of peace is entered into on a permanent basis, the security pacts can be regarded as more or less temporary in nature, to be replaced by a broader arrangement for the Pacific area at a later date.

I wish to emphasize the difference between these security arrangements and those which we have made with the nations of the north Atlantic community. Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty states:

The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.

In drawing up the security treaties for the Pacific areas it was felt by Mr. Dulles and his colleagues, and I think very wisely, that the United States was not yet in a position where it could subscribe to an article as strong as that in the North Atlantic Treaty. We were not prepared to agree that an attack upon one would be an attack upon all.

The treaties with Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines provide in article III for consultation among the parties whenever the territorial integrity, the political independence, or the security of any of them is threatened in the Pacific.

Under article IV each of the signatories recognizes that "an armed attack in the Pacific area on either of the parties would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common dangers in accordance with its constitutional processes."

I myself think it was most essential to follow that procedure as distinguished from the procedure followed in another area of the world, where some of the problems we have in the Far East do not exist.

During the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations the question arose as to what type of action was contemplated in the event an armed attack should occur. When asked this question Ambassador Dulles replied that each country would have to decide the question, "in the light of the fact that there is recognition that it is a common danger, and that each will act in accordance with its constitutional processes to meet that danger."

This program for the Pacific area is similar to the Monroe Doctrine which prevailed for so long in the Western Hemisphere. By the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro a few years ago the Monroe Doctrine became a multilateral doctrine, participated in by all the Americas and distinguished from the unilateral doctrine which was its original form.

Mr. President, in drawing up these new treaties, we were thinking in terms of the precedent of the Monroe Doctrine, and the language used is virtually that of the Monroe Doctrine.

THE NEED FOR SECURITY

Some well-meaning and conscientious people have been disturbed because the United States has deemed it necessary to enter into these security pacts.

I may say that I have received a number of letters from people who regret that we were called upon to enter into a security arrangement of this kind, and who felt that Japan should not be re-armed. They are naturally and sincerely afraid of an outburst of further militarism in Japan.

These people maintain that the peace treaty alone would have been sufficient to terminate the state of war with Japan. That is true. The treaty of peace would by itself terminate the state of war with Japan, but it would not prevent Japan from falling prey to aggression. The history of the Soviet Union and its far-eastern aggressions gives rise to real concern regarding Japan's ability, lacking her own national armed forces, to protect her freedom and newly developed democratic institutions. Today the Japanese people are in no position to protect themselves. Were the United States to withdraw all of its military forces from the area of Japan it would leave behind it a power vacuum into which Soviet pressure would immediately rush.

When the aggression occurred in Korea in 1950, it was viewed in strategic circles as a direct thrust at Japan and a bid for Soviet control over the Japanese islands, which in turn would have paved the way for Communist conquest of the entire Far East.

I share that view, having studied this matter very carefully. Having been in that area and having seen the geographical relationships between Korea and Japan, I am convinced that had that effort succeeded we would today be faced with a very serious and critical situation. Probably we would have to withdraw our own defense lines from where they are in the islands in the Pacific, at least to Hawaii, and possibly to the Pacific coast.

It has been recognized by far-eastern strategists that Korea is one of the avenues to the conquest of Japan and also one pathway to the control of the continent of Asia. Communist China has deliberately defied and is today defying the United Nations forces in Korea. She has been branded an aggressor by the U. N. I submit, therefore, that a moment's reflection on these tremendous forces which menace Japan and its great industrial potential, are a complete justification for the security treaties.

TRADE WITH CHINESE MAINLAND

Mr. President, I should like to discuss briefly Japan's prospective trade position in the Far East, especially toward China. My colleagues are aware that in the past Japan's trade with China has been large and the source of much of Japan's foreign exchange. The question naturally arose during the peace

treaty hearings whether Japan can earn her living in the world markets without her traditional trade with the Chinese mainland. This question is, of course, bound up with the fears that Japan might begin to trade with Communist China, now dominated by Moscow, as soon as the peace treaty comes into force.

Perhaps the question can best be answered by pointing to the experience of the past 6 years. In those years, Japan's trade with the Chinese mainland has been negligible. Yet in spite of the loss of this trade, Japan has achieved substantial economic recovery, and most of her standard of living has been restored to prewar levels.

At this point I wish to pay tribute to the magnificent work which was done by General MacArthur and his aides in connection with the economic recovery of Japan. I was there earlier, in 1949, and again last fall. I talked with those in charge of this work. It is an amazing thing which has been done. During the last year, in fact, Japan has been able to earn her own way. Although this was due in large measure to the extraordinary earnings of Japan for services rendered the United Nations troops in Korea, it is a healthy sign. By the time that this unusual revenue ceases, Japan's recovery should be complete, if we can help her to build up her trade with the other areas in the Far East, and especially in southeast Asia.

Because of Japan's geographic location toward China, this state of affairs is, of course, highly unnatural. China has always been a traditional market and source of raw materials for Japan. I fervently hope that the conditions that caused the disruption of this trade are temporary. We must keep hoping that the mainland of China can be brought back to the family of free nations. However, this change cannot take place overnight.

In the meantime, it is my conviction that Japan can and will be economically self-sufficient without trading with Moscow-dominated China.

We went into this question in great detail. It was discussed by Mr. Dulles, the Senator from Alabama, and others. The question was whether it would be possible for Japan to be economically self-sufficient without trading with Communist-dominated China. I came to the conviction, as I have just stated, that Japan can and will be economically self-sufficient without trading with Moscow-dominated China. We can help her to this goal by not barring our doors against her goods and letting her have free access to the raw materials of the world.

In spite of the fact that Japan can earn her way without China some people have expressed fears that Japan will engage in such trade for the sake of the great profits at stake. This fear I believe to be unfounded.

I invite the attention of the Senate to a letter from Prime Minister Yoshida to Mr. Dulles, wherein Prime Minister Yoshida expressed the intention of the Japanese Government to open negotiations for a bilateral peace treaty with

the Nationalist Government now on Formosa, and under no conditions to do business with Communist China while Communist China is defying the United Nations, as she is doing today in Korea, and threatening to do in other parts of the world.

Japan has alined herself squarely with the free world in embargoing strategic goods to Communist countries. In fact, she is embargoing more than the necessary minimum. She has certified to us that she is complying with title I of the Mutual Security Assistance Act—more commonly known as the Battle Act. Senators will remember that this act terminates economic and military assistance to countries selling strategic and related goods to Communist countries.

Parenthetically I should like to state that I wish that other nations which are supposed to be allied with us in the United Nations' endeavor would carry out the spirit of the Battle Act to as great an extent as we found Japan was doing. If, therefore, Japan should decide to trade with a Moscow dominated Communist China she would under the Battle Act automatically become ineligible for American aid. This is an important factor to keep in mind. Equally important, however, is the fact that Japan, in the Yoshida-Dulles letters, expresses its concurrence with the United Nations' resolution recommending an embargo on Moscow dominated Communist China and North Korea and its antipathy for the Red Chinese regime in general. Japan has so much to fear from Russia, her traditional enemy, that I am convinced she will remain alined with the free world against aggression, direct or indirect.

In summary, Mr. President, I maintain that Japan can be economically self-supporting without trading with Communist China and will continue to aline herself against aggression by not trading with the aggressors.

ASIA'S YEARNING FOR FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE

Mr. President, a month ago I reported to the Senate on my recent trip to the Far East. Since then developing events have only strengthened the convictions which I expressed on January 29. I am more than ever convinced that, despite the importance of Western Europe in building the defenses of the free world, it is in the restless areas of the Near East and Far East that the most immediate threats to world security now lie.

I know that there are those in our Government who do not agree with that conclusion, but having been in the far-eastern area and having sensed the imminence of trouble there because of the danger of a sudden aggression in Indochina and elsewhere, my feeling is that, however important the Western European build-up, the immediate threat is likely to come in the far-eastern area. The restlessness to which I have referred and which grows out of the yearning of the Asiatic peoples for freedom and independence, takes its expression in deep-seated resistance to any form of imperialism or colonialism. We cannot forget this social ferment as we con-

sider the Japanese treaties. It is of the greatest importance that we avoid any semblance of colonialism or imperialism in our actions. It has been difficult, in dealing with some of the countries which heretofore have had interests and possessions in the Far East, and which have been charged with a certain degree of imperialism or colonialism, to make it clear that we must be independent of colonialism or imperialism, and that we must move toward the elimination of all forms of imperialism and colonialism in the area. The peace treaties which we have before us will go far in that direction. There is a real danger that injudicious actions—no matter how well intentioned—may do serious harm to the security of the Far East in general and to our own interests in that area in particular. Soviet propaganda, which is busily trying to paint the United States as an imperialistic power, would welcome our imposing a treaty of retaliation and revenge. These treaties which we have before us, being reasonable and just in their provisions, will rob Soviet propaganda of much of its effectiveness.

I now move to a question which to me is of great importance, because it seems to me that it may be the key to the future peace of the Far East. That is the subject of a free and independent China—free and independent from any outside control.

A FREE AND INDEPENDENT CHINA

We must recognize, Mr. President, that a stable peace with Japan is dependent upon, and inextricably interwoven with, our relations with other far-eastern nations, especially China. During the last war we recognized, as we have always done, that the key to peace and stability in the Far East was a free and independent China.

We worked for it and we backed up China continuously, in the first place against Japan. Historically this has always been our policy. When, at the close of the last century, the major imperialistic powers were planning to divide China into spheres of influence, it was an American Secretary of State, John Hay, who insisted that we would not stand idly by while such a partition took place. We insisted upon China remaining open and free to trade with all nations. This policy has ever since been known as the open-door policy. Later, when Japanese forces invaded China and created the puppet state of Manchukuo, it was Secretary Stimson who announced that the United States would not recognize that conquest as valid.

The Stimson doctrine stated:

But in view of the present situation and of its own rights and obligations therein, the American Government deems it to be its duty to notify both the Imperial Japanese Government and the Government of the Chinese Republic that it cannot admit the legality of any situation de facto, nor does it intend to recognize any treaty or agreement entered into between those governments, or agents thereof, which may impair the treaty rights of the United States or its citizens in China, including those which relate to the sovereignty, the independence, or the territorial and administrative integrity of the Republic of China, or to the international policy relative to China, commonly known as the open-door policy; and that it does not

intend to recognize any situation, treaty, or agreement which may be brought about by means contrary to the covenants and obligations of the Pact of Paris of August 27, 1928, to which treaty both China and Japan, as well as the United States are parties.

I have quoted Mr. Stimson's words in full because it seems to me that we become a little confused when we think, as we have for sometime in the past, in terms of the possibility of recognizing Communist China, which we know is dominated by Moscow. We would be abandoning the Stimson doctrine if we permitted Communist China, so long as she remains defiant of the United Nations and while she is dominated by Moscow, to come into the United Nations. I consider it unfortunate that some members of the United Nations have recognized Communist China.

Throughout the entire history of American-Chinese relations the theme of a free and independent policy has been repeated over and over again. We have insisted upon Chinese freedom regardless of the opposition. We have always insisted upon the maintenance of the territorial integrity of China. When foreign powers have cast covetous eyes our policy has been to demand that China be allowed to become free and independent. That must still be our policy today.

A TWO-PRONGED POLICY FOR ASIA

Much remains to be done before China can again achieve her freedom. The United Nations can and must stop Communist aggression in Korea and elsewhere in the Far East. I repeat what I said on January 29: "Only a close uniting of all the United Nations forces on a courageous, determined policy to apply extreme sanctions in the event of further outbreaks" will prevent the aggression which constantly menaces all free countries in Asia.

An effective policy to meet any defiance of U. N. authority requires close cooperation between the United States, Britain, and France in uniting against all forms of aggression in the Far East.

I am hopeful that we can get together with our principal allies in Europe, Great Britain and France, on a common policy with respect to this issue in the Far East.

We and our allies must be prepared to take strong and unified action against any future "Koreas" which may be precipitated as well as any further attacks in Korea itself. We must be willing to act together in withdrawing recognition, imposing blockades and embargoes, making limited air attacks, and carrying out any other measures which can serve to meet and oppose Communist defiance of the United Nations. This could include the removing of restrictions on the Nationalist forces on Formosa, which forces could well be used for guerrilla raids on the China coast and for resistance to any Communist attacks elsewhere in Asia.

The threatened attack on French Indochina would suggest to me the immediate removal of the restrictions on the Nationalist forces in Formosa.

But the use of force to prevent aggression will not in itself be sufficient to develop China into the kind of partner

we need in the Far East. China must be won away from the control of the Soviet Union. It is not too late. The Chinese are a proud and independent people. They have a great and unique culture. Throughout history the Chinese have been able to withstand any and all attempts to subject them to complete foreign domination. A positive and imaginative American foreign policy could still, at this late date, bring China once again into the community of free nations. Such a policy, as I visualize it, would combine specific security guarantees with trade agreements and economic aid. When and if China is able to demonstrate her independence from Soviet control and her willingness to resist, along with the free nations of Asia, Communist imperialism and expansionism, this Nation should be willing, as it has so wisely done in the case of Yugoslavia, to support such resistance. In this way China's independence and opportunity for self-determination would be protected.

Mr. President, it is within this context that the Japanese treaties must be considered. Japan is the industrial hub of the Far East. The full economic development of this area cannot take place unless and until normal trade patterns are developed between Japan and her neighbors. Should China assert her independence from the Soviet Union it is not unlikely that healthy trade relations could be established between Japan and China. Such trade, when combined with American aid could furnish the push needed to start China on her way to the full development of her vast resources. With some of her economic problems under control, China would have a real chance of developing those democratic institutions so long sought by Sun Yat-sen and others of her past leaders and friends.

The contrast between the picture which I have outlined and that promised by the Soviet Union must soon become apparent to the people of China. Many Chinese are already noting the hasty manner in which the Soviet Union is sucking materials and resources from their country. Armaments is all that the Chinese are getting in return. Every day we are presented with new evidence of the extent to which China's present masters are willing to go to secure conformity. Purges are becoming almost as extensive and frequent as those carried on in the Soviet Union itself. The day will come when China will tire of the Soviet parasite. When that day comes, and it need not be far off, the United States must be ready with an attractive alternative.

It would include also other areas, such as Ceylon, from the remarks of whose delegate I quoted a short time ago.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

I have dwelled at length on the importance of China in the far-eastern picture. I have purposely emphasized her place in these relationships for I consider it to be of extreme importance. I should also like, however, to stress the importance of the smaller nations in this area. The peoples of southeast Asia, like their neighbors to the north, are

striving for full economic and social independence. If we are to win them as our friends we must support them in their just struggle. The economic welfare of these people is closely tied to the economy of Japan. This peace treaty, which represents the American policy of fostering a healthy Japanese economy, is also a contribution to the economic welfare of southeast Asia. I refer, of course, to the area which includes Indochina, Thailand, Burma, and Indonesia, and Malaya.

INDIA

This approach to Asia's problems which I am proposing has a particular relevance to the nation of India. In the past India has demonstrated a certain misunderstanding and fear of United States intentions. We have so far failed to secure the full cooperation of a nation which is destined to play a crucial role in determining the future of Asia. Should America develop an Asian policy along the lines I have discussed it is not unlikely that India would find in us a nation with which she could work with full confidence. We would have demonstrated our genuine interest in the welfare of the people of Asia and our willingness to aid them in their efforts to raise living standards. We would have proven our opposition to all forms of imperialism, eastern or western.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, I have stated that the Japanese treaties can be the basis of a lasting peace in the Far East. I should like to be more specific. It is my hope that before long we shall be able to build upon these treaties a strong Pacific treaty organization within which we, with the United Nations, would offer the people of Asia, in exchange for security agreements, a comprehensive program of cooperative trade, cultural exchange, and technical aid. Asia is on fire. While we concentrate on Europe we may lose the battle of Asia. But the battle is not yet lost. The Japanese treaties are a vital step toward our goal.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the prompt ratification of these treaties. They open a new chapter in the history of the Far East and, in fact, in the history of the world. They give a new illumination to the future; a new dawn of freedom, independence, and self-determination for the suffering masses in the overcrowded areas of Asia.

In these treaties I see real progress in the fulfillment of the promise of long ago that the individual human personality is sacred and is entitled to full self-realization. The world needs the release of the creative energies of the people of Asia.

Mr. President, following centuries of suffering, our ancestors saw a new destiny here on our shores, and they were willing to die in order that the individual liberty they sought might be made a vital truth. I have always been convinced that they were inspired and led by a power beyond their own, that they were guided by Almighty God to the great destiny America has achieved.

By these treaties of reconciliation with Japan, America and her allies today are seeking to give to these people in the Far East the great gift of freedom, inspired

by God, which has been our inheritance. This conception of freedom and independence for all peoples will point the way to real, lasting peace in Asia and throughout the world.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I note with much interest that the Foreign Relations Committee makes a unanimous recommendation and urges unanimously the ratification of this peace treaty.

I am sure the Senator from New Jersey recalls, that about 5 years ago the Foreign Relations Committee made a unanimous recommendation regarding another peace treaty, that with Italy. At that time the Senate voted overwhelmingly for ratification of the treaty, primarily because of the recommendations and the report submitted by the Foreign Relations Committee.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey whether there is any analogy between this treaty and the treaty which was signed with Italy, which subsequently has been repudiated by everyone concerned, with the possible exception of Red Russia.

Many Members of the Senate, including myself, have some misgivings and doubts about treaties of the magnitude of this one. Naturally, we wish to know whether the Foreign Relations Committee has carefully considered and scrutinized the terms of the treaty and its impacts and, in connection with the treaty, the possibility of restoring Japan to the status of an independent, sovereign nation.

Can the Senator from New Jersey give us any assurances that a year hence or 2 years hence we shall not face a situation comparable to that involving the Italian Peace Treaty, and that we shall not reach a time when there will be widespread demand for repudiation of this treaty with Japan?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Idaho has asked that question.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I ask it most sincerely.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I realize that.

I suppose the best answer I can give to the question is that we learn by experience. Mr. Dulles and our group discussed the other treaties to a great extent; I refer to those with Italy and with the satellite countries. We discussed the strengths, if any, and the weaknesses of those treaties.

We knew that we had been all wrong about the treaty with Italy; we have discovered that since the ratification of that treaty. We realize now that that treaty was one of retaliation and revenge. In that treaty we deprived Italy of the means of self-defense; apparently we gave her no chance to defend herself. However, following the repudiations which have been made, Italy has been

given an opportunity to return to the family of nations.

So it was with great care and with knowledge of that situation that we have favored this treaty, which is not a treaty of revenge, but is a treaty of reconciliation and of inclusion of the Japanese people among the family of nations, which includes the Western Powers.

It is for that reason that I have no hesitation in saying that I do not believe the difficulty referred to by the Senator from Idaho will arise in connection with this treaty. Of course, difficulties may arise. However, I believe we have approached the matter from the standpoint of preparing a treaty which will invite the development and cooperation of Japan, as opposed to a treaty similar to the Versailles Treaty or the Italian Treaty, which had to be revised.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator from New Jersey give us any assurance that the interests of Nationalist China are adequately taken care of by the treaty to such an extent that in the near future we shall not be met with a demand for reconsideration of this treaty in order to take care of some defects or imperfections in it which keep it from giving adequate treatment to Nationalist China or from making sufficient allowance for the developments which may occur between Japan and Nationalist China?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In response, I may say that, of course, one of the important questions we went to Japan to consider, after the treaty had been signed at San Francisco, was the question of which China Japan would recognize. We knew that here there was a strong feeling against recognition of Communist China by Japan. We also realized that for us to say to Japan, "You must do this, that, or the other thing," probably would be the wrong approach, if we were going to carry out our treaty with Japan on the basis of recognizing Japan as a free, independent state with her own sovereignty.

Therefore, we discussed that issue in a friendly way with the Japanese leaders. We did not hide anything. We went "right to bat" with the Foreign Relations Committee of the Japanese Diet, and with Mr. Yoshida, in particular, and with Mr. Iguchi, the Japanese Foreign Minister.

I am sure the Senator from Idaho is aware of the so-called Yoshida letter, which was addressed to Mr. Dulles. In that letter Mr. Yoshida stated clearly the intention of the Japanese Government to negotiate a treaty of peace with the Nationalist Government of China, with which Japan formerly had been at war, and the intention of the Japanese Government not to have any contact whatever with the Communist group, because of their defiance of the United Nations.

Of course, no one can guarantee what will happen in the future. We are watching with interest the current negotiations between representatives of the Japanese Government and representa-

tives of the Nationalist Chinese Government on the island of Formosa. In that connection we hear that various points are being raised from time to time—points which very naturally are the subject of discussion between the two nations. Of course, we do not know what the final result will be.

I believe it should be pointed out that the position we took was one which it is perfectly natural for the American people to take, but one which is new in negotiations between nations. We said to the representatives of the Japanese Government, "It is up to you to make your own choice, after knowing these facts." Following that, they reached the decision which was reported by Mr. Yoshida to Mr. Dulles. It seems to me that we did the logical thing in that situation.

DEATH VALLEY NATIONAL MONUMENT,
CALIF.—AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN
PROPERTIES BY EXCHANGE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have requested the leader of the majority to come to the floor. There is on the calendar a bill which has been unanimously approved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and which involves the exchange of land in the Death Valley park. Private concerns desire to exchange lands, the value of which runs to about \$2,500, for about 20 acres of land, the value of which is about \$25. The reason for that is that the land desired is on the floor of the valley, and is very essential for use as a landing field.

Mr. President, I dislike very much to make a motion or to submit a request without the presence of some one of the leaders, but I now, as in legislative session, respectfully ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be momentarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill, which erroneously appears as Order No. 1299 on the calendar, the correct number of which should be 1229. It is House bill 4515 to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes. It is a bill to which there can be no objection, it having been passed unanimously by the House and approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The bill is now in proper form.

My reason for being anxious to have the bill considered is that we are desirous of getting an appropriation of the necessary funds, in order that an airport may be constructed on the floor of Death Valley. It is all-essential from a military standpoint, and it is all-essential from a commercial standpoint. Twenty acres of land in Death Valley is all that is involved. The land which is offered in exchange for the land on the floor of the valley is much more valuable for scenic purposes and scenic reasons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Nevada to say that it was Calendar No. 1229?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is Order No. 1229, but it is erroneously numbered on the calendar. On the calendar it appears as Order No. 1299, but that is an error.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. The order number is really 1229.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Has the Senator from Nevada conferred with the minority leader, or with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, regarding this bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have conferred, but not regarding the matter of taking it up. I urged the passage of it, and it was reported to the Senate only the other day, by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the chairman of the committee. It has been on the calendar for several days. I did not confer with the Senator about taking it up.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, under the circumstances, as acting minority leader, I am compelled to object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, some time ago, when neither the majority nor the minority leader was present, I attempted to have called up a bill which involves the exchange of land in the Death Valley National Monument. It is Calendar No. 1229, H. R. 4515. The bill has been passed by the House, it has been unanimously approved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, and, as I have stated, is now on the calendar of the Senate.

I shall state again why I am anxious to have the bill considered. It involves the exchange of land. A private party, a company known as Borax Consolidated, Ltd., is offering to exchange 230 acres of land in Death Valley for about 25 acres on the floor of the Valley.

The reason for making the exchange is that the 25 acres is in the center of a site which is most advantageous for the construction of an airport. I am anxious to have the bill passed so that the exchange may take place in order that the money may be appropriated during this appropriation period. The appropriation will amount to about \$125,000, to be used for building an airport on the floor of Death Valley. The construction of this airport is highly essential from a strategic standpoint, and from the commercial point of view, as well.

The junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], who is now in the Chamber, as the acting minority leader objected when I made the request formerly, but now the leader of the minority, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is present. I have discussed the matter

with him, and I now ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4515.

The report of the committee—No. 1298—is very short, and I shall read it. It is as follows:

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4515) to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

H. R. 4515 would provide for an exchange of land between the Federal Government and the Borax Consolidated, Ltd., in order to give the company perpetual rights-of-way over certain lands for general utility purposes.

No expenditure of Federal funds necessary.

The Federal land, which consists of 20 acres, is valued at approximately \$25. The privately owned land involved consists of two separate tracts, about 230 acres in size, valued at about \$2,875. The land that the company offers the Federal Government can be utilized fully, one tract as part of a proposed airport and the other tract as one of the important scenic viewpoints in Death Valley.

All parties concerned have completely approved the exchange of land, and the Department of the Interior feels that it will be most beneficial to the Government and will have no adverse effect upon the monument.

An identical bill (S. 1730) was introduced in the Senate by Senator Knowland.

The favorable report of the Secretary of the Interior to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereinbelow set forth in full and made a part of this report.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada that, as in legislative session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill 4515?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4515) to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif. and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill, but I wish to have the RECORD show that the bill does not in any way violate what has become known as the "Morse formula" in regard to the disposition of Federal property. Let the RECORD show that in this instance the Federal Government is getting a fair exchange for its Federal interest, and, therefore, in my judgment, the taxpayers are receiving fair and equitable compensation for the Federal interest in the property. Therefore, I do not object.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, when consideration for this bill was sought a short time ago the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] was acting as minority leader, and he objected to its consideration. Since that time we have checked on the matter, and as a result of that check I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Is it a fact, as I have been told and led to understand, that the bill had the support of all the members of the committee to which it was referred?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am so advised; but the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who is a member of that committee, has just entered the Chamber, and I am sure he can advise the Senate whether or not House bill 4515, Calendar No. 1229, was unanimously reported. It refers to the exchange of land on the floor of Death Valley.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes, it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then it had the unanimous support of the members of both parties in the committee, did it?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; there was no objection. As a matter of fact, it appeared from the evidence brought before the committee that it would be to the interest of the United States to make the exchange.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no objection. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

CITATION OF MARY JANE KEENEY FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is another matter to which I invite the attention of the acting minority leader. As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 283, citing Mary Jane Keeney for contempt of the Senate. The resolution appears on the calendar as order No. 1145. It has been approved by the Committee on the Judiciary, and if Senators wish a further explanation, I shall make it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I may ask the able Senator from Nevada whether he has conferred with the majority leader regarding this matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have conferred with the majority leader in regard to it. He told me that, at any time I could get the resolution taken up, I might do so. It must be considered by the Senate, so I desire to draw it to the attention of Senators, in order that they may act on it.

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

There being no objection, the Senate as in legislative session, proceeded to the consideration of Senate Resolution 283, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Mary Jane Keeney to answer a series of questions before the said subcommittee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United

States Senate, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Mary Jane Keeney may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to offer a brief explanation. If this resolution should prove to require any length of time, I shall withdraw the request.

The resolution requests the President of the Senate to certify the report of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, as to the refusal of Mary Jane Keeney to answer a certain question before that subcommittee, together with all facts in connection therewith, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, in order that the said Mary Jane Keeney may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Briefly stated, this resolution calls for issuance of a contempt citation. Mary Jane Keeney, an American citizen formerly employed in the secretariat of the United Nations, appeared before the Internal Security Subcommittee pursuant to subpoena, and in the course of her questioning she was asked if anyone in the Department of State had assisted her in procuring employment with the United Nations. Mrs. Keeney refused to answer this question on the ground that a United Nations staff rule bound her to secrecy concerning such a matter, touching, as she alleged, the internal administration of the United Nations. In other words, Mrs. Keeney refused to answer to a question pertinent to the inquiry of the subcommittee, and continued her refusal despite the command of the subcommittee, in reliance upon the supremacy of United Nations rules over the laws of the United States Government.

The committee has promptly called for the adoption of this resolution in order that such a challenge to the authority of the Senate may be tested by judicial process.

Later, Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary received a most remarkable letter from the attorney for the former witness, Mary Jane Keeney. This letter stated, in effect, that the question of whether the witness should have testified has now been submitted to the Legal Division of the United Nations, and that if the Legal Division of the United Nations decided that she should have testified she would then be willing to come before the committee again and testify. Mr. President, that is almost intolerable effrontery. This is a matter to be decided by the courts of the United States, not by the Legal Division of the United Nations. Mrs. Keeney is not even employed by the United Nations, and has not been for quite some time. What possible reason she and her lawyer can have for submitting this question to the legal staff of the United Nations, except the possible desire to make some further gesture in the direction of setting that body up as superior to the Senate of the United States is hard to imagine.

Still more recently another letter from this lady's attorney says she will now answer the specific question which she

refused to answer before the committee on the grounds that the United Nations rule excused her. The attorney indicates he has received a ruling from the Legal Division of the United Nations. Furthermore, he does not make an offer that his client will testify fully; but only that she will answer the particular question which she previously refused to answer. I am advised that the opinion from the Legal Division of the United Nations which was furnished to this attorney saved the question of whether the United Nations rule might excuse the witness from answering any other questions.

Mr. President, if and when the day comes that a ruling of the Legal Division of the United Nations is held superior to the right of Congress to hear a witness, I predict that the Congress will assert itself in unmistakable terms.

So that this question may not plague us any longer than necessary, I urge that the Senate now approve the resolution, Senate Resolution 283, citing Mary Jane Keeney for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senate passed Senate Resolution 283, citing Mary Jane Keeney for contempt of the Senate. There was an amendment on the desk which should have been considered. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the resolution was agreed to be reconsidered, in order that the amendment may be offered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, as in legislative session, the vote by which Senate Resolution 283 was agreed to earlier in the day will be reconsidered.

The clerk will state the amendment which is on the desk.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, at the beginning of line 6, it is proposed to strike out "series of questions" and insert "a certain question", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Mary Jane Keeney to answer a certain question before the said subcommittee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Mary Jane Keeney may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY—TRIBUTE TO THE IRISH

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, today is the 17th of March, St. Patrick's Day, the day on which the sons and daughters of Ireland, wherever they may be, turn their hearts and minds to memories of the Emerald Isle and its noble role in the history of mankind. It is the day on which the Irish gather to-

gether to pay a tribute of gratitude, affection, and reverence to Ireland's patron saint, and it is a day on which they may in all decency and without boastfulness express their pride in the magnificent achievements of their race in every land and clime.

Mr. President, this is a year of trial and tension everywhere, a time when the age-old battle between liberty and tyranny is being fought throughout the world and when the outcome of that struggle is fraught with meaning not only to all of us here in America but to all men wherever they may live who hunger for the freedom and well-being we enjoy. At such a time it is more than ever fitting to remind our friends here and abroad that throughout the many centuries since the idea of individual freedom dawned, the cause of liberty has had no more vigorous advocates or gallant defenders than the people of Ireland. Those who fight to escape from tyranny and to win the right to a free way of life can well take courage from the history of a nation whose men for centuries fought and died to establish man's God-given right to enjoy that way of life.

In other and better times we might well reflect on Ireland's other values; on its piety, its peacefulness, its productivity. But in times like this it is well to focus our attention on those Irish attitudes which characterized the long, long years through which men fought for Ireland's freedom; years which presented to the world a picture of indomitable courage, of persistent sacrifice, of selfless heroism, and of the fact that, backed by such a spirit, the idea of freedom can and will triumph over all obstacles and despite all tyrannical concentrations of military power.

It is so short a time since Ireland won its freedom, Mr. President, that all of us can well remember the details of that victory. But what I would recall to mind—what I regard as of the utmost importance to today's world and in today's struggle against tyranny—is one often overlooked and seldom recognized aspect of the Irish Revolution. It is the fact that during Ireland's long struggle for freedom from an imperialistic oppressor, not once did the people of Ireland, embittered as they might well have been, lose sight of their real goal or of the true values they sought to win. Never in the heat of the immediate battle did they forget that they fought for freedom and justice not for themselves alone but for all men everywhere. Time and time again in the course of that heroic struggle, whenever Britain in its relations with other nations was in the right, the Irish flocked to serve the cause of justice in Britain's fighting forces. The job being done, always they returned to their struggle to establish Ireland's freedom. And when that battle was finally won, the proud, fighting Irish proved humble in victory, restrained in their triumph, willing to prove to the people of England the essential friendliness which characterizes all the Irish people.

Mr. President, I think that Britain has learned that Ireland's victory and the establishment of the Irish Republic

was a gain and not a loss. That it is far more valuable to Britain to have a free people and a free nation for one's neighbor than it is to waste their substance in trying to hold a nation and a people enthralled. Britain learned that lesson as regards southern Ireland. She is learning it again in her efforts to maintain her empire in other parts of the world. Perhaps, in the not-too-distant future, we will have more definite proof that the lesson has been finally learned when northern Ireland too becomes a part of Eire.

But, Mr. President, in the history which I have been recounting there is a lesson for us, too, and for free men everywhere. For in this story of the relationship between Ireland and Britain lies the proof that we in the free democratic nations are right in the course we are pursuing and that Russia is wrong; proof that if other nations, victims of aggression, will show the same courage, understanding, and willingness to sacrifice in the cause of freedom as did the Irish, we and the world will win. And, Mr. President, it is proof, too, that tyranny over the minds and souls of men in other lands does not pay off; it cannot permanently prevail.

It may be that we cannot today penetrate the iron curtain and see for ourselves what is going on in the minds of men in Poland and in Latvia, in Czechoslovakia, or in Bulgaria. It may be that we cannot now document the feelings which will sooner or later overtake the people of China as more and more of their freedom and their substance is stolen by the dictators of Moscow. But this we do know, Mr. President, and we know it from our study of Ireland's history: we know that every time Moscow has enslaved a nation, it has weakened itself and has driven yet another nail in what will eventually be the coffin of communism. For it is only in freedom and in the amicable relationships among free nations that strength and well-being can be found. Wherever the minds of men are kept in chains, there too we will find exploitation, waste, and festering political sores on the body politic. Therein lies the lesson which Ireland's recent history holds for the world.

But we have been speaking of Ireland's recent history and of the world of today. Permit me, Mr. President, since this is St. Patrick's Day, to speak awhile of Ireland's past and of what that, too, meant to the world. For this is a day on which we should remember an earlier time in history when Eastern hordes swept over Europe and the Dark Ages overtook western civilization. It was in Ireland then that the torch of learning was kept alight. In Ireland's schools and monasteries, men remembered and taught and studied. A people, who instinctively valued knowledge and learning, willingly gave of their all-too-little wealth to support those institutions, and today, when some carping, short-sighted critics object to America's giving a little of her great wealth in the same cause, it is well to remember what came of the willingness of the Irish people to sacrifice for so-called intangible results. Our people and the world should be reminded that when the time was ripe and

men in the Europe of the Middle Ages were sickened unto death by centuries of bloodshed, rapine, plunder, and petty tyrannies, when most of Europe was what most of the Communist world must be like today, then it was that these seeming sacrifices proved their immeasurable value. For when the hearts and minds and souls of men again sought peace and faith and knowledge, it was Ireland's scholars and teachers, spreading out through France, through Belgium, Germany, and Italy, who brought back to Western Europe the light it so sorely needed.

And from that time to the day in which we live, Mr. President, wherever Irishmen have gone, their capacity for work, their friendliness, their simple loyalty, their faith and their intelligence have contributed much to the well-being of the world. It is perhaps here in America that their contributions to the Nation have reached their highest level. In every walk of life, in every State of the Union, Irishmen of courage and of stamina, of intellect and decency, have won the respect of their neighbors and friends.

In closing this tribute to the people of Erin, Mr. President, I should like to make sure that in speaking as I have of Ireland and its people, I am not misinterpreted. The Irish make no claim that theirs is a race or a people or a heritage superior to all others. History proves that the qualities characteristic of the Irish which are responsible for Ireland's peaceful and prosperous place in the world of today are to be found in many lands and among many peoples. It further proves that wherever those high qualities have appeared and amongst whatever people, the Irish have been quick to hold out the hand of friendship and respect. And history also shows that wherever like-minded men, seeking to establish a decent, self-respecting, free and moral way of life, met with opposition and oppression, the Irish have hastened to their aid; not with money or with arms alone but with their blood as well. Centuries ago in France and in Scandinavia; then in a colonial America fighting in 1776 for its independence; in the early 1800's when our great South American neighbors won their freedom; and in the 1940's when Israel won its liberty, yes, whenever men of other races and other beliefs fought for independence and for freedom, there, too, fighting at their sides, were the men of Ireland.

So, Mr. President, when I speak of Ireland and its virtues, I am confident that Ireland's friends throughout the world will know and understand that ours is not vainglorious or self-serving talk. With us they recognize the fact that March 17 is Ireland's day, and as we pay our tributes of gratitude, affection, and reverence to St. Patrick, they will, I know, join with me in singing the praises of the Irish people.

It is in this spirit, Mr. President, that I call on all who hear my voice or read these words to pledge themselves anew, and, in these days of world-wide crisis, to emulate the courage, the fortitude, and the determination of those who fought for Ireland's freedom. God grant that

we shall continue to fight as they did for the rights and liberties of free men everywhere; fight to insure the strength of free nations, the dignity of the individual, and the establishing of justice and of peace throughout the world.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH JAPAN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive A (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

Mr. JENNER. On behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and myself, I offer four reservations to the Japanese Peace Treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reservations will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and myself, I offer three reservations to the security treaty between the United States of America and Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The three reservations also will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on behalf of the same sponsors, I offer a reservation to the security treaty between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That reservation will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on behalf of the same sponsors, I offer a reservation to the mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same procedure will be followed as to this reservation.

The reservations submitted by Mr. JENNER (for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine) were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed as follows:

JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

RESERVATION NO. 1

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its Military Establishments, and its domestic concerns, or (b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan.

RESERVATION NO. 2

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to diminish or prejudice in favor of the Soviet Union, the right, title, and interest of Japan, or the Allied Powers as defined in such treaty, in and to South Sakhalin and its adjacent islands, the Kurile Islands, or any other territories, rights, or interests possessed by Japan on December 7, 1941, or to confer on the Soviet Union any right, title, or benefit therein or thereto, and nothing in such treaty, or the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification thereof, implies recognition on the part of the United States of the provisions of the so-called Yalta agreement of February 11, 1945, or the so-called Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945.

RESERVATION NO. 3

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to abrogate the claims of the United States for direct military costs of the

occupation, or just and proper claims of private citizens of the United States.

RESERVATION NO. 4

In accordance with the so-called Stimson doctrine of January 7, 1932, which states that "The American Government * * * cannot admit the legality of any situation de facto nor does it intend to recognize any treaty or agreement * * * which may impair the treaty rights of the United States or its citizens in China, including those which relate to the sovereignty, the independence, or the territorial and administrative integrity of the Republic of China or to the international policy relative to China, commonly known as the open-door policy; and * * * does not intend to recognize any situation, treaty, or agreement which may be brought about by means contrary to the covenants and obligations of the pact of Paris of August 27, 1928," no rights or claims referred to in this treaty shall be deemed to accrue to any government or so-called Government of China established by recourse to war, and, as used in this treaty, the word "China" refers to the legally established Republic of China, the sovereignty of which shall be deemed to extend to all areas which were a part of China at the outbreak of the late war between Japan and China, including Manchuria, Formosa, and the islands adjacent to Formosa.

TREATY WITH THE PHILIPPINES

RESERVATION

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of this treaty with the understanding that nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its military establishment, and its domestic concerns.

SECURITY TREATY BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND JAPAN

RESERVATION NO. 1

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its military establishment, and its domestic concerns, or (b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan.

RESERVATION NO. 2

Since Congress under the Constitution has the sole power to declare war and authorize the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States, any so-called administrative agreements under article III of this treaty relating to the right to dispose of the Armed Forces of the United States or any part of its military establishment in or about Japan shall not become binding on the United States unless ratified by the Senate as a treaty in accordance with article II, section 2, of the Constitution, or approved by the Congress by act or joint resolution specifically referring to such agreement or arrangement.

RESERVATION NO. 3

The rights of the United States under this treaty shall not expire until all agreements or arrangements for our security in the Pacific, referred to in article IV, have been ratified by the Senate as a treaty in accordance with article II, section 2 of the Constitution or approved by the Congress by act or joint resolution specifically referring to such agreements or arrangements.

SECURITY TREATY BETWEEN AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, AND THE UNITED STATES

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of this treaty with the understanding that nothing contained in this

treaty shall be construed to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its Military Establishment, and its domestic concerns.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, in several recent statements I have put before the Senate a fundamental analysis of the Japanese Peace Treaty and the three Pacific security treaties.

On February 20 I spoke at length on this subject on the floor of the Senate. I do not intend to speak very long this afternoon. I pointed out that the treaties were contracts in which the language was unclear. On the surface they appeared to resemble the proposals of General MacArthur for peace with Japan, and military assistance for defense of Japan until she was prepared to defend herself.

I understand, Mr. President, that we must have a treaty, and I am for a treaty, but I want to be sure that the interests of America are preserved.

Carefully examined, the contracts have been transformed into a legal maze in which we give up command of our own military forces and accept permanently in the Pacific the policy of confusion and defeat which we suffered in China and face today in Korea.

I have just offered reservations designed to clarify the treaties so that they will conform to the historic policies of the United States in the Pacific and preserve our full sovereign power over our Military Establishment in accordance with our Constitution.

The reservations which the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and I have just offered are very simple.

They merely assert that the United States does not surrender any of its sovereign power over its foreign policy, its Military Establishment, or its domestic concerns, and does not agree to any limitation of sovereignty on Japan or China.

These reservations can, I am sure, be approved by every Member of this body. They will not delay the peacemaking nor prolong the occupation. They do not necessitate sending the peace treaty to other signatories. Already by unanimous vote the Foreign Relations Committee has accepted one reservation concerning Yalta. That reservation was offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

They do not involve disagreements with other nations, unless our stating that we are opposed to government by conquest is offensive to some other nation.

THE PEACE TREATY

Reservation No. 1 to the peace treaty with Japan is a simple assertion that, in agreeing to this treaty, the Senate is not consenting to any limitations on the sovereignty of the United States, or on the elements that make up sovereignty—control of our foreign policy, Military Establishment and domestic concerns.

We likewise impose no limitations on the full sovereignty of Japan.

This reservation is necessary because in several places throughout the treaty there are phrases which limit our mili-

tary or diplomatic action to choices approved by the United Nations.

Since the U. S. S. R. and her satellites are among the governing bodies of U. N., and Red China may be invited in—more than likely she will be—the treaty as it stands limits us in the Pacific to policies which the U. S. S. R. or its satellites agree.

Reservation No. 1 establishes our freedom to make diplomatic and military moves in the Pacific as our national interest or moral responsibilities require even if we stand alone. Americans are willing to stand for that which they think is right, whether they have help or not. We still believe that God and one make a majority.

This reservation also is necessary to preserve our sovereignty in domestic affairs. The treaty refers at several points to the U. N. declaration of human rights, and the imposition by U. N. of policies of FEPC, compulsory racial equality, full employment, and other purely domestic policies imposed by articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter.

If the Senate of the United States wishes to approve the U. N. definition of human rights, it can do so openly. We cannot approve it for Japan without approving it by indirection for ourselves.

Mr. JENNER. I know it is said that this declaration occurs only in the preamble, and that it is not in the body of the treaty, and therefore is not binding.

If the Senate of the United States wishes to impose FEPC, compulsory racial equality, and State-controlled full employment upon Japan and ourselves, it can do so openly, not by indirection in a treaty.

The provisions of this treaty as they stand are contrary to the recently submitted Bricker amendment which would specifically forbid Congress to permit interference by an international body in our domestic concerns under the guise of a treaty.

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

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the first reservation which the Senator proposes a long one? In order that we may have it clear, will the Senator read it?

Mr. JENNER. I do not have a copy before me. It is very brief. Several days ago I sent a copy of it to every Senator. The Senator has a copy of it in his office.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it would be well to clarify this question as the Senator discusses the reservations, if he could read reservation No. 1.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, may the clerk read reservation No. 1 to the Japanese peace treaty?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read reservation No. 1.

Reservation No. 1 was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

RESERVATION NO. 1

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and un-

limited control over its foreign policy, its Military Establishment, and its domestic concerns, or (b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan.

Mr. JENNER. I am somewhat confused by recent statements that what is contained in the preamble is not binding in the courts. This issue is not going to be submitted to the courts. It is going to be decided by political action. This preamble, together with similar statements, is designed to win electoral consent to a gradual change in our sovereignty and our military command.

If it is affirmed it is as effective in the preamble as anywhere else, in winning political support.

It will not be decided in the courts.

The Constitution gives Congress the power to declare war and to raise and support armies.

This is the indispensable power in representative government.

We cannot cling tightly to Congress' legal right to control of the sword and ignore the actuality that the power of the people's representatives to decide whether we shall resort to war, is being eroded by political action which will never be subject to judicial tests.

Reservation No. 2 to the peace treaty is the amendment submitted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, except that it excludes Potsdam as well as Yalta.

Potsdam in effect reaffirms the Yalta agreement.

Potsdam took the territories away from Japan but did not decide what to do with them. Yalta took the territories from Japan and gave them to Russia.

Therefore, voting not to recognize Yalta would still leave us fully committed to the Yalta agreement through its reaffirmation at Potsdam.

Forrestal reports in his diary how President Truman said, "that if one part of the agreements at Yalta were breached, he—the President—would consider the entire Yalta agreement was no longer binding."

If Russia has breached the agreement again and again, why should we validate it now?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. Gladly.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it the position of the Senator from Indiana that the reservation put into the treaty by the Committee on Foreign Relations only did a part of the job, so to speak?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct. It provided that we would not recognize Yalta in any sense of the word. However, it is impossible to say it without at the same time also mentioning Potsdam, because the Potsdam agreement reaffirms the Yalta agreement. Under the Potsdam Agreement we said we would take the territories away from Japan, but we did not specifically say to whom they were to be awarded. Of course de facto the Kuriles and South Sakhalin, for example, are in Russian hands because they are occupied by Russian troops.

Mr. BRIDGES. In other words, the job which the Committee on Foreign Relations purported to do has been only partly done by it, unless the reservation proposed by the Senator from Indiana, which follows through with Potsdam, is adopted by this body.

Mr. JENNER. That is my understanding.

Reservation No. 3 merely retains for the United States freedom of decision with respect to occupation costs and private claims until the reparations issue and the claims of other nationals are all submitted.

We can then forgive occupation costs, use them as we used the Boxer indemnity, or collect them, as seems best when we have complete information.

In other words, it would look absurd if Communist China were to make claims for reparations against Japan for \$50,000,000,000, which Mr. Dulles said she could do, and for us to turn right around and forgive Japan all of our costs of occupation, and so forth, while at the same time permitting Japan to pay Communist China the \$50,000,000,000. Under the reservation we would not decide until all reparations and claims issues were decided.

Reservation No. 4 reaffirms the Stimson doctrine and the open-door policy, which represent our traditional policy in Asia, namely, that we agree to no carving up of the Republic of China.

This is also reaffirmation of the Cairo declaration, which says:

All territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores shall be restored to the Republic of China.

This reservation is necessary to preserve our historic policy of nonrecognition of conquest.

But it is also a matter of vital self-interest to us.

The treaty, as it stands, conforms to the Yoshida letter, which amputates all mainland China from the legal government of the Republic, now on Formosa.

It, therefore, conveys all war claims, including reparations—estimated by Mr. Dulles at \$50,000,000,000—to mainland China, now Red China.

I am sure that Members of this body do not want to be a party to any deal like that.

The reparations clauses of this treaty fix exactly the proposals of the Pauley reparations mission to Japan in 1945.

Recently, before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. Lattimore, under oath, referred to his influence on the Pauley report.

The Pauley report was the Morgenthau plan for Japan.

It provided for a leveling down of the production and standard of living of the Japanese to that of the rest of Asia, just as Germany was to be leveled down to the standards of Eastern Europe.

The so-called surplus equipment of Japan was to be used to industrialize the rest of Asia as the so-called surplus equipment of Germany was to be used to increase the war industries of Russia.

The only difference is that the present treaty does not transfer industrial plants as in Germany.

It transfers the output of the plants, as in Finland, Czechoslovakia, and the Balkans.

The Soviet Union learned from its failure in Germany and Manchuria that commandeering output was a far more profitable kind of tribute than seizing plants.

So far as the treaty stands now we are agreeing that a substantial part of the annual output of Japanese plants must be transferred to Red China if she wants it.

And we know she wants it.

Reservation No. 4 preserves intact the legal sovereignty of the Republic of China over the mainland and makes it the claimant for all reparations labor and output which are allotted to China.

The reservation withholds our consent to the arrangement by which Japan could be compelled to provide modern arms and construction to build up a Communist China.

THE SECURITY TREATIES

Reservation No. 1 to each of the three treaties reaffirms our sovereign right to control of our foreign policy, military establishment and domestic concerns.

Reservations No. 2 and 3 to the Japan Security Treaty reaffirms Congressional control of the right to make war.

The second reservation provides that the so-called administrative agreement with Japan, which will determine our rights to troops and bases—and I quote from the treaty—"in or about Japan," shall not be binding until ratified by Congress.

Mr. President, we now have a draft of that agreement, most of which deals with the legal status of military and civilian personnel at our bases. But Article XXVI sets up a joint commission of one American and one Japanese with virtually unlimited power over our "facilities and areas"—I quote from the agreement—in Japan.

Mr. President, I do not want any personal diplomacy. If there is going to be war, either under the United Nations or PATO or anyone else, I want Congress to have the right to say whether our country will participate in that war. The Congress represents the people of the United States. We who serve in Congress cannot turn over to someone else the war-making power of the Congress, and then hide behind our action. So far as the welfare of the people of the United States is concerned, the power to make war is one of the most important powers dealt with by the Constitution of the United States. In the absence of a constitutional amendment to that effect, the Congress cannot give that power to anyone else.

Mr. President, will the lone representative of the United States on the proposed joint commission composed of one American and one Japanese represent the State Department or the Defense Department? I do not know. No Senator knows, and no one else knows. Congress needs to know what commitments are made in our name.

The third reservation to the security pact between the United States and Japan provides that our rights under this treaty which are to expire when the Government of the United States and Japan approve a substitute arrangement, shall not expire unless the agreements which replace those rights have been approved by Congress. Mr. President, do you see anything wrong with that? Could any other nation in the world object to that?

In other words, under the mutual security pact we are to build bases and to station men in Japan for the defense, peace, and security of Japan. However, whenever our Government and the Japanese Government determine that there is sufficient security in and about Japan, then under this treaty, by a stroke of the pen the President of the United States will be able to turn over to United Nations' command our equipment and our soldiers in that area.

As the treaty now stands, the President has the power to decide that either the U. N. or a Pacific regional pact, or PATO, satisfactorily provides for the collective security of the United States in the Pacific. The President then can transfer our military forces in the Pacific and our bases there either to U. N. or to PATO.

Reservation No. 3 requires that any substitution must be approved by Congress. We do not want any more Koreans or any more police actions, and this is the only way to prevent them. This is a reaffirmation of the position of Congress on troops for Europe, and would prevent a repetition of the situation of June 1950, when the President, without consulting Congress, transformed American forces in the Korean war into U. N. forces, which are not subject to congressional policy making. That is exactly what happened. This treaty will provide for it again, unless the Senate adopts these reservations.

POWER OF THE SWORD

These are details, Mr. President, designed to clarify the wording of the proposed contract. Mr. President, I say again that I am in favor of a Japanese peace treaty. I know we must have a treaty with Japan. However, the underlying meaning of every word of the reservations is this:

By ratifying these treaties as they stand, Congress effectively and finally transfers its constitutional power over the sword to the Executive arm, which in turn can transfer it to another sovereign power, U. N. or PATO.

Representative government stands or falls on the power of the people's representatives to keep the military establishment obedient to the public will.

It does not make the slightest difference what the Congress does, how busy it is, or how many so-called laws it passes; if the Executive can use the military establishment to serve its own purposes, we have despotism. It may be a long time before the full evil is unveiled, but the transfer of power is complete and soon irrevocable.

Mr. President, the people's control of their own Armed Forces, through the

Congress, was not won by any paper document describing their rights. It was won by the vigorous assertion of their power by the Parliament under the Sturarts, and by the American Continental Congress under the Georges.

The right of Congress to choose when we shall invoke armed force against another nation rests, not in the written rights of Congress, but in the political wisdom and skill of Congress in maintaining this right against all forms of Executive encroachment, including guile.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield at this point for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Indiana recall that some time ago we found on our desks in the Senate Chamber a pamphlet described as a study of the executive power from the standpoint of the Executive? It had an introduction, as I recall, signed by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Does the Senator from Indiana recall that in that pamphlet it was stated that it is now apparent that the power of Congress to declare war is in abeyance? If the Senator remembers that, does he agree with the results of that study?

Mr. JENNER. I certainly do not agree. That is exactly what I am trying to point out in connection with this treaty, so that we shall not encounter that situation again.

Mr. President, I will not consent, either now or ever, to let any President transfer the Armed Forces of the United States to any sovereignty.

I will not sign a blank check which permits a President of the United States to haul down the American flag in the Pacific and to put another flag over air fields and naval bases constructed with money taken from the American people for defense of their country.

I cannot agree to a constitutional change, hidden in a peace treaty, which will effectively transfer the power of the sword from the Congress to the Executive.

Mr. President, in statements I have made to this body on previous occasions I have given the arguments supporting my position. On February 20 I made a long speech on this entire subject. I have spent many hours of work on this matter. As I understand, until today no Member of the Senate other than myself has raised his voice in this body in regard to this situation. Many Senators have admitted to me that they have not read this proposed peace treaty.

Mr. President, I am just a country lawyer; I am not a great constitutional lawyer. Nevertheless, I have dug deeply into this matter. I ask all my colleagues to listen to the questions and have them answered to their satisfaction. That is all I ask. I know that all Senators are busy, and cannot read every speech or follow every bill.

However, Mr. President, I ask all my colleagues, Members of the United States Senate, if they do not have time to study this treaty—and a study of it requires long hours of very patient work—then vote "no," or at least do not vote at all.

At this critical hour, Mr. President, I ask my colleagues not to vote for this treaty without first including in it the necessary clarifying reservations, unless Senators are willing to deliver to the Presidency the military power of this Nation and unless Senators are willing to let a strange, new flag wave over American soldiers and sailors in the Pacific water so recently stained with American blood.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me at this time?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is the Senator from Indiana aware of the fact that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has submitted a unanimous report urging ratification of this peace treaty at an early date, thus creating the impression that the members of the committee are entirely satisfied with the provisions of the treaty and that there is little, if any, justification for any delay in ratifying the treaty or any scrutiny of the various provisions of the treaty?

Mr. JENNER. I am aware of that. I do not know why there should be so much rush.

Only a little while ago the admission was made on this floor that Yoshida now is trying to negotiate a treaty with Nationalist China located on Formosa, and that those negotiations have been under way for several weeks. Very well; then why do not we look into that matter? I do not know why there is so much rush.

Many thousands of our troops are pinned down in Korea, and Korea is the sword point directed toward Japan. So why is there so much rush, Mr. President? I do not know. But, Mr. President, do not get me wrong. I am not opposed to the Japanese Peace Treaty. I want a treaty. We must have a treaty. But I want a treaty which will not pull down the American flag, to erect in its place a United Nations flag. After all, General Ridgway is in command of the United Nations forces in Korea today; but there is no guaranty that, a year from now, or 2 years from now, under NATO, even a United States general will be in charge of the American boys in Asia. So, let us look at this realistically. Let us have these questions answered satisfactorily. For example, does this body want the Japanese economy to engage in the production of war reparations to Red China, to the extent of \$50,000,000,000, to build up the strength of Communist China, and to enable them to proceed with their deadly assaults upon Indochina? But it can be done under this treaty, unless this reservation concerning reparations and claims is adopted by this body.

Mr. President, we are supposed to be opposed to communism. This should afford a test of where we stand. I do not know the answers, though I know that I have dug deep and hard. I know I am fearful about this; and all I ask of this body is to listen, read, and study before Senators cast their votes.

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

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I would like to ask the Senator from Indiana whether he has presented this point of view to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

Mr. JENNER. No, I have not.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator plan to do so?

Mr. JENNER. As a matter of fact, I did not get into it in time. I have not had time enough to do that. As Senators know, the Japanese Security Pact was signed before the Senate had had an opportunity of seeing it. No Member of this body that I know of, with the exception possibly of a small committee, had an opportunity to see it. I did not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it had not been my intention to address myself to the Japanese peace treaty this afternoon, but since no other Senator seems to be ready to speak, I think I shall avail myself of this opportunity. It will not be my purpose to discuss in any detail the reservations proposed by the distinguished Senator from Indiana. It is my understanding that the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will discuss the reservations at a later time.

Mr. President, I should like at this time merely to call attention to two or three general propositions, without going into detail.

The first one is this: The first reservation offered by the Senator from Indiana provides that there shall be no limitation on sovereignty. A treaty, by its very nature, imposes certain limitations, otherwise there would be no necessity of entering into a solemn and binding contract such as a treaty.

In another instance, the distinguished Senator from Indiana objects to our use of the term "China." As I recall he refers to that in connection with Article 10, and also in Article 21, I believe it is. The language used in Article 10 is the exact language recommended by the Nationalist Government of China. On this point, there has been, of course, a great deal of discussion from time to time about the failure to have the Nationalist Chinese represented in this peace treaty. Of course, I wish that they might have been present, and might have participated; but the failure to have them do so was the result of conditions with which we were confronted. We were confronted with the alternative either of having no peace treaty at all, or of following the practical solution of not having either of the Chinese governments invited, and of leaving it to Japan to decide upon the one with whom she would execute a treaty.

At the time, we were in contact with the Nationalist Chinese Government, the only government we recognize. While that Government naturally was disappointed in the solution arrived at, I believe they understood it fully and I may say that as the treaty was being gradually built up, we were in communication with representatives of the National Chinese Government and accepted many of their suggestions as to what should be placed in the treaty. It was not a situation in which Nationalist China was left

without friends among those who were drafting the treaty.

I have listened to all the debate which has taken place on this peace treaty—perhaps I should call it the discussion, rather than the debate, because I believe there is a fair degree of unanimity as to the desirability of having the treaty with Japan ratified as early as possible. Every person who has represented us in connection with Japan, its occupation and the administration of its affairs, has urged that very thing. As a matter of fact, it was General MacArthur who gave the word as to when he thought we were ready to begin drafting a treaty of peace with Japan; and all the way through, he urged that we proceed to that end. The same thing was true of General Ridgway; it was true of our various political representatives who deal with the Japanese problem from time to time.

Mr. President, I wish to second the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as to the manner in which this peace treaty was formulated. As I said in the course of the hearings, and as I am glad now to repeat, I feel that the drafting of this peace treaty, and all the work connected with bringing it to this point, has constituted perhaps the finest demonstration I have yet seen of proper bipartisan cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. Before a single word of this treaty was put on paper, Mr. Dulles, who ably represented the State Department all the way through, and Mr. John Allison, who was his chief assistant, and Mr. Dean Rusk, who was the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, sat across the table from our subcommittee, the members of which include the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], as well as myself. We sat across the table and discussed, first, why we needed to execute a peace treaty at this time; second, what were the general principles which should underlie the peace treaty and, third, methods of operating whereby we might get an overwhelming majority of the countries who were concerned to participate in the formulation with us of the treaty.

Fifty-four countries were concerned with the treaty with Japan, the greatest number, I suppose, that ever tried to work out a peace treaty with a conquered nation. Little by little the treaty developed. I remember that at another meeting Mr. Dulles brought to us the first draft, consisting of approximately 6 pages, simply a general statement. He said at that time, "We want this treaty to be brief." He told us how long some treaties were, the treaty with Italy, for instance, and said, "We want about the shortest possible treaty the world has ever seen."

The treaty expanded somewhat from six typewritten pages, but not very much. It is still one of the shortest peace treaties of record, but it covers the whole field, and we believe it covers it adequately.

Mr. President, the treaty was not drawn and brought to us with the state-

ment, "Here it is." It was worked out step by step and word by word within our committee, by our subcommittee, consisting of two Democrats and two Republicans, and by the able representatives of the State Department, and, in turn, between them and the representatives of the various governments concerned. Every time there was a new development, we would have an additional meeting, and then Mr. Dulles or Mr. Allison would start off on a swing that took them practically around the world as they consulted with the 54 governments concerned with this peace treaty.

There were many jobs to be done. I see the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] on the floor. I well recall one time when we were trying to work out this treaty and he made a trip to Japan and to the far eastern area in order to talk with the people and to make such contribution as he could, even though he was not a member of our committee; but he was greatly interested in such matters as maritime activities, shipbuilding, fishing, and things of that kind.

So the treaty was built little by little, and I believe I am safe in saying that there never before was a treaty built more carefully and more painstakingly than was this one.

As I say, Mr. President, it is not my purpose, and I hope the Senate will not construe it so to be, to answer at this time the reservations proposed by the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. It is my understanding that the distinguished and able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will discuss them at a later time.

Mr. President, I desire to turn most of my attention to the security pacts.

It is a pleasure for me to rise in support of these treaties. I wish to speak in several capacities: First, as a citizen; second, as a Senator; third, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and fourth, as one of the United States delegates to the San Francisco Conference. I think it may be in order to state that I visited the Far East accompanied by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] just before the opening of this session of the Congress. It is thus with some first-hand knowledge and with great interest in this area that I rise to address the Senate.

Mr. President, I am fully aware of the apprehension which many American citizens and our brave former allies have in entering into these treaties. I am also aware of the many dangers that lie in wait for the world if we fail to make peace with Japan. Balancing one against the other, I have no hesitation in supporting these treaties with firmness and with wholehearted conviction.

When we decided to negotiate a treaty of peace with Japan, we meant to go much further than merely ending the state of war. It was our firm intention to strengthen the cause of peace and mutual security throughout the entire Pacific area. That is why we now have three security pacts before us for consideration at the same time we consider the treaty of peace with Japan. These four treaties taken together make clear

that our interests in the Pacific are not confined to a single country but are as broad as the area itself. They also show that for both practical and sentimental reasons we desire the closest cooperation with the Australians, the New Zealanders, and the Filipinos, who, like ourselves, are deeply concerned with creating peaceful and stable conditions in the Far East.

Mr. President, let us look for a moment at the background against which we must appraise these treaties. Vast changes have occurred in Japan since the historic signing of the surrender instrument on board the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Harbor on September 2, 1945. The war-making power of Japan has been liquidated, its aggressive spirit has been transmuted into economic production, its large monopolistic combines have been broken, women have been given political rights and are now on the road to equality with men, and a democratic constitution has been promulgated. It is a new democratic Japan, which we confront—one ready to take its place with the peace-loving states of the world, prepared to make its contribution to a peaceful and orderly Far East. The Japanese people, freed of feudalistic inhibitions and warlike traditions, eagerly await the opportunity to test their new institutions and freedoms unshackled by occupation forces and regulations. Since they are ready to assume their responsibilities as an independent state, I, for one, believe that the United States should join promptly in granting them the freedom they now seek. As Senators know, it has long been our stated purpose to accord the Japanese people freedom and independence just as soon as they are ready.

The problem, Mr. President, is far more complicated than merely granting Japan her independence. The facts are that Japan is located in an area of great change and restlessness. In her present disarmed conditions she could easily fall prey to aggression unless someone helps her. Without in any way condoning past Japanese aggressions, we can all recall from our study of history that for many generations it has been Russia's aim to conquer the Asiatic mainland and then, in turn, to seize control of Japan. Let any doubter scan the history of Russian aggression in the Far East. Let him recall the dreams of Muraviev, the bunglings of Alexeiev, the schemings of Count Witte, the history of the Trans-Siberian Railway, the Russo-Japanese War, the running fights between Japan and the Soviet Union during the 1930's, and the postwar Soviet colonialism throughout Eurasia. The record is so voluminous that we cannot possibly ignore it.

Every Senator knows that there is an urgency about the Russian problem. It concerns the treaties before us. But recently something new has been added to Russian expansionism. The Soviet Union is served by satellites and minion states who do its bidding. In June 1950 one of the puppets, North Korea, embarked upon aggression against its freedom-loving neighbor, South Korea, and directly menaced the security of Japan. Where the next aggression may come

from is, of course, a strategic mystery; but that aggression is contemplated can no longer be doubted, and that it may affect Japan can also no longer be doubted. Look, for example, at developments in Indochina. The Far East is riddled with Communist propaganda, the consequences of which are unpredictable. Conquests are schemed and engineered by Soviet and other Communist governments producing a restlessness in which aggression may appear at any moment. In the very center of this area lies Japan and on the periphery we find the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand.

This is the background against which we must examine the treaties before us. Obviously, if there is a pressing problem in the Far East, it is that of security.

The Senate will recall that the Japanese constitution uniquely renounces war forever as an instrument of national policy. Furthermore, by article 5 of the Treaty of Peace Japan undertakes to live peacefully, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which according to article 2 (6) of the Charter, means that Japan is obligated to refrain in international relations from the threat or the use of force. In addition to these contractual obligations Japan does not now have the physical means with which to defend herself against attack.

She has thus entered upon noble undertakings which in a different situation might spell stability, but in today's world make her an easy mark for the aggressor. If Japan were left without any kind of protection against aggression, that condition would constitute an open invitation to disaster and serfdom for Japan. In fact, in my opinion, it would spell disaster for the peace and security of the Far East generally. Russian forces are poised only a few miles from the Japanese homeland. They are located on the Habomai Islands, on the Kurile Islands, and on Karafuto—Southern Sakhalin—all of which are situated only a few miles from Hokkaido. Is there anyone among us who sincerely doubts that the Soviet forces would be able within a few hours to conquer most of Japan, if Japan were left without means of defense?

I know there are those who would point out that article 5 of the peace treaty states that Japan possesses "the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense." But let us be realistic. I ask Senators, if that right is not implemented with real power, can it be exercised? Obviously not. Japan could easily be shorn of all her rights in her present unarmed condition. What good is any right of self-defense if a country is unable to exercise it? Who would plead that an unarmed man was adequately protected by his inherent right of self-defense when attacked by an armed murderous madman?

Under these circumstances I am sure every member present will agree with the underlying purposes of article 6 of the peace treaty. That article calls for the end of the occupation of Japan, but at the same time gives Japan the opportunity of securing the defense it needs provided it asks for the aid. Article 6 sets a 90-day period in which the occu-

pation forces now in Japan must be withdrawn. The period is to be measured from the time the treaty comes into force. But, as already indicated, this same article also permits Japan to enter into multilateral and bilateral treaties or arrangements for the retention or the stationing of allied troops in Japan. I want to emphasize that the determination of whether or not she shall enter into such agreements depends completely on Japan's decision to do so.

This arrangement grew out of the suggestion made by Ambassador Dulles to Japanese officials in February 1951, that the United States would "sympathetically consider" the stationing of armed forces in Japan for the defense of Japan if Japan so wished. On February 11, 1951, Premier Yoshida warmly welcomed this offer. Subsequent discussions developed the conclusion that the best arrangement would be a bilateral security agreement between the United States and Japan.

When the conference met in San Francisco last September, Ambassador Dulles made this comment:

No person in this room, and I mean that literally, honestly believes that Japan seeks collective security with the United States because it is coerced. That is palpably absurd.

In discussing the dangers confronting Japan and speaking of a peace which granted Japan sovereignty and freedom without permitting Japan to protect them, he went on to say:

That kind of peace, in this kind of a world, would be a fraud. To give a sovereignty which cannot be defended is to give an empty husk. Indefensible sovereignty is not sovereignty at all. An undefendable and indefensible Japan would be so subject to the menace of surrounding power that Japan would not, in fact, be able to lead an independent existence.

Mr. President, these are some of the reasons why something more than a peace treaty seemed to be needed. These clearly point out why a security pact between the United States and Japan was deemed important and necessary. We shall examine its nature in just a moment.

Before going into that, however, let me make one point, which seems, at least to me, to be very important. Some anxious people have raised an important and sound question. They ask, When the treaty comes into effect, since Soviet Russia and China are not signatories nor parties to it, will these countries still be at war with Japan? If they are still at war with Japan, will it not be perfectly proper for them to move in and occupy Japan? If they were to do so, in what position would that leave the Allied Powers? The argument has been made that there would be no legal obstacle in the way of such Russian or Chinese action.

Mr. President, I believe that those who are worried on this score can be completely reassured. The committee looked into the matter and was told by the Secretary of State that no basis exists in law for such unilateral action. Legally, the situation is this: The Potsdam surrender terms of July 26, 1945, to which the Soviet Union became a partner,

called for Allied occupation until the basic objectives set forth in the declaration had been attained, and when the Japanese people had set up a government of their freely expressed choice. The occupation was thus a joint undertaking, not that of a single power, neither that of the United States nor of the Soviet Union, nor of Great Britain. No nation, except as it might act in the behalf of the other powers, had by itself any occupation rights in Japan. That continues to be just as true today after the signing of the peace treaty with Japan as it was before the signing. It will continue to be true after the treaty has become effective. Neither the Soviet Union nor the Chinese Communist Government has any right to act alone in Japan. They have neither belligerent nor occupation rights to do so.

The San Francisco conference on these treaties showed clearly that it considered the terms of the Potsdam declaration fulfilled, and that the time for peace had arrived, not only because those powers desired peace with Japan, but also because Japan under the terms of the Potsdam declaration was entitled to a peace treaty. I am sure that only those who seek an excuse for aggression would reason otherwise.

We all know that there will always be those who, for aggressive or selfish purposes, will invent spurious arguments to justify aggressive acts, and we all know that no human instrument can be given ironclad protection against such assaults. But looking at the matter with complete candor and balance, I am sure that Senators will reach the same conclusions. Russia and China have the physical power to embark upon aggression, if they so desire. Whether they will do so, they alone can tell. If they embark upon aggression in Japan, it will not be for legal reasons. Such pseudo-legal justifications as they might make would only cloak their previously determined judgment that the time was propitious to seize with force that which they were unable to obtain by legal means.

Now, that being the case, if any power were to resort to what has been euphemistically called "belligerent rights," it would violate the Potsdam surrender terms and bring into immediate play article 2 of the security treaty with Japan, which reads:

During the exercise of the right referred to in article I, Japan will not grant, without the prior consent of the United States of America, any bases or any rights, powers, or authority whatsoever, in or relating to bases or the right of garrison or of maneuver, or transit of ground, air, or naval forces to any third power.

It is clear to me at least that Japan would have to oppose any such effort to conquer her country, and this would bring the whole Pacific security arrangement into play.

In such a case, I need not point out that any aggression of this sort could only mean that its perpetrators have deliberately embarked upon their acts with a view to plunging mankind into world war III. They would not stumble into such a debacle. They would deliberately with malice aforethought launch their aggression.

It is only reasonable then that the preamble of the security treaty with Japan should recite the conditions which prevail in the world and state that Japan has voluntarily sought an agreement with the United States to protect Japan from irresponsible militarism. It is reasonable likewise that the preamble should state that the United States in the interests of peace and security is willing to maintain Armed Forces in and about Japan. And article I logically grants the United States the right to dispose its land, sea, and air forces in and about Japan, and provides that the troops so stationed may be used for the protection of peace and security in the Far East. They may also be employed to put down large-scale riots and disturbances in Japan caused through the instigation and intervention of an outside power.

Mr. President, I think that statement is deserving of emphasis. It is not merely to quell disorder within the country itself, but to put down large-scale riots and disturbances in Japan caused through the instigation and intervention of an outside power.

Since the treaty merely provides the framework for the arrangements, article III provides that details shall be spelled out in administrative agreements. The first of these has already been signed, and I shall say more about it in a moment.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the unofficial text of the administrative agreement to which I have made reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the agreement will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. In negotiating the treaty it was recognized that security conditions in the Pacific might change, particularly that the United Nations might provide a broader framework for peace and stability than that contained in this security treaty. Thus article IV sets forth the conditions for the termination of the treaty, namely, whenever the two governments agree that the United Nations has provided for the peace and security of Japan or when alternative arrangements to that end have been furnished.

Mr. President, some persons have raised objection to the treaty or to the security pact because of this particular provision in it, and have brought up the argument that, in effect, it subordinates the United States to the United Nations, and that the United Nations could order us out of Japan at any time it might wish to do so. I wish to emphasize as strongly as I can that that is not true under the terms of the agreement. The reason this provision is inserted is that we cling to the hope that eventually—the sooner the better—the United Nations may become an effective organization and be able to maintain peace throughout the world. Even short of that, we recognize the desirability of regional pacts which are made within the framework of the United Nations. I refer to such

pacts as the North Atlantic Pact, for example.

There are many people who look forward to the day when there may be a Pacific pact. We believe that the time may well come when the bilateral agreements existing between the United States and Japan, between the United States and the Philippines in another case, and between the United States on the one hand and Australia and New Zealand on the other, may all be merged into an over-all Pacific pact agreement, in which other nations in that area may join with all of us in seeing that peace is maintained in that area of the world. That is the purpose of this provision of the security pact.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it not true also that what we are doing here will provide us with a blueprint and a good foundation, constituting a step in the direction of a formal Pacific pact, which we hope will be entered into in the not too distant future?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Senator is exactly right. I believe we might find a comparison in something which happened more than a hundred years ago. A hundred and twenty-five years ago or more the United States unilaterally announced what became known as the Monroe Doctrine. After all, these pacts in the Pacific amount virtually to an extension of the Monroe Doctrine to that area. The Monroe Doctrine has lived throughout the years. But we saw a few years ago the organization of an agreement among the American states. That does not necessarily replace the Monroe Doctrine, but certainly it brings it in as an area agreement, and that is what we look forward to as a possibility some day in the Pacific. I hope that day will come soon. I should like to see Japan, the Philippines, Nationalist China, Indonesia, Siam, Indochina, Australia, New Zealand, Burma, and an independent Korea unite in a regional pact which might have the same premise and might develop the virility which we see developing under the North Atlantic Pact, and under other pacts into which we have entered.

Thus it is clear that the treaty constitutes only a first step—as do the other two security treaties—toward a more general arrangement for the security of the entire Pacific area. It imposes no obligation on the United States, merely giving this country the bases and the rights with which to aid in the defense of the Japan area. I wish to emphasize that we are not obligated to station troops or ships anywhere, nor are we required to provide Japan with anything except that which we voluntarily choose to supply. On that point Mr. Dulles significantly said during the hearings that “what we do will be determined, I take it, by what an enlightened view of our own self-interest requires.”

I may interpolate at that point that the United States feels a very definite obligation to help maintain peace in that area of the world. We feel a very definite obligation toward helping Japan

to rebuild herself into a condition in which she can fulfill her responsibilities in the family of nations. Certainly we feel that obligation toward the Philippines, to whom we gave independence only a few short years ago. Certainly we feel such an obligation to our gallant allies in the recent war, Australia and New Zealand. We want to see peace in that area; and within the spirit of these various treaties we dedicate ourselves to that end.

Since the Committee on Foreign Relations has concluded its hearings and consideration of these treaties, the State Department has announced that it had signed an administrative agreement with Japan governing the disposition of our Armed Forces in and about Japan, and an unofficial text of that agreement was released on February 28, 1952. It is the text which I asked to have inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. It is an executive agreement, and therefore does not require congressional action. Suffice it to say that the agreement conforms in general to similar agreements concluded with sovereign countries throughout the world in which United States forces are now maintained.

Among many other things stated in the press release on this subject is the following sentence:

Concluded on the basis of sovereign equality and trust by direct negotiation between the two countries, the agreement is satisfactory to both the United States and Japanese Governments and will strengthen the close bonds of mutual interest and regard between their two people.

I believe that one of the reservations which have been proposed by the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] relates to an administrative agreement, not requiring action by Congress.

In that connection, Mr. President, I should like to invite attention to the fact that an administrative agreement is provided for in the security pact itself. It is anticipated and its formulation is provided for. However, such an agreement is a document which relates to what places will be occupied, where the troops will be placed, matters of administration, what rents shall be paid, arrangements for utilities, and so forth, and covers just about every imaginable subject that could be thought of.

We must recognize the fact that the many hundreds of details which must be worked out in these various administrative agreements are subject to change from year to year, from month to month, and even from day to day. It would be impossible to change a treaty each time some detail in it had to be altered.

Mr. President, as I mentioned, they are the kind of administrative agreements we have been using with other governments under which our troops have been placed in foreign countries. I do not know that I should make it as a positive statement, but I do not recall any treaty having been made with England with reference to stationing our troops on the bases we occupy there. I do not recall the making of a treaty with any power when we have obtained from it air bases and when we have located

our air forces and other troops in such countries. That has all been done through administrative agreements, just as is sought to be done in this instance.

Mr. President, it is article III of the security treaty between the United States and Japan which makes reference to these administrative agreements, and I desire to read it:

ARTICLE III

The conditions which shall govern the disposition of Armed Forces of the United States of America in and about Japan shall be determined by administrative agreements between the two governments.

Mr. President, I shall mention one problem that we know will be subject to change and will have to be worked out under an administrative agreement. I refer to a problem which the Presiding Officer, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, who has been president of the American Bar Association, will readily recognize as being a real one. It is the subject of extraterritoriality with reference to criminal offenses committed by our forces in Japan. Who shall try them? What law shall be applied?

It is a difficult problem to solve anywhere, particularly as between the West and the East, because our respective backgrounds and traditions and legal principles differ so greatly.

Finally, this agreement was reached, and I believe everyone will concede that it was a wise solution of the problem, namely, that for the time being American forces will retain jurisdiction over our men when they commit offenses, but when the agreement which we draw up with reference to our forces in the NATO countries is agreed to or comes into being that agreement shall be applied. I have not tried to give the exact wording, but in substance, that is the agreement. It takes into consideration that changes may take place and, indeed, are anticipated.

I believe the Senate will recognize the wisdom of making it an administrative or executive agreement and not requiring its ratification by the Senate or its approval by Congress as a whole.

As the Senators know, Japanese security is only a part of the security of the whole Pacific area. Therefore, when the United States considered the former, the latter also inevitably had to be taken into account. Both Australia and New Zealand were menaced by Japanese aggression during the late war. Any all-out aggression in the Pacific, regardless of its source, was bound to affect both countries. Thus the United States deemed it imperative to enter into a security arrangement with them, especially in view of the lack of some over-all arrangement, which would guarantee the peace and security of the whole Pacific area. A security arrangement with Australia and New Zealand would have the great merit that it would tie the four powers concerned by two security treaties into a common defense of the peace of the Pacific area and thus constitute a stronger deterrent to aggression than would the efforts of one or two countries alone to furnish such a guaranty. Unlike the Japanese security treaty, which ends with the determina-

tion of the two signatory powers, article 10 of the treaty with Australia and New Zealand provides that it shall remain in effect indefinitely.

This treaty reaffirms the faith of the contracting parties in the principles of the U. N. Charter, notes that the United States is in occupation of the Ryukyus, recognizes the military obligations of New Zealand and Australia in the Pacific, declares the unity of the contracting parties, warns potential aggressors that each party does not stand alone, and proclaims the desire of the signatories to coordinate their collective defense for purposes of peace and security in the Pacific area. There is a most excellent and persuasive precedent for this treaty. The terms are framed after the North Atlantic Treaty and in many instances the wording of the two documents is identical.

Senators will recognize, for instance, the following language in article I. It states that the contracting parties undertake to settle their disputes amicably and not to resort to the use of force or threat of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. Likewise, article II has a familiar ring. It states that the parties agree separately and jointly by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid to maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack, and article III provides for consultation whenever the territorial integrity, the political independence or security of any of the parties is threatened in the Pacific.

The most important provision, article IV, deviates somewhat from the more positive terms of the North Atlantic Treaty. Article IV states that the parties agree that an armed attack in the Pacific area would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the parties, and they agree to meet the common danger in accordance with their constitutional processes.

Mr. President, the statement I made a few minutes ago, to the effect that this treaty virtually means an extension of the Monroe Doctrine to that area of the world, was based on the article to which I have just referred, for its language is the language of the Monroe Doctrine, applied to the security pacts.

The attack must be reported to the Security Council of the United Nations, and measures taken to combat the attack shall terminate when the Security Council has taken the steps necessary to restore international peace and security.

Finally, provisions are made for the establishment of a council of foreign ministers or their deputies, whose duty it shall be to implement the treaty. Pending the development of a more comprehensive system of regional security, the Council is authorized to maintain a consultative relationship with State, regional organizations, associations, or States, or other authorities in the Pacific area in a position to further the purposes of the treaty and to contribute to the security of the area. Thus, the Council and the organization which it may set up to implement the treaty possess the authority and power to coordinate the secu-

rity arrangements which now exist or which may be created for that purpose in the Pacific.

In this connection let me call attention to the third paragraph of the committee report before us. It reads:

The committee agrees that the treaty will serve the national interests of the United States by making clear our mutual interests and our common destiny with our allies in the Pacific. It seems highly desirable that our friends as well as our enemies understand that our concern over such matters as the North Atlantic Pact and the Japanese Peace Treaty in no way implies any lack of interest on our part in working for peace with such valuable allies as New Zealand, Australia, and the Philippines.

Mr. President, I may add that it is my own personal conviction that once we had determined that a security treaty with Japan was in our own interest we were of necessity bound to enter into security arrangements with our doughty allies, the Australians and the New Zealanders. That we did.

The treaty before us has two salutary effects. In the first place, it means that if trouble does develop in the Pacific area, where we are so heavily committed because of our many vital interests there, we shall not be required to go it alone. Of course, that principle operates with equal force for our partners in this treaty. In the second place, it gives assurance to the New Zealanders and the Australians, who suffered so much during the late war, and who have had to make substantial sacrifices under the Japanese Peace Treaty that they have not been forgotten and that we and they have joined hands to move toward a common destiny together.

The third security treaty before us at this time is the mutual defense treaty with the Philippines. It is closely patterned after the treaty with New Zealand and Australia, with the exception that it does not specifically provide for a council.

The Senate will recall that there already existed a security arrangement between the United States and the Philippines in the form of a base agreement, but between the two countries there was no formal security agreement similar to that with Australia and New Zealand. It is generally understood that the United States would consider an attack on the Philippine Islands as a threat against American security, and that this country would act accordingly. Therefore, the treaty with the Philippines was a natural complement to the other security treaties, and has been entered upon accordingly. In a major sense it formalizes what has actually been an unwritten yet inescapable obligation on the United States since the Philippines were granted their independence.

I hope the Senate will permit me to express one more thought before concluding. It concerns the use of Japanese facilities by the U. N. forces. The situation in Korea and the involvement of the United States, the United Nations, and Japan in the Korean affair caused the United States Government to make sure that the treaties with Japan would have no adverse effect upon the assistance

now being given by Japan to the U. N. effort in Korea.

In article 5, Japan promises to furnish the U. N. every aid in any action it takes in accordance with the Charter. An exchange of letters between Secretary Acheson and Prime Minister Yoshida dated September 8, 1951, set forth fully Japan's intention to give effect to both the terms and the spirit of Japan's commitments to the U. N. Premier Yoshida said, in part:

I have the honor, on behalf of my Government, to confirm that if and when the forces of a member or members of the United Nations are engaged in any United Nations action in the Far East after the treaty of peace comes into force, Japan will permit and facilitate the support in and about Japan, by the member or members of the forces engaged in such United Nations action, the expenses involved in the use of Japanese facilities and services to be borne as at present or as otherwise mutually agreed between Japan and the United Nations concerned.

Mr. President, there are many other aspects of these treaties which we might discuss. Let me call attention to the committee report now before us for a more extended treatment of this subject.

In closing, let me say that I hope I have said enough to show that the treaties constitute parts of a pattern. All four of the treaties are necessary if we are to bring to an end the state of War with Japan and if we are to embark upon the construction of a more stable, secure, and peaceful Pacific area. All four of the treaties are essential to the security of the United States.

I strongly urge the Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of these pacts.

Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to refer to the main treaty and some of the conditions existing in the Far Eastern area of the world. I do not intend to duplicate the statements made earlier today by the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

It was a privilege for me to have the fine experience of spending most of the month of December in that area along with the able Senator from New Jersey and former Senator John Foster Dulles, who now is serving as a special representative of the State Department. That was a delightful experience for me. From it I received many impressions which I never would have been able to obtain had I not been able to make that visit.

I went abroad a little ahead of time, in order to be able to visit a few of the other countries in that area of the world. That was the first time I had ever been to the Far East. I visited briefly the Philippines, Hong Kong, Thailand, Formosa, Japan, and Korea. For most of the time when I was in Formosa, the Senator from New Jersey was also there, and we were together from that time on, as we went to Japan and Korea and returned to the United States.

Mr. President, everywhere I went I was tremendously impressed with what seemed to me to be a new feeling among the peoples of that part of the world, a belief in the possibility of a peaceful Pacific which, I think, may very well mean a peaceful world. I believe we are

fairly well along with building peace in Western Europe, Mr. President. I believe that the particular trouble area immediately ahead of us is the Pacific.

In proposing this treaty and the three security pacts, I believe we are taking a long step toward building a peaceful Pacific which may be the key to a peaceful world.

Mr. President, I am thoroughly convinced that, certainly as of today, the key to the Pacific is Japan.

It will not be easy for Japan to maintain herself and to maintain a sound economy for her people. In Japan there are approximately 85,000,000 persons, who are increasing at the rate of approximately 600,000 a year, or perhaps even more than that. In fact, during the past 10 years I believe the population of Japan has increased at the rate of more than 1,000,000 a year. All those people live in a country smaller in size than the State of California.

I believe that Japan is the fourth or fifth most heavily populated country in the world. I believe that Japan has the greatest density of urban population in the world. I believe that Japan possesses the fourth largest city in all the world.

The 85,000,000 people of Japan certainly are among the most industrious people in all the world. They are striving, struggling, determined to rebuild their country and to restore it to the family of nations.

Mr. President, I never conceived of such things as those I saw—a people who, when defeated, accepted defeat absolutely, and who, almost immediately, started with determination on the job of rebuilding; a people who have appreciated the attitude shown by the victors toward the vanquished; a people who, I believe, stand ready to show their appreciation by alining themselves with the free nations of the world.

I enjoyed the very able discourse on the subject of the peace treaty by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], in which he touched upon certain of these things, and by our distinguished friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as well as by the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I believe we cannot be too diligent in trying to understand the spirit of these people, their willingness, their determination, their resolve to rebuild a nation at peace and to make a contribution not only to a stable condition in the world but to bring about a peaceful world.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from Alabama hear the speech of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] this afternoon?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I heard it.

Mr. MORSE. As one who was not a member of the Senator's committee, but who understands that the committee was unanimous in its report, I should like to know whether the committee had before it the main points raised by the Senator from Indiana in his reservations, whether the committee gave careful consideration at least to the objec-

tives of those reservations, and whether, having done so, the committee then came forward with its unanimous report. Or does the committee find itself in the position of not having considered some or many of the points which the Senator from Indiana has raised by his reservations?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I may say that the reservations of the Senator from Indiana were not before our committee, and that, as he stated at the conclusion of his speech today, they had not been presented to our committee by him. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, as I said in the beginning, I am not going to discuss the reservations in detail, because that task, I believe, is to be undertaken by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, who will at some later time take them up and discuss them one by one, I understand.

But let me say that, as I remember them, I believe that every point covered in the reservations proposed by the distinguished Senator from Indiana was considered by the committee; and I believe that if any Senator will review the hearings he will find that those questions came up at different times in the course of the hearings. Let me mention one of them, for instance, because I think perhaps we have heard more about it than any other. I refer to the Declaration of Human Rights. The claim has been made that the treaty constitutes a back-door method of ratifying the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As a matter of fact, that simply is not the case. That question was discussed, and the discussion will be found in the testimony of Mr. Dulles.

I do not see the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] on the floor at the moment, but some time ago, when this question was first raised, I knew that the Senator from Ohio intended to introduce a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment covering this matter. Knowing that he is a very fine lawyer, I asked him what he thought about the suggestion concerning the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and whether he had checked into it.

He said he had. "Furthermore," he said, "I took it up with the American Bar Association, and they tell me that there is nothing wrong with the treaty provision in that respect." I wish the Senator from Ohio were present in order that he might state whether he is still of that opinion. That must have been a month or so ago. I merely cite that as an example. It will be found that the question of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is discussed in the committee report on page 17.

By the way, I may also call attention to the remarks of the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], last Friday, at which time he obtained permission to have certain documents printed in the RECORD, to show that the treaty would not ratify the declaration referred to.

I do not want to take up the reservations in detail one by one. It is not my purpose to thrust any one of them aside, but, as I mentioned a few moments ago,

in each case, the first reservation both to the main treaty and to each of the security pacts, says that (a) the treaty shall not be in any way a limitation of the sovereignty of the United States, and (b) that nothing in it shall be construed to be a continuing limitation upon Japanese sovereignty.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me conclude this thought, please. I stated in the beginning that a treaty, by its very nature, contains a certain amount of limitation of sovereignty, that is, to the extent provided in the treaty itself, because it becomes a binding contract between the powers; and there is a continuing Japanese obligation in this treaty which I do not believe the able Senator from Indiana would want to strike out, but which his reservation would do. If his first reservation were adopted, it would virtually amount to eliminating the treaty altogether, and each one of its parts.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It was not my purpose to ask the Senator from Alabama to discuss the points raised by the Senator from Indiana this afternoon. I was only interested in the procedural matter, because I think most of us follow the policy of giving the benefit of a rebuttable presumption to a committee report; and, when the committee report is unanimous, I, in evaluating the report and determining whether it is entitled to the benefit of that presumption, wanted to find out from the Senator from Alabama whether he, in fact, considered the points raised by the Senator from Indiana. I certainly think his points are deserving of consideration by the Senate, and I wanted to know whether the committee report was adopted after the Senator became cognizant of the objections which the Senator from Indiana had raised.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Oregon understands, I hope, that the reservations proposed by the Senator from Indiana were not submitted to the committee. He did not make the proposals, until after we had reported the treaty to the Senate. But I believe I am safe in saying that every single point covered by the reservations of the Senator from Indiana came up in the course of the hearings and in the course of the committee discussions. For instance, he made reference to the proposed reservation which the Senator from Utah had offered. We felt all along, and we still feel, that the treaty itself says exactly what the Senator from Utah thought it ought to say but we admit that it is necessary to construe perhaps two or three sections together in order to get the true meaning; therefore, in the resolution of ratification we wrote into the resolution a statement, although the question raised is already taken care of in the treaty.

The Senator from Indiana refers to the Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945, and says there should be no limitation based upon that. As a matter of fact, the Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945, related entirely to Europe and

had nothing whatever to do with Japan. Terms of surrender were agreed upon at Potsdam, I believe, at an earlier date, and it may be those to which the Senator from Indiana makes reference. But I submit that there is not one thing in this treaty which recognizes the right of Russia to occupy a single one of the islands referred to and Mr. Dulles so testified very clearly in the course of the presentation of the treaty.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to make it clear that I am not passing judgment on any of the objections raised to the treaty by the Senator from Indiana. I certainly want to study his objections before I reach any conclusion in my own mind with respect thereto. But from a procedural standpoint, let us assume that the Senator from Alabama is in error in his impression that the treaty, in effect, covers some particular point which the Senator from Indiana raised, but covers it in a little different language than the Senator from Indiana would have it covered. Let us assume, in the second place, in my hypothetical question, that the Senate, in its wisdom, might decide to attach to the treaty reservation X. Could it be attached on a bilateral arrangement between Japan and the United States, or would there be necessitated another treaty conference in which all the parties to the treaty would have to meet and accept the reservation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, answering the able Senator from Oregon, I think I am correct in saying that if the reservation should be attached to our ratification of the treaty, it would amount to a substantive change which would require renegotiation of the treaty.

Mr. MORSE. And, therefore, a renegotiation of the treaty not only on a bilateral basis between the United States and Japan, but really on a basis involving the United Nations and Japan?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, I refer to to main treaty. Of course, the security treaty is a bilateral treaty between the United States and Japan.

Mr. MORSE. I am talking about the body of the treaty itself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Let me repeat that the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will discuss this question in greater detail, probably tomorrow. I am not posing at this time as an absolute authority on these points, but I think that what I have said is correct.

The Senator from Oregon referred to the unanimous report of the Committee. I may say that every step taken in the formulation of this treaty was by unanimous agreement by the four members of the subcommittee, two Democrats and two Republicans, but as we went along many changes were made by suggestions in the conferences.

I think the Senate might like to know something about our subcommittee meetings. Frequently Mr. Dulles would call us and say, "I should like to see you right away." Perhaps it was a committee meeting of some kind. We would meet in the morning and in the afternoon. We found the best time to get a committee together was at breakfast,

so that most of our committee meetings were held around the breakfast table before the regular meetings of the day started. But every step taken in the formulation of the treaty was by unanimous agreement of the subcommittee.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator permit me to raise an additional point by way of supplementing what I have already said? One reason why I am raising these questions is because I understand the Senator from New Jersey and, possibly, other members of the committee, will discuss the nature and effect of the Jenner reservations. But if the statement of the Senator from Alabama is correct, if I correctly understood him, that in his opinion, at least, some of the reservations can be interpreted as requiring substantive changes in the meaning and intent of the treaty, then it follows that, in some respects, at least, the points raised by the Senator from Indiana are not already covered by the treaty in effect and meaning by way of other language, but that his reservations constitute really new language on an independent point not presently covered in the treaty.

Of course, if that be true, and if the Senator from Alabama is correct as to the matter of procedure—and it is my understanding as to the procedure, that a new treaty conference would be required, then I think it becomes clear that in effect the adoption of the Jenner reservations would be really a rejection of the treaty and would necessitate a new treaty conference with 48 nations, where there would be faced the possibility, and, I dare say, the probability, that in a new conference, perhaps some other nation than the United States might wish to make some substantive changes. That would not only mean delay, but it would raise a doubt as to whether we would finally have a treaty which the committee would feel by its unanimous vote would be as good as this one.

I waive the procedural points because, frankly, I do not know what the effect of the Jenner reservations would be.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Oregon is correct, and I am glad he brought out the point in the way he has, because I certainly should not like anything I have said to be interpreted as meaning that everything mentioned in the proposed reservations ought to be a part of the treaty. I do not admit that to be so. I think the Senator from Indiana mentioned some reservations which, upon closer examination, everyone would say should not go into the treaty. I think the first proposed reservation would amount to a repeal of the treaty, if there is such a thing as repealing a treaty. I think the treaty would be without effect.

In the fourth reservation there is a provision the effect of which I think would be to do away with the plan we worked out with reference to reparations. It is true that Japan was not burdened with a heavy load of reparations. We worked out a plan which we felt Japan could meet, in an effort to avoid a duplication of what came after Versailles, when Germany could not meet the reparations imposed upon her. I think it is

the fourth reservation of the Senator from Indiana which would break up the plan of reparations.

One of the hardest things we had to do was to satisfy the Philippines, Indonesia, and some of the other nations with reference to reparations. I think the matter was worked out admirably. We know that if we increase the burden on Japan it will delay her getting on a firm footing.

All these problems, Mr. President, were within the purview of the committee at the time it was considering the various questions, even though the Senator from Indiana had not at that time presented any reservations.

Mr. President, I referred to being in Japan during December, along with the able Senator from New Jersey. As he stated, it was a working trip for us. We were there approximately 2 weeks, and we were working. It would be interesting to know how many conferences we had. We had not been there an hour before we called on the Premier, and then there was a continuous round of conferences with the Finance Minister, with the Governor of Japan, with the Diet, with the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Presiding Officers of the two Houses of the Diet, with the Emperor himself, and with General Ridgway and various other military officers and private citizens. The Senator from New Jersey and I saw many private citizens. I should like to dispel the thought that we talked only with persons who were favorable to the treaty. We talked with everyone we wanted to see, or whom we could see, in order to obtain their viewpoints. We talked with the opposition. We heard them make their arguments. We sat down with them and discussed the various points. We talked with labor leaders and with industrialists. We conferred with just about everybody whom we could reach, from whom we could get helpful information, and I believe we did get helpful information.

Mr. President, a short time before we were in the Far East, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey went through the same area and he included a visit to Japan. When he returned, he wrote a series of articles for Collier's magazine, I believe three, certainly as many as three. All of them were very interesting. I commend to everybody a reading of them for a very good report. His second article, entitled "Can Japan Stay On Our Side?", is a very fine presentation of the whole Japanese problem, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the question of Nationalist China, what her attitude is, and so forth, has come up many times. The able Senator from New Jersey and I were in Formosa. We talked with practically all the Chinese officials there, both of the Nationalist Government and of the Government of Formosa.

A great deal has been said about trading with Red China. The day before the

Senator from New Jersey and I arrived, I called on the Foreign Minister, Mr. George Yeh, and we began to talk about the question of trade with China. Of course, the officials there were greatly interested. I think I could say they were primarily interested in seeing that Japan recognized the Chinese Nationalist Government. I had no hesitancy in saying that I wanted to see it done, and that I believed the great majority of the Members of the Senate also wanted to see it done.

Much has been said in the press to the effect that the three of us went there to persuade the Prime Minister of Japan and his Government to recognize Nationalist China. I submit that we did nothing of the kind.

I recall one day in Tokyo when we sat in a press conference. The room was filled with newspaper representatives. The question was asked if we believed that a peace treaty with Japan could be ratified, and if it was necessary for Japan to recognize Nationalist China in order to have a peace treaty negotiated. Some had received the impression that we were there to tell the Japanese that they could not get a treaty negotiated until Nationalist China was recognized. I answered that question every time it was put to me. I think the Senator from New Jersey will speak for himself and will bear out my statement. We always said that in whatever treaty we negotiated with Japan, we would recognize the right of sovereign Japan to recognize whatever governments she wished to recognize. But whenever we were asked the practical question as to what effect that would have upon ratification of the treaty in the Senate, I remember answering one time in this way.

"I would not say that the Senate cannot ratify it if Japan does not act. I can state only my own views. I will say, of course, that a treaty would be much easier of ratification if Nationalist China were recognized." But always I would repeat that it was a matter about which sovereign Japan would have the right to make up her own mind.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to confirm what the distinguished Senator from Alabama has just said, and to suggest, as I did earlier today, in speaking on the same subject, what we tried to do.

In discussing this matter with Prime Minister Yoshida and his foreign minister, Mr. Iguchi, we tried to indicate what the consequences would be of recognizing one-half of the country as Communist China and the other half as Nationalist China, and its effect on the future of both the Far East and the Western World.

There was no attempt in any way to hold them at the point of a gun and say, "If you do not do this, we will not do anything at all to help you." The whole procedure was one of persuasion. They were convinced that it was to their best interest to do what they are trying to do now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the able Senator from New Jersey. We were not trying to do anything secretly or to keep things away from anybody. The Senator from New Jersey knows that many times we talked with the representative of the United Kingdom, and he knew at all times what our interests were.

There have been many reports circulated in the press and in other ways that we were over there trying to break faith with the British Government and our other allies in the drafting of this treaty. That is as far from the truth as it can be, because the representative of that Government knew from the very day we arrived, and he was kept advised of every step we took and what our wishes were.

I had started to say something about the attitude of the Nationalist Government of China with reference to Japanese recognition. The Chinese Nationalist Government wanted recognition, and wanted it badly, and I do not blame them.

By the way, Mr. President, it was interesting to me to note, as on every side, I gathered from everybody I talked with in Formosa, including the Generalissimo, his Minister of State, his Foreign Minister, his Defense Minister, and the very able Governor of Formosa, that there was no bitterness or resentment so far as I could detect, on the part of those people with reference to the treatment the United States had accorded them. Do not think I mean by that that they were pleased with everything that had been done. But I found on the part of the Chinese Nationalists a spirit of willingness and a desire to cooperate, and to work out a plan of cooperation.

The question of trade with Red China was, of course, troublesome all along. It was the Foreign Minister of the Nationalist Government who made to me a suggestion which, though I am not certain, I am rather of the opinion that he mentioned to the Senator from New Jersey when he saw him on the following day. This is what he said to me:

"We realize the close tie between Japan and the Asiatic mainland. We would not insist that there be no trade relations with the Asiatic mainland. What we want is to be recognized as the Government."

That is exactly what is taking place. Japan has recognized the Nationalists as the Government of China.

Many persons contend it is necessary for Japan to trade with China and Manchuria. That may be so, I do not know, but, if it is, there is ample provision under the law whereby it can be done, just as Denmark may trade with Poland or the Netherlands with Czechoslovakia or England with Bulgaria. Under the act which Congress passed last year, that determination can be made, and trade may be permitted if it serves the security of the United States. That is a question which must be determined.

I was interested in the statement of the able Senator from New Jersey to the

effect that such trade was not necessary. I certainly commend to the careful reading of Senators the testimony given by Mr. John Foster Dulles, beginning at page 27 of the hearings. I asked him this question:

A great many people have it fixed in their minds, I think, that Japan is dependent upon China both as a source for raw materials and also as a market for her manufactured goods. You give some statements which I think largely offset that, but I wonder if you could go a little more into detail or if you would make this statement. Are you convinced that Japan can build a sustaining economy without being closely tied with the Chinese mainland?

Mr. DULLES. I think this, Senator SPARKMAN. Let me first express my very deep appreciation of the words you have been kind enough to say about my work here. It is not often that a witness on the stand has such an enjoyable interlude as you have given me, and I am deeply grateful for it.

The question you put is probably the most difficult question there is to give an absolutely clear answer to. I would say this—

This is something for us to remember when people talk about the absolute necessity of trade between Japan and the Chinese mainland:

That prior to the 1930's, Japan's trade was primarily overseas trade and not to any large extent trade with the Asian mainland, and the mainland was not a major source of supplies for Japan.

When 1930 came along with the world-wide depression which largely disrupted Japan's overseas trade, and with the concurrent growth of militarism in Japan, there developed in Japan a desire actually to control its own sources of raw materials so that they would not be subject to interruption either through world-trade convulsions, or perhaps through economic sanctions which the League of Nations might impose to try to restrain Japan from adopting an aggressive policy.

So that, beginning with the thirties, there came the effort by Japan to try to get control of its own sources of raw material on the Asian mainland, particularly in Manchuria.

From then on, Japan increasingly got coal and iron ore from that area, whereas, previously it had largely gotten its iron ore, for example, from the Philippines and Malaya. But, in order that its trade in those items should not be vulnerable to the forces to which I alluded, the Japanese sought to get control of Manchuria.

During the 1930 period there was an increasing change in the Japanese trade from the overseas trade to a colonial trade in relation to the Asia mainland.

That trade was, of course, broken off completely at the end of the war, and it has never been resumed to any substantial extent.

Dropping down a little:

I can see that over a period of some years, granted access to southeast Asia markets and perhaps granted some help to meet the heavy foreign exchange burden of importing coking coal, particularly from long distances, that the Japanese can get along reasonably well. I think that one must recognize that over a long-range period—I am talking now in terms of decades and not necessarily just of years—over a long-range period it is as I say, abnormal that there should be an iron curtain which cuts Japan's trade completely off from the nearby markets and sources of raw material in Asia.

EXPECTED DISAPPEARANCE OF SOVIET COMMUNISM IN CHINA

That is why I believe that we must assume and can properly assume that the conditions which require that interruption of trade are not going to be with us permanently. It would be, in my opinion, a wrong and a defeatist policy to assume that these conditions which exist in China today are in China forever.

I do not believe they are there forever. I think they are going to change. I do not think, as I said in my main statement, that indefinitely the Soviet brand of communism is going to rule in China. There will be increasing resentment against that, hatred of it, and eventually it will disappear as so many foreign conquests of China have disappeared in the past.

I think Mr. Dulles was discussing the matter of trade with Asia in a very realistic manner, and and it may be well for us to keep these things in mind.

Speaking of the relationship between Japan and Nationalist China, I have been pleased to note in the press within the past few days that apparently considerable headway is being made toward drafting a treaty of peace between Japan and Nationalist China. The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] raised some question about that the other day. He seemed to think that the negotiators were dragging their feet, so to speak. My recollection is that of a total of 22 articles 18 have been agreed upon. I understand there were 22 in the original draft.

I believe it is fitting at this time to read a statement which was issued by Dr. George Yeh, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China, on January 18, on the occasion when there was published in Tokyo the letter which Prime Minister Yoshida addressed to Mr. John Foster Dulles, dated back in December. This is what Mr. George Yeh said at that time:

The publication in Tokyo of the letter from Premier Yoshida to Mr. Dulles on the subject of the conclusion of peace between China and Japan has served the purpose of cleaning up certain misapprehensions in this regard. It also makes clear Japan's intentions to concert her efforts with the free and democratic nations in the maintenance of the peace and security of the world. My Government has consistently made known its desire for an early conclusion of peace with Japan and has directed its efforts in conjunction with the other Allied Powers toward this end. The conclusion of a peace treaty between China and Japan has been unduly delayed. The Chinese Government will therefore hold itself in readiness to enter into negotiations with the Japanese Government with a view to its early conclusion. It is gratifying to note in Premier Yoshida's letter that Japan fully realized the true character of the enslaved Communist regime now occupying the Chinese mainland and of the so-called Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance concluded in Moscow in 1950. We also welcome the expressed intention of the Japanese Government to render every assistance to the United Nations in all its measures to stem aggression.

Let me say a brief word as to some of the things Japan has done, showing her intent to carry out her obligations under the treaty and to restore herself to full enjoyment of the proper relationships among the family of nations.

One of the first treaties or agreements which Japan executed was a tripartite agreement—I am not sure that it is a treaty—between Japan, the United States, and Canada, with reference to fishing in the North Pacific. It was an agreement which was negotiated without too much trouble. It did exactly what we want to see done, and what we have been trying for a long time to do. It promoted good practices of conservation.

Japan has worked out an agreement for reparations with the Philippines. This was one of the hardest tasks she had to undertake. It may be remembered that the Philippine representative at the San Francisco conference made a very strong speech in which he evidenced certainly a degree of distrust, resentment, and reluctance on the part of the Philippine people. When I was in Manila, I was told that the Japanese commission was coming there within a few days. I know that there was some concern expressed. I was at breakfast one morning with the President of the Philippines and his Minister of Defense, a Mr. Magsaysay, and our friend Carlos Romulo, who is now the Ambassador to the United States, as well as our former colleague in the House Representatives, "Mike" Elizalde, who was formerly Ambassador to the United States. Various others were present. I heard some concern expressed by some of those present as to whether or not it would be safe for the Japanese to come there. That feeling was there; and we can understand it when we think of the devastation and destruction the Philippines withstood during the war. Yet, in spite of all that, the Japanese went there in earnest and sought to negotiate a treaty of reparations. I believe it has been completed. I believe the Japanese have also completed such a treaty, or agreement, with Indonesia. They are working very hard at rebuilding their economy and to rebuild their proper standing in the family of nations.

I conclude my remarks with a short quotation from the speech which Mr. Dulles delivered at the San Francisco Conference on September 5, 1951. It is found at page 16 of the pamphlet entitled "Japanese Peace Treaty and Other Treaties Relating to Security in the Pacific," containing the message from the President of the United States transmitting the treaties. It reads:

Fortunately, there are also in most of the Allied countries those who see with truer vision. They know that this treaty is good to the point where it cannot be made better without its becoming worse. Better words might theoretically be found, but to seek these is to let escape what is now within our grasp. There come times when to seek the perfect is to lose the good. This is such a time.

EXHIBIT 1

[Unofficial text]

ADMINISTRATIVE AGREEMENT UNDER ARTICLE III OF THE SECURITY TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND JAPAN

PREAMBLE

Whereas Japan and the United States of America on September 8, 1951, signed a se-

curity treaty which contains provisions for the disposition of United States land, air, and sea forces in and about Japan;

And whereas article III of that treaty states that the conditions which shall govern the disposition of the Armed Forces of the United States in and about Japan shall be determined by administrative agreements between the two Governments;

And whereas Japan and the United States of America are desirous of concluding practical administrative arrangements which will give effect to their respective obligations under the security treaty and will strengthen the close bonds of mutual interest and regard between their two peoples;

Therefore, the Governments of Japan and of the United States of America have entered into this agreement in terms as set forth below:

ARTICLE I

In this agreement the expression—

(a) "Members of the United States Armed Forces" means the personnel on active duty belonging to the land, sea, or air armed services of the United States of America when in the territory of Japan.

(b) "Civilian component" means the civilian persons of United States nationality, who are in the employ of, serving with, or accompanying the United States Armed Forces in Japan, but excludes persons who are ordinarily resident in Japan or who are mentioned in paragraph 1 of article XIV. For the purpose of this agreement only dual nationals, United States and Japanese, who are brought to Japan by the United States shall be considered as United States nationals.

(c) "dependents" means:

- (1) Spouse, and children under 21;
- (2) Parents, and children over 21, if dependent for over half their support upon a member of the United States Armed Forces or civilian component.

ARTICLE II

1. Japan agrees to grant to the United States Armed Forces the use of the facilities and areas necessary to carry out the purposes stated in article I of the Security Treaty. Agreements on specific facilities and areas not already reached by the two Governments by the effective date of this agreement shall be concluded in consultation between the two Governments through the joint committee provided for in article XXVI of this agreement. "Facilities and areas" include existing furnishings, equipment and fixtures necessary to the operation of such facilities and areas.

2. At the request of either party, Japan and the United States shall review such arrangements and may agree that such facilities and areas shall be returned to Japan or that additional facilities and areas may be provided.

3. The facilities and areas used by the United States Armed Forces shall be returned to Japan whenever they are no longer needed for purposes of this agreement, and the United States agrees to keep the needs for facilities and areas under continual observation with a view toward such return.

4. (a) When facilities and areas such as target ranges and maneuver grounds are temporarily not being used by the United States, interim use may be made by the Japanese authorities and nationals provided it is agreed that such use would not be harmful to the purposes for which the facilities and areas are normally used by the United States Armed Forces.

(b) With respect to such facilities and areas as target ranges and maneuver grounds which are to be used by United States Armed Forces for limited periods of time, the Joint Committee shall specify in the agreements concerning such facilities

and areas the extent to which the provisions of this Agreement shall apply.

ARTICLE III

1. The United States shall have the rights, power and authority within the facilities and areas which are necessary or appropriate for their establishment, use, operation, defense or control. The United States shall also have such rights, power and authority over land, territorial waters and airspace adjacent to, or in the vicinities of such facilities and areas, as are necessary to provide access to such facilities and areas for their support, defense and control. In the exercise outside the facilities and areas of the rights, power and authority granted in this article, there should be as the occasion requires consultation between the two Governments through the Joint Committee.

2. The United States agrees that the above-mentioned rights, power and authority will not be exercised in such a manner as to interfere unnecessarily with navigation, aviation, communication, or land travel to or from or within Japan. All questions relating to frequencies, power and like matters used by apparatus employed by the United States designed to emit electric radiation shall be settled by mutual arrangement. As a temporary measure the United States Armed Forces shall be entitled to use, without radiation interference from Japanese sources, electronic devices of such power, design, type of emission, and frequencies as are reserved for such forces at the time this Agreement becomes effective.

3. Operations in the facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces shall be carried on with due regard for the public safety.

ARTICLE IV

1. The United States is not obliged, when it returns facilities and areas to Japan on the expiration of this Agreement or at an earlier date, to restore the facilities and areas to the condition in which they were at the time they became available to the United States Armed Forces, or to compensate Japan in lieu of such restoration.

2. Japan is not obliged to make any compensation to the United States for any improvements made in the facilities and areas or for the buildings or structures left thereon on the expiration of this agreement or the earlier return of the facilities and areas.

3. The foregoing provisions shall not apply to any construction which the United States may undertake under special arrangements with Japan.

ARTICLE V

1. United States and foreign vessels and aircraft operated by, for, or under the control of the United States for official purposes shall be accorded access to any port or airport of Japan free from toll or landing charges. When cargo or passengers not accorded the exemptions of this agreement are carried on such vessels and aircraft, notification shall be given to the appropriate Japanese authorities, and such cargo or passengers shall be entered according to the laws and regulations of Japan.

2. The vessels and aircraft mentioned in paragraph 1, United States Government-owned vehicles including armor, and members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component and their dependents shall be accorded access to and movement between facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces and between such facilities and areas and the ports of Japan.

3. When the vessels mentioned in paragraph 1 enter Japanese ports, appropriate notification shall, under normal conditions, be made to the proper Japanese authorities. Such vessels shall have freedom from compulsory pilotage, but if a pilot is taken pilotage shall be paid for at appropriate rates.

ARTICLE VI

1. All civil and military air traffic control and communications systems shall be developed in close coordination and shall be integrated to the extent necessary for fulfillment of collective security interests. Procedures, and any subsequent changes thereto, necessary to effect this coordination and integration will be established by mutual arrangement.

2. Lights and other aids to navigation of vessels and aircraft placed or established in the facilities and areas in use by United States Armed Forces and in territorial waters adjacent thereto or in the vicinity thereof shall conform to the system in use in Japan. The United States and Japanese authorities which have established such navigation aids shall notify each other of their positions and characteristics and shall give advance notification before making any changes in them or establishing additional navigation aids.

ARTICLE VII

The United States Armed Forces shall have the right to use all public utilities and services belonging to, or controlled or regulated by, the Government of Japan, and to enjoy priorities in such use, under conditions no less favorable than those that may be applicable from time to time to the ministries and agencies of the Government of Japan.

ARTICLE VIII

The Japanese Government undertakes to furnish the United States Armed Forces with the following meteorological services under present procedures, subject to such modifications as may from time to time be agreed between the two governments or as may result from Japan's becoming a member of the International Civil Aviation Organization or the World Meteorological Organization:

(a) Meteorological observations from land and ocean areas including observations from weather ships assigned to positions known as X and T.

(b) Climatological information including periodic summaries and the historical data files of the central meteorological observatory.

(c) Telecommunications service to disseminate meteorological information required for the safe and regular operation of aircraft.

(d) Seismographic data including forecasts of the estimated size of tidal waves resulting from earthquakes and areas that might be affected thereby.

ARTICLE IX

1. The United States shall have the right to bring into Japan for purposes of this agreement persons who are members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents.

2. Members of the United States Armed Forces shall be exempt from Japanese passport and visa laws and regulations. Members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents shall be exempt from Japanese laws and regulations on the registration and control of aliens, but shall not be considered as acquiring any right to permanent residence or domicile in the territories of Japan.

3. Upon entry into or departure from Japan, members of the United States Armed Forces shall be in possession of the following documents: (a) Personal identity card showing name, date of birth, rank and number, service, and photograph; and (b) individual or collective travel order certifying to the status of the individual or group as a member or members of the United States Armed Forces and to the travel ordered. For purposes of their identification while in Japan, members of the United States Armed Forces shall be in possession of the foregoing personal identity card.

4. Members of the civilian component, their dependents, and the dependents of members of the United States Armed Forces shall be in possession of appropriate documentation issued by the United States authorities so that their status may be verified by Japanese authorities upon their entry into or departure from Japan, or while in Japan.

5. If the status of any person brought into Japan under paragraph 1 of this article is altered so that he would no longer be entitled to such admission, the United States authorities shall notify the Japanese authorities and shall, if such person be required by the Japanese authorities to leave Japan, assure that transportation from Japan will be provided within a reasonable time at no cost to the Japanese Government.

ARTICLE X

1. Japan shall accept as valid without a driving test or fee the driving permit or license or military driving permit issued by the United States to a member of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents.

2. Official vehicles of the United States Armed Forces and the civilian component shall carry distinctive numbered plates or individual markings which will readily identify them.

3. Privately owned vehicles of members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents shall carry Japanese number plates to be acquired under the same condition as those applicable to Japanese nationals.

ARTICLE XI

1. Save as provided in this agreement, members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents shall be subject to the laws and regulations administered by the customs authorities of Japan.

2. All materials, supplies, and equipment imported by the United States Armed Forces, the authorized procurement agencies of the United States Armed Forces, or by the organizations provided for in article XV, for the official use of the United States Armed Forces or for the use of the members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, and materials, supplies, and equipment which are to be used exclusively by the United States Armed Forces or are ultimately to be incorporated into articles or facilities used by such forces, shall be permitted entry into Japan; such entry shall be free from customs duties and other such charges. Appropriate certification shall be made that such materials, supplies, and equipment are being imported by the United States Armed Forces, the authorized procurement agencies of the United States Armed Forces, or by the organizations provided for in article XV, or, in the case of materials, supplies, and equipment to be used exclusively by the United States Armed Forces or ultimately to be incorporated into articles or facilities used by such forces, that delivery thereof is to be taken by the United States Armed Forces for the purposes specified above.

3. Property consigned to and for the personal use of members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, shall be subject to customs duties and other such charges, except that no duties or charges shall be paid with respect to:

(a) Furniture and household goods for their private use imported by the members of the United States Armed Forces or civilian component when they first arrive to serve in Japan or by their dependents when they first arrive for reunion with members of such forces or civilian component, and personal effects for private use brought by the said persons upon entrance.

(b) Vehicles and parts imported by members of the United States Armed Forces or

civilian component for the private use of themselves or their dependents.

(c) Reasonable quantities of clothing and household goods of a type which would ordinarily be purchased in the United States for every day for the private use of members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian component, and their dependents, which are mailed into Japan through United States military post offices.

4. The exemptions granted in paragraphs 2 and 3 shall apply only to cases of importation of goods and shall not be interpreted as refunding customs duties and domestic excises collected by the customs authorities at the time of entry in cases of purchases of goods on which such duties and excises have already been collected.

5. Customs examination shall not be made in the following cases:

(a) Units and members of the United States Armed Forces under orders entering or leaving Japan;

(b) Official documents under official seal;

(c) Mail in United States military postal channels and military cargo shipped on a United States Government bill of lading.

6. Except as such disposal may be authorized by the Japanese and United States authorities in accordance with mutually agreed conditions, goods imported into Japan free of duty shall not be disposed of in Japan to persons not entitled to import such goods free of duty.

7. Goods imported into Japan free from customs duties and such other charges pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 may be re-exported free from customs duties and other such charges.

8. The United States Armed Forces, in cooperation with Japanese authorities, shall take such steps as are necessary to prevent abuse of privileges granted to the United States Armed Forces, members of such Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents in accordance with this article.

9. (a) In order to prevent offenses against laws and regulations administered by the customs authorities of the Japanese Government, the Japanese authorities and the United States Armed Forces shall assist each other in the conduct of inquiries and the collection of evidence.

(b) The United States Armed Forces shall render all assistance within their power to insure that articles liable to seizure by, or on behalf of, the customs authorities of the Japanese Government are handed to those authorities.

(c) The United States Armed Forces shall render all assistance within their power to insure the payment of duties, taxes, and penalties payable by members of such forces or of the civilian component, or their dependents.

ARTICLE XII

1. The United States shall have the right to contract for any supplies or construction work to be furnished or undertaken in Japan for purposes of, or authorized by, this agreement, without restriction as to choice of supplier or person who does the construction work.

2. Materials, supplies, equipment, and services which are required from local sources for the maintenance of the United States Armed Forces and the procurement of which may have an adverse effect on the economy of Japan shall be procured in coordination with, and, when desirable, through and with the assistance of, the competent authorities of Japan.

3. Materials, supplies, equipment, and services procured for ultimate use by the United States Armed Forces, or by the organizations provided for in article XV shall be exempt from commodity and gasoline taxes upon appropriate certification by the United States Armed Forces. With respect to any present or future Japanese taxes not specifically referred to in this article which might be found to constitute a significant and

readily identifiable part of the gross purchase price of materials, supplies, equipment, and services procured by the United States Armed Forces, or for ultimate use by such forces, the two Governments will agree upon a procedure for granting such exemption or relief therefrom as is consistent with the purposes of this article.

4. Local labor requirements of the United States Armed Forces or civilian component shall be satisfied with the assistance of the Japanese authorities.

5. The obligations for the withholding and payment of income tax and of social-security contributions, and, except as may otherwise be mutually agreed, the conditions of employment and work, such as those relating to wages and supplementary payments, the conditions for the protection of workers, and the rights of workers concerning labor relations shall be those laid down by the legislation of Japan.

6. Persons in the civilian component shall not be subject to Japanese laws or regulations with respect to terms and conditions of employment.

7. Neither members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian component, nor their dependents shall by reason of this article enjoy any exemption from taxes or similar charges relating to personal purchases of goods and services in Japan chargeable under Japanese legislation.

8. Except as such disposal may be authorized by the Japanese and United States authorities in accordance with mutually agreed conditions, goods purchased in Japan exempt from the taxes referred to in paragraph 3, shall not be disposed of in Japan to persons not entitled to purchase such goods exempt from such tax.

ARTICLE XIII

1. The United States shall not be subject to taxes or similar charges on property held, used, or transferred in Japan by the United States Armed Forces.

2. Members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component and their dependents shall not be liable to pay any Japanese taxes to the Japanese Government or to any other taxing agency in Japan on income received as a result of their service with or employment by the United States Armed Forces. The provisions of this article do not exempt such persons from payment of Japanese taxes on income derived from Japanese sources nor do they exempt United States citizens who for United States income-tax purposes claim Japanese residence from payment of Japanese taxes on income. Periods during which such persons are in Japan solely by reason of being members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component of their dependents shall not be considered as periods of residence or domicile in Japan for the purposes of Japanese taxation.

3. Members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component and their dependents shall be exempt from taxation in Japan on the holding, use, transfer inter se, or transfer by death of movable property, tangible or intangible, the presence of which in Japan is due solely to the temporary presence of these persons in Japan, provided that such exemption shall not apply to property held for the purpose of investment or the conduct of business in Japan or to any intangible property registered in Japan. There is no obligation under this article to grant exemption from taxes payable in respect of the use of roads by private vehicles.

ARTICLE XIV

1. Persons, including corporations organized under the laws of the United States, and their employees who are ordinarily resident in the United States, and whose presence in Japan is solely for the purpose of executing contracts with the United States for the benefit of the United States Armed

Forces shall, except as provided in this article, be subject to the laws and regulations of Japan.

2. Upon certification by appropriate United States authorities as to their identity, such persons and their employees shall be accorded the following benefits of this agreement.

(A) Rights of accession and movement, as provided for in article V, paragraph 2.

(B) Entry into Japan in accordance with the provisions of article IX.

(C) The exemption from customs duties, and other such charges provided for in article XI, paragraph 3, for members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian components, and their dependents.

(D) If authorized by the United States Government, the right to use the services of the organization provided for in article XV.

(E) Those provided for in article XIX, paragraph 2 for members of the Armed Forces of the United States, the civilian component, and their dependents.

(F) If authorized by the United States Government, the right to use military payment certificates, as provided for in article XX.

(G) The use of postal facilities provided for in article XXI.

(H) Exemption from the laws and regulations of Japan with respect to terms and conditions of employment.

3. Such persons and their employees shall be so described in their passports and their arrival, departure, and their residence while in Japan shall from time to time be notified by the United States Armed Forces to the Japanese authorities.

4. Upon certification by an authorized officer of the United States Armed Forces depreciable assets except houses, held, used, or transferred, by such persons and their employees exclusively for the execution of contracts referred to in paragraph 1 shall not be subject to taxes or similar charges of Japan.

5. Upon certification by an authorized officer of the United States Armed Forces, such persons and their employees shall be exempt from taxation in Japan on the holding, use, transfer or transfer by death, or transfer to persons or agencies entitled to tax exemption under this agreement, of movable property, tangible or intangible, the presence of which in Japan is due solely to the temporary presence of these persons in Japan, provided that such exemption shall not apply to property held for the purpose of investment or the conduct of other business in Japan or to any intangible property registered in Japan. There is no obligation under this article to grant exemption from taxes payable with respect to the ownership or use of private vehicles.

6. The persons and their employees referred to in paragraph 1 shall not be liable to pay income or corporation taxes to the Japanese Government or to any other taxing agency in Japan on any income derived under a contract made in the United States with the United States Government in connection with the construction, maintenance, or operation of any of the facilities or areas covered by this agreement.

The provisions of this paragraph do not exempt such persons from payment of income or corporation taxes on income derived from Japanese sources, nor do they exempt such persons and their employees who, for United States income tax purposes, claim Japanese residence, from payment of Japanese taxes on income. Periods during which such persons are in Japan solely in connection with the execution of a contract with the United States Government shall not be considered periods of residence or domicile in Japan for the purposes of such taxation.

7. Japanese authorities shall have the primary right to exercise jurisdiction over the persons and their employees referred to in paragraph 1 of this article in relation to offenses committed in Japan and punishable

by the law of Japan. In those cases in which the Japanese authorities decide not to exercise such jurisdiction they shall notify the military authorities of the United States as soon as possible. Upon such notification the military authorities of the United States shall have the right to exercise such jurisdiction over the persons referred to as is conferred on them by the law of the United States.

ARTICLE XV

1. (a) Navy exchanges, post exchanges, messes, social clubs, theaters, newspapers, and other nonappropriated fund organizations authorized and regulated by the United States military authorities may be established in the facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces for the use of members of such forces, the civilian component, and their dependents. Except as otherwise provided in this agreement, such organizations shall not be subject to Japanese regulations, license fees, taxes, or similar controls.

(b) When a newspaper authorized and regulated by the United States military authorities is sold to the general public, it shall be subject to Japanese regulations, license fees, taxes, or similar controls so far as such circulation is concerned.

2. No Japanese tax shall be imposed on sales of merchandise and services by such organizations, except as provided in paragraph 1 (b), but purchases within Japan of merchandise and supplies by such organizations shall be subject to Japanese taxes.

3. Except as such disposal may be authorized by the Japanese and United States authorities in accordance with mutually agreed conditions, goods which are sold by such organizations shall not be disposed of in Japan to persons not authorized to make purchases from such organizations.

4. The obligation for the withholding and payment of income tax and social security contributions, and, except as may otherwise be mutually agreed, the conditions of employment and work, such as those relating to wages and supplementary payments, the conditions for the protection of workers, and the rights of workers concerning labor relations shall be those laid down by the legislation of Japan.

5. The organizations referred to in this article shall provide such information to the Japanese authorities as is required by Japanese tax legislation.

ARTICLE XVI

It is the duty of members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian component, and their dependents, to respect the law of Japan and to abstain from any activity inconsistent with the spirit of this agreement, and, in particular, from any political activity in Japan.

ARTICLE XVII

1. Upon the coming into force with respect to the United States of the "agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces," signed at London on June 19, 1951, the United States will immediately conclude with Japan, at the option of Japan, an agreement on criminal jurisdiction similar to the corresponding provisions of that agreement.

2. Pending the coming into force with respect to the United States of the North Atlantic Treaty agreement referred to in paragraph 1, the United States service courts and authorities shall have the right to exercise within Japan exclusive jurisdiction over all offenses which may be committed in Japan by members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, excluding their dependents who have only Japanese nationality. Such jurisdiction may in any case be waived by the United States.

3. While the jurisdiction provided in paragraph 2 is effective, the following provisions shall apply:

(a) Japanese authorities may arrest members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian component, or their dependents outside facilities and areas in use by United States Armed Forces for the commission or attempted commission of an offense, but in the event of such an arrest, the individual or individuals shall be immediately turned over to the United States Armed Forces. Any person fleeing from the jurisdiction of the United States Armed Forces and found in any place outside the facilities and areas may on request be arrested by the Japanese authorities and turned over to the United States authorities.

(b) The United States authorities shall have the exclusive right to arrest within facilities and areas in use by United States Armed Forces any person subject to the jurisdiction of Japan and found in any such facility or area will, on request, be turned over to the Japanese authorities.

(c) The United States authorities may, under due process of law, arrest, in the vicinity of such a facility or area, any person in the commission or attempted commission of an offense against the security of that facility or area. Any such person not subject to the jurisdiction of the United States Armed Forces shall be immediately turned over to Japanese authorities.

(d) Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3c, the activities outside the facilities and areas of military police of the United States Armed Forces shall be limited to the extent necessary for maintaining order and discipline of and arresting members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents.

(e) The authorities of the United States and Japan shall cooperate in making available witnesses and evidence for criminal investigations and other criminal proceedings in their respective tribunals and shall assist each other in the making of investigations. In the event of a criminal contempt, perjury, or an obstruction of justice before a tribunal which does not have criminal jurisdiction over the individual committing the offense, he shall be tried by a tribunal which has jurisdiction over him as if he had committed the offense before it.

(f) The United States Armed Forces shall have the exclusive right of removing from Japan members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents. The United States will give sympathetic consideration to a request by the Government of Japan for the removal of any such person for good cause.

(g) Japanese authorities shall have no right of search or seizure, with respect to any persons or property, within facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces, or with respect to property of the United States Armed Forces wherever situated.

At the request of the Japanese authorities, the United States authorities undertake, within the limits of their authority, to make such search and seizure and inform the Japanese authorities as to the results thereof. In the event of a judgment concerning such property, except property owned or utilized by the United States Government, the United States will turn over such property to the Japanese authorities for disposition in accordance with the judgment. Japanese authorities shall have no right of search or seizure outside facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces, with respect to the persons or property of members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, or their dependents, except as to such persons as may be arrested in accordance with paragraph 3a of this article, and except as to cases where such search is required for the purpose of arresting offenders under the jurisdiction of Japan.

(h) A death sentence shall not be carried out in Japan by the United States Armed Forces if the legislation of Japan does not

provide for such punishment in a similar case.

4. The United States undertakes that the United States service courts and authorities shall be willing and able to try and, on conviction, to punish all offenses against the laws of Japan which members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian component, and their dependents may be alleged on sufficient evidence to have committed in Japan, and to investigate and deal appropriately with any alleged offense committed by members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, which may be brought to their notice by Japanese authorities or which they may find to have taken place. The United States further undertakes to notify the Japanese authorities of the disposition made by United States service courts of all cases arising under this paragraph. The United States shall give sympathetic consideration to a request from Japanese authorities for a waiver of its jurisdiction in cases arising under this paragraph where the Japanese Government considers such waiver to be of particular importance. Upon such waiver, Japan may exercise its own jurisdiction.

5. In the event the option referred to in paragraph 1 is not exercised by Japan, the jurisdiction provided for in paragraph 2 and the following paragraphs shall continue in effect. In the event the said North Atlantic Treaty agreement has not come into effect within 1 year from the effective date of this agreement, the United States will, at the request of the Japanese Government, reconsider the subject of jurisdiction over offenses committed in Japan by members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents.

ARTICLE XVIII

1. Each party waives all its claims against the other party for injury or death suffered in Japan by a member of its armed forces, or a civilian governmental employee, while such member or employee was engaged in the performance of his official duties, in cases where such injury or death was caused by a member of the Armed Forces or a civilian employee of the other party acting in the performance of his official duties.

2. Each party waives all its claims against the other party for damage to any property in Japan owned by it, if such damage was caused by a member of the armed forces or a civilian governmental employee of the other party in the performance of his official duties.

3. Claims, other than contractual, arising out of acts or omissions of members of, or employees of the United States Armed Forces in the performance of official duty or out of any other act, omission, or occurrence for which the United States Armed Forces is legally responsible arising incident to non-combatant activities and causing injury, death, or property damage in Japan to third parties shall be dealt with by Japan in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) Claims shall be filed within 1 year from the date on which they arise and shall be considered and settled or adjudicated in accordance with the laws and regulations of Japan with respect to claims arising from the activities of its own employees.

(b) Japan may settle any such claims, and payment of the amount agreed upon or determined by adjudication shall be made by Japan in yen.

(c) Such payment, whether made pursuant to a settlement or to adjudication of the case by a competent tribunal of Japan, or the final adjudication by such a tribunal denying payment, shall be binding and conclusive.

(d) The cost incurred in satisfying claims pursuant to the preceding subparagraphs shall be shared on terms to be agreed by the two Governments.

(e) In accordance with procedures to be established, a statement of all claims ap-

proved or disapproved by Japan pursuant to this paragraph, together with the findings in each case, and a statement of the sums paid by Japan, shall be sent to the United States periodically, with a request for reimbursement of the share to be paid by the United States. Such reimbursement shall be made within the shortest possible time in yen.

4. Each party shall have the primary right, in the execution of the foregoing paragraph, to determine whether its personnel were engaged in the performance of official duty. Such determination shall be made as soon as possible after the arising of the claim concerned. When the other party disagrees with the results of such determination, that party may bring the matter before the Joint Committee for Consultation under the provisions of article XXVI of this agreement.

5. Claims against members of or employees of the United States Armed Forces arising out of tortious acts or omissions in Japan not done in the performance of official duty shall be dealt with in the following manner:

(a) The Japanese authorities shall consider the claim and assess compensation to the claimant in a fair and just manner, taking into account all the circumstances of the case including the conduct of the injured person, and shall prepare a report on the matter.

(b) The report shall be delivered to the United States authorities who shall then decide without delay whether they will offer an ex gratia payment, and if so of what amount.

(c) If an offer of ex gratia payment is made, and accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction of his claim the United States authorities shall make the payment themselves and inform the Japanese authorities of their decision and of the sum paid.

(d) Nothing in this paragraph shall affect the jurisdiction of the Japanese courts to entertain an action against a member or employee of the United States Armed Forces, unless and until there has been payment in full satisfaction of the claim.

6. (a) Members of and civilian employees of the United States Armed Forces excluding employees who have only Japanese nationality shall not be subject to suit in Japan with respect to claims specified in paragraph 3, but will be subject to the civil jurisdiction of Japanese courts with respect to all other types of cases.

(b) In case any private movable property excluding that in use by the United States Armed Forces which is subject to compulsory execution under Japanese law is within the facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces, the United States authorities shall upon the request of Japanese courts possess and turn over such property to the Japanese authorities.

(c) The United States authorities shall cooperate with the Japanese authorities in making available witnesses and evidence for civil proceedings in Japanese tribunals.

7. Disputes arising out of contracts concerning the procurement of materials, supplies, equipment, services, and labor by or for the United States Armed Forces which were not resolved by the parties to the contract concerned may be submitted to the joint committee for conciliation, provided that the provisions of this paragraph shall not prejudice any right which the parties to the contract may have to file a civil suit.

ARTICLE XIX

1. Members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, shall be subject to the foreign exchange controls of the Japanese Government.

2. The preceding paragraph shall not be construed to preclude the transmission into or outside of Japan of United States dollars or dollar instruments representing the official funds of the United States or realized as a result of service or employment in con-

nection with this agreement by members of the United States Armed Forces and the civilian component, or realized by such persons and their dependents from sources outside of Japan.

3. The United States authorities shall take suitable measures to preclude the abuse of the privileges stipulated in the preceding paragraph or circumvention of the Japanese foreign exchange controls.

ARTICLE XX

1. (a) United States military-payment certificates denominated in dollars may be used by persons authorized by the United States for internal transactions within facilities and areas provided for by this agreement. The United States Government will take appropriate action to insure that authorized personnel are prohibited from engaging in transactions involving military-payment certificates except as authorized by United States regulations. The Japanese Government will take necessary action to prohibit unauthorized persons from engaging in transactions involving military-payment certificates and with the aid of United States authorities will undertake to apprehend and punish any person or persons under its jurisdiction involved in the counterfeiting or uttering of counterfeit military-payment certificates within the facilities and areas in use by United States Armed Forces.

(b) It is agreed that the United States authorities will apprehend and punish members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, or their dependents, who tender military-payment certificates to unauthorized persons and that no obligation will be due to such unauthorized persons or to the Japanese Government or its agencies from the United States or any of its agencies as a result of any unauthorized use of military-payment certificates within Japan.

2. In order to exercise control of military-payment certificates the United States shall have the right to designate certain American financial institutions to maintain and operate, under United States supervision, facilities for the use of persons authorized by the United States to use military-payment certificates. Institutions authorized to maintain military-banking facilities will establish and maintain such facilities physically separated from their Japanese commercial banking business, with personnel whose sole duty is to maintain and operate such facilities. Such facilities shall be permitted to maintain United States currency bank accounts and to perform all financial transactions in connection therewith including receipt and remission of funds to the extent provided by article XIX of this agreement.

ARTICLE XXI

The United States shall have the right to establish and operate, within the facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces under this agreement, United States Military Post Offices for the use of members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component and their dependents, for the transmission of mail between United States Military Post Offices in Japan and between such military post offices and other United States post offices.

ARTICLE XXII

The United States shall have the right to enroll and train all eligible United States citizens, residing in Japan, in the Reserve organizations of the Armed Forces of the United States, except that the prior consent of the Japanese Government shall be obtained in the case of persons employed by the Japanese Government.

ARTICLE XXIII

The United States and Japan will cooperate in taking such steps as may from time to time be necessary to insure the security of the United States Armed Forces, the members thereof, the civilian component, their

dependents and their property. The Japanese Government agrees to seek such legislation and to take such other action as may be necessary to insure the adequate security and protection within its territory of installations, equipment, property, records, and official information of the United States, and the punishment of offenders under the applicable laws of Japan.

ARTICLE XXIV

In the event of hostilities, or imminently threatened hostilities, in the Japan area, the Governments of the United States and Japan shall immediately consult together with a view to taking necessary joint measures for the defense of that area and to carrying out the purposes of article 1 of the United States-Japan Security Treaty.

ARTICLE XXV

1. It is agreed that the United States will bear for the duration of this agreement without cost to Japan all expenditures incident to the maintenance of the United States Armed Forces in Japan except those to be borne by Japan as provided in paragraph 2.

2. It is agreed that Japan will:

(a) furnish for the duration of this agreement without cost to the United States and make compensation where appropriate to the owners and suppliers thereof all facilities, areas, and rights-of-way, including facilities and areas jointly used such as those at airfields and ports, as provided in articles II and III.

(b) make available without cost to the United States, until the effective date of any new arrangements reached as a result of periodic reexamination, an amount of Japanese currency equivalent to \$155,000,000 per annum for the purpose of procurement by the United States of transportation and other requisite services and supplies in Japan. The rate of exchange at which yen payments will be credited shall be the official par value, or that rate considered most favorable by the United States which on the day of payment is available to any party, authorized by the Japanese Government or used in any transaction with any party by the Japanese Government or its agencies or by Japanese banks authorized to deal in foreign exchange, and which, if both countries have agreed par values with the international monetary fund, is not prohibited by the articles of the agreement of the fund.

3. It is agreed that arrangements will be effected between the Governments of Japan and the United States for accounting applicable to financial transactions arising out of this agreement.

ARTICLE XXVI

1. A joint committee shall be established as the means for consultation between the United States and Japan on all matters requiring mutual consultation regarding the implementation of this agreement. In particular, the joint committee shall serve as the means for consultation in determining the facilities and areas in Japan which are required for the use of the United States in carrying out the purposes stated in article I of the security treaty.

2. The joint committee shall be composed of a representative of the United States and of Japan, each of whom shall have one or more deputies and a staff. The joint committee shall determine its own procedures, and arrange for such auxiliary organs and administrative services as may be required. The joint committee shall be so organized that it may meet immediately at any time at the request of the representative of either the United States or Japan.

3. If the joint committee is unable to resolve any matter, it shall refer that matter to the respective Governments for further consideration through appropriate channels.

ARTICLE XXVII

1. This agreement shall come into force on the date on which the security treaty between the United States and Japan enters into force.

2. Each party to this agreement undertakes to seek from its legislative necessary budgetary and legislative action with respect to provisions of this agreement which require such action for their execution.

ARTICLE XXVIII

Either party may at any time request the revision of any article of this agreement, in which case the two Governments shall enter into negotiation through appropriate channels.

ARTICLE XXIX

This agreement shall remain in force while the Security Treaty remains in force unless earlier terminated by agreement between the parties.

NOTES EXCHANGED BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN CONCERNING THE USE OF FACILITIES AND AREAS BY THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

UNITED STATES NOTE TO JAPAN

His Excellency SHIGERU YOSHIDA,
Prime Minister of Japan.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to our discussion on the terms of the administrative agreement signed today, in which Your Excellency stated as the opinion of the Japanese Government that, as the occupation of Japan by the Allied Powers comes to an end on the coming into force of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, the use of facilities and areas by United States forces on the basis of occupation requisition also comes to an end on the same date; thereafter, the use of facilities and areas by United States forces must be based upon agreement between the two Governments, subject to the rights which each might have under the Treaty of Peace with Japan, the Security Treaty, and the administrative agreement. I hereby confirm that such is also the opinion of the United States Government.

In article II, paragraph 1, of the administrative agreement, it is stipulated that, "agreements as to specific facilities and areas, not already reached by the two governments by the effective date of this agreement, shall be concluded by the two governments through the joint committee provided for in article XXVI of this agreement." The United States Government is confident that our two governments are agreed that consultation shall be on an urgent basis in order to complete such arrangements at the earliest possible date. With this in mind, the United States Government is prepared to join with the Japanese Government in constituting a preliminary working group, consisting of a representative and the necessary staff from each government to begin such consultations immediately, with the understanding that the arrangement made by the preliminary working group shall be put into effect as agreed and that the task of the preliminary working group would be taken over by the joint committee upon the effective date of the administrative agreement.

However, unavoidable delays may arise in the determination and preparation of facilities and areas necessary to carry out the purposes stated in article I of the security treaty. It would be much appreciated, therefore, if Japan would grant the continued use of those particular facilities and areas, with respect to which agreements and arrangements have not been completed by the expiration of 90 days after the effective date of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, pending the completion of such agreements and arrangements.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

DEAN RUSK,
*Special Representative of the President
of the United States of America.*

JAPANESE NOTE TO THE UNITED STATES

His Excellency DEAN RUSK,
*Special Representative of the President
of the United States of America.*

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of today's date in which Your Excellency has informed me as follows:

"I have the honor to refer to our discussion on the terms of the administrative agreement signed today, in which Your Excellency stated as the opinion of the Japanese Government that, as the occupation of Japan by the Allied Powers comes to an end on the coming into force of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, the use of facilities and areas by United States forces on the basis of occupation requisition also comes to an end on the same date; thereafter, the use of facilities and areas by United States forces must be based upon agreement between the two Governments, subject to the rights which each might have under the Treaty of Peace with Japan, the security treaty, and the administrative agreement. I hereby confirm that such is also the opinion of the United States Government.

"In article II, paragraph 1, of the administrative agreement, it is stipulated that, 'agreements as to specific facilities and areas, not already reached by the two Governments by the effective date of this agreement, shall be concluded by the two Governments through the joint committee provided for in article XXIV of this agreement.' The United States Government is confident that our two Governments are agreed that consultation shall be on an urgent basis in order to complete such arrangements at the earliest possible date. With this in mind, the United States Government is prepared to join with the Japanese Government in constituting a preliminary working group, consisting of a representative and the necessary staff from each Government to begin such consultations immediately, with the understanding that the arrangement made by the preliminary working group shall be put into effect as agreed and that the task of the preliminary working group would be taken over by the joint committee upon the effective date of the administrative agreement.

"However, unavoidable delays may arise in the determination and preparation of facilities and areas necessary to carry out the purposes stated in article I of the security treaty. It would be much appreciated, therefore, if Japan would grant the continued use of those particular facilities and areas, with respect to which agreements and arrangements have not been completed by the expiration of 90 days after the effective date of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, pending the completion of such agreements and arrangements."

The Japanese Government fully shares the desire of the United States Government to initiate consultations on an urgent basis in order to complete arrangements for the use of facilities and areas at the earliest possible date. The Japanese government agrees, therefore, to the immediate constitution of the preliminary working group referred to in Your Excellency's note, with the understanding that the arrangements made by the preliminary working group shall be put into effect as agreed and that the task of the preliminary working group would be taken over by the joint committee upon the effective date of the administrative agreement.

With full appreciation of the contents of Your Excellency's note, I have the honor, on behalf of the Japanese government, to confirm that the Japanese government will grant

to the United States the continued use of those particular facilities and areas, with respect to which agreements and arrangements have not been completed by the expiration of 90 days after the effective date of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, pending the completion of such agreements and arrangements.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

SHIGERU YOSHIDA,
Prime Minister of Japan.

EXHIBIT 2

[From Collier's of December 8, 1951]

CAN JAPAN STAY ON OUR SIDE?

(By Thomas E. Dewey)

(If the Kremlin's plans for world conquest are to be thwarted, this country must have strong allies in the Pacific, as well as a powerful defense cordon in the Far East. To see at first-hand economic, political, and military conditions, to study the problems of the free nations trying to protect themselves against the Reds, Governor Dewey made a 41,000-mile trip. He talked to leaders and ordinary citizens in a dozen important Pacific areas. This is the second of three articles telling what he found.)

II

It was a big day when I arrived in Japan. It was a big day not because it was the Fourth of July or because I arrived. It was a big day because at the customary Independence Day reception at the American Embassy Maj. Gen. Andrei P. Kislenko, the highest representative of the Soviet Union in Tokyo, appeared at a social gathering for the first time in many months.

My plane had been 4 hours late, so it just gave me time to dispose of greetings and press questions at Haneda Airport, get to the Imperial Hotel for a much-needed shower after 2 days of flying, and get to the reception. The several hundred people already there were buzzing with excitement. They interpreted General Kislenko's presence to mean the Russians really were serious in their bid for a truce in Korea. The cease-fire talks were only 4 days away.

The general was smiling and brought his wife along. He was nice even to me, though his Government had branded me Public Enemy No. 1 on several occasions.

Beneath the surface of the optimism, however, I soon found crosscurrents and grave concerns. Every point of view was represented since nearly everybody of importance in Tokyo was present.

Our military men were hopeful but worried. Many were frankly fearful that the truce was a trap. If the Reds could achieve a lull during which to realign their forces and bring up reserves and supplies, freed without harassment from the air, they might launch a surprise offensive of crushing weight.

There was even more alarm over the expected effort of the Communists to make a settlement on the thirty-eighth parallel. If we could be tricked into accepting that indefensible, artificial line, our position would be precarious to impossible.

The Japanese were worried too, but for even more fundamental reasons. What if the truce should succeed? Suppose a political settlement should be made? Would America then withdraw all her troops from Korea? If so, the Japanese saw in the future just a repetition of what had already occurred—another attack, perhaps successful, and then a Communist-occupied Korea pointing like a dagger at the heart of Japan.

This fear I thoroughly understood, because 4 years before, in a public speech, I warned that if we withdrew our troops from Korea, we would leave a vacuum into which the Soviets would inevitably move.

The Koreans were unhappy too—bitterly unhappy—for they saw the possibility of a

settlement again dividing their country, perhaps permanently.

I never saw so many people so worried over the prospect of peace.

This was my introduction to Japan.

My specific reason for going first to Tokyo was to accept the invitation of the America-Japan Society to speak on the 6th of July. The recall of General MacArthur had, of course, created the greatest uncertainty and uneasiness among the Japanese people. Would it mean a complete change of policy? Would America abandon her efforts for a treaty of reconciliation? Or worse, would we abandon Japan to the Russians?

One of my closest associates for many years, Ambassador John Foster Dulles, was in charge of the peace treaty. He strongly urged that it was vital for a Republican not associated with the national administration to visit Japan and buttress the American position, giving further evidence of our good intentions, both by a friendly visit and by a major speech.

So the completion of my speech was the first order of business. In its final revision I particularly valued the help of two extraordinary men, Ambassador Sebald and General Ridgway.

William Sebald started life as a language officer in the United States Navy, one of his specialties being Japanese. In due course he married a lovely Eurasian lady—half Japanese, half British—and after resigning from the Navy in the 1930's, practiced law in Kobe for 7 years. It was natural that he should be asked to become political adviser, with the rank of Ambassador, to General MacArthur. With his knowledge of the Japanese people and his command of the language, his quiet manner and his immense capacity for hard work, my own opinion is that he has made a brilliant contribution toward the building of the new Japan.

General Matthew Ridgway is straight soldier. He was sent out to succeed the late General Walton H. Walker in command of the UN forces at a critical, if not desperate, time. Erect, calm, forceful, with his trademark of a live grenade on his shoulder strap, he rallied and reorganized our forces. Later, replacing General MacArthur, he moved easily into the position of Supreme Commander, which he has filled with distinction. After spending a whole day with him, I both like and admire him. Tremendously diligent, clear-thinking, and very able, he has surrounded himself with top-flight men, of whom Gen. James A. Van Fleet is a brilliant example.

Delivering the speech the next day was a very interesting experience. Would my audience understand enough English for it to be intelligible? And what about the extemporaneous remarks that somehow always creep in? They can fall very flat if they are not understood.

A test of audience appreciation

My fears were groundless. It was a distinguished audience, including the Prime Minister and other leaders of the Government, business, and professional people, and a number of Americans. At the opening I made it very clear that although I had been three times elected Governor of New York, I was speaking solely as a private citizen and in no way for the Government of the United States. Then I couldn't resist the temptation to add, "Some of you may recall that I tried a couple of times to get into the National Government but without success." This brought a good laugh and from then on I was sure that I had not only a politically conscious audience but one that understood English.

It was at this luncheon that I really began to feel that I knew Premier Shigeru Yoshida, and I liked him. I had seen him before at the Fourth of July reception and for an hour's private talk at his official residence

the next day. But it was during the luncheon and afterward when we retired to a private room to take off our coats, drink some iced tea, and cool off that we really began to get acquainted.

Yoshida is a sensitive, quiet man of fine ability and character. Steadfast, unyielding in his opposition to militarists who had seized control of Japan, he suffered greatly in the days before and during the war, and was imprisoned in the last month of the war. He was a natural choice for premier of the new Japan. As leader of the dominant Liberal Party, he has successfully steered his country through the most remarkable political revolution of modern times.

In 6 years Japan has made the change from a country completely dominated by the military, without liberty or justice, to a genuine constitutional monarchy with the people actually in control of their Government. I do not know of any precedent in history for such a swift and vast transformation. It is easy for me to understand why people in almost every country I visited asked: "Has Japan really become a free and peaceful nation? Will it last?"

Americans inquire as a matter of interest. But the people of Asia, of the Philippines, of Australia and New Zealand lived right under the guns of a militarist Japan. They ask the question as a matter of life and death. I think the question can mean life or death for us, too.

We have learned the bitter lesson that with a hostile Japan we could hold no defenses short of Hawaii or even possibly the coast of California.

Will Japan remain a free country and on our side? Nobody knows. The answer will come from Japan, from events in Washington, Moscow and elsewhere, and—like a Greek chorus dominating every scene—southeast Asia.

Right now is a critical time for Japan. What happens in the next few months will determine the outcome of the elections next spring, and they may decide the direction of Japan for years to come. Underlying every moment of the lives of 83,000,000 people is the basic Asian problem—tomorrow's rice. This edge of hunger is never far away. Despite a generally almost adequate diet, the first big essential for Japan is rice. Nobody can get very interested in political or economic theories or world affairs if he is hungry. What Japan—and most of the Orient—needs first of all is more food. Almost every home I saw in Japan which had as much as 20 square feet available had a vegetable garden. The garden is not for fun but from necessity.

Of all the people in Japan, 55 percent live on farms, and the election next spring will be dominated by the farm vote. But the farmer is close to the edge, too. In the opinion of nearly every political leader with whom I spoke, the farmer will support the present government if he gets a fair price for his rice. If the farmer is in distress as a result of further inflation while the price of rice remains fixed, he may overturn the government.

The Liberal party presently in power is made up of a solid group of able people who recognize that their only hope for the future lies with the United States and the Western World. They are basically in agreement with the Democratic party, which is a bit to the right of the Liberal. Both parties find much in common with a substantial group of independents or nonparty members.

The alternative to these parties, if a change occurs, would be the slightly leftist Socialist party, which has opposed the peace treaty because Russia and Red China are not signers. But the Socialists are split sharply on this issue by a large middle-of-the-road bloc of voters.

The Communist party has dwindled almost to the vanishing point. In the municipal

elections this year, where 90 percent of the men and women of Japan voted, the Communists got less than one percent of the vote.

Our occupation policy under General MacArthur's brilliant direction robbed the Communists of their most effective propaganda weapon—the promise of land reform. Today 90 percent of all the farmland of Japan is owned by the men who farm it. This is revolutionary. Before the war, most of the land of Japan was held by landlords who owned 15 to 20 acres apiece. To us this is trifling. In Japan it is enormous.

Experiment in land reform

Land Reform is the Communist battle cry in much of the world today, from the Philippines, through southeast Asia, India, the Near East, Italy, and elsewhere. Many countries are trying to meet the problem honestly, but none has been wholly successful yet. But in Japan, the first step is a great success.

During the occupation, the Government launched a program to buy all farmland owned by anyone who had more than the national average, which amounts to about 2.4 acres per family in Japan. The price was fair, about 40 times the annual rental in 1938. Each tenant was then allowed to buy from the Government his share, which usually amounted to a little less than 2½ acres. For this they gave their notes to the Government.

Then a tidal wave of inflation swept over Japan and the new landowners struck it rich. The yen had declined very slightly in value under the rigid wartime controls and for some months after the end of the war. But, as always, the dam finally burst. Before the war the yen was worth 40 cents. Today it is worth less than one-third of a cent, or about 360 yen to one American dollar.

This terrible inflation nearly wrecked the Japanese economy. The savings of the people were wiped out, life insurance and the working capital of businesses almost vanished.

But the tenant farmers, who bought their new land in the land-redistribution program at a fair price in 1946, were able to pay off their debts with the proceeds of two or three crops sold at 360 yen to the dollar. Then they, in turn, began to suffer as other prices rose faster than the price of rice.

The former owners of land were the major victims. They had sold their land at a fair price to the Government, which had paid them in bonds. The bonds then lost 99 percent of their value. The Government is struggling with the problem now of providing some fair reimbursement to the former owners.

In Japan, I followed a long-standing habit of spending at least 1 day visiting farms whenever I am in a foreign country. I am not an industrial expert, but I operate a dairy farm, at Pawling, N. Y., and do know something about farming. Agriculture is a kind of universal language. I find I can talk to people on farms and really learn to know them and how they are thinking. On the farms you find the thoughtful man and his wife who live away from the mass opinion and sometimes hysterical attitudes in the big cities. They are friendly and direct, too, and always pleased when their American visitor shares their feel for the soil and for its problems.

Far too many listeners-in

I tried to arrange my usual farm trip in Japan so I could go alone with an interpreter, and thought I had succeeded. But to my dismay, when I finally got to the country, I found myself in the company of the Minister of Agriculture, the governor of the province, a dozen local officials, and 20 newspaper reporters and photographers. Serene private conversation with Japanese farmers was, to put it mildly, not easy.

The 28-year-old farmer we first visited had bought his land under the land-reform program. He had done a little better than the national average and had about 3½ acres. But the thing that really makes him upper-crust is that he owns a cow—not a milk cow but a working cow. The cow enables him to plow his land. In addition he can hire his cow out to his neighbors for their plowing. Or, if he cannot trust them to handle the cow, he goes and plows their ground himself. They pay him in hours of labor. As a result, when I found six people working in his fields, he explained they were paying for the use of the cow.

Having a cow is a great asset in another way. Most of the fertilizer of Japan is night soil—human fecal matter. The farmer who owns a cow goes to the village and collects the sewage from a group of families with whom he has a regular arrangement. He can put as many as 10 or 12 large cans on a long cart and after his own needs are met he sells the surplus to his poorer neighbors. In a 50-mile drive in the country you will see 10 manure carts for every automobile. Our American soldiers have gaily dubbed those night-soil cans "honey buckets."

This little farm of 3½ acres supports the farmer, his wife, and three children, his father and his grandfather. He raises rice, barley, and vegetables. I asked him how they keep the vegetables for use during the winter. He explained that that was his wife's function, that she preserved them and also did the cooking and the meals. What he did not say was that, in addition to those duties, she works as many hours in the field every day as he does.

Former landlords are being executed by the Communists of China today. In Japan they were allowed to keep the same share of their own land that anyone else could have. A former landlord we visited used to own about 14 acres. He is now reduced to three which he farms himself. He is obviously an intelligent man. He would be a landowner in any society where a good farmer could succeed.

I managed to make my conversation with him quite private with the help of a local interpreter. He betrayed no bitterness over the land reform. Even before the war he had been selling some of his land to the best tenants. He was still living in the family house and was happy, working his 3 acres with fine skill and effectiveness, letting his former tenants use his barn for the storage, just as they always did. He still had a horse and in addition—almost as precious—he had a pig.

His wooden bathtub interested me. Against the outside of his house, under the eaves, it is about 3 feet deep and 4 feet long, oval in shape, with a small metal stove in one end. They put a little charcoal or wood into the stove from the outside. The other side of the stove forms the end of the tub and heats the water. This barefooted family works long hours in the rice paddies in mud up to their knees. Nevertheless, they are a clean family. The bathtub is the most used piece of equipment in the house.

Under the land-reform program, Japan has greatly increased her food production. But the population has increased also—from 70,000,000 to 83,000,000 in 10 years. So the Japanese are just where they were a decade ago, still importing 20 percent of their rice. Both the people and the government want to become self-sufficient but they have a tough road ahead.

Stripped of her former possessions, the Kurile Islands, Manchuria, Formosa, Korea, and also denied many of her former fishing areas, Japan must trade for her food or starve.

The rice bowl of the Orient is southeast Asia. But will southeast Asia remain free?

Mao will drive hard bargains

That is the crucial question. If it does, Japan has a trade area which will be vitally beneficial to both. Each needs the other. If southeast Asia is lost, I do not see where Japan will get either her food, her minerals, or a market for her manufactured goods. If she is forced to get them largely from Red China, we may be sure that Mao Tse-tung will attach a political price to every cargo. Every transaction will increase Communist power in Japan until both economically and politically she will fall into the grasping arms of Soviet slavery.

Japan is our most populous ally in the Pacific. But a base of 83,000,000 starving people would be a hopeless liability, not an asset.

So, if Japan is to remain free, so must southeast Asia. Economically, Burma, Siam, and Indochina are part of the front-line defense of America. It disturbed me considerably to find so little knowledge of southeast Asia among the Japanese. I had hoped to find clear-cut opinions and constructive suggestions as to how to save southeast Asia from Communist aggression. But at meeting after meeting with individuals and groups I ran into a blank wall.

The truth finally emerged: The Japanese military and political leaders who occupied that area have been purged; the remaining people of Japan have been isolated from the world for 10 long years. They have been so isolated that very few are familiar with the conditions in the areas which are vital to their very life. Wherever I went the conversation drifted back to one simple theme: "America must stand by us or we will be lost."

This does not mean they are not willing to work hard and make every sacrifice. It just means that they know that without American friendship and strong support they are lost to the Red czar.

In talks with intellectuals I also found an uneasy concern among some of them over the work of the Communist underground. One distinguished scholar said: "The Communist leadership has been driven out of the trade-unions pretty well. But it is still in the teachers' unions and two Communists in a hundred can spoil the other ninety-eight."

A leading member of the judiciary expressed another worry. "Left alone," he said, "I am convinced Japan will have no internal trouble with communism. But I am worried about what will happen after the treaty, when the necessities of trade may bring an increasing number of Communists in one guise or another into our country."

Generally, however, Japan's problems today are more economic than political. There are excellent men in all parties. One of my best meetings was at the Diet Building with the leaders of the political parties. As usual, tea was served and we sat around a large table. I was delighted to find Frank Matsumoto, a Diet member representing Hiroshima, serving as interpreter, just as he had done when the Japanese delegation came to Albany last year.

Abandonment by United States feared

Discussion was free and forceful. Every time a member of one party made a flat declaration, one of the others would crack back at him across the table. One of the Socialist members spoke highly of the proposed Japanese Treaty, although his party publicly opposes it without Russia and Red China as signatories. He was thoroughly ribbed by the liberals present, who said they wished he would say it in public, which brought a gale of laughter from the whole group. Even here, though, the grim question came out again and again: "Will America abandon Korea once more? And, if she does, might she not abandon Japan?"

This is quite natural. Stripped back to her four comparatively barren home islands,

Japan has no army, navy, or air force. Unhappily, we gave the Kurile Islands to Russia at Yalta. So today there are Russian divisions 3 miles from the Japanese home island of Hokkaido.

If Red divisions should ever occupy all of Korea, Japan would be surrounded on two sides or almost three—and defenseless. Every Japanese I saw feels with great intensity that Japan must be a part of the western world. They know their safety will require for many years the protection of American ground forces, Navy and Air Forces.

The extent to which Japan will rebuild her own defenses is by no means clear. I am convinced there is a genuine popular revulsion against military domination of the country. I found it in every stratum of society. Yet for her own safety Japan must rebuild her armed forces.

Right now there is little public support for a rearmament program. Moreover, there is no money for one. Only by the most drastic measures, almost coerced by the occupation, was the government able to balance the budget, and stabilize the yen. Even the governing Liberal Party is not united in favor of a balanced budget because the difficulties are so great.

We have conferred on Japan the dubious blessing of the progressive income tax, and it is very high. So are business taxes. The new defense forces cannot be built out of increased taxes. The money for defense, for hydroelectric dams and flood control and countless other needs can only come from a greatly increased volume of business.

Here again, however, we come right up against the basic lack of capital for expanded business. It will cost billions to build the needed new ships, new factories and new stores. Capital can come only from the savings of businesses or of people. Neither can save much, if anything, today.

Government salaries are an example. The average government employee makes between 9,000 and 10,000 yen or \$25 to \$28 a month. A member of the Diet is paid 50,000 yen or about \$150 per month. The elected governor of a province gets about the same. Cabinet officers get little more.

In the silk mills, the girls work intensively and with great skill in the fascinating process of transforming cocoons at one end of the factory into baled silk at the other—all for \$2 a month plus board and room. They have little or no opportunity to meet young men. But that isn't important since most of them come from nearby farms and by the time they are 20 years old their parents usually have arranged a satisfactory marriage with an appropriate young man from the neighborhood.

A good stenographer will get about 8,000 yen or about \$21 a month. In the steel mills the most highly skilled workers can go as high as 15,000 yen or about \$42 a month. Weavers earn from \$20 to \$40, a locomotive engineer \$20 a month.

A people living with hunger

Very few savings for new capital can come from businessmen or employees. It takes about \$28 a month to buy a little rice, a piece of fish and a couple of vegetables every day for a man with a wife and two children. Despite a small bonus for men with children, the simple fact is that no worker in Japan can earn enough to support a family under the present structure. His wife and some of the children must also work to keep a roof over their heads. That thin edge of hunger is so very close there can be few savings.

Despite this low living standard, the cost of Japanese goods is so high that they are being undersold in the world market in many articles. The businessmen blame this on the high freight rates they now have to pay and the 8-hour day which was imposed during

the occupation, which means that only 6 hours of work are done, after deducting a paid lunchtime and tea and rest periods. Before the war, the Japanese worked a 10- to 12-hour day and I suspect that, rightly or wrongly, a longer working day is coming back.

In addition to new capital, Japan must have raw materials. She is acutely short of iron, coal, and salt. Six out of her seven million tons of shipping were sunk in the war and shipping is the very lifeblood of Japan. The gaunt skeletons of bombed-out factories dot the whole country from one end of the nation to the other. One B-29 fire raid on Tokyo did more damage than the atom bomb at Hiroshima. Today most of the Tokyo homes have been rebuilt, but the industrial damage remains.

On our visit to Hiroshima, however, we drove through a vast expanse of terrible devastation, to the heart of the city where only half a dozen buildings still stand, aside from new houses built since the war. After a visit to the museum showing Hiroshima exactly as it was after the atom explosion, we went to the city hall with the mayor, and up on the roof he showed us the plans for the new and beautiful Hiroshima which is to rise in the future. The psychology of the people of Hiroshima was very interesting and surprising. They eagerly welcome visitors. They want everyone to come and see the devastation of the bomb because they want Hiroshima to be a city dedicated to peace—a living demonstration of the horrors of war.

It was a startling change to go on a short flight from the horror of the past to the bustling, vigorous present of Osaka, the Pittsburgh of Japan. Here in Osaka and in Kobe which adjoins it, one gets the full impact of Japanese industry. In contrast to the charming rural atmosphere surrounding the silk factories and the brocade mills, these industrial plants are mighty and profoundly impressive.

Japan's industrial leaders

The men who run them are impressive, too. They have all survived the exhaustive purging and the breakup of the cartels which dominated Japanese business before the war. From Governor Bunzo Akama of the Osaka Prefecture to Governor Sachio Kishida of the Hyogo Prefecture, they are typical of the Japanese leaders of today. Alert, intelligent, almost all of them speaking English, they represent the future of Japan.

In the course of 1 day I saw dramatically almost all of Japan's critical problems other than food: the shortage of capital, raw materials and flood control and power.

On arrival at the harbor of Kobe we transferred to a launch in a driving rain and rode across that large and beautiful harbor to the Central Japan Heavy Industry Shipyard. On the way across the bay another great shipyard was pointed out which was standing idle. Each shipyard has to close down 1 day out of 5 for lack of electric power.

The Central Japan Shipyard was impressive. They have been building fine ships for 50 years, and a 10,000-ton freighter was about ready to be launched. This yard, as well as the steel mill we visited next, seemed to my inexperienced eyes to be models of efficiency and productive power. With every passing hour I could see more forcibly than ever why Japan is a prime object of Stalin's desire—and why Russia must never get Japan.

The Japanese believe that if they can find the capital and if they can get the raw materials, they can rebuild their lost shipping in 25 years. But they do not know where the capital will come from.

The power shortage is equally critical. Only in America where the power industry has largely remained free of Government ownership is there still an almost adequate

supply of power. I have always appreciated the value of the American free enterprise system, and everywhere I went it was driven home again and again that competitive private enterprise is the only system which can meet the needs of a modern society.

In Japan the need for flood control and electric power go together. Each year thousands of acres of priceless rice lands are devastated by floods. Each year the shortage of power grows worse. During a long ride in from the country one day, the Minister of Agriculture told me of his dream of a tremendous flood control and power program. He sees the absolute necessity of a \$2,000,000,000 program over a 10-year period. If half of that or \$100,000,000 a year could come from the United States either by Marshall plan aid or as a loan, he believes Japan could match it. Then, he believes, the food problem of Japan as well as the electric power shortage would be solved.

Even wood is in short supply. The old forests and even the trees in the cities were cut down during the war for fuel by the shivering, freezing, miserable Japanese people. To a newcomer it is hard to realize that Japan, which we think of as a hot country, is cold in the winter.

I asked repeatedly how the Japanese keep warm in the winter with their thin wooden houses and the glazed-paper windows. The best answer I got was from an American who shrugged his shoulders and said: "They don't." It is a pitiful sight to see women, old men, and children spending hours each day searching for the few twigs and sticks they must have even in summer for cooking. It is a sight you never escape in Japan, in city or country.

Yet, on the whole, the people I talked with in the shops and on their farms, in the factories and in the stores, were quite cheerful. In a letter from a member of the Cabinet which I received after I came home, he said:

"Once again I want to express the hope that you will inform the leaders and the people of America of the concrete progress Japan is making in recovery and that she is so democratized she will become a member of the family of the peaceful nations of the world and also a leader in Asia to be a bulwark to stop communism in this part of the world."

As of today I believe this is a genuine expression of Japanese sentiment. They know they have a tough but simple choice. Their choice is hard work, freedom and progress with the Western World or slavery under the claw of their ancient enemy—the Russian bear. They have made their choice and hope to be able to stick to it.

In the background of the Japanese scene there always remains Emperor Hirohito. He was rarely discussed except by a few Japanese who have been in the West enough to know they could be quite frank. They all knew that the issue of the Emperor was very acute. The Russians as well as many of the left-wing elements in our own Government thought the Emperor should be executed as a war criminal. They were frustrated and disappointed by the findings of the War Crimes Commission that, in fact, the Emperor had held out to the end against the war. It appears that this finding was correct.

Personally the Emperor is very little understood. I certainly do not pretend to be an authority on the subject after 10 days in Japan and a 1-hour visit with him. But some things are clear. He has been through a dreadful period of strain, finding his country launched on a disastrous war which he opposed with all the authority left to the Crown. After the war he took every action required by the occupying authorities to make it clear that he favored a free constitutional monarchy and that the Crown no longer claimed divine powers.

In his discussion of foreign affairs and matters of state he is obviously nervous and under strain. But immediately when the subject goes to science or farming, he relaxes and becomes completely absorbed in what his visitor has to tell him and in what he himself contributes to the conversation. He becomes himself.

The Emperor is an amateur biologist of considerable distinction and an avid student of the technical literature in the field. He has written a two-volume work on the flora and fauna of Tokyo Bay, which is regarded as excellent and authentic.

It is a strange contradiction that today, stripped of all claims of divinity, at the end of a terrible war, the Emperor is personally more influential than before.

Help must come from the west

Right or wrong, I left Japan, convinced that as of today, the Japanese, from the Emperor down, feel that their whole future is bound to the Western World. In the race against hunger, time, and the Communists to rebuild their factories and their ships, to develop new areas for trade and to expand their production of food, they will need substantial help.

Without southeast Asia as a trading area, I do not see how Japan can avoid falling into the clutches of the Reds or, in the alternative, becoming a permanent dependent upon the generosity of America. If the Rice Bowl of southeast Asia, the Philippines, and Indonesia are kept in the free world, Japan will have a trading area nearby. She can ultimately succeed as a self-sustaining member of the family of free nations. In time she can develop her own defenses.

How to be sure to save Indochina, Burma, Siam, Malaya, Indonesia? These are burning questions for Japan, for the whole Pacific, for the defense of our own shores. I was eager to get on to see them at first hand.

One thing is clear. We of America will have to do practically everything right if we are going to keep this decisive balance of power on our side. We cannot afford to make a single mistake or to let any more nations in southeast Asia fall to communism.

If our national influence is firm and constructive, if we solve the critical problem of southeast Asia and if the rice crop is good next year, I think our chances of keeping the Pacific free, without war, are good.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, following the very fine remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I merely wish to say that I was not in the Chamber when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] submitted his proposed reservations. However, I was present when he made his speech. Since that time I have devoted considerable attention to his arguments.

I realize that it is the privilege of every Senator to place his interpretation upon language, if he so desires. However, as the Senator from Alabama has stated, I feel that the reservations which have been suggested, if they were to be adopted by the Senate, would make it necessary to have a conference of the 48 signatory nations, and that in such case there would develop, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has suggested, a situation in which the other signers undoubtedly would also have their own ideas as to interpretations and reservations.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that at this point in the RECORD there be printed my comments on the reservations proposed by the Senator from Indiana. In the comments I take up the reservations one by one. The other day

I spoke somewhat generally on the subject, but in the comments I specifically treat each reservation.

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

COMMENTS BY SENATOR WILEY

I. THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY Reservation No. 1

This reservation in its first part provides that nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its Military Establishment, its domestic concern.

A treaty, by its nature, is a contract that binds and accordingly limits the sovereign right of the parties. The statement that a treaty shall not impose any limitations is, in effect, the reservation of a right to break the treaty at will, in which event it ceases to be a treaty. Presumably this is not intended. If that is not intended, then the proposed reservation has no significance, because outside of a few obligations to Japan, such as to end the state of war, to recognize its sovereignty, and to waive certain claims, etc., the United States assumes no obligations and gives no one else any voice in, much less control over, the foreign policy, the Military Establishment, or the domestic concerns of the United States.

The second part of the reservation says that the treaty shall not be construed "(b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan." This would presumably mean that Japan is bound only by the provisions of the treaty that are not continuing.

This would nullify article 3, which requires Japan to give the United States continuing jurisdiction and legal authority over the Ryukyus and would thus jeopardize our Okinawa air and naval base.

There are other provisions, such as the renunciation of right, title, and claim to Korea, which might be held to be continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan as to which Japan might be relieved under the proposed reservation.

Reservation No. 2

This represents an effort to rewrite the declaration unanimously proposed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It differs in these respects:

(a) It eliminates reference to the Habomai and Shikotan Islands which Russia occupies and claims;

(b) It fails to identify the Yalta Agreement of February 11, 1945, as the agreement regarding Japan. There were two other agreements also dated February 11, 1945, one of which deals with liberated Europe and the other of which deals with German reparations and the proposed reservation does not make clear which of the three is referred to.

(c) It adds a reference to the so-called Potsdam Agreement of August 1, 1945. This agreement of August 1, 1945—not to be confused with the Japanese surrender terms formulated on July 26, 1945—deals entirely with European matters, principally Germany, and not at all with Japan. The Japanese Peace Treaty bears no relationship whatsoever to the Potsdam Agreement of August 1, 1945.

(d) It is cast in the form of a reservation which implies the necessity of a change in the treaty which in turn would require the approval of the other parties. The treaty does not in fact do any of the things against which the proposed Senate Foreign Relations Committee declaration, and for that matter, the proposed reservation, is di-

rected. Therefore it is appropriate and in the interests of the United States to follow the form recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Reservation No. 3

This would alter article 14 (b) of the treaty by eliminating from its waiver the claims of the United States for direct military costs of the occupation and the claims of the United States nationals.

If we try to rewrite this article, others will do the same and this will expose Japan to reparation claims amounting to over a hundred billion dollars. It would totally wreck Japan's credit and economy and confront the United States with the alternative of seeing Japan go Communist or giving Japan vast relief, which would in effect mean that we would pay the reparation claims now barred, which the proposed reservation would revive.

United States interests are thoroughly protected as the treaty stands.

Japan has already paid the equivalent of \$1,900,000,000 to defray the costs of our military occupation. A principal expense not borne by Japan was that of the so-called GARIOA aid which amounted to about two billion dollars.

Article 14 keeps this GARIOA obligation alive and gives it a priority over the reparations claims of others. That Japanese indebtedness is already more than Japan can repay and the proposed addition to that debt of more debt for direct military costs would merely make some addition to an amount which is already beyond Japan's capacity to repay. Furthermore, it would dilute our position by opening the door to claims by the British Commonwealth Occupation.

As regards the claims of private citizens, these, in so far as they relate to property in Japan, will be completely taken care of under article 15, dealing with restoration of property and the rights and interests in Japan.

Insofar as private claims are not covered by article 15, they can be met out of the proceeds of Japanese property in the United States which, under article 14, the United States is authorized to apply for this purpose. The value of these assets amounts to about \$85,000,000. Certain American claims have already been met out of this fund and others can be met as soon as Congress passes the enabling legislation.

The United States, the richest of the Allied countries, gets the best financial treatment under the treaty. Its \$2,000,000,000 GARIOA claim, as noted, is preserved intact and given priority. Its citizens' claims are of a kind that can be met almost 100 percent either by the provisions of article 14 or of article 15. No other national claimants are in nearly as good a position, and there has been bitter complaint on this score. If we now attempt to get an even better position we would in fact lose this very favorable treaty position we now have, and which has been acquiesced in, although reluctantly, by the other Allied countries.

Reservation No. 4

The first part of this reservation provides that "no rights or claims referred to in this treaty shall be deemed to accrue to any government or so-called government of China established by recourse to war, and, as used in this treaty the word 'China' refers to the legally established Republic of China."

The fact is that the treaty only mentions the word "China" twice. The first time is article 10, where it is used geographically. The text of article 10 is precisely word for word what was proposed by the National Government of China.

Under this article Japan "renounces" all special rights and interests in China. These rights merely disappear; they do not "accrue" to anyone.

Article 21 confirms, by cross-reference to article 14 (a) (2) the right to seize and liquidate Japanese property in China. This property was all expropriated 6 years ago (1946) by the National Government of the Republic of China, and the effect of the treaty is to validate that action.

The second part of the proposed reservation provides that the sovereignty of the Republic of China "shall be deemed to extend to all areas which were part of China at the outbreak of the late war between Japan and China, including Manchuria, Formosa, and the islands adjacent to Formosa." This reservation would carry into effect the proposals of the Soviet Union. At San Francisco, Gromyko complained that the treaty "grossly violates the indisputable rights of China to the return of integral parts of Chinese territory; Taiwan (Formosa) and the Pescadores." They want Formosa to be recognized as purely a Chinese internal problem, and they want to end any international interests in Formosa, which is the basis for continuing United States concern.

It is because of that that the treaty merely requires Japan to renounce its interests in these islands without ending the right of the United States as one of the victorious Allied Powers to continue to concern itself with the ultimate disposition and intermediate status of the islands.

This treaty handling of the matter was accepted by the Chinese National Government itself, and the alternative now proposed was, after careful study, rejected by United States negotiators, with the approval of the Foreign Relations Committee, as contrary to the best interests of the United States. We do not want to write ourselves out of Formosa.

II. UNITED STATES-JAPAN SECURITY TREATY Reservation No. 1

This reservation, identical to Reservation No. 1 of the Japanese Peace Treaty, is subject to the comments made above. It is also subject to the further comment that if the security treaty does not impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan" that would enable the Japanese to repudiate article IV, which enables the United States at its election continuously to have the right to put its land, air and sea forces in and about Japan.

Reservation No. 2

This would make the so-called administrative agreements, made pursuant to article III, into treaties. This is impractical and would be very disadvantageous to the United States. These agreements are largely flexible and designed to deal with a situation which will be constantly changing as the number and character of United States forces vary, and as the facilities they require change from time to time. If the United States treats the administrative agreements as treaties, Japan will do the same and the United States position in Japan would in effect be frozen subject to Diet and Senate action, which it would be impossible to obtain quickly and which, in the case of Diet action, might be impossible to obtain at all.

Reservation No. 3

This would, in effect, write into the treaty a provision that the treaty cannot expire except with the concurrence of the Senate or of Congress. The treaty, as is customary, does not inject into external relations United States internal constitutional problems. It gives an option to the United States. How the United States shall act is a matter for us to decide for ourselves and it is not an issue into which Japan should be invited. If the present proposal is in fact a reservation it changes the treaty. Then it would have to go back to Japan for renegotiation and further action by the Japanese Diet. It is highly doubtful if today we could renegotiate as advantageous a treaty as we

now have, particularly on the point of duration, because there is now very strong objection in Japan to giving us an easement for military purposes for an indefinite time which the Japanese cannot, of themselves, end. Particularly since the implications of the Security Treaty have now been made manifest by the detailed administrative agreements, there is increasing opposition; and to reject the present treaty which Japan has ratified, and the relevant administrative agreements which Japan has signed, might seriously prejudice the security interest of the United States.

III. AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, AND UNITED STATES SECURITY TREATY

The proposed reservation is similar to the first part of the proposed reservation No. 1 to the Japanese Peace Treaty and the comments there made are relevant here.

IV. UNITED STATES AND PHILIPPINES MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY

The proposed reservation is similar to the first part of the proposed reservation No. 1 to the Japanese Peace Treaty and the comments there made are relevant here.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had intended to make some remarks tonight on the pending peace treaty, but in view of the lateness of the hour I think I will forego the privilege until tomorrow.

However, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity, so that my remarks may go into today's RECORD, to compliment the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on what I believe to be a very fine presentation of the question at issue, and also to compliment, as he has been already complimented by everyone, John Foster Dulles on his very able work in connection with the treaty, not only at the time he was in Japan with the Senators who have worked on the treaty, but at the time he was there with me in connection with commercial matters, which are of vital importance, and to which I hope to address myself tomorrow. His whole attitude and his whole approach to the subject have been of the finest.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The Senator from Washington has the floor.

PROPOSED STATUE IN MEMORY OF LEIF ERICSON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as in legislative session, on behalf of myself and several other Senators, I should like to discuss briefly a subject which has been before Congress ever since I have been a Member of it, and I suspect a long time before that. I think today is a good time to discuss it.

I have a joint resolution which I wish to introduce out of order at this time, and I ask that it be appropriately referred, as in legislative session.

As I say, similar measures have been before Congress probably for the past 30 years. The joint resolution is a simple one, and some of us cannot understand why we cannot get any action on it. It would authorize the erection in the District of Columbia of a statue of Leif Ericson. We have the statue. It was a gift to the United States from the peo-

ple of Iceland. I believe the school children participated in its casting with small contributions. It now reposes, as it has for many years, in the Newport News Marine Museum. There it is. All we have been trying to do is to have Congress authorize the Secretary of the Interior to request the Fine Arts Commission to find a place for old Leif in the District. All we need is the pedestal. We want to put Leif where he belongs.

After all, he did discover America. America was not discovered by Christopher Columbus. Leif was the first one to come to America. He was not here once, but four times.

Although we do not have affidavits to that effect, the old Scandinavian sagas have never been disputed. His mother established the first Christian church on the Continent of North America. Such achievements have actually been proved.

Mr. President, we have erected statues to Christopher Columbus all over the United States, and we have erected statues to Civil War generals, Revolutionary War generals, Presidents, and Vice Presidents. That is all right; I do not object. We have erected such statues and we have paid for them. We have the statue of Leif Ericson. All we want is a base or pedestal to place it on.

I do not know to what committee the joint resolution should be referred. Sometimes such joint resolutions have gone to the Committee on Rules and Administration, sometimes they have gone to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I believe at one time such a resolution even went to the Committee on the Judiciary. If it is possible for the Chair to use his discretion in the matter I hope he can find a committee which has a sufficient number of members of Scandinavian descent to assure some action on the joint resolution.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe it is very appropriate indeed that the Senator from Washington should speak on this subject today, St. Patrick's Day, which we celebrate in honor of the great man who Christianized Ireland.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure it is proper to bring it up on St. Patrick's Day, particularly when it is remembered that Leif Ericson's grandfather, Leif the White, ruled Ireland for nearly 86 years. That fact has been established by several Norwegian sagas. Perhaps that is why so many Norwegians and Icelanders have blue eyes and dark complexions. They were driven out of Ireland by the ancestors of the people we are honoring today, the O'Malleys, the O'Tooles, the O'McFarlands, and others.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did the Senator say "O'McFarland" or "oh! McFarland"?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I said "O'McFarland." [Laughter.]

The Vikings finally were run out of Ireland, and thereafter they landed in Scotland, and remained there for a few years, and then went to Iceland and then to Greenland, and then to North America and to what is now the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. One of my first responsibilities in coming to the Senate was to familiarize myself with the measure proposing the erection of a statue to Lief Ericson. I certainly hope that one of these days we can dispose of this measure, without forever being bothered about finding a base and a pedestal for the statue. I assure the Senator from Washington that I shall be glad to give whatever support I can to his joint resolution, and I hope no Member of the Senate will oppose its passage.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Louisiana, and I appreciate his support.

As I said, Mr. President, I thought March 17 might be a good day to bring up this matter.

As the Senator from Wisconsin himself knows, on one of those expeditions the first white child was born in what is now the United States. That child was not Virginia Dare, but was a child of one of those who came from Iceland to North America.

Mr. President, we think the discoverer of America, who came from Iceland, is entitled to have his statue placed in the Capital, along with the many other statues which are located here.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk the old perennial, a joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Lief Ericson in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 142) authorizing the erection of a statue of Lief Ericson in the District of Columbia, was read, received, twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in connection with the introduction of the joint resolution, I submit, on behalf of myself, the Senators from Minnesota [Mr. THYE and Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], a statement in regard to this measure, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND SENATORS THYE AND HUMPHREY OF MINNESOTA, WILEY OF WISCONSIN, AND YOUNG OF NORTH DAKOTA, ON INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING PLACEMENT OF STATUE OF LIEF ERICSON IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

It is with feelings of deep satisfaction, as of performing an act of justice long overdue, that we propose that the Government of the United States erect in this Capital City a statue commemorative of that magnificent figure of history and of legend—the great Norseman, Lief Ericson. I use the two words "history" and "legend" advisedly, for while our knowledge of Ericson's actual achievements is based on the sagas of the Greenland and Vinland voyages whose accuracy, of course, can never be proved, there can scarcely be any doubt whatever that such

a person as Lief Ericson actually did exist. The evidence is too overwhelming.

The very name of Lief Ericson conjures up visions of stalwart warriors embarking on their dragon's-head ships. As one glances through the modern translations of those Norse sagas one seems to feel the sting and tang of the salt spray and hear the lusty shouts of the explorers above the roar of the waters. There is a peculiar fascination about those northern seas which no one who has ever traversed them—even in a modern liner—can ever forget.

If we, in the comfort and security of our great ships today are still reminded that we are at times no match for the mighty Atlantic, imagine the boldness, the enterprise, the intrepid courage of these early Norse voyagers.

In the year A. D. 999, as it is told, Lief Ericson, son of that famed warrior, Eric the Red, visited the court of King Olav Tryggvesson of Norway who commissioned him to sail for Greenland and convert the natives to Christianity. Lief himself in the Saga of Vinland is described as a big, strapping fellow, handsome to look at, thoughtful and temperate in all things.

Arriving in Greenland, Lief heard talk on all sides of lands even farther to the west. So he set sail once more and about the year 1002 landed, as is now commonly believed, somewhere in Labrador or Newfoundland and, finding them barren, sailed down the coast where he rounded Cape Cod, finding a fair, wooded country where wild grapes grew in abundance. Thus was discovered that "Vinland" which Americans have every right to believe is their own New England coast and certain adjacent islands, notably Martha's Vineyard and No Mans Land.

It is entirely fitting, therefore, that our Government erect here in the District of Columbia a memorial to the great and gallant figure who will ever live in saga and in history.

PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT OF WAYNE COY, FOLLOWING HIS RESIGNATION FROM THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on March 13, 1952, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] had printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which he wrote some 2 years ago for the American magazine. I commend it to all Senators as being good thinking and good reading. He submitted that article for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD, because of the fact that there had been much complaint and controversy regarding former Government employees, Mr. Joseph Nunan, Jr., and others, who had resigned their positions in various branches of the Government and received well-paid employment by various groups doing business with the Government agencies which those former employees had served.

At the outset, I wish to state that I am not trying to speak from a partisan viewpoint in regard to this matter. I am mindful of the fact that those of us who serve in the Senate see from time to time various former colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, who have been repudiated at the polls by their constituents, and then have returned to Washington as registered lobbyists, representing various industries or other forms of business, at large and lucrative retainers.

The other day I was impressed when I read about Wayne Coy, formerly chairman of the Federal Communications

Commission. Mr. Coy resigned his position only a few days ago, and within 24 hours accepted employment with Time magazine, as its radio and television expert, at a retainer of \$25,000 a year; and he is still to be free to engage in other business activities on the side.

Mr. President, I do not wish to speak in a derogatory fashion of Mr. Coy or of Time magazine. I am mindful of the fact that perhaps Mr. Coy has sacrificed a great deal in working for the Government all these years. He began governmental service in 1933, in the State of Indiana, under Governor McNutt. Mr. Coy has served in many branches of the Government.

However, the salient fact in connection with this matter is that Time magazine now intends to go into the television and radio field; and Mr. Coy, who resigned from the Federal Communications Commission on February 21, within 24 hours of that time received his appointment from Time magazine, at a retainer, as I say, of \$25,000 a year.

Mr. President, I wish to read an article which the American people, the television people, and the broadcasters, are having trouble in understanding, due to the fact that the very essence of good government is involved in criticisms which now are being focused upon Washington, D. C., and the lack of integrity on the part of many of the governmental agents and elective officials:

COY STATION GETS FCC NOD

WASHINGTON, March 8.—Federal Communications Commission this week granted KOB, Albuquerque, recently purchased jointly by Time, Inc., and Wayne Coy, after he resigned as FCC Chairman, authorization to operate on 770 kilocycles until September 1. The authorization was necessary pending settlement by FCC of the 10-year-old case concerning the facilities to be allotted KOB. During Coy's tenure as FCC Chairman, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals here last fall prodded FCC into faster settlement of the case.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is the station referred to a television station?

Mr. WELKER. Yes, I understand it is a television station.

Mr. MORSE. The Portland, Oreg., area and the Denver, Colo., area are still waiting for the granting of television licenses which Mr. Coy never could see his way clear to grant while he was Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. I never did feel that any sound reason was advanced why such discrimination should be practiced against the Portland, Oreg., area, or the Denver, Colo., area.

Mr. WELKER. I certainly appreciate the remarks of my distinguished colleague and friend, the junior Senator from Oregon. His remarks help focus the attention of the American people on such activities. It is my understanding that Station KOB was heretofore licensed, but of course the new purchasers had to get a new authorization.

Mr. President, what can the people of Portland, Oreg., think when they realize that the television application for their area has been delayed so many

years, along with the applications from many other sections of the country, when now they read in the newspapers that within 24 hours of the time the former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission resigned, he received the great honor of being appointed to represent Time magazine and its television chain, at a stipulated salary of \$25,000 a year, for representing only that one organization and its television chain, and when they see an immediate authorization granted Wayne Coy and Time, Inc., to acquire and operate a previously licensed television station in New Mexico?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEM. Am I to understand that an exception has been made to the television "freeze" order, and that a permit has been granted to the Albuquerque, N. Mex., station?

Mr. WELKER. As I say, Station KOB was heretofore licensed; but I think the Senator from Missouri is on safe ground in assuming what he has said, in view of the press release I have read. I shall read others to the same effect.

Mr. KEM. On what ground was the exception to the general "freeze" order made, on behalf of the Albuquerque, N. Mex., station?

Mr. WELKER. That question is in my mind at this time; but since the station was a licensed station, Mr. Coy and Time probably are exceptions to the "freeze."

I am also familiar with applications made to the Federal Communications Commission by organizations in my own State and by organizations in many other locations, I am sure they will be unable to understand Mr. Coy's and Time's activity.

Mr. President, this matter does not look well or read well. I do not wish to be critical of Mr. Coy, but the American people have had about enough of this sort of activity.

I am mindful of the fact that various members of my own profession, the legal profession, and ex-members of this body have participated in bringing about ridicule and criticism, because of which the Members of this body must be embarrassed.

At this time I wish to refer to the duties of the Federal Communications Commission and its organization. In doing so, I have special reference to the statement made a moment ago by my good friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

As he well knows, being the attorney that he is, one of the duties of the Federal Communications Commission is to classify stations and their services, to assign the frequencies, and to make commitments for interstate and foreign radio and television services.

I am sure the American people can well question why this sudden employment of Mr. Coy has occurred within 24 hours of his resignation from the Federal Communications Commission, of which he formerly was chairman, whereas now we find that he is a coowner with Time magazine of the large Albuquerque,

N. Mex., television station, which in my opinion will be worth a tremendous sum. The question may be asked, How about this deal? After he stated that he was resigning to replenish his private income, where did he get the money to help buy television station KOB? If he had no funds, what consideration did he offer so that he now is a coowner of this television station? Certainly if this activity does not deserve strict censure, I do not know what does? I think Mr. Coy and Time magazine should explain this setup.

Let me read now what the magazine Broadcasting under date of February 25, 1952, had to say of the matter I am speaking about. This magazine is a publication which is devoted to the broadcasting and television industries and related matters:

While no announcement was made, it was learned that Time, Inc. (Time, Life, Fortune), intends filing applications for the maximum number of five television stations in strategic markets. Time, Inc., also may seek to purchase existing broadcast properties. This, presumably, will be Mr. Coy's principal activity. Mr. Coy is a UHF booster, and that may be the Time, Inc., pitch. The Washington law firm of Pierson & Ball has been retained by Time, Inc., to handle its communications affairs.

I read from a subsequent portion of the article:

Mr. Coy also might negotiate for acquisition of an interest in broadcast properties, it is thought.

Mr. Coy did not enter into negotiations with Time, Inc., until Friday morning—following his surprise resignation of the preceding day.

Let us bear in mind that within less than 24 hours after he resigned, he was hired by Time, Inc.

I read further from the article:

He left for New York Thursday afternoon with Phillip G. Locks, Washington attorney and friend. A number of proposals had been under consideration by Mr. Coy, it is understood.

Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a broadcast by Ray Henle in Three-Star Extra on National Broadcasting Co. on March 12:

We hear that the Time and Life magazine people are trying to buy up no less than 16 important radio and television outlets in various cities across the country. Former FCC Chairman Wayne Coy is in charge. It eventually may mean a brand-new television network.

Mr. President, Wayne Coy is entitled to the greatest presumption of innocence. However, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, I am wondering what the small television operator in Portland, Oreg., or the small radio operator in Idaho or in Missouri thinks of such activities. They do not read well at a time when all branches of the Government are being carefully scrutinized and watched as never before.

It seems that in this case we have a man who is very well acquainted with the present members of the Commission. He worked with them for some 4 or 5 years, and he knows them well. Now he has resigned; and within 24 hours of his resignation he has begun

to work for a giant television network. Certainly he can be accused—and justly so, I think—of being retained, not for his great television ability, but because of his former connection with the Federal Communications Commission and its activities. What asset greater than that would he have?

It is as the Senator from Nebraska has stated in his American magazine article:

How to make a lot of money: Go to work for Uncle Sam, learn the ropes, make friends, then graduate and hire out at a fat fee to a private business which wants inside contacts in Washington. This old gradism invites skulduggery, says Senator BUTLER, and must be stopped before it undermines confidence in our Government.

Mr. President, this activity on the part of Time magazine and Wayne Coy may be 100 percent honest, and I hope it is. But it will have to withstand careful cross-examination by the Members of the Senate and its particular committees. The American people are tired of this sort of activity. What the answer will be, I do not know. Certainly Time magazine is entitled to seek and retain the best man available; and certainly Mr. Coy is entitled to seek and obtain the best employment possible but it should be done so that neither Coy nor Time are embarrassed or even questioned. The Senator from Nebraska introduced certain proposed legislation about 2 years ago on this subject matter. I invite the attention of my colleagues to it. Perhaps it is the answer. I do not have it. But I know it is unfortunate that at this time, when suspicion is so prevalent, that there should be such activity as is evidenced by the resignation of Mr. Coy, and, within 24 hours thereafter, his having a retainer of \$25,000 a year, which leaves him free to represent all the other radio and television organizations in America, and then the startling disclosure that he is a coowner, and authorization is granted to a broadcasting station to operate at Albuquerque, N. Mex., Mr. President, I think the Senate certainly should watch that proceeding from this time hence. It is a bit of activity that can only add more fuel to the fire of criticism of Government from top to bottom.

INVESTIGATION OF IRREGULARITIES IN SALES OF LIQUOR AND COLLECTION OF TAXES IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial regarding the settlement of commercial bribery charges brought by the Federal Government, published in the Hamlin County Herald-Enterprise of Hayti, S. Dak., on February 28, 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Seven South Dakota wholesale liquor dealers have offered \$136,733 in settlement of commercial bribery charges brought by the Federal Government. The charges concern the offering of bribes to municipal liquor

store managers in the purchase of merchandise. The offers, acceptance of which is still pending in Washington, write fines to 2 years of patient investigation by agents of the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Settlements were offered by the accused wholesalers on the basis of dollar for dollar for merchandise and cash gifts made by representatives to managers and buyers of 117 of the State's 134 municipal liquor stores. These represent only those instances in which ATU agents obtained evidence or confession; undoubtedly there are many additional cases of bribery that could not be uncovered. The violations occurred during 1948 and 1949, terminating early in 1950 when the Government investigations developed in earnest. The evidence is now in the process of further study by State authorities to determine whether State commercial bribery statutes were violated. What further action is to devolve will depend on this study, but it is obvious that only half of the picture has been dealt with. What about the venal managers and buyers who accepted the bribes? We understand that bales of signed confessions by these are in the files. These should be released to the public so that people may know which of their servants have been faithless to the trust imposed in them. Apologists point out that no single large amounts were involved in any case. Simple arithmetic based on the administrative settlement offers aggregating \$136,000 and covering about 114 stores, indicates an average bribery of better than \$1,000 per store. Obviously, some buyers did real well by themselves. They should be prosecuted, and restitution should be demanded. Subrosa information indicates that in some instances, if not most, the scheme went much beyond mere competitiveness; prices charged the municipal liquor stores were said to be substantially higher than for comparable privately owned stores. Municipal stores were penalized directly for bribes which liquor store representatives were passing out, buyers were accepting. This should be checked into also. The offending dealers' group points out sanctimoniously that it has policed itself "voluntarily" and that the "unethical" practices have been terminated. It might not be amiss to point out in rebuttal that the voluntary policing did not come about until after the Government had developed its case beyond possibility of controversy. Since then terrific pressure has been applied to public officials to drop the matter; to call off the field agents "who are embarrassing us"; and to soft-pedal the affair. We feel that United States District Attorney Leo P. Flynn deserves handsome applause for refusing to be intimidated and for insisting on going through with the matter regardless of where it hit. Will our State administration prove itself equally dispassionate in following up this scandalous affair?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this editorial commends United States Attorney Leo P. Flynn upon the manner in which in the State of South Dakota he is handling certain cases involving the Alcohol Tax Unit, but at the same time it indicates that the State administration might have been somewhat lax, under the attorney general of South Dakota, Mr. Dunham, in the prosecution of such portions of the cases as affect them.

This is an erroneous impression because the attorney general of South Dakota has for many months been trying to get access to the records of the Justice Department in order that his agency might prosecute those State employees against whom charges were made. As

far back as November 28, 1952, he requested my assistance in this matter.

I desire at this time to read excerpts from a letter dated November 28, 1951, addressed to me by Ralph A. Dunham, attorney general of the State of South Dakota. I do so to clear up any impression that Mr. Dunham might be dodging his responsibilities. The excerpts are as follows:

Shortly after taking office as attorney general of the State of South Dakota in January of this year I learned that a State-wide investigation of irregularities in the sale of liquor was being conducted by the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Upon learning that this investigation was nearing completion I went with a member of my staff and the State's attorney of one of our counties to the Alcohol Tax Unit field office in St. Paul, Minn., where we conferred with a Mr. Albert L. Durkin, district supervisor of that office, and certain members of his staff. We learned that the report would be completed in the near future and would, when completed, be turned over to the United States district attorney for the district of South Dakota for appropriate action.

Subsequently, one of my assistants met with the United States district attorney, Mr. Leo Flynn, on several occasions, and when the report was sent to the office of the United States district attorney he permitted this assistant to inspect a part of it. The volume encompassed by the report was such that my assistant could only form a general impression of the conclusions reached by the Federal investigators and reported therein. The report generally indicated extremely widespread bribery by liquor wholesalers of those persons in charge of municipal liquor stores in this State, and there was also a suggestion of considerable income-tax evasion in that the moneys and merchandise used to effect this bribery were deducted by the wholesalers as business expenses.

Until July of this year the United States attorney for the district of South Dakota showed great eagerness to cooperate with my office in effecting prosecution of the wrongdoers, Mr. Flynn suggesting that he would prosecute the wholesalers and the State the corrupt municipal officials and employees. In fact, during July of this year Mr. Flynn, at a conference of States' attorneys and sheriffs at the capital in Pierre, stated in a speech that law-enforcement agencies of the State of South Dakota, in cooperation with his office, would shortly be engaged in investigations and prosecutions deriving from the sales of certain merchandise to municipalities throughout the State.

Shortly after this July meeting, and at Mr. Flynn's invitation, I attended a conference at the United States district attorney's office in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in company with that assistant who had seen the report, which conference was also attended by Mr. Flynn, Mr. Durkin, and a Mr. Avis from the Washington office of the Alcohol Tax Unit.

* * * the meeting, which had been called for the purpose of determining a division of effort in effecting prosecutions, resulted in a statement from Mr. Flynn that the matter would have to be referred to the Attorney General of the United States. The meeting concluded on this unsatisfactory basis, with an agreement that Mr. Flynn would make application to the Attorney General, after which he was to advise my office of the determination reached, and whether or not the Federal Government would aid the State.

No indication has, of course, reached my office as to the conclusions of the Attorney General of the United States, and conversations subsequently had with the United States attorney have been most evasive on his part.

At the meeting just described Mr. Avis took the position that he believed this to probably be a proper case for administrative settlement of both the commercial bribery and income-tax charges against the various wholesalers, and he made it plain that should such a course be followed the State of South Dakota could not obtain the report of the Alcohol Tax Unit on which to base its prosecutions.

It would appear, then, that we have this situation: The Federal investigators did an honest job and laid the basis for prosecutions. High officials have apparently, however, for reasons best known to themselves, determined to follow the secret administrative settlement procedure.

The secret administrative settlement procedure is a device which lends itself to corruption, and moreover the general public never had a chance to discover the wrongdoers in its own midst, a most serious limitation on effective law enforcement. The attorneys general of the various States, at their national conference in Seattle in August of this year went on record as strongly opposing the administrative settlement device in dealing with criminal matters for just these reasons.

In not just this instance, but in situations arising under the PMA and FSA programs of the United States Agriculture Department, here in the State of South Dakota, it has come to my attention that very serious criminal derelictions involving the theft of Federal funds were or are being settled rather than prosecuted. The whole settlement procedure of the Federal Government should be closely investigated and, perhaps, terminated.

The investigation conducted by the agents of the Alcohol Tax Unit was extensive and expensive far beyond the abilities of my small office. I have neither the staff nor type of trained investigators to duplicate the Federal investigation, and it would appear a most unnecessary expenditure of public funds when a Federal investigation, probably costing much in excess of \$100,000 has already been made by the Federal Government. I have at all times, therefore, insisted upon the full cooperation of the Federal Government in making available to my office both the evidence discovered in the investigation and the testimony of the personnel who made the investigation. I do not think this an unreasonable position, for Federal and State governments should cooperate fully when such cooperation is clearly beneficial to the entire community and when such cooperation can effect enormous savings of public time and money.

I have detailed to you a situation wherein an agency of the Federal Government has investigated and discovered corrupt practices permeating an entire State. In this situation the Federal Government apparently intends to dispose of the entire matter by secret administrative settlement. I think that you will agree with me that the philosophy and acts of the Federal agency do not serve the ends of good government.

This appears to be another item in the seemingly endless disclosures of corrupt or improper practices which are destroying the moral fiber of American Government.

I shall be most interested in having your reply, and I trust I shall hear from you at your convenience.

Yours very truly,

RALPH A. DUNHAM,
Attorney General.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am highly gratified that the able Senator from Delaware is bringing this matter

to the attention of the Congress and of the country. I am not entirely conversant with the details of the case which the Senator is discussing, but I have read the editorial to which he referred in the early part of his remarks. I am sure that the implications in the editorial would not have been made had the editorial writer been in possession of the full set of facts which the Senator from Delaware is now, for the first time, making available for public consideration.

I can say that the attorney general of the State of South Dakota is a very able and courageous attorney general. He has been doing some very useful work in investigating the situation which he has called to the attention of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and on which we shall begin public hearings on Wednesday of this week.

As I say, Mr. President, I am not intimately familiar with the details of this case, but I can assure the Senator from Delaware that the people of South Dakota like to see public business publicly conducted.

I think the attorney general is certainly correct when he insists that these settlements be not handled secretly and that the information be not denied to the American public. If there have been income-tax violations, if the Alcohol Tax unit has been in error, if the Federal Government, and thereby, the American taxpayer, has been cheated out of revenue which should rightfully have come to it, those are things which should be made public and should lead to whatever convictions seem to be indicated by evidence.

I appreciate sincerely the fact that the Senator from Delaware is bringing the matter to the attention of the public.

In the early part of last fall the attorney general of South Dakota talked to me about the matter, and I at that time suggested that the Senator from Delaware, because of his close familiarity with the whole situation and because of the tremendous public service he has been rendering in discussing certain derelictions in the Internal Revenue Bureau, was the logical man to go to for any additional facts which the attorney general was desirous of obtaining. The letter written on November 28 certainly was a fair request that the facts, whatever they are, be made known jointly to Mr. Flynn, for whom I have very high regard, and to the attorney general of South Dakota, so that they could focus on the same problem the investigative capacity and strength not only of the office of the United States prosecutor in that area, but also the office of the attorney general of the State. It seems to me, if we are to have law enforcement which is worthy of the name, there should be an end of rivalry between two law enforcement agencies and that they should cooperate in the public interest.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his contribution, and I want to emphasize the fact that I am not criticizing acts of the United States attorney or of the attorney general of the State of South Dakota. I do feel, as the Senator has said, that any evidence which the United

States Government has assembled in the course of its investigation regarding bribery which involves State employees—I understand the cities and municipalities in South Dakota operate most of the liquor stores—should be made known. I see no excuse whatever for the United States attorney or the Attorney General of the United States not to make available to the attorney general of the State affected any facts they have in their possession. I think there should be a close working arrangement between agencies of law enforcement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as I say, I am not familiar with the situation which has developed, because the Senator from Delaware has made an independent investigation with his customary thoroughness and with his customary accuracy. In my State there are some municipal liquor stores. I am not aware of State stores selling liquor, but under our law certain municipalities are authorized to go into the liquor business as municipal stores.

I am not aware whether these alleged charges of bribery involve municipal officials or whether they involve private persons. I simply want to reiterate what I said earlier, that I know the good people of South Dakota sufficiently well to realize that whatever the facts may be, they want to know them. Whatever the settlement may be, they want to know how the settlement was made. They believe that public business is not something to be conducted in the dark of the moon or in the dark of a basement or behind closed doors and windows.

If I correctly understand the Senator from Delaware, that is the burden of his approach this afternoon. It is his desire to have made available to the public all the facts, let the evidence lead wherever it may, and to bring about a harmonious working together of law-enforcement agencies.

I have a very high regard for Mr. Flynn, the United States attorney in that area, and I also have great regard and respect for the State attorney general. It would be hazardous in the extreme if because of some rivalry or because of some administrative policy in Washington it were made impossible for the State to cooperate with the United States Attorney General.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, following the receipt of Mr. Dunham's letter I addressed a letter to Mr. A. L. Durkin, district supervisor, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, and I ask unanimous consent at this time to have that letter incorporated in the RECORD along with Mr. Durkin's reply thereto. In his reply he indicates that such an investigation had been conducted and that he had forwarded his report to the Bureau in Washington.

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

JANUARY 2, 1952.

Mr. ALBERT L. DURKIN,
District Supervisor, Alcohol Tax Unit,
Bureau of Internal Revenue,
St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. DURKIN: It is my understanding that you have in your possession a report re-

garding a certain investigation of alleged irregularities in the sale of liquor and the collection of liquor taxes in the State of South Dakota. It is also my understanding that this investigation report contains evidence of numerous irregularities; however, no action has been taken.

Will you please advise me, furnishing either a copy or a summary, of the contents of this report.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

— — —
TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
ALCOHOL TAX UNIT,
St. Paul, Minn., January 25, 1952.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 22, 1952, in which you refer to your letter of January 2, 1952, requesting information regarding certain investigations of alleged irregularities in the sale of liquor in the State of North Dakota.

You are advised that your original inquiry concerning the matter was forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Washington, D. C., for appropriate attention.

Very truly yours,

A. L. DURKIN,
District Supervisor, Alcohol and
Tobacco Tax Division.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, following that, I addressed a letter under date of January 2, 1952, to Hon. John B. Dunlap, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter incorporated in the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 2, 1952.

HON. JOHN B. DUNLAP,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
United States Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DUNLAP: It is my understanding that early in 1951 an investigation was conducted by the Alcoholic Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue regarding certain alleged irregularities in the sale and collection of liquor taxes in the State of South Dakota.

Will you please advise me the status of this investigation and if completed, furnish information regarding what was found and the action taken.

In the event that you see fit to answer this letter with your usual form letter, stating that the request must come from the committee, then I am asking that you assemble this information and be ready to furnish the answer January 8, 1952.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I now ask to have incorporated in the RECORD the reply by Mr. Dunlap to me dated January 8, 1952.

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

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 8, 1952.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In your letter of January 2, 1952, you requested information as to the status of an investigation in 1951 of "certain alleged irregularities in the sale and collection of liquor taxes in the State of South Dakota."

The cases perfected as a result of the investigation of the wholesale liquor industry

in South Dakota have been referred to the United States attorney for the district of South Dakota and to the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice in Washington. These cases are in a pending status. Inasmuch as jurisdiction is in the Department of Justice, it is suggested that your inquiry be directed to that Department.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. DUNLAP,
Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to point out that Mr. Dunlap in his letter states that the case has been referred to the United States Attorney for the District of South Dakota for criminal prosecution.

At this point I should like to have incorporated in the RECORD my letter of January 2, 1952, to Mr. Leo Flynn, United States Attorney, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, together with his reply dated January 9.

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

JANUARY 2, 1952.

MR. LEO FLYNN,
United States District Attorney,
Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

DEAR MR. FLYNN: It is my understanding that early in 1951, an investigation was conducted regarding certain alleged irregularities in the collection of taxes by the Alcohol Tax Unit in South Dakota and that the evidence assembled in this investigation was turned over to your office for prosecution.

Will you please advise me what action has been taken.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Sioux Falls, January 9, 1952.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I have your inquiry of January 2, 1952.

I wish to advise that there is no prosecution pending in this district regarding certain irregularities in the collection of taxes by the Alcohol Tax Unit in South Dakota.

In all probability the investigation you have been advised of has to do with inducements that were made by certain wholesale liquor dealers to the managers of municipally owned liquor stores in this State. This investigation has been going on for some time but was not completed until November 29, 1951, when the final report concerning this investigation was submitted to this office.

This investigation divulged a folly carried on by the wholesale liquor dealers to induce managers of municipally owned liquor stores to purchase their liquor from them. This practice is perfectly regular when it is carried on with managers who own their own stores, but is not permitted when carried on with managers of municipally owned liquor stores. We have a peculiar statute in this State that permits municipalities to own and operate their own liquor stores. I understand that Minnesota is the only other State having a similar statute. I refer to it as a folly for the reason that the Government was, positively, in no way injured by this practice. The business was there to be had by one or the other of the seven wholesalers, and in their greed and anxiety to grab as much of this business as they could they were apparently willing to share their profits with the managers of the municipally owned liquor stores who had no right thereto.

By the greatest stretch of imagination, so far as the taxes are concerned, the Govern-

ment is in no way involved, nor is there any showing in any way, shape or form that there have been any irregularities on the part of the Alcohol Tax Unit in South Dakota.

I have recently read a couple of articles concerning your activities in connection with investigations of matters concerning the Government, and I was especially interested in the instances in your own life that first started you in this kind of work.

I guess we have a rather peculiar type of people out here in South Dakota, for after being a prosecutor almost continuously since 1933 I can state that no one has ever come into my office to offer me any kind of an inducement to favor them, nor in my experience in working with investigative agencies out here have I ever seen any indication that any investigator was influenced by any individual, or that he was coloring his report in any way.

I want you to know that I am in complete sympathy with your activities with reference to unearthing graft and incompetency in the Federal Government. Also, that I am perfectly willing so far as the regulations under which I work permit me to give you any and all information in this and any other matter that may be pending in this office, or which may ultimately find its way to us.

I can well appreciate the fact that if I were so inclined I might find occasion to interpret your inquiry as an indication that I had been or am lax in my duties in this matter. However, I am inclined to interpret it as an honest inquiry, based upon a certain distrust that seems to be widespread in the Nation involving Federal employees who either don't seem to know enough to take the duties of their office seriously, or, if they do, don't care to.

I hope I will be hearing from you again and you may be sure that all of your inquiries will be received and acted upon in the same spirit of sincerity that I feel they are made.

Very truly yours,

LEO P. FLYNN,
United States Attorney.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall read one paragraph from Mr. Flynn's reply:

I wish to advise that there is no prosecution pending in this district regarding certain irregularities in the collection of taxes by the Alcohol Tax Unit in South Dakota.

I presume Mr. Flynn by that statement meant that perhaps such matters were in process of being settled by administrative fines, although his answer is not too clear.

Mr. President, following receipt of that letter, I addressed a letter to Attorney General Howard McGrath. In reply, I received a letter signed by Mr. James M. McInerney. I shall read the last paragraph of that letter, as follows:

Because of the fact that this is an actively pending case and the negotiations are now taking place, I respectfully request that you receive and treat this information in confidence.

I may say that in this letter Mr. McInerney points out the procedure the Department of Justice is following, and it is for the reason that the Office of the Attorney General of the United States had asked that this be kept in confidence that I am not incorporating their answer in the record now.

I make this statement today merely because I think there is unfortunately a misunderstanding on the part of some in South Dakota who are unjustly criticizing the Attorney General of South Dakota and other State officials for not

enforcing the provisions of the law as they should be enforced. According to reports, there have been certain bribes which will aggregate about \$125,000, paid largely to municipal employees, and certainly, if that is true the records should be made available to the Attorney General of South Dakota and other law-enforcement officers of that State.

I think this is more a matter of policy than of criticism of any individuals. I understand it is currently the policy of departments in Washington that administrative settlements and fines are secret and not released to the public. I feel that whenever a crime has been committed, the public has a right to know what disposition has been made of it. If it is settled by administrative fine, I think the public has a right to know the charge against the individual and the amount of settlement.

I understand that this position has been taken by the attorney generals in their recent conference. I sincerely hope that the United States Attorney for the District of South Dakota and the Department of Justice in Washington will establish a closer working relationship with the Attorney General of South Dakota to clear up the situation to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Likewise I think the Department of Justice should adopt a permanent policy of publicity listing all administrative fines and settlements. This will remove much criticism regarding possible favoritism or improper settlements.

NOMINATION OF IVAR H. PETERSON

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand some Senators wish to make further remarks on other subjects. I do not desire to deprive them of that privilege, but I ask unanimous consent that, out of order, the nomination of Mr. Ivar H. Peterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the unexpired term of 5 years, from August 27, 1951, be considered and acted upon at this time.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, we on this side of the aisle could not hear all the majority leader said.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I asked unanimous consent that the nomination of Mr. Ivar H. Peterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board be considered and disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ivar H. Peterson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified.

JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on yesterday I sat among those citizens who attended the program presented by the American Forum of the Air. The subject

under discussion was What is the Role of New Japan? The program guests were the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota. The moderator was Theodore Granik.

Earlier today I received consent of the Senate to have a transcription of the American Forum of the Air program printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

During the course of the program Mr. Granik recognized the Senator from Washington by this language:

Moderator GRANIK. I see another one of your colleagues in the audience, Senator HARRY CAIN, of Washington State.

Do you have a question, perhaps, Senator?

The question I offered was this:

I think that I understood the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SPARKMAN, to have stated in no uncertain fashion that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has unanimously repudiated the Yalta agreement by making very certain in language that no Japanese territory was legitimately ceded at Yalta to the Russian Government. Did I understand the Senator from Alabama correctly?

Senator SPARKMAN's response was this:

That is correct, and it is a part of the resolution that is pending before us. And it was unanimously adopted.

Mr. Granik then went on to say:

Did you want to comment further, HARRY? No. I just want the American Nation to be fully aware of what the Senator from Alabama has just said.

Mr. President, so far as I know, the Senator from Alabama is the first spokesman for the administration to state publicly—and on yesterday he did so in the hearing and sight of millions of Americans—that the Yalta agreement was repudiated. The Senator from Alabama indicated that he was speaking for all of the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The membership of that committee numbers thirteen, and includes seven Democrats and six Republicans.

Webster's definition of "repudiate" is "to cast off; disown; to refuse to have anything to do with; to renounce; to refuse to accept as true, just, of rightful authority or obligation."

I respected and appreciated the frank and firm response which the Senator from Alabama offered to my understanding that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has repudiated the Yalta agreement. I believe that the Nation will take new hope from the firmness of the answer provided by the Senator from Alabama.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. In connection with what the Senator from Washington has just said, does he recall what brought about the discussion of this subject?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to say that I was moved to ask my question because of a colloquy which had just been concluded between the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who was a guest on the program, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who was an interested observer, as was I, seated in the audience.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of fact, I was called upon by the moderator, was I not, to say something about an interpretative reservation, covering the Yalta agreement, which I had sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations with respect to this treaty?

Mr. CAIN. When the program was about half finished, the moderator interrupted the proceeding to say that he understood the Senator from Utah had offered an interpretative or restrictive amendment to the Japanese Peace Treaty when it was before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and he inquired whether the Senator from Utah would not make his own references to his amendment.

It was after that that the Senator from Utah made it very clear to the Senator from Alabama, as I understood, that the Senator from Utah seeks in the Japanese Peace Treaty to make it conclusive and clear that under the terms of the Japanese Peace Treaty no title to any property previously owned by the Japanese was being given away to the Russian Government.

Mr. WATKINS. I call that to the Senator's attention for this reason: I want the RECORD to show that there was no doubt about what was under discussion during the broadcast. This matter had been specifically called to the attention of the Senator from Alabama, a distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee. After he had been apprised of the reservation, what it meant, and its purpose, and the fact that it had been adopted, the Senator asked his question. In other words, there can be no doubt that when the Senator from Washington asked his question the Senator from Alabama had full information as to what had been discussed and what had been offered in the past, and what the committee had done.

Mr. CAIN. By way of compliment to my friend from Utah, I will say that I would not have felt impelled to ask the question had it not been for the observations offered but a few minutes before by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to say in that connection that I felt that the Senator from Washington rendered a very great service to the country by bringing out that fact and having it clinched by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, as to what had happened and what was intended by the interpretative reservation which was actually written into the resolution ratifying and approving the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Mr. CAIN. It was my impression from what passed between the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Utah that they were in agreement that the Japanese peace treaty was not designed to give away Japanese territory to the Russian Government. My only intention—and I think it proved to be successful—was to inquire whether or not such an understanding represented a considered repudiation of the wartime agreement signed at Yalta.

The Senator from Alabama is no unimportant person, for many reasons. He is important as a Senator as well as a citizen. He is further important because

he is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs, and therefore his answer that the Foreign Relations Committee has repudiated the Yalta agreement ought, by every means possible, to be brought to the attention of the Nation.

CITATION OF ABRAM FLAXER FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I send to the desk, out of order, a resolution in behalf of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 294) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States as to the refusal of Abram Flaxer to answer a series of questions before the said subcommittee and the failure and refusal of Abram Flaxer to furnish records and supplemental information in compliance with a subpoena duces tecum of said subcommittee and as ordered by the subcommittee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that said Abram Flaxer may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution, I submit, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, a report to accompany the resolution and also certain testimony, as a part of the report, and I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Without objection, the report will be printed as requested.

Mr. WATKINS. In that connection, I wish to make some insertions in the RECORD and to make a brief statement.

Mr. President, I have just reported a resolution to cite Abram Flaxer, president of the United Public Workers of America, for contempt of the Senate. Flaxer has contemptuously refused to comply with a subpoena of the Internal Security Committee. He has refused to provide the committee with membership lists of the UPWA.

I wish to state for the record the remarks I included in my statement to the press. In that release I suggested that Federal employee members of the UPWA either clean up their union or get out of it without delay. Patriotic employees have no business belonging to any Communist-dominated union.

I cannot understand why the UPWA has not been included on the Attorney General's subversive list. I am informed by what I consider reliable sources that the United Public Workers of America has on several occasions been recommended for inclusion in the Attorney General's subversive list. These recommendations were made not only by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but also

informally by officials of President Truman's own Loyalty Review Board.

BIRTH OF UPWA

The UPWA was born on April 25, 1946, at the Atlantic City Convention of the CIO. It was formed by a merger of two CIO unions, the United Federal Workers of America and the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America. Abram Flaxer, who was president of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America was elected president of the newly formed UPWA. The new union claimed a membership of 75,000.

Much of the credit for exposing the UPWA belongs to Jerry Klutz, Federal Diary Reporter, on the Washington Post. Jerry Klutz attended the 1946 convention of the CIO and became disturbed by what he saw and heard at the convention. Upon his return, he wrote several columns exposing what he called the extreme left-wing policy and actions of the UPWA.

In his column of May 3, 1946, Jerry Klutz reported on the convention activities of George Morris, of the Daily Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party in America. Morris, with the assistance of Flaxer, was able to get the newly formed UPWA to adopt a pro-Russian foreign-policy resolution. These resolutions charged that the demobilization of American troops was being deliberately delayed to further the imperialist ambitions of the United States and Great Britain. They called for the immediate withdrawal of American and British troops from all friendly countries, including China, the Philippines, France, Greece, India, Indochina, Belgium, and Iceland. These resolutions were 100 percent in accordance with the Communist line. They were adopted by overwhelming vote.

Convention speakers charged that the United States and Great Britain were plotting to destroy the Soviet Union with atomic bombs. An attempt to have the foreign-policy resolution include a recommendation for the withdrawal of Russian troops from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, and other middle European nations, which are now behind the iron curtain, was shouted down. Those who supported inclusion of such language in the resolution were called reactionaries and Red baiters.

The constitution of the UPWA, as it was drafted and adopted at the Atlantic City convention in 1946, contained a section which read as follows:

Membership in the international union shall not be denied by reason of sex, race, creed, color, nationality, or religious or political affiliation or belief.

This provision of the constitution of the UPWA was designed to welcome Communists into the union and to assure them of eligibility for membership. Some of the more patriotic American labor unions had already acted to bar Communists from membership and from holding union office. The newly formed UPWA had no such ban. Its constitution invited Communists to membership.

The UPWA constitution which was adopted at the Atlantic City convention contained a provision asserting the right

of Government employees to strike against the Government. Following passage of legislation making it mandatory for Government employees to sign nonstrike affidavits, the UPWA executive board passed a resolution banning strikes by union members against the Federal Government. Nothing was said, however, about strikes against State and municipal governments. This move saved the jobs of Federal employee members of the UPWA.

I request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the May 3, 1946, Federal Diary column of Washington Post Reporter Jerry Klutz.

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

THE FEDERAL DIARY—PUBLIC WORKERS' UNION LEANS TO LEFT, REPORTER FINDS

(A new CIO union was born at Atlantic City a week ago. Known as the United Public Workers, it is an amalgamation of the old United Federal Workers of America and the State, County and Municipal Workers, both CIO. Since his return from covering the Atlantic City convention, Post Reporter Jerry Klutz has been flooded with requests from interested Government workers to tell the "real story" of what happened at the sessions. Klutz in today's Federal Diary presents a behind-the-scenes picture of events at Atlantic City.)

(By Jerry Klutz)

This is the story of the extreme left-wing policies and actions of the United Public Workers of America, the newly-created CIO union which has 75,000 members among Federal, State, county and municipal employes.

I arrived at the Atlantic City convention at noon a week ago yesterday April 24. I was promptly told—as were other reporters—that nothing newsworthy would happen for the remainder of that day as the convention had to go through the time-consuming process of merging the two CIO unions, the United Federal Workers of America, and the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America into UPWA.

As the afternoon wore on, George Morris of The Daily Worker, official Communist Party organ, and another New York reporter came into the convention hall at the Hotel Chelsea. Abram Flaxer, SCMWA president who was later elected president of UPWA, told them what he had told me earlier—that nothing newsworthy was on the schedule.

Morris, however, told Flaxer that he was concerned over the sharp criticism directed at the Russian foreign policy by Emil Rieve, president of CIO's textile workers and a leader of the right wing in the CIO, at the opening of the union's convention several blocks down the boardwalk. In so doing, Rieve endorsed the policies of both the President and State Secretary Byrnes.

This had made Morris most unhappy and he frankly told Flaxer that he needed a story from the public workers to offset Rieve's speech. Finally, The Daily Worker correspondent suggested to Flaxer that he "pull out the foreign policy resolution and get it passed." (Obviously, Morris knew what it proposed or he wouldn't have made the suggestion.)

Flaxer returned to the platform and took over the gavel. It was only a matter of minutes before the foreign policy resolution was called up for action.

The resolution in effect charged the demobilization of American troops throughout the world is being "deliberately delayed" to further the "imperialist ambitions" of the United States and Britain and to isolate Russia. It called for the immediate withdrawal

of American and British troops from "all friendly countries including China, the Philippines, France, Greece, India, Indonesia, Belgium and Iceland."

RED WITHDRAWAL SUGGESTED

What became the real issue was stated clearly by Peter N. Demas, an employee of the Jamesburg (N. J.) School For Boys. Demas suggested a line be added to recommend the withdrawal of Russian troops from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Estonia and other friendly countries. He paid high tribute to the Russian Army but he asked the delegates to play the game both ways. He said what was good for the United States was also good for the Soviet Union.

"I like the Russians," he said, "but I put the United States first."

He warned the convention that the CIO was losing members because many workers say it is communistic.

Demas was answered by obvious spokesmen for the union administration who came right out and charged the United States and Britain were plotting to destroy the Soviet Union by atomic bombs before the Russians could get themselves prepared. One speaker, Frank Herbst of New York, even went so far as to set the date he said he was told when it would happen, sometime in June.

OPponents BRANDED

The opponents of the resolution were called reactionaries and Red baiters.

In the end, Demas was shouted down and the resolution as proposed was approved by an overwhelming vote. Union officials say the vote was unanimous. However, several delegates told me they voted against it. They didn't make themselves heard very far if they did.

George Morris, the Daily Worker correspondent, was happy. He had his story to offset the Rieve speech.

(NOTE.—A foreign policy resolution similar to the one which was approved was voted on by many locals before the Atlantic City session.)

But at the opening of the convention on the day before, observers detected the Communist Party line in certain sentences of the officers' reports of both organizations. For example:

The UPWA report had this sentence which could have been taken from a Communist publication: "The present administration and Congress are actually carrying out a program of aggressive imperialism in foreign affairs and of attacking labor and lowering living standards at home."

POLICY DISCUSSION

The first 10 pages of the SCMWA officers' report discussed foreign policy and in it were typical left-wing phrases such as:

"We insist that the U. N. renounce their championship of the imperialistic-minded groups in our own country. * * * The universal denunciation of Churchill (for his Fulton speech) did not stop the British and American Tories in their drive for world domination * * * whatever the decisions of this convention all perspectives and plans will be swept away in a maelstrom of atomic destruction if the war mongers succeed in their scheme."

And this incident, I believe, is worth noting as it also indicates the line some members of the UPWA are following.

I made it a point to buy copies of The Daily Worker to read stories on the UPWA convention. On Friday morning I went up to the hotel newsstand to ask for a copy. Before the girl had a chance to answer me, a young fellow jumped up from a nearby chair and told me in an apologetic manner that the copies hadn't arrived but that they would be in at any minute. And then he asked me:

"Have you contributed to the fund?"

FUND TO BUY DAILY WORKER

I told him I had not and I asked him about it. He explained that some of the delegates had thought it vital that a Sunday copy of *The Worker* be given to each of the 600 delegates and that they had collected a fund to buy several hundred extra copies. He insisted I come back in half an hour and get a free copy. I agreed.

I did return within the hour and I found a stack of *Daily Workers* at least 3 feet high. I picked up a copy. The same young man came up, and, again apologetically, he asked: "You told me you hadn't contributed to the fund?" I nodded in agreement. Then he explained:

"We've had a little meeting and we've decided that those who haven't contributed should buy a copy." He went on to say that it was agreed the delegates would be likely to throw away the paper if it were given to them, but they would be sure to read it if they paid for it.

ON UNION MEMBERSHIP

Certain sections of the UPWA constitution which was adopted at the convention also give a clue to the new union's attitude. Many unions specifically bar Communists from either membership or from holding office. Section 2, article 3, of the UPWA constitution, in effect, welcomes Communists along with everyone else. It reads: "Membership in the international union shall not be denied by reason of sex, race, creed, color, nationality or religious or political affiliation or belief."

The constitution also leaves the door open to strikes against municipal, county, State, and the Federal Governments. SCMWA has had several strikes.

In defending the strike language in the constitution, Don Murray of Washington, told the convention that Attorney General Tom Clark had recently written a letter in which he said there was no prohibition to keep Federal workers from striking.

REPORT NOT CONFIRMED

A check at the Justice Department revealed that Clark wrote no such letter. The Attorney General did answer a letter from Senator LANGER of North Dakota, who asked if any Federal agency is barred from bargaining collectively with its employees. Clark said he did not know of any such act but he cited an opinion of the late President Roosevelt in which he said collective bargaining could not be transplanted into the public service.

Off the convention floor, a distinct minority of the delegates added up the officers' report, the foreign policy resolution, and some parts of the constitution as acts of an extreme left-wing group. They charged the union was following the Communist line.

But the only concrete step taken by the opposition was Friday afternoon at a caucus of New Jersey delegates. Delegate Joseph F. Hambrose, of Camden, an Internal Revenue employee, suggested the New Jersey group back an amendment to the constitution which would say:

"We oppose all that is un-American whether it is nazism, fascism, or communism."

His proposal lost by a voice vote of the New Jersey caucus.

I don't mean to suggest or even hint that every delegate at the convention except Demas and Hambrose were Communists or even fellow travelers. If anything, it's the other way around as I believe very few of the delegates were outright Communists.

But on its record at Atlantic City the union has had an extreme left-wing label pinned on it. It must change that record on foreign policy and other issues before it can shake off the label.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on May 19 Jerry Kluttz published a second column about Abram Flaxer and the

UPWA. In his column he published some of the personal history and background of Mr. Flaxer. I request unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the *RECORD* at this point in my remarks.

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

THE FEDERAL DIARY

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Federal workers not only have a new union, CIO's United Public Workers of America, but they also have a new leader, Abram Flaxer of New York, the union president.

Flaxer is relatively unknown here. He made his first public speech to UPWA members here Friday night in the Commerce Auditorium. Those who attended saw and heard a persuasive speaker, an able organizer and a vigorous individual.

The union leader has a pleasant personality. He appears to take things easy. He is short, has a mop of black hair, and a straight-stemmed pipe is seldom from his mouth.

Though only 41, Flaxer is an old hand in union affairs. He was an official of the AFL's public worker union in 1937 when John L. Lewis, then the CIO boss, appointed him to form the State, County and Municipal Workers of America. He did and he built it up to an organization of 331 locals and 50,000 members.

UNION HAS \$70,000 IN BANK

Flaxer today is more powerful than ever. His SCMWA was merged with CIO's United Federal Workers and he emerged as the dominant leader of the new union, UPWA. Two of the three top UPWA offices are held by former SCMWA officials, Flaxer and Bob Weinstein, director of organization. Eleanor Nelson, former UPWA president, is secretary-treasurer of UPWA.

Another important point—Flaxer's old union had a \$70,000 bank account while UPWA found it most difficult to balance its books and for years it was given grants by the CIO. Further, SCMWA had twice as many members as UFWA.

So there is no question that Flaxer is the No. 1 person in the UPWA and what he says and does must be reckoned with by Federal, State, county, and municipal governments.

HE CALLS SOURCES DOUBTFUL

[A preliminary draft of this article was made available to Flaxer for comment. Flaxer contented himself with charging that the article was part of a campaign of misrepresentation and vilification by the Post, passing up the opportunity to rebut specific passages.

[Flaxer asserted that Kluttz used sources which Kluttz would not consider reliable. He added that Kluttz distorted "the views which I expressed several years ago in a magazine article by quoting the article out of context." He said the true program and purposes of the Government employees union were outlined in an advertisement in the May 15 Post.—EDITOR'S NOTE.]

ACTIONS HE DEFENDS

Since UPWA was created a couple of weeks ago at Atlantic City, Flaxer has had his hands full defending a couple of actions on that convention. They are:

1. The provision in the UPWA constitution that leaves the way open to strikes against Federal, State, county, and municipal governments.

2. The Communist-line foreign-policy resolution which demanded the removal of American and British troops from friendly nations and refusing to demand the same of Russia.

The Congress is threatening to enact legislation which would bar from Federal employment any member of any organization that

asserts the right to strike against the Government.

RANK AND FILE BALK

Many union rank and filers are revolting against the pro-Russian foreign-policy resolution. They are supporting a substitute which supports the official CIO-PAC position which isn't Communist-biased.

And now, it is a proper question to ask—were these two actions of the UPWA convention accidents, or were they by design?

The official UPWA line, as set forth by Flaxer, Nelson, and other paid officers, is now to flatly oppose strikes in the public service, and (2) to kiss off the Communist line foreign policy resolution as a convention act made solely by the delegates themselves. Maybe so.

But since Flaxer and his old SCMWA are so little known here, and in view of the intense controversy of the two convention actions, it is certainly in order to go back a bit to see how Flaxer and his union have behaved in the past. Doing so, will give us a better perspective of what happened at the Atlantic City convention.

DAILY WORKER CITED

First, the strike controversy.

In September 1941, SCMWA held its second biennial convention. The *Daily Worker*, official Communist Party organ, had an article on September 27 of that year in which it said Flaxer supported a proposed constitutional provision which declared:

"There is no law or any legal precedent denying us the right to strike and we will fight any abridgment of this right."

Several months later, in the April 1942 edition of *Survey* magazine, Flaxer wrote:

"The Government employer asserts that a strike against the Government is akin to insurrection. Therefore, if the Government employee strikes he is subject to penalties. But if the Government employee refrains from striking, he is barred from the collective-bargaining rights to which other citizens are entitled. Can a more effective trap be devised for trade-union men and women?"

And this added bit of evidence—Flaxer's SCMWA has engaged in several strikes in the public service. A SCMWA official told me in Atlantic City that he thought the number was 8. He wasn't sure.

FOREIGN POLICY

I also talked to Flaxer about the strike provision. The UPWA president told me in Atlantic City that it would be possible to have a strike under the Constitution, but he offered the opinion that it would rarely, if ever, occur.

Now, let's take up the Communist-line foreign-policy resolution. Was it really the will of the 600 delegates—an accident—or was it by design?

In 1938, the Communist line was anti-Hitler. In March of that year Flaxer had his name on a statement issued by the American League for Peace and Democracy, cited as a Communist-front by the Attorney General, which demanded cooperation of the United States, Soviet Russia, and other peace-loving nations to prevent the Fascist powers from obtaining the means to carry on war.

On March 25, 1939, SCMWA members participated in a stop-Hitler parade in New York City.

IN THE LIFE OF THE PACT

Then the Stalin-Hitler pact was signed and let's see how Flaxer and his union behaved.

The *Daily Worker* of September 12, 1940, quotes Flaxer as denouncing compulsory military service, declaring it could knock into a cocked hat civil-service tenure, seniority rights, and income levels.

Earlier, on April 6, SCMWA members staged a demonstration in New York's Madison Square Park to show how much they hate war and want the United States to stay out. Members were urged to write the

President to tell him the Yanks are not coming. Peace committees were formed in many SCMWA locals and a weekly score sheet for peace was published by the union.

Flaxer was a leader in the American Peace Mobilization which threw a picket line about the White House, and which, oddly enough, was withdrawn the day before Hitler invaded the Soviet Union. The peace outfit was against lend-lease, convoys, conscription and the imperialist war.

ANOTHER SOMERSAULT

But Flaxer and his group flopped again when the Nazis invaded Russia. At the 1941 CIO convention, Flaxer said in part:

"The object of our foreign policy is the defeat of fascism and we are going to take every step that is necessary to bring about this defeat. * * * It is a policy that requires the revision of our Neutrality Act * * * and requires that our seamen stand ready to their stations and be ready to shoot at sight * * * it is a policy that recognizes that this war is our war."

With the war won, the Communist line has changed again. The line is to charge the United States and the British with imperialistic ambitions; to demand the withdrawal of all United States and British troops from friendly nations, and to charge the United States and Britain are ganging up to isolate and destroy Russia.

This is the line indorsed by the UPWA convention.

So again, I ask in all sincerity: Was the convention action an accident, or by design?

Now, here are other straws in the wind which may, or may not, be a clew as to the character of the new union.

A good many people here—including many UPWA members—were horrified when a motion was voted down in a caucus of some New Jersey delegates at Atlantic City to amend the constitution to bar Communists, Nazis and Fascists from membership in the union.

Well, the SCMWA convention held in Lansing, Mich., in September 1941, according to the New York Times, rejected a proposal to outlaw Communists, Nazis and Fascists from union office.

And again the New York Times, the February 3, 1938, edition, quoted Flaxer on the issue of barring Communists from membership in CIO unions to this effect:

"We do not inquire as to the political affiliations of our members. We have no specific way of knowing or any specific interest in the way our members exercise their political franchise."

A FEW MORE INCIDENTS

So is it by design or accident that the UPWA constitution permits Communists, Fascists and Nazis to be members and officers of the union?

Other straws:

The October 28, 1940, edition of the Daily Worker reveals that Flaxer was a delegate on the committee of election rights to protest to the then Governor Lehman against attempts by pressure and coercion to keep the Community Party off the ballot in the November 5 New York election.

The New York World-Telegram on March 25, 1943, said that Flaxer was one of three CIO national presidents who signed a protest attacking their own leaders and others who protested the executions of Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter, Polish laborites, by the Soviet Government.

And there are other straws. Add them up and make up your own mind. I happen to believe it is most important for Government employees generally, and UPWA members in particular, to know something of the records of their leaders.

And these are the vital statistics: Flaxer was born in Vilna, Russia, on September 12,

1904. He claims citizenship through his father, who was naturalized in Brooklyn in 1917. He holds a bachelor of science degree in philosophy which he received from City College of New York in 1932. He married Charlotte Rosswaag in 1941.

THROWN OUT OF CIO

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in 1949 the executive board of the CIO authorized CIO President Philip Murray to appoint a committee to conduct hearings and to report back to the board on certain charges of Communist activities which had been formally made to the board. The committee appointed by Philip Murray consisted of Emil Rieve, Harry Sayer, and Joseph Beirne. The hearings began on January 9, 1950, and were concluded on January 11. They had been postponed to January as a consequence of a suit filed by the UPWA seeking to enjoin the committee from holding the hearings.

The Rieve committee in its report unanimously concluded that the policies and activities of the UPWA are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the CIO constitution. The committee recommended to President Philip Murray that the CIO revoke the certificate of affiliation granted to the UPWA and expel it from the CIO. Such action was thereupon taken by the CIO.

THE UPWA AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The UPWA naturally moved in on the United States Atomic Energy Commission. In 1948 it moved for recognition as agent or representative of the Atomic Energy Commission's Argonne Laboratory at the University of Chicago. The AEC took courageous action and directed the University of Chicago to refrain from recognizing the UPWA as an agent or representative of employees at the Argonne Laboratory. I invite attention to a letter which appears at page 193 of the Fifth Semiannual Report of the AEC. This is the order barring the UPWA as a bargaining unit at the Argonne Laboratory.

UPWA AND THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The UPWA was especially vicious in its activities in the New York regional office of the Veterans' Administration which employed some 2,000 people. They openly passed out scurrilous handbills; they viciously attacked the manager and they openly endorsed certain political candidates and viciously attacked others.

On February 17, 1950, the Veterans' Administration withdrew all recognition of the UPWA as agent or representative of employees of the Veterans' Administration. I request unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a telegram dated February 17, 1950, from Carl R. Gray, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to all Veterans' Administration field stations. It will be noted that this action was taken by the Veterans' Administration after the expulsion of the UPWA from the CIO for Communist activities.

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

TELEGRAM TO MANAGERS OF ALL VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FIELD STATIONS, FEBRUARY 17, 1950

The Veterans' Administration has as a matter of public policy determined that the United Public Workers of America will no longer be recognized as an organization representing Veterans' Administration employees. Veterans' Administration officials will no longer either contact UPWA as one of the regularly recognized organizations representing employees or confer with UPWA representatives seeking consultation with regard to matters affecting Veterans' Administration employees.

The content of this telegram will be brought to the attention of all employees.

CARL R. GRAY,

Administrator, Veterans' Affairs.

THE UPWA AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the State Department in an order dated February 27, 1950, formally withdrew its recommendation of the UPWA as an agent or representative of employees of the Department of State. I request unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point Department of State departmental announcement No. 44 of February 27, 1950. It will be noted that this action was taken after the expulsion of the UPWA from the CIO.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE DEPARTMENTAL ANNOUNCEMENT No. 44

FEBRUARY 27, 1950.

Subject: Employee organizations.

1. Effective immediately the Department of State no longer recognizes the UPWA as an acceptable agent or representative of its employees. All personnel are hereby ordered not to enter into negotiations of any kind with this union.

2. This order does not affect in any way existing policy, as set out in section 383.1 of the Manual of Regulations and Procedures, which states that the Department subscribes to the belief that its employees have a right to join or refrain from joining employee organizations. The policy further states that any choice made in this matter will be without interference, coercion, restraint, fear of discrimination or reprisal.

PANAMA CANAL

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in July 1946 the UPWA launched a drive to organize Panama Canal employees. By September 1946 no less than 17,000 United States employees in the Canal Zone had joined Abram Flaxer's union.

An excellent report of this activity by the UPWA was contained in an article in Plain Talk of November 1946. I request unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Stalin's Hand in the Panama Canal" by Ralph de Toledano.

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

STALIN'S HAND IN THE PANAMA CANAL

(By Ralph De Toledano)

(The material on which this article is based comes from unimpeachable sources. United States official quarters in Panama as well as in Washington have followed the undercover developments in the Canal Zone

with increasing anxiety. The author saw service in the Caribbean during the war and has a complete command of the Spanish language. He has long been a student of Falangist and Communist activities in Latin America. In the preparation of this article he has had the cooperation of persons in direct touch with the situation in the Canal Zone.)

When the United Public Workers, whose flagrant pro-Soviet record is unsurpassed among the labor unions of America, suddenly launched a whirlwind drive last July to organize the Government employees in the Panama Canal Zone, the question arose before the men in charge of our national defense:

"Is Stalin's hand behind it?"

The Soviet Government, even as those of Germany, and Japan in their days, has long taken an unhealthy interest in the big ditch—the keystone of the American defense system. As far back as 1933 the world was treated to the sensational exposure of an international espionage ring which showed Stalin's hand deep in the Military Establishment of the Panama Canal.

Now the leadership of the United Public Workers has demonstrated its unswerving loyalty to the Soviet system on numerous occasions, as our examination of the record will reveal. This is the union whose constitution favors the right of Federal employees to strike, a provision denounced by President Truman last June and he warned that if it ever happened the Government would cease to exist.

Why did the United Public Workers suddenly descend upon the faraway Canal Zone in its organizing activities when there are so many richer fields to cultivate right here at home? This question became a veritable challenge when it was announced officially by the CIO last September that 17,000 United States employees in the Canal Zone had been brought under the banner of the United Public Workers, forming in one swoop the largest local in that union.

As there is no private industry in the Canal Zone, the entire working force in our key defense area is claimed as being under the jurisdiction of the United Public Workers. This includes such diverse groups as teachers, hotel, and restaurant workers, locomotive engineers, nurses, doctors, power plant workers, truck drivers, painters, machinists, street cleaners, salesgirls, bookkeepers.

No wonder that top Government officials have expressed their anxiety over this development as a possible threat to the security of the country in the event of war.

If Stalin has in the Canal Zone, too, his secret battalion for the organization of catastrophe—as described by none other than Harold J. Laski—then he would be in a position to strike a deadly blow of sabotage at the jugular vein of our system of defense. Through such an operation he could paralyze our Navy and immobilize a whole fleet of aircraft carriers in a moment of crisis.

Panama began to witness unusual Communist activity in July 1931 during our great depression. It was 2 years after Stalin had declared before the special American Commission of the Communist International that when a revolutionary crisis develops in America, that will be the beginning of the end of world capitalism as a whole.

That month, I am reliably informed, a raid on a three-story building in West Sixteenth Street, Panama City, disclosed an underground Communist press. Many arrests followed. Leaflets and other papers taken in the raids showed that the Communist Party of Panama described itself as a section of the Communist International.

The following year a certain mysterious Russian, Ivan Krassin, was arrested in Panama. It then appeared that Moscow had access to incoming and outgoing telegrams at Panama through an employee of the All American Cables & Radio Corporation.

In October 1932 a postal clerk in the Canal Zone opened a "dead letter" which had been returned to Cristobal because it had not been claimed at its destination.

The contents of the letter included two secret military documents, a summary memorandum on the antiaircraft practice of the artillery in the Canal Zone and the text of the so-called White plan described by the sender as a complete plan for the subjection of Panama in the case of revolution. The White plan was regarded by our military authorities as a vital secret plan for the defense of the Canal Zone.

While the investigation into the matter was going on, Col. C. G. Bunker, in command of Fort Sherman in the Canal Zone, discovered that confidential documents were missing from his files. This was in the spring of 1933.

There followed the arrest on espionage charges of Corp. Robert Osman, Headquarters Battery, First Coast Artillery, stationed at Fort Sherman. He was found to have had connections in New York City and admitted receiving money from a certain Communist whom he knew as Harry Duryea.

From Panama the threads ran to New York City. Osman was found in possession of a photograph of a Russian girl who went under the name of Frema Karry, of 6801 Bay Parkway, Brooklyn. Miss "Karry" who then vanished without trace, had written to Osman boasting of "being a cog in the machine" of the Communist movement. The "dead letter" had been addressed to a Mr. Herman Meyers of 1859 East Ninth Street, Brooklyn. It proved impossible to locate or identify Mr. Meyers. The mysterious Harry Duryea gave a mailing address in care of Dr. Joseph Stenbuck, of 444 Park Avenue, New York City, but the mention of Duryea's name there elicited no information.

There were many other threads running from "Big Ditch" to New York. Among the papers seized in the Panama City raids there had been a letter from one Arnold Reid, representative in Panama of the Colonial Committee of the Young Communist League of America. He wrote: "Immediately communicate with B. Small, 3451 Giles Place, Bronx." The correspondent in the Bronx was alleged in official reports to be a Communist Party member.

The Osman case attracted national attention. He was court-martialed, found guilty, and sentenced to 20 years at hard labor. One day in September 1933 a middle-aged couple called on Louis Waldman, New York labor attorney, with an introduction from a prominent labor leader. They were the parents of Cpl. Robert Osman. They pleaded with him to take over the defense of their son. After inquiring into the matter, he agreed to do so and went down to Panama to appeal the case, which eventually ended in an acquittal of Osman.

Throughout his investigations, the identity of Harry Duryea remained a major mystery. On March 21, 1934, the New York Times carried the following dispatch from Paris:

"A world-wide spy ring with a recruiting center in New York and formed to deal in military secrets of the United States and other countries, was said by the authorities to have been revealed by a Mr. and Mrs. Robert Gordon Switz."

On May 8, 1934, en route to Panama, in the lobby of the Hotel Nacional in Havana, Mr. Waldman picked up the March 26 issue of Time. As he leafed through it, his attention was caught by a photograph. Acting on a hunch, he tore out the page and took it with him.

"When I saw Osman, I took this photograph from my pocket," writes Waldman in the chapter Espionage in the Caribbean of his autobiography, *Labor Lawyer*. "I cut it out so as to expose the face, head, and shoulders of the photograph. The picture showed the long, narrow head of a young

man with a small, ungenerous, dissipated mouth, cynical, pulled up to one side almost to the point of distortion; the nose was long and thin with a slight malformation at the bridge; and even in the black and white photograph the shading of the full and wavy hair suggested that it might be blond.

"Laying the picture before Osman, and watching him narrowly, I asked, 'Robert, tell me the truth, do you know who this man is?'"

"Without a moment's hesitation, the young corporal replied, 'Sure, I do. That's my friend, Harry Duryea.'"

The Switzes had been arrested by the French police on December 18, 1933, and found in possession of a collection of baffling documents. Held incommunicado for several months, the Switzes maintained their innocence until confronted with their thumbprints discovered on a package of film brought from Switzerland which contained a key to a secret code for espionage communications. The Switzes then confessed and admitted meeting agents of an international spy ring in Berlin in July 1933.

Photographs of Robert Gordon Switz in the press led to his identification by Osman as Harry Duryea, his Communist patron. The investigation disclosed that Switz had registered at a hotel in Colon, Panama, on May 26, 1932, and on March 27, 1933, the latter date coinciding with the time when Colonel Bunker discovered the disappearance of secret documents.

As a result of the confessions by the Switzes, a number of persons, including some high French officers, received long prison sentences. When Gen. Walter Krivitsky, erstwhile chief of the Soviet secret service in Western Europe, who was found shot under mysterious circumstances in Washington in February 1940, was asked about Switz and a certain Alfred Tilden mentioned in the press, he replied:

"Switz? Yes; I knew him. And this 'Alfred'—I knew him well * * *. He was Soviet espionage chief in the United States in the early thirties."

Such is the background of Stalin's interest in the Panama Canal.

The United Public Workers of America—what is it? In addition to being a union, is its leadership also engaged in advancing Communist ends?

The United Public Workers was formed last April at a convention held in Atlantic City through the amalgamation of the two CIO unions, the United Federal Workers, with an estimated membership of 25,000, and the State, county and municipal workers, with a claimed membership of 50,000.

The United Federal Workers had a long history of adherence to Stalin's policies. It had been led by Eleanor Nelson, regarded by insiders as a pro-Communist, to whom the Daily Worker, Communist organ, devoted a fulsome biographical sketch with her photograph on August 9, 1942. As far back as October 1937, she was one of the speakers at the Communist-controlled National Negro Congress. In March 1938, she addressed another Communist-sponsored meeting in Washington. She was a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which was active in behalf of Earl Browder when he was convicted and imprisoned in connection with his passport case. When Helen Miller was dismissed by the Department of Labor on suspicion of engaging in subversive activities, the United Federal Workers came to her defense.

Before the outbreak of the Second World War, the official organ of this union, the Federal Record, agitated for a world-wide fight against the Fascist aggressors. After August 23, 1939, upon the conclusion of the Stalin-Hitler pact, the line of the Federal Workers suddenly changed. Its various publications began to denounce all warlike expenditures, to oppose the projected draft, and to urge affiliation with the Emergency

Peace Committee which was cooperating with the American Peace Mobilization conducting the picket line around the White House.

In September 1940, following the adoption of a resolution opposing the proposed draft law, Kenneth Decker, president of the WPA local of the union, and several officers and members resigned, charging that this is the latest of a series of instances in which a small official group has undertaken to commit the union to a stand on political questions without full consultation with the membership.

During the period of the Stalin-Hitler friendship, the union leaders supported Communist-led strikes in important defense industries such as Allis-Chalmers, Ford, International Harvester. This was as late as April 1941.

Soon after June 22, 1941, when Hitler attacked Russia, the policy of the United Federal Workers once more changed sharply. It agitated for the passage of the teen-age draft bill without restrictions, for a break in diplomatic relations with Vichy France and Franco Spain, for a declaration of war on Finland and, of course, for the immediate opening of a second front—this in October 1942.

Among the fronts with which the Federal Workers Union had cooperated were: Workers' Alliance, Consumers' Union, Labor Research Association, the Washington Bookshop, and the Washington Committee for Aid to China. Among the speakers who had addressed the union was Donald Henderson, dismissed Columbia University instructor and confirmed member of the Communist Party. The former editor of the union's Federal Record, Frank Rhylick, became the Washington correspondent of the Daily Worker.

Now let's look at the record of the other partner to the merger, the State, County and Municipal Workers Union, headed by Abram Flaxer, another stalwart, and see how closely he hewed to the Moscow line.

On February 3, 1938, when the question of barring Communists from membership in CIO unions was under discussion, the New York Times quoted Flaxer to this effect: "We do not inquire as to the political affiliations of our members." In March of that year Flaxer signed a statement by the American League for Peace and Democracy, an organization which Attorney General Biddle had cited as a Communist front. Later Flaxer was a member of the committee which protested to Governor Lehman against attempts to keep the Communist Party off the ballot.

Flaxer's union participated on March 25, 1939, in a "Stop Hitler" parade in New York City. When the Stalin-Hitler pact came, he did his somersault. On April 6, 1940, his followers staged a demonstration in Madison Square under the Communist slogan, "The Yanks Are Not Coming." Flaxer was reported by the Daily Worker of September 12, 1940, as violently denouncing the proposed draft law. He was active in the American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House. Until June 22, 1941, the date of Hitler's invasion of Russia, the conflict in Europe was to Flaxer an "imperialist war." Some months later, at the 1941 convention of the CIO, Mr. Flaxer described his foreign policy as follows: "It is a policy which recognizes that this war is our war."

In September 1941, the State, County and Municipal Workers of America, at their convention in Lansing, Mich., rejected a proposal to bar Communists, Nazis, and Fascists from holding office in the union.

When Ehrlich and Alter, the two Jewish labor leaders from Poland who had sought refuge in Russia, were executed by Stalin in spite of the intercession of Wendell Willkie and other prominent liberals, there was a storm of protest in American labor circles. The Communists rushed to the defense of the executioners. Flaxer was one of those who publicly upheld Stalin's wanton defiance of justice.

At the Lansing convention Flaxer had supported a constitutional provision affirming for Government employees "the right to strike" and declaring that "we will fight any abridgment of this right." As a matter of fact, Flaxer's union had experimented in several strikes in the public services, just as a branch of Eleanor Nelson's Federal Workers had once staged a strike at the Social Security Board in Baltimore. Mr. Flaxer, in a magazine article, made light of the contention that a strike against the Government might amount to insurrection.

The United Public Workers of America came into existence in Atlantic City on April 25, 1946, through the merger of the two unions whose records have been outlined here. The new union made its debut at the very time that Soviet imperialism went on a rampage throughout the world. The union was new, but the familiar figure of Abram Flaxer appeared as its president. The secretary-treasurer was Eleanor Nelson. Other members of its executive board included the following persons who have been in varying degrees associated with Communist fronts: Robert Weinstein, director of organization, and vice presidents Mort Furay, James King, Thomas Richardson, and Arthur Stein. Two comrades, Ajay and Abrashkin, made up the art staff of the union's publications.

The newly named United Public Workers of America started out by flinging two significant challenges in the face of the Nation. The first of these was the provision in its constitution safeguarding the right of Government employees to strike. This challenge was promptly taken up by the Government of the United States. President Truman characterized it as a threat to the existence of the Government. In the Congress, Senator Joseph Ball, of Minnesota, sponsored legislation, which was quickly adopted, making it mandatory for Government departments to secure from their employees affidavits declaring that they had not engaged and will not engage in a strike against the Government.

The prompt action of the Senate had an immediate effect upon Flaxer and his associates. The executive board of the United Public Workers hurriedly met in June to save its 25,000 Federal members from possible dismissal, and passed a resolution banning any strike against the Federal Government "by any local of this union." This apparently leaves the door open to strikes against State, county, and local governments. Presumably the same executive board could by a similar resolution reverse the union's policy again, as the original provision in its constitution has not been repealed.

The second challenge thrown down by the United Public Workers was the pro-Russian foreign policy stand taken by the Atlantic City convention. It adopted a series of resolutions hardly distinguishable from those passed at Communist Party conventions. Their wording made it appear that the United States, and not the Soviet Union, was responsible for postwar disunity.

The convention demanded the removal of American and British troops from friendly countries, but refused to ask the same of Russia. Yet a demand was made that the secret of the atom bomb be shared with the Soviet Union. A resolution urging the severance of diplomatic relations with Spain was also passed. The Selective Service Act was attacked as an undemocratic maneuver to push America into war against Soviet Russia.

In brief, the foreign policy declaration of the United Public Workers was couched in terms which might have been culled from Daily Worker and Pravda editorials, the main theme of which has been that "Anglo-American imperialism" menaces world peace.

The road from Atlantic City to the Panama Canal became extraordinarily short. One week after the birth of the United Public

Workers there was a May Day parade in Panama City. Three thousand participated in the march, thousands watched. The marchers demanded the establishment of diplomatic relations between Panama and the Soviet Union. They carried banners calling upon the masses "to break the chains of capitalism" and denouncing "Anglo-American imperialism."

The following day, on May 2, "Operation Panama," as it was labeled in the pro-Communist press, was formally launched. "A spectacular organizing drive in the Panama Canal Zone has brought over 17,000 United States Government employees who work for the Panama Canal into the ranks of the CIO Public Workers," announced the CIO News on September 2, 1946.

Spectacular indeed was the rise of the Canal Zone Workers' Union, chartered as local 713 of the United Public Workers, upon the arrival in Panama of its educational director, Leonard H. Goldsmith. He exploited shrewdly the justified economic grievances of the workers due to the high cost of living. He demanded equality in wages between native labor and white American workers. All this fell on fertile soil when sown to the refrain of "Yankee imperialism."

Early in August Goldsmith addressed a mass rally of 10,000 on the Pacific side at the Olympic Stadium in Panama City. This was followed by a rally of 6,000 on the Atlantic side. Goldsmith triumphantly announced that he had secured from Governor Joseph H. Mehahey of the Panama Canal, a satisfactory settlement of all his demands and space for union quarters at the Pacific and Atlantic entrances to the Isthmus. He also declared that the officers of the Panama Canal West Indian Employees Association had unanimously agreed to join the CIO. He promised the new union the support of the PAC (Political Action Committee) in the United States to promote its interests and aims.

"Operation Panama" was apparently a pronounced success. But it is doubtful if the vast majority of the Canal Zone employees knew the history of Len Goldsmith. The record shows that in 1941 and in 1943 a Lenoard Goldsmith signed a Communist Party election petition from an address at 3145 Fourth Street, Brighton, Brooklyn, N. Y. Although a native of Tennessee, his career includes service as executive secretary of the CIO Council of New Jersey.

In 1939, Goldsmith was a member of the civil-rights committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy; in July of that year he addressed the National Conference of the International Labor Defense; he signed petitions issued by the National Federation of Constitutional Liberties against the deportation of Harry Bridges. All the three organizations involved were cited as Communist fronts by Attorney General Biddle.

Goldsmith was a member of the National Council of the American Peace Mobilization which picketed the White House and encouraged strikes in defense plants during the Stalin-Hitler collaboration. He is a sponsor of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, a pro-Communist outfit. He was one of the signers of a statement in support of the Daily Worker on the occasion of its twentieth anniversary in January 1944.

Such is the partial record of Len Goldsmith, the man who, according to the CIO News, spearheaded the campaign in Panama. Before returning to the United States, Goldsmith elevated Edward Cheres, a pharmacist employed in the Canal Zone, as regional director of the new big local. Cheres, who was born in Brooklyn in 1908, has, according to my information, been an employee of the Canal Zone only since 1945.

The world over, pro-Communist organizers have always displayed a special interest in

the field of communications. Len Goldsmith, during his short sojourn in the Canal Zone, announced that the CIO planned to organize a longshoremen's union in Panama. He introduced to the Olympic Stadium rally M. L. Edwards, a delegate of the CIO Transport Workers' Union, whose assignment was to organize the employees of the Pan-American World Airways. One of these, a certain Lewendowsky who now goes under the name of A. E. Lovern, became the CIO representative in the Zone.

"Operation Panama" will probably be continued until the airways and shipping of the Canal Zone are brought under the control of the CIO. According to Washington press reports, Robert Weinstein, national director of organization for the United Public Workers, left for Panama on October 16, 1946, on a routine inspection trip. He was accompanied by J. L. Strobel, an organizer, who will remain in the Canal Zone for 6 months.

Robert Weinstein was an instructor at the Communist Jefferson School. He has been active in numerous "fronts," and has a record which might be the envy of many a Communist leader. A Robert Weinstein, residing at 4321 Eighteenth Avenue Kings County, N. Y., was the signer of a Communist election petition, No. 2366, on September 21, 1941. Significantly enough, a Jacob Strobel is listed as the signer of Communist election petition No. 10339, on June 7, 1942, for Israel Amter, once American representative at Communist International Headquarters in Moscow.

Coinciding with the arrival of the two CIO organizers in the Canal Zone was the appearance in Panama City of a new Communist magazine, *ACLA*, decorated with pictures of Stalin, Lenin, and Molotov.

In a poor country such as Panama, the comrades have been able to begin publication of a kind of naive *New Masses*, 76 pages thick with a two-color glossy cover, devoted to attacks on "el imperialismo yanqui" and to the glorification of the Soviet wonderland which is not imperialist because it is a socialist state and therefore has no need to exploit weak countries.

In the first issue of *ACLA*, an editorial titled "The Soviet Union, Defender of Latin America," takes up the question of espionage. The editors state that "while the American embassies are nests of spies . . . the diplomatic centers of the Soviet Union are agencies for peace and aid . . . which assure the stability and development of our economy."

The editors of *ACLA* forgot to tell the people of Panama of the recent revelations of Soviet machinations in the northern neighbor of the United States, Canada, where the Soviet Embassy was exposed by its own trusted official to be a nest of vast hemispheric espionage.

While the drive was going on in the Canal Zone, on July 19 the country was treated to a sensational announcement from Washington, which the *New York Times* carried under the headline: "Five ousted by Army to guard security." The dispatch reported that the War Department had dismissed five scientific workers employed at the Aberdeen Proving Ground, all of which were officials of the local union of the United Public Workers. The reason for the unusual act was officially given as "in the interest of national security." There followed a single protest by President Flaxer the next day, and then there was silence on the part of the vocal leadership of the union.

When the *Washington Star* recently raised the question editorially "as to where the loyalties of the leaders of this union lie," it did so for the avowed reason that their activity in the Panama Canal Zone might "endanger the security of this country."

The Panama Canal has long been regarded by our leading military authorities as the key to our Atlantic and Pacific defenses, as well as the central pivot of our security in

Latin America. For this reason, the Government of the Canal Zone, with its complex administration, is semi-military in character and has been placed in the hands of the United States Army. Its employees are in the civilian field as vital to our defenses as the civilian employees of our War Department, for they have access to secret technical and military information of the highest value. Who controls these employees is a matter of major concern to the Nation, transcending any questions of the rights of labor unions in the ordinary sense.

The facts presented here show a development in the Canal Zone which calls for an immediate congressional investigation and for appropriate congressional action. Stalin's hand, which once delved deeply into our affairs in Panama, must not now be given any opportunity to resume its activities.

UPWA NOT ON SUBVERSIVE LIST

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the UPWA is not on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, even though its inclusion has been recommended not only by the FBI, but also by several other Government agencies, including the President's Loyalty Review Board.

There are reports that the Veterans' Administration, the Department of State, the Treasury Department, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Defense, have suggested to the Attorney General that the UPWA be included on the subversive list. In that connection I request unanimous consent to insert in the *RECORD* at this point an article by Washington Post Reporter Jerry Klutz which was published on March 29, 1951.

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

THE FEDERAL DIARY

(By Jerry Klutz)

NEW MOVE REPORTED TO PLACE UPWA ON SUBVERSIVE LIST

A new move is being made to have the left-wing United Public Workers of America placed on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, it was learned yesterday.

The Veterans' Administration is reported to be the most recent agency to urge that a subversive label be pinned on UPWA which claims 25,000 Federal-employee members. In addition, Civil Service's Loyalty Review Board is said to have discussed the possibility with the Justice Department.

State, Treasury, Commerce, and Defense are among other agencies that have either recommended that UPWA be listed as subversive or have discussed the matter with Justice officials.

The FBI gathers evidence which the Attorney General considers before deciding whether an organization shall be placed on his subversive list. It's reliably reported that the FBI has turned over material on the UPWA to the Attorney General.

The UPWA was expelled from the CIO a year ago on charges that it followed the Communist line instead of CIO policy.

Several agencies have refused to recognize the UPWA and meet with its leaders. Any number of UPWA members have been dropped from their Government jobs on loyalty charges. Most people consider the rank and file UPWA members as loyal but misled by the union leaders.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, why has the Attorney General not included the UPWA on the subversive list?

Why has the President not issued an order barring the UPWA as a representative of employees in all departments, agencies, and branches of the executive department?

Why is it that the Federal Government continues in its employ members of the UPWA, a Communist-dominated union expelled from the CIO almost 2 years ago because of its Communist activities?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to state to the Senator from Utah that a procedural question has been raised, and the Chair would like to inquire of the Senator from Utah whether the resolution which he has submitted represents the expressed wish of the Committee on the Judiciary, as opposed to a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WATKINS. As this moment I am not prepared to say, but I would understand that it is the action of the entire committee. Although I cannot speak for the whole committee, I am sure it represents the action of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been advised that the precedents of the Senate require that resolutions of the type submitted by the Senator from Utah be properly offered in the name of the full committee, rather than in the name of a subcommittee. The question appears to be whether the resolution in question was authorized by the membership of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WATKINS. I cannot answer that question definitely, as I have already stated, but I do know that the material was prepared by the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary. I refer to the resolution and the report. I am not advised whether that was actually the case with reference to the full Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Because the procedural question has been raised, the Chair would like to inquire of the Senator from Utah whether he would be willing, in view of the uncertainty, to offer the resolution in his name.

Mr. WATKINS. Since the question has been raised and I cannot answer definitely for the full committee, I would be very happy to do so, and I offer it in my own name as a matter of information for the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appreciates the Senator's consideration and courtesy.

Mr. WATKINS. I do so with the statement that possibly later we may have the concurrence of the full Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would accept the resolution as submitted in the name of the Senator from Utah, and would refer the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary for a decision.

Mr. WATKINS. May I have it understood that it will lie on the table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah that his resolution lie on the table? In the absence of objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF
GEORGE KENNAN

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour, I shall not detain the Senate for more than a few minutes.

Mr. President, I would like to suggest to the Senate in general and the Foreign Relations Committee in particular, that where questions of foreign policy are concerned, less haste and more light would be desirable.

I doubt if there ever was a time in our history when the foreign policy encountered graver doubt with our people than now. No small part of this doubt has been provoked by the State Department itself. The Department's record for suppressing information, for distorting facts, and for going about its business by stealth is notorious.

I do not think the Senate should, by precipitate action, run the risk of convincing the country that we are collaborating with the State Department in these stealthy, if not outrightly conspiratorial tactics.

As a case in point, I may mention the confirmation of George Kennan to be Ambassador to Russia. This confirmation was put through at the very close of business and without a record vote, last Thursday, March 13, 1952, while the Senate was, for a brief moment, in executive session.

The only reference to the confirmation of Mr. Kennan is found on page 2282 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13. The RECORD states:

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George F. Kennan to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified forthwith.

I would like to call to the attention of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a few facts. The nomination of Mr. Kennan was sent over by the President some weeks ago. Silence rested upon the scene. I assumed that, of course, a public hearing would be held upon this nomination.

What happened? In the Daily Digest section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 11, 1952, there appeared an announcement, and I quote the relevant portions entire:

Committee Meetings for Wednesday, March 12 . . . Committee on Foreign Relations, executive, on nominations, 10:30 a. m., room F-53, Capitol.

That is all; not a word about Mr. Kennan.

The Daily Digest section of the RECORD on the next day—Wednesday March 12, 1952—contained this statement, which again I quote verbatim:

Committee on Foreign Relations: In executive session, committee approved for reporting the nomination of George F. Kennan to be Ambassador to Soviet Russia.

That is all. There was a closed session of the Foreign Relations Committee on the nomination, and no record vote was taken.

The next day, as I said—Thursday, March 13, 1952—the nomination was

brought up in the Senate at the very close of business and, without a record vote of the Senate itself, was hustled through confirmation.

It so happened that I intended to bring some material to the attention of the committee. I attempted a time or two to find out when the matter of Kennan's nomination would be up, but was told that the time was undetermined. I assumed that some form of clear notice on the matter of this nomination would be given. It was not.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee may tell me that due notice of committee action in the Kennan nomination was published in the Daily Digest. He is correct. It was so published. He may tell me that if I wished to discuss the Kennan nomination on the Senate floor, I could have done it on Thursday, when Kennan's name was brought up. That is most certainly true also.

All I can say is that I did not see the announcement in the Digest, nor was I present the next day at the close of business in the Senate when the Kennan nomination was rushed through.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee may tell me that my failure to see the announcement is no fault of his. True again, but I would point out to him that American relations with Russia are critical, that doubt and suspicion of our State Department are wide-spread, and that voters generally—and, I may say, rightly—observe Senators very narrowly these days on these questions.

The only excuse I have is press of business. I know that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has his hands full. So do I. He is a candidate for reelection next fall. So am I. These are busy days. But I cannot help but feel that where the nomination of a man to be Ambassador to Russia is concerned, some more forthright warning might be given than a three-line notice in the back of the RECORD, with subsequent Senate action with only a few Members present.

The voters, if they got wind of this, might be more than suspicious. They would be doubly suspicious if they knew that the nominee had, upon occasion, revealed the fact that the State Department had under consideration the granting of economic aid to the Chinese Communists.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee may tell me that it is useless to lock the stable door after the horse is stolen. Right again.

All the same, belated though the arrival of the information may be, I feel compelled to relate to the Senate a very curious story.

The Senate will recall that some months ago, during May and June 1951 there was an investigation into the circumstances of General MacArthur's recall and of the military situation in the Far East. This investigation was a joint affair, conducted by the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, and the Foreign Relations Committee. During these MacArthur hearings a great mass of papers, documents, and materials of every conceivable sort came into

the hands of committee members. So many avenues of questioning were opened up that it was impossible to explore them all.

It so happened that among the materials brought to the attention of a number of Senators was an off-the-record statement by Mr. Kennan. For some reason—why, I do not know—this Kennan fragment was lost sight of. It was not used as a basis for questions during the MacArthur hearings. I think it important, however, that the Senate and the public should know about it now.

This statement was made at a hearing held by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on June 17, 1949. The subject under consideration was the Korean Aid Act of 1949. Mr. Kennan was the witness, and at the time he was Director of the Policy Planning Staff of the State Department.

Representative SMITH, a member of the House committee, asked Mr. Kennan this question:

I would like to know if the State Department has reached the conclusion that China is gone, so far as we are concerned. Are we ready to do business with the new Red government that is about to be set up?

To this question Mr. Kennan replied as follows:

The term "do business" is a very wide one. If it means trade and having economic relations, that will depend upon how that new regime, which is not yet set up, but which will be set up, how it will conduct itself, what respect it will show for the United States, and what terms it will permit that trade to be carried out on.

I realize what has happened in China has been a very unfortunate thing. There is no question about that. None of us are complacent about it. I can promise you that. We are going to go through a bad time. China is.

A greater part of China for a time will be in the hands of those who are thoroughly poisoned against us and from whom we must expect very unfriendly treatment.

I think we will have difficulty in handling those people. We are not without cards in the coming period. They will require economic assistance. I think it will be vital to them.

Mr. President, let me repeat the last four sentences of the Kennan statement:

I think we—

That is, the United States Government—

will have difficulty in handling those people—

That is, the Chinese Communists—

We are not without cards—

Said Mr. Kennan—

in the coming period. They will require economic assistance. I think it will be vital to them.

Mr. President, in my time I have seen and heard of astounding State Department statements, but I cannot recall one that surpasses this remark of Mr. Kennan. It is hardly surprising that Representative VOYTS, of the House Foreign Relations Committee, after hearing Mr. Kennan say "They will require economic assistance. I think it will be vital to them," should instantly ask Mr. Kennan this question:

Who are?

To which question Mr. Kennan replied:

The Chinese Communists.

That is to say, Mr. President, Mr. Kennan, when testifying regarding State Department policy, made it perfectly clear that our Government contemplated the possibility of economic aid to the Chinese Communist Government, provided that government behaved.

I suppose there still are at large some starry-eyed dreamers who believe that the leopard is going to change his spots, that Communists who are now and always have been participants in an international conspiracy, will perhaps reform. But, Mr. Kennan, presumably, can hardly be put into any such category. Or can he?

Mr. President, so astonished were committee members at Mr. Kennan's statement, that at the next hearing on the Korean aid bill some of them cross-examined Mr. Kennan further.

Mr. Kennan is in a special position in respect to Russian affairs. In certain circles of what might be called intellectual cafe society, something of an aura hangs over Mr. Kennan by virtue of the fact that his great-uncle George wrote a famous work on Siberia and the Exile System.

Nor is this all. Mr. Kennan entered the Foreign Service more than 25 years ago—on September 1, 1926, to be exact—and during the 1920's, as the House committee was informed by him, he was sent to Russia with "four or five others to undergo a very thorough and long term study on Russian matters." Later, in 1933, he accompanied William Bullitt to Moscow, and was a foreign service officer there. In other words, Mr. Kennan, the eminent intellectual, was no Johnny-come-lately in respect to communism. He had observed it in Russia at first hand. He had pondered over it long.

The House committee questioned him closely. Mr. Kennan stated that at the time of the Yalta Conference, when he was Minister-Counselor of the Embassy at Moscow, he did not believe the Soviet Union would cooperate with us after the war. He said he had been concerned with Russian matters for many years. He said that he and those of the State Department colleagues who had been trained in Russian affairs since the 1920's, had very deep misgivings about things.

But—

Said Mr. Kennan, and I am quoting what he said to the House Foreign Affairs Committee on June 20, 1949—

we were a small handful of people and the appreciations that we had were far too small, too shallow, and they were among far too few people, really, to effect the course of events at that time.

In effect, Mr. Kennan tells us that all along he suspected Russian and Communist designs, but that his influence was then too slight to affect policy.

But by 1949 Mr. Keenan had become Director of the Policy Planning Staff of the State Department. Presumably he was a much more influential person.

Yet, with a perfectly straight face, this man told a House committee that we are going to be in a strong position with

the Chinese Communists because they will need our economic aid.

Is this Mr. Kennan's idea of how to deal with our most deadly enemies?

I recommend to the Senate that it look closely into this matter. It is useless to examine the printed hearings for this particular statement of Mr. Kennan. I refer to the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress, first session, on House bill 5330, June 8-23, 1949. It is useless because Mr. Kennan's remarks were off the record. But if the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will inspect the unexpurgated transcript of those hearings for June 17 and 20, 1949, it will find there the passages I have cited.

I had supposed that Mr. Kennan's record and accomplishments would be reviewed for the Senate in some detail. I would say the subject deserved it.

Some months ago, less than a year, Mr. Kennan published a book called American Diplomacy 1900-1950. I had supposed that this curious work would be analyzed for the benefit of the Senate.

Mr. Kennan is the mysterious "Mr. X," the author of the American containment policy against Russia. His discussions of this interesting theory were originally published in the magazine Foreign Affairs in July 1947 and in April 1951. The discussions are included in his book on American Diplomacy.

It seems to me that the performance of a man who, as a high State Department official, was thinking about economic aid to the Chinese Communists, would be more than interesting to the Senate, and, I may say to the Nation also.

Furthermore, the author of the containment policy deserves special attention. I think he should have had it. If the United States succeeds in containing Russia and her satellites as successfully during the next 5 years as we have done in the past 5 years—and I say this, recollecting the submergence of China, the present situation in Indochina, the firing of General MacArthur, the payment of blackmail for Robert Vogeler and the American flyers, and numerous other painful illustrations of the containment policy—I would say that within the next 5 years the United States will have nothing left to contain. The Communists, under Kremlin leadership, will have it all.

I doubt if American voters are going to like that at all.

RECESS

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, as in executive session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 18, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 17 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United

States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William Henry Abendroth, ~~XXXXXX~~ National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Howard Louis Peckham, ~~XXXX~~ United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Max Lentz, ~~XXXX~~ Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Patrick Henry Tansey, ~~XXXX~~ Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. William Preston Corderman, ~~XXXX~~ United States Army.

Col. Waldo Eugene Laidlaw, ~~XXXX~~ United States Army.

Col. Willis Small Matthews, ~~XXXX~~ United States Army.

Col. William Everett Potter, ~~XXXX~~ United States Army.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be assistant veterinarians, effective date of acceptance:

Joseph Puleo

Wendell O. Kelley

Surgeon to be senior surgeon:

Manly B. Root

Senior assistant surgeon to be surgeon:

Leo E. Melcher

Assistant surgeon to be senior assistant surgeon:

George W. Metcalf

Junior assistant sanitary engineer to be assistant sanitary engineer:

Mary R. Fulmer

Senior assistant scientist to be scientist:

Geoffrey M. Jeffery

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 17 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Ivar H. Peterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the unexpired term of 5 years from August 27, 1951.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may we begin this new week with a clearer vision of Thy greatness and goodness; for then no task, however difficult, and no experience, however tragic, can darken our minds and obscure our hopes.

We pray that we may never feel that our life is in the grasp of a blind fate that neither knows nor cares, but give us the glad assurance that we are in the safekeeping of a God whose name is Love.

Grant that by Thy grace we may triumph over all our doubts and fears and quit ourselves like men who are serving their day and generation with faith and courage.

Inspire us with an increasing sense of human solidarity and social responsi-

bility, reminding us that we are members one of another and that in ministering to the needs of humanity we are doing Thy will and fulfilling Thy law.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 13, 1952, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 10, 1952:

H. R. 2212. An act conferring jurisdiction upon a United States district court to determine the claims of William P. Novotny, Sr., and others; and

H. R. 2858. An act for the relief of William C. Reed.

On March 14, 1952:

H. J. Res 396. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the legislative branch and the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2077) entitled "An act to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1851) entitled "An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52-14.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. KIRWAN. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, the carnations being worn today by Members of the House and the Senate on the

other side of the Capitol were presented by the League for an Undivided Ireland, and I am happy to see the spirit in which Members of the Congress are wearing these carnations, because it is in that same spirit that the wearing of the green is being displayed all over the world today.

The Irish certainly did a job in selling St. Patrick, not only to their own nation but to every nation in the world. There is not a nation in the world that has not its own patron saint, but the Irish did a world job in selling St. Patrick, because in China, in Japan, everywhere, you will find the people today wearing the green and they are wearing it in the spirit that St. Patrick must have displayed 1,600 years ago when he sowed the seed of Christianity in Ireland.

May I say from my observations in Ireland, having driven over a large part of it some 2 years ago, that never once did I hear the word "communism" mentioned in the whole of Ireland. I hope that when another saint comes along he will instill that same confidence in the world that St. Patrick instilled in it 1,600 years ago.

Mr. RODINO. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, once more on the flying heels of winter March 17 returns, bringing with it the promise of spring and the rebirth of tree and flower and beautiful things on the earth. No less surely do Irish hearts turn to that green and fragrant isle beloved in song and story. Today is especially dear to Irishmen everywhere for it is the feast day of the good St. Patrick, patron saint of the land of their fathers and a sacred bond between all Irishmen everywhere. One of the many blessed attributes of the saint is his ability to draw the sons of Erin together, as it were, into one family group so that they become his friendly sons, indeed.

Irishmen never tire of hearing the story of the holy youth. Born sometime between the years 373-389 into a Roman family of high rank which had embraced Christianity, at the age of 16 Patrick was captured and carried off into slavery to a part of Ireland which in all likelihood was the present County Antrim. There his master, a Druid priest, set Patrick to tending flocks. But although a slave, young, helpless and in a strange land, the faith of the youth did not desert him. Years later in his confession the saint was to record that during the dark years of his captivity while tending his flocks he prayed "many times in the day."

The love of God—

He relates—

and His fear increased in me, and the spirit was roused, so that, in a single day, I have said as many as a hundred prayers and, in the night nearly the same, so that whilst in the woods and on the mountain, even before the dawn, I was roused to prayer and I felt no hurt from it, whether there was snow or ice or rain; nor was there any slothfulness in me, such as I see now, because the spirit was then fervent within me.

Thus the years of captivity were transformed by a benign providence into a wonderful spiritual experience, a preparation for the great apostolate which was to follow.

After 6 years Patrick escaped and fled to France where, after long years of study and preparation, he was ordained a priest. His thoughts turned to the land of his captivity. Tradition tells us that during his years in France, Patrick was favored by visions of children from Focluth by the western sea who cried out, "O holy youth, come back to Erin, and walk once more amongst us."

After a pilgrimage to Rome he was commissioned by Pope Celestine I to carry the light of Christianity to the darkness of Ireland.

So in the year 432 Patrick set foot once more on Irish soil to claim its people for the faith. He landed, according to the story, at the mouth of the river Vantry, close by Wicklow Head. First, he proceeded to Dalaradia, where he had been a slave, to pay the price of ransom to his former master, and in exchange for the servitude and cruelty he had once received to impart blessings and the freedom of God's children.

Thus began the long and glorious apostolate to the Irish—one of the most memorable in the annals of Christianity. By the time Patrick and his followers and successors had finished their work Ireland had, indeed, become the isle of the saints. She was more than that: On Ireland alone from the sixth to the ninth century fell the main burden not only of propagating the Christian faith but of preserving European civilization and transmitting the precious treasures of the classics to posterity. From the sixth to the ninth century she held the torch to enlighten all Europe during the Dark Ages. By the time its golden fire was dimmed Irish monks had carried faith and learning to every part of the known world and perhaps beyond it.

Then came the days of misery when the land of St. Patrick and St. Columba was overrun by barbarian hordes in numbers too overwhelming for a small, pastoral people to resist. First the Scandinavian invaders then the English. For a thousand years the isle of the saints lay under cruel foreign domination until, like Job's comforters, her enemies might have taunted her that there was nothing more to live for. But, like Job, her faith rose triumphant from the ashes and the potsherd until, after long centuries, the day of freedom came.

Meanwhile, many of her sons and daughters found haven and refuge in a new world, which—who knows?—St. Patrick himself may have foreseen, and there they and their children's children kept the faith of freedom alive until the blessed day of liberty dawned once more for the old sod and Ireland, like her blessed Patrick, was released from captivity. To those brave spirits on both sides of the Atlantic, who never faltered during the years of darkness and political slavery, we raise today our voices in tribute. May the good, green land evermore retain the memory and the spirit of St. Patrick, and may Christian faith and unquenchable love of liberty ever

animate the hearts of her sons and daughters, whether in Ireland, America, or elsewhere.

Erin go Bragh!

ROBERT E. VIGUS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), I return herewith H. R. 3219, entitled "An act for the relief of Robert E. Vigus."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 17, 1952.

PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table 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, insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. MURRAY of Tennessee, MORRISON, and REES of Kansas.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CONGRESSIONAL DAILY DIGEST

Mr. PRIEST. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to call attention to the birthday of the Congressional Daily Digest. The Digest starts its sixth year of operation today. It was established in conformance with part 2, section 221 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and has functioned very successfully under the supervision of the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, respectively. In each issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Digest carries a report of all committee meetings and a brief account of the proceedings that transpire in both Chambers. Nowhere else is it possible to find a running account of the activities of all congressional committees

such as is carried by the Digest. The Daily Digest also carries the legislative program for the day, a list of the committees that are meeting, along with the place of meeting, the time, and the subject matter to be considered by the committees. In addition to these services, they handle numerous telephone requests for various types of information, I have been told. So to any one who wants to keep well informed, I recommend the reading of the last four pages of each CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I take this occasion to wish continued success to the Congressional Daily Digest.

THE LATE HOWARD CHANDLER CHRISTY

Mr. COX. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, millions mourn the passing of Howard Chandler Christy. We have lost not only a great friend and a great artist but a great American as well. As early as the First World War his painting and portraits of Americans and things American have looked out at us from the pages of magazines, from posters in windows and from the walls of famous buildings. During the Second World War his patriotic pleas on oil were more eloquent than words. One of his greatest works, the painting of the Signing of the Constitution hangs here in the Capitol—a daily reminder to us of the magnificent character and foresight of those revered few who chartered our future. We recognize the fine qualities in these men because they shine forth in the brush strokes of the man who placed them there with love and care for not only did Howard Chandler Christy paint with his hand and with his head but with his heart as well. His enthusiasm for our great traditions and for the momentous decisions that have framed our government impart a shining truth to each canvas so that when we see it we believe in its sincerity. Mr. Christy is famous as a portrait and landscape artist. Others have described his talents more eloquently than is possible here. It is the patriot we wish to praise; the man who carefully studied early American history so that each detail might be correctly portrayed; the man who traced America's past and believed in the fulfillment of a glorious destiny; the man who concerned himself with America's present. We must read his message that is preserved in glowing colors for all to see: "This was America then—look forward, go forward, but keep these events ever sacred, our forefathers did not fail us nor must we fail them."

Howard Chandler Christy had a great gift and he shared it with us all. Let us be thankful for the beauty that was his bequest to us and may we all in our hearts make a monument to the loving memory of a true American.

Mr. JENKINS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed with the speech just made by our distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. Cox] with reference to Mr. Howard Chandler Christy. Howard Chandler Christy was born in my State, right close to my district. He was truly a great painter and a great American.

Just about a year ago I had a long talk with him about his painting of the great picture, the Signing of the Constitution. This picture is located on the east side-wall of the Capitol Building and can be seen advantageously from the balcony that surrounds the House Chamber.

He told me in great detail about how much work he had done and about how much time it took to paint that picture in order to make it accurate physically and historically. I am genuinely proud of his reputation not only as an artist but as an historian.

He did much to give us the story of the incidents surrounding the preparation and signing of the Constitution of our Republic. He has given us a picture of the room in which the Constitution was written as it was furnished at the time of the signing. He has also given us a picture of the faces of most of the signers and the clothes that they wore when they signed. Mr. Speaker, he will be long remembered by those now alive and posterity will recognize him as one of the world's greatest artists. I am proud to have been his friend.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I concur in the statement of my distinguished colleague from Ohio, as well as that of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. America has lost a great citizen and his profession has lost a real master.

THE TRUMAN TAX PROGRAM

Mr. WERDEL. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, today is the last day to file Federal income-tax returns. As many of you know, the Members of the California delegation have been deluged with shirts mailed by protesting taxpayers who have got a bellyful of the Truman tax program. You do not wonder at this spontaneous outburst of indignation when you realize that Harry S. Truman in less than 7 years has collected more taxes from the American people than all the other 31 Presidents who preceded him, including Franklin D. Roosevelt.

At this time I wish to present to the ranking Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee the shirt which I hold in my hand, and I ask him that it be filed with the chairman of his committee, as a symbol of the fact that

Harry S. Truman is back where he started—in the shirt business.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say that if the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] desires to accept the shirt it is his business. It makes no difference to the Chair.

Mr. REED of New York. I know that if I accept this shirt I will be subject to a gift tax. I know if I pass it on to the chairman he will need it after the next tax bill, because he will not have a shirt left.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PRESENTATION OF A SHILLELAGH TO THE SPEAKER

Mr. BUSBEY. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, today Americans the length and breadth of the land are joining the Irish in honoring their patron saint and we pay our respects to the gallant people of Irish extraction on this St. Patrick's Day.

The Irish are noble people—honest, loyal, and patriotic, with the greatest respect for the law of the land. This is attested by the fact that many of them engage in the occupation of enforcing the laws that we, the State and local governments enact. Generous, kind-hearted, jovial, and devoted to the principles which founded this great Republic, they make the highest type of American citizen.

Today each of us received a fresh green shamrock, which was flown from Ireland to us with the compliments of the Ambassador of Ireland. We are most appreciative of this friendly gesture and wear the shamrock in celebration of this important day.

While I was in Europe last summer I spent some time in Ireland. I want to state that nowhere in all my travels throughout 13 foreign countries did I receive a more friendly hospitable reception than I did from the people of Ireland. With a twinkle in the eye and a bit of blarney on the tongue, I was made to feel that I was the most important visitor who ever set foot on the hills of Erin or gazed upon shimmering Killarney.

I hold in my hand a genuine black-thorn shillelagh which came from the county of Tipperary, Ireland. By virtue of the esteem the Members of this body hold for the Speaker, I believe it very appropriate for him to use a shillelagh on St. Patrick's Day to preside over the House of Representatives. This shillelagh was presented to me during my visit in Ireland by Mr. Nicholas Lakas, one of our younger and most promising Foreign Service officers, who was in charge of the United States consulate at

Cork, Ireland. I, in turn, present it to our Speaker with my compliments, a shillelagh from O'BUSBEY to Speaker O'RAYBURN.

The SPEAKER. I appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois.

THE LATE HOWARD CHANDLER CHRISTY

Mr. REED of New York. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply impressed with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. Cox], in regard to Howard Chandler Christy and the great contribution he has made to art in this country. But in the picture of the Constitutional Convention, in the front is Dr. Benjamin Franklin sitting there, and next to him is young Alexander Hamilton. Alexander Hamilton is portrayed as saying: "Doctor, what have we here?" And the doctor replied, "We have a Republic, if we know enough to keep it."

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. VELDE. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, it should be of considerable interest to Members of Congress, as well as to all loyal American people, to review the leftist and pro-Communist propaganda being issued through the national weekly known as the National Guardian.

For a long time now this magazine has, in its editorial policies as well as its news reports, shown a tendency to support socialistic Communist causes and legislation. While a great deal of material has been assembled by the House Un-American Activities Committee, about this propaganda instrument, the committee has not yet notified the public through a report that it is actually published by an American Communist.

Cedric Belfrage, whose Communist Party name was for many years George Oakden, was recently described by Martin Berkeley as a very important Communist in the United States. He formerly lived in Hollywood, where he was a Hollywood correspondent for the Manchester Guardian, another leftist publication. While in Hollywood Belfrage was a cohort of Herbert Biberman, Gale Sondergaard, Lionel and Alice Stander, John Howard Lawson, and other such notable Communists.

The National Guardian is just another propaganda arm of Soviet Russia which follows the American Communist Party line down to a "t", creating race and class hatred among its readers and generally tearing down the precepts of our constitutional Republic. In addition to the evil effect of its editorial policy, the

National Guardian sells its mailing list to other national publications, thus enabling it to survive financially.

I cannot overemphasize the sinister effect on Americanism that Cedric Belfrage and his Communist-propaganda machine promotes. The House Un-American Activities Committee should, and I feel sure it will, subpoena Cedric Belfrage to appear before it to answer many questions which are important to the committee itself as well as many other American people.

PROPAGANDA OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. DONDERO. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a page from the Detroit Free Press for February 27, 1952 which contains a half-page ad inserted by the State Committee of the Communist Party of the State of Michigan. At the bottom of that ad is this statement:

We predict that the people of Detroit and the State of Michigan will not permit the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any other group to bring about any of these described results by the present witch-hunt;

That the people of Detroit and the State of Michigan will mount to ever higher levels in their fight to retain the basic constitutional rights of freedom of speech, of press, of assembly, of religion for every American regardless of his or her political beliefs.

This ad refers to the hearings recently held by the Committee on Un-American Activities in the House of Representatives in the city of Detroit at which time the activities of Communists were exposed.

This ad is a brazen attempt to simply deceive the people of the United States, and especially the people of Detroit, and the State of Michigan, into believing that those rights would be guaranteed and saved under a Communist regime. We all know that those freedoms, which the Communists claim they will fight for, as well as all other freedoms will be destroyed if communism ever controls the United States of America.

WALTER REUTHER

Mr. WALTER. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to compliment that great leader and labor statesman, Walter Reuther, for the courageous action he took in attempting to rid local 600 of the Communist influences which unquestionably dominated that union. The Committee on Un-American Activities conducted hearings in Detroit for 3 days last week. These hearings disclosed beyond any peradventure of doubt that

Communists dominated that large union, and the action taken by Mr. Reuther is to be commended by every patriotic American. Without strong courageous leadership such as Mr. Reuther furnishes, the labor movement in the United States would become impotent. I am not so certain that that is not what the Communists and their fellow travelers want. Weak labor organizations with the reluctant low labor standards provide the soil in which the seeds of communism flourish.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. BAKEWELL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BAKEWELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION

Mr. CURTIS 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. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Stabilization is beginning today to make checks in 139 cities of stores and wholesale outlets to ascertain what articles are selling above ceiling prices.

I have written a letter to Mr. Ellis Arnall, head of that office, asking that when his agency makes that check it also should report to Congress the number of articles that are selling under the ceiling price.

If the Congress is going to intelligently act upon the request for an extension of price control, certainly we should have all of the facts and not just a few facts. The Office of Price Stabilization should report to this Congress the result of its findings when it goes into these establishments on what articles are selling below ceiling prices as well as those above ceiling prices.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

OUR NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. KEATING. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, quite understandably, many of us have received letters this past week protesting emphatically about the income taxes our people have to pay. That is only natural. I certainly do not blame him. In fact, it's a healthy symptom that the people are at last widely aroused.

I have received one letter which has a rather novel suggestion. This correspondent suggests that each taxpayer be billed separately at income tax time each year for his share of the interest on the national debt. He wants a separate column in the income tax return to show how much of the total tax paid is made necessary by our huge national debt upon which we have to pay interest. Undoubtedly, this suggestion will not meet with favor from an administration dedicated to more and more spending and ever deeper debt but it deserves sympathetic study.

The annual interest on the national debt is over \$6,200,000,000. Assuming that there are 40,000,000 families in this country, that means about \$156 per family. For a man earning an average wage of \$60 a week that represents about 2½ weeks work. He has to work that long just to pay his family's share of the interest on our national debt. And if the Congress does not rise up, assert itself and absolutely refuse to yield to the President on his inflated request for \$86,000,000,000 to run the Government for another year, we will end up still deeper in red ink than we are now. That would mean, of course, sinking even more of our tax dollars in this item of interest on the national debt which yields no return whatever in the way of services or benefits, but which must be met to maintain national solvency and honor.

Little wonder that more and more of our citizens every day are coming around to realize that there must be a halt to the reckless squandering of the people's hard-earned dollars, extracted from their pay envelopes, their savings accounts, yes and even in many cases, from their pensions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

CORRUPTION IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. MEADER. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the House to the subject of corruption in the executive branch of the Government.

On January 14, 1952, I introduced House Resolution 492, to create a special bipartisan committee to do the job that everyone recognizes needs to be done, namely, to find out whether wrongdoing prevails in the executive branch of the Government, and, if it exists, to eradicate it.

Mr. Newbold Morris, appointed by the President to clean up corruption, testified before the Hoey committee of the Senate on 2 days last week. It is my contention that his appearance before that committee conclusively demonstrated that he is neither qualified nor competent to conduct an investigation of corruption in the Federal Government. On special orders today I propose to quote from the record of the tes-

timony of those hearings to establish that point.

I urge the House, and particularly the majority leadership of the House, to take action immediately so that the Congress can conduct an independent investigation of corruption in public affairs, in which the people of the country can have confidence.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE GIRL SCOUTS

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the last week the Girl Scouts of America celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the founding of that organization. On Saturday in my own city of Lowell I attended the Greater Lowell Girl Scouts' celebration of the fortieth birthday. I wish the world could be ruled by the Girls Scouts ideal. I was tremendously impressed with their courtesy and what they have accomplished and what they stand for and what they live for. In these days of unrest, war, attack, and counter-attack, it is refreshing to see a group that is just trying to make this world better.

There has never been, so far as I know, during all the 40 years of Girl Scouting a single criticism or attack on any of them or on their leaders.

I am sure we all wish them a happy birthday.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sunday Sun of March 9, 1952]

GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA TO HAVE FORTIETH BIRTHDAY

LOWELL PROUD OF GIRLS IN GREEN—TWO THOUSAND MEMBERS PLEDGE "ON MY HONOR"—AND THEY REALLY MEAN IT

(By Norma G. Ackerson)

LOWELL.—"On my honor, I will try"—

This is just about as much as you could ask of anybody—to try—and these are the words with which 1,500,000 Girl Scouts in the United States begin the recitation of the Girl Scout Promise, which each of these girls in green must learn and understand before she is formally invested and becomes a tenderfoot.

Next Thursday Girl Scouting in America will have its fortieth birthday party, and one of the finest youth agencies ever devised will receive the attention it so thoroughly deserves. There is no purer form of democracy in the world than scouting, and its effect is also being felt by thousands of volunteers.

The rest of the above quoted promise reveals that the Scout intends to do her best "to do my duty to God and my country, to help other people at all times, to obey the Girl Scout laws."

Before she may wear the gold trefoil pin that is the insignia of her organization, she must learn and understand these laws. She learns that her honor is to be trusted; she is expected to be loyal; her duty is to be useful and to help others; she is a friend to all and a sister to every other Girl Scout; she is to be courteous; she should be a friend to animals; she obeys orders; she is cheer-

ful, thrifty, and, last but far from least, she is clean in thought, word, and deed.

There are approximately 2,000 Girl Scouts in Lowell, about 300 of whom are volunteer adults. Without these women, the entire Girl Scout program would collapse of its own weight, and the only remuneration they receive is the personal satisfaction that comes from engaging in this type of service.

As a former Girl Scout leader and a present associate member, we can honestly say there's nothing like it.

What they do

These volunteers serve in many ways. Some are members of the council and as such serve on working committees—and they really work. Others are troop leaders, special program consultants or serve on troop committees. And then there are those who only serve once in a while, when called upon, but they all really roll up their sleeves and toil.

Girl Scouts work in cooperation with other agencies, mainly the Red Cross, Goodwill Industries, Lowell Tuberculosis Association, YWCA, and Girls Club in planning their programs and special activities.

The old timers

It is with deliberate intent that the names of those who have made scouting what it is in Lowell today are not given too much attention. But there were many of them, and they have worked for years. There are the women who have served the cause of developing character and skills in young girls ever since the organization started in Lowell in 1922.

They don't ask any favors, these old timers. They know their jobs and they go about them quietly. It's nothing to visit the Girl Scout headquarters at 150 Middlesex Street and find somebody working hard in the large assembly hall, surrounded by papers and record books, not getting in the way of the staff members but just going about her job and doing it well. It would be impossible to find the names of all these women and we wouldn't want to omit anyone.

In its early days, scouting in Lowell was sponsored by the Middlesex Women's Club. First headquarters were in Colonial Hall, and when that building was destroyed by fire it was found that the closet had not been seriously affected and the contents, containing precious early records, were practically intact.

Pride and joy of the agency then was the big bass drum used by the drum corps. This was found by the firemen who took it to the fire station and poured the water out of it. When it dried it was practically as good as new, served the unit for many years and was sold a few years ago.

The oldest records available are of troop 2 for 1924-25, and enrolled at that time were Constance Caverly, Ruth Doran, Isabelle Doyle, Elispolis Athanasia, Ethel Fling, Mary Hebb, Beatrice Hoar, Ruth Lambert, Mary Murphy, Sophie Panaglatocopoulos, Helen Pappas, Adele Parra, Beatrice Robinson, Beulah Shaw, Evangeline Turcotte, and Myrtle Scott.

Financial support

Girl Scouting in Lowell is a Community Chest agency. This year the service received the sum of \$9,805 from the chest, the largest allotment in many years. From this amount must be paid the salaries of three people, an executive director, an acting field director, and an office secretary.

The building in which the headquarters is maintained is owned by the ministry at large and no rental is charged. However, from the aforementioned amount must also come the cost of heat, light, insurance, all inside repairs (and there are always many in an old building), office equipment, files, records, postage, telephone, and the hundred and one expenses incurred in the direction of Girl Scouting.

All Girl Scouts, children and adults, pay a membership fee of \$1 per year, which goes to the national organization. Their troop dues are 5 cents per week, and this money must provide equipment such as patrol books, craft utensils, supplies for occasional parties, and the like.

Troops occasionally have fund-raising activities within their own boundaries and the proceeds are used for such purposes as educational trips, scholarships to camp for needy and deserving girls, and other events. However, Community Chest agencies do not conduct major public-fund-raising drives because the chest does not wish to keep constantly asking people for money for the services it sponsors. The Girl Scouts adhere rigidly to this rule.

Occasionally a bequest comes to Girl Scouting, not often and not large, but in the event of such a windfall it is used for sorely needed equipment that could not possibly be obtained under the aforementioned overlaid budget. At times benefactors send contributions for camp scholarships and these are awarded to girls known to leaders as deserving of this award.

Serves its purpose

There is no doubt that Girl Scouting is one of the finest youth services in the world today. Thousands of Lowell women speak proudly of the fact that they were once Girl Scouts, and their memories of scouting days are fond and happy ones.

We ought to know, because we're one of them.

CAMP RUNELS BEST IN REGION—LOWELL COUNCIL OPERATED RESORT IN PELHAM SO RATED BY EXPERTS IN FIELD

(By Norma G. Ackerson)

LOWELL.—The finest Girl Scout camp operated by a local council in this section of the country, judged on the basis of its physical set-up, location, equipment and preparedness for the purpose it serves, is Camp Runels, operated by the Greater Lowell Girl Scout council on Little Island Pond in Pelham, N. H.

This is not just the opinion of the writer, who has visited the camp on countless occasions and is admittedly prejudiced. It is the expressed judgment of experts in the field of camping who are often overwhelmed on their first visit to Runels by the excellence of the establishment.

Girl Scouting in Lowell was born in 1922, and it was not long after its formation, probably in 1924, that the need for a camp to complete its program was manifested. For the first 2 years of its summer program the agency rented the YWCA Camp at Long-Sought-For Pond in Westford for a short period in the summer.

Like everything else in scouting, the camp program was so good it grew far beyond the limitations found in renting a camp on a part-time basis. The use of adjoining property on the same pond was secured, and the single large cottage on the land became Camp Watusco. There are many women in Greater Lowell today who recall with happy memories the days they spent at Watusco, and if they could see themselves in the pictures we have examined while doing research for this article they would promptly laugh themselves into tears.

According to the camp folder for these years, the camp period ran from June 25 until July 30. The fee was \$8 per week (those were the good old days) and the attire for camping was out of this world. The only dress brought to camp was the Girl Scout uniform, and judged from today's fashion standards the wearers were woebegone looking creatures.

Girls were told to bring middies, bloomers (absolutely no knickers), sneakers and stockings, brown or black. It was emphasized that there were to be no socks and no silk

stockings. Visiting hours were held every afternoon from 3 until 6 o'clock, and the same visitors were not allowed to come to the camp more than twice each week.

Purchased in 1929

It was in May of 1929 that there appeared in *The Sun* a news story headlined "Girl Scouts Buy Permanent Site for Camp." Through the consecrated work of many volunteers who believed in the cause of Scouting, a 330-acre tract of land in Pelham, N. H., was acquired from the Martina Gage property.

Thousands of dollars were needed to develop the property. It was necessary to construct a passable road with little bridges over brooks, from the main road into the camp, a distance of nearly a mile. There was underbrush to be cleared, a beach to be developed, and many buildings had to be erected.

One of the most exciting fund raising projects from a community standpoint, was a street fair held May 10, 1931. One of the women who was a mainstay of Scouting in those days describes it in this way.

"What a disappointment that was! We had visions of dancing on the street, booths and music, suppers on the stone terraces. The theme was to be a medieval bazaar. And then it rained—a torrential rain! The street fair had to be in the Auditorium; added expense and lack of glamour. But it netted over \$1,400 which went a long way after the contributions of more than \$5,000 from kind Lowell people to insure the success of our camp."

Down but not out

Everything went smoothly at Camp Runels for a number of years—perhaps the quiet that comes before the storm. And what a storm it was! Everybody remembers the hurricane. Another of the "old faithful" workers in Scouting says of this experience:

"I shall never forget my first view of the camp after the storm. Nothing but great fallen trees, some more than 100 years old, and crushed buildings. Some one assumed that it would be years before we could function again, but as Mrs. Walter Chase stood looking at this desolation she said, "This camp will open the first of next July," and it did."

The camp committee and its many friends went to work, and 35 great stumps were hauled over into the woods, and many others were left to help support the shore line. The larger trees were brought to Lowell where they were transformed into the boards from which the new dining hall at the camp was made.

More trouble

For several years there was smooth sailing at Runels. The camp continued to grow and prosper, its reputation sailing higher and higher with each passing year.

And then, a few years ago, came the snow. There had been a lot of it, thick and heavy, and the camp committee was worried. Its members, their husbands and friends, headed for Pelham one Sunday afternoon. They had to go in that long camp road, nearly a mile, on snowshoes. And their hearts sank to their heels when they saw that the weight of the snow had caused the roof of the craft house to cave in. All the boats owned by the camp were stored in that building.

It took a lot of shoveling and other heavy work to determine the damage. When the wreckage had been cleared away the workers were close to tears. For just about everything in the building was damaged beyond repair. It took a lot of planning to replace those boats, but the job was done quietly and efficiently, just like every other part of the Scout program.

Camp Runels is licensed by the State of New Hampshire. Its registration list each year contains girls from all the New England States, New York, Pennsylvania, and as far west as Ohio. Many of the girls from out

State are the daughters of former Runels campers.

The camp program is an exceptionally fine one, and Runels, which accommodates 100 girls, was 98 percent full for its 8-week period last summer. The only vacancies were caused when it was necessary to turn down applicants for the counselor-training program because they were under age.

This counselor training project is comparatively new in Girl Scout camping. It is a 2-year course, taking 4 weeks each year. The first summer the girls have an accelerated program in their own pioneer unit, perfecting the skills of camping. In the second year they serve an apprentice counselorship, assisting the leaders with crafts, water-front, office duties and developing their skills in all-round camping.

Today the operating cost of the camp must come from the \$17 per week which is the fee, also including insurance which covers the campers in case of illness or injury. The annual cookie sale pays for new equipment and repairs.

The camp is excellently equipped. It has six new rowboats, two older ones, two sail boats and five canoes. The kitchen is modern, with a large new range installed last year. The purchase of mattresses, bed-springs, screening, canvas and other equipment is done on the basis of a certain amount each year.

One of the greatest needs of Camp Runels now is a permanent building suitable for troop camping on a year-round basis. This house would have to have heating facilities and be usable for such things as troop camp week ends even in the winter. In the summer it could be used as a staff house, as at present there is no place in which staff members may have a period of relaxation when the day's work is done.

There is no doubt that Lowell can be proud of Camp Runels. Its exceptionally high standards, its excellent operation and the good reputation it has brought to this city are things in which any city may feel a just pride.

And at the rate it is going now, that pride will last for a long, long time.

REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS IS A TENDERFOOT

LOWELL.—Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was formally invested a Girl Scout, and became a tenderfoot in May 1926. To do this she was required to memorize the promise and laws, like any other Girl Scout. She is thereby entitled to wear the gold trefoil pin that is the symbol of Scouting throughout the country.

NO BARRIERS IN GIRL SCOUTING

LOWELL.—In the Girl Scout program there are no boundaries regarding race, religion, background, or anything with the exception of a minimum age requirement.

Of the more than 200 troops in the Greater Lowell area, many operate under the sponsorship of Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic Churches, and others meet in schools or privately owned buildings.

Girl Scouts are trained to respect people as individuals, and to share with all other youngsters in activities that bear no restricting lines. The outstanding part of the Girl Scout program is working together in groups, sharing duties and interests, and doing things together. Troops meeting in buildings owned by various churches may not be restricted to girls of the faith or denomination represented by the church owning the property.

MIDDLESEX CLUB SPONSORED SCOUTING

LOWELL.—The Middlesex Women's Club, which sponsored the Girl Scouts in Lowell when the organization started here in 1922, has found that bread cast upon the waters will be returned in quantity. On several occasions the club has called upon these little girls in green to help with special programs, and the Scouts are always willing and eager to help the club. A Girl Scout council mem-

ber is still named as cubchairman of the Middlesex club's community service committee.

SCOUTS ASSIST IN CHARITABLE ENDEAVORS

LOWELL.—Seldom is there a major community enterprise in this city in which Girl Scouts do not participate. They help fold Christmas seals for the Lowell Tuberculosis Association and prepare them for mailing, work on other volunteer projects as part of their training in community life.

PROGRAM INCLUDES VARIED ACTIVITIES

LOWELL.—The Girl Scout program covers 11 fields of activity in which the youngsters are trained. The list includes agriculture, arts and crafts, community life, health and safety, homemaking, international friendship, literature and dramatics, music and dancing, out of doors and sports and games.

"OLD TIMERS" MEMORIES GOOD

LOWELL.—Girl Scouts have phenomenal memories. It may be because the scouting program brings many memorable experiences. For it was due to the fact that many of the old timers in the organization were eager to cooperate in anything that would help serve scouting that much of the material presented here was obtained.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of this week, 15 minutes each day, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

DANGEROUS STRATAGEM OF THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is a violation of what we call congressional comity to criticize Members of the United States Senate. I hope my statement will not be considered a criticism of the Members of that body, but I do want to sound this warning: They have no right to vote the American people into Egyptian bondage, as I fear they will do if they approve this so-called treaty of peace with Japan, in its present form.

It seems to be an attempt to subordinate our national sovereignty, as well as our States' rights, to the domination of this so-called United Nations and in that way undermine, and probably destroy, American freedom. In the so-called United Nations, Communist Russia has far more influence, and she and her satellites have many more votes, than does the United States. This Japanese Treaty would go a long way toward undermining and destroying American freedom, as you will see from this telegram from a former president of the American Bar Association, which reads as follows:

I have only recently had an opportunity of studying the proposed Japanese peace treaty. To my mind it constitutes a back-door attempt to secure Senate approval of many of the dangerous features of the Dec-

laration of Human Rights, the Genocide Convention and the Draft Covenant on Human Rights. If this treaty is ratified by the Senate, and the courts enforce its provisions, then the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and other declarations, pacts, and covenants made under the UN charter will become the supreme law of the land and American rights, both State and individual, will be overridden by this new international law. This ratification would rob your constitutional amendment proposal of a large part of its effectiveness to protect American rights and American independence. The provisions of the treaty should be carefully analyzed by each Senator. It seems to me the matter is of such importance that there should be a public hearing before the treaty is presented to the Senate for final vote.

As has been pointed out:

The United Nations is steadily assuming the statute of a world government. It is slowly usurping the necessary powers from the hands of Congress.

A world government means the death of the sovereignty of the citizens of this Republic as set forth in the Constitution of this Union of Sovereign States. Each Senator, by his oath of office, is pledged to uphold that Constitution.

Now is the time to call a halt. The Senate should not vote to endorse the principles of the Declaration of Human Rights, the principles of International Law applied at Nuremberg and embodied in the Genocide Convention. It has no constitutional power to pass any law, or ratify any treaty, making these principles, as well as those that will govern public and private trade, subject to determination by any legislative body other than one subject to the vote of American citizens or the courts of this Nation. These powers must be retained in the hands of Congress to protect the Constitution of the United States of America.

Hanging over this Nation at this moment is the greatest constitutional crisis in the history of the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, we are in far more danger of losing our liberties and our freedom than the average American realizes. If we keep on going down this international road towards destruction, that has been followed for the last few years, the children of the next generation may not know what individual freedom means in this country.

We had better get back to the policies of Washington and Jefferson, of "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the consent calendar.

AUTHORIZING PARTICIPATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN OLYMPIC GAMES

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar (H. R. 1184) to authorize the training for, attendance at, and participation in, Olympic games by military personnel, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATING FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A COORDINATED LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL PROGRAM IN THE CITY OF BOSTON, MASS.

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 254 to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this House joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE PANAMA CANAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5490) relating to the compensation of certain employees of the Panama Canal.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

RECORDING AND PERFORMING RIGHTS IN LITERARY WORKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of section 1 of title 17, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) To perform or represent the copyrighted work publicly if it be a drama or other literary work not enumerated in subsection (c) hereof, or, if it be a dramatic work and not reproduced in copies for sale, to vend any manuscript or any record whatsoever thereof; to make or to procure the making of any transcription or record thereof by or from which, in whole or in part, it may in any manner or by any method be exhibited, performed, represented, produced, or reproduced; and to exhibit, perform, represent, produce, or reproduce it in any manner or by any method whatsoever; and."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That subsection (c) of section 1 of title 17, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To deliver, authorize the delivery of, read, or present the copyrighted work in public for profit if it be a lecture, sermon, address, or similar production, or other non-dramatic literary work; to make or procure the making of any transcription or record thereof by or from which, in whole or in part, it may in any manner or by any method be exhibited, delivered, presented, produced, or reproduced; and to play or perform it in public for profit, and to exhibit, represent, produce, or reproduce it in any manner or by any method whatsoever; and."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Delete the last word of the committee amendment "and" and add the following sentence: "The damages for the infringement by broadcast of any work referred to in this subsection shall not exceed the sum of \$100 where the infringing broadcaster shows that he was not aware that he was infringing and that such infringement could not have been reasonably foreseen; and."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TWO-YEAR PRESUMPTIVE PERIOD FOR DISEASE OF PSYCHOSIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the veterans regulations to establish for certain persons who served in the Armed Forces a further presumption of service connection for an active psychosis.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is scheduled to be considered under a suspension of the rules today; I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MINING DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES OF PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 472) to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MID VALLEY BRIDGE CO., HIDALGO, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1511) granting the consent of Congress to the Mid Valley Bridge Co., Hidalgo, Tex., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Mid Valley Bridge Co., Hidalgo, Tex., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Rio Grande, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation not more than 3 miles above nor more than 3 miles below the Donna pump station, in accordance with the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved

March 13, 1906, subject to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and subject also to the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico as to the construction, operation, and maintenance of the bridge. Construction of the bridge shall not be undertaken until after an agreement regarding such construction has been effected between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Mexican States.

SEC. 2. The authority granted in this act for construction of the bridge shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction be commenced within 2 years and completed within 4 years from the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. There is hereby conferred upon the said Mid Valley Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, and all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Texas needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State of Texas, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation and expropriation of property in such State.

SEC. 4. The said Mid Valley Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and in accordance with any laws of Texas applicable thereto, and the rates of tolls so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of the Army under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 5. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act, is hereby granted to the said Mid Valley Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR AND INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 108 providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the national security and prosperity of the United States require the development of improved relations and increased trade with Latin America and the world; and

Whereas international friendship and trade are founded upon the good will and mutual respect of the people of one nation for those of another, and must be based primarily upon extensive popular contact and understanding; and

Whereas the natural expansion of our trade with Latin America and the world, without

subsidy or compulsion, will sustain employment and production and improve living standards both in the United States and throughout the world, preventing the infiltration of undemocratic philosophies there while promoting mutual good will, understanding, and confidence, lasting trade connections, and solidarity among all the nations of the world; and

Whereas any constructive long-range program for the development of a balanced foreign trade with the world must provide ample opportunity for the participation of small businesses, together with adequate merchandising facilities for their products and their representatives; and

Whereas there is a compelling need for the establishment of a trade center which will aid in carrying out these objectives and which will provide an opportunity to bring together large numbers of people from throughout the world and give recognition to their respective cultural, scientific, and artistic and industrial achievements; and

Whereas during the past quarter century outstanding statesmen, industrialists, and internationalists have frequently urged the establishment of such a trade center; and

Whereas the city of New Orleans, La., has been for over 200 years an international city and the natural gateway to the United States from much of Latin America for over two centuries by virtue of its geographical position and the rail, water, air, and highway connections with all parts of the United States; and

Whereas New Orleans in 1944 established International House, which has become a world-famous institution for the promotion of peace, trade, and understanding, and in 1947 established the International Trade Mart, which has assumed a position of much importance in world trading circles, and particularly in Latin America; and

Whereas New Orleans today is the second port of the United States in dollar values of foreign trade, and in recent years has made very rapid progress in foreign trade and has spent several millions of dollars in developing a foreign-trade consciousness in the Mississippi Valley region, and has worked diligently, intelligently, and with results in promoting healthy two-way foreign trade; and

Whereas the city of New Orleans, therefore, is a natural location for further development as an international trade center operated in the national public interest; and

Whereas 1953 is the sesquicentennial anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase, which united the United States and started them on the way to becoming a world power, and this purchase was negotiated and consummated in New Orleans, capital of the Territory, and the business, cultural, social, and intellectual center of the South then and now: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Congress hereby expresses its endorsement of the establishment of an International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans in 1953 in observance of the Louisiana Purchase anniversary and as a nonprofit enterprise for the development of improved relations and increased trade with all nations. The President is authorized and directed, by proclamation or in such other manner as he may deem proper, to grant recognition to the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, calling upon officials and agencies of the Government to assist and cooperate with such center, and inviting the participation of all the nations of the world therein.

That all friendly nations be invited to send exhibits to display at this International Trade Fair and Center and that all such exhibits should be permitted to enter the United States duty-free.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 8, strike out after the word "with" the word "all" and insert "other."

Page 3, line 9, strike out "directed" and insert "requested."

Page 4, line 4, strike out "all of the nations of the world." and insert "foreign nations."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Boggs of Louisiana: On page 4, strike out everything after line 4 and insert in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 2. All articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, to be held at New Orleans, La., from November 30, 1953, to May 31, 1954, inclusive, by the International House, Inc., a corporation, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at the said trade fair, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said trade fair to sell within the area of the trade fair any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the trade fair, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to, and entry for exhibition at, the said trade fair under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the International House, Inc., a corporation, shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for sal-

aries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the International House, Inc., a corporation, to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1524)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE MINERAL LEASING ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4752) to amend the mineral leasing laws in order to eliminate the waiver of rentals of oil and gas leases.

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

Mr. SCHWABE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

COMPACT ON DELAWARE RIVER JOINT TOLL BRIDGE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4960) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 1938) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the Senate bill is identical with the House bill?

Mr. WALTER. It is identical; word for word.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the supplemental compact or agreement set forth below, and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided*, That nothing therein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, over or in regard to any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of the aforesaid compact or agreement or otherwise affected by the terms thereof:

Supplemental agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

Amending the agreement entitled "Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties," as heretofore amended, by extending the jurisdiction and powers of the commission.

Whereas the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "commission") was created by a compact or agreement entitled "Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties," executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 19th day of December 1934, pursuant to an act of its general assembly approved the 25th day of June 1931 (Pamphlet Laws 1952), as last amended by an act of said general assembly approved the 18th day of May 1933 (Pamphlet Laws 827), and executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 18th day of December, 1934, pursuant to an act of its senate and general assembly approved June 11, 1934 (chapter 215, laws of 1934; R. S. (1937) 32:8-1), to which compact or agreement the consent of the Congress of the United States was given by section 9 of an act of Congress approved August 30, 1935 (Public No. 411, 74th Cong., 49 Stat. 1051, 1058); and

Whereas said compact or agreement was amended by a supplemental agreement executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 8th day of July 1947, pursuant to an act of its general assembly approved June 13, 1947 (Pamphlet Laws 592), and executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 3d day of July 1947, pursuant to an act of its senate and general assembly approved June 13, 1947 (ch. 283, laws of 1947), to which supplemental agreement the consent of the Congress of the United States was given by an act of the Congress approved August 4, 1947 (Public No. 355, 80th Cong., 61 Stat. 752); and

Whereas it is necessary to protect the investment made by the commission in the bridge now under construction between the city of Trenton, N. J., and the Borough of Morrisville, Pa., and the investments made by said Commonwealth and said State in the approach highways connected with said bridge, and in order to finance additional bridges over the Delaware River and thereby facilitate the flow of traffic between said Commonwealth and said State; now, therefore,

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby solemnly covenant and agree, each with the other, as follows:

Paragraph (a) of article X of the agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties, which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 19th day of December 1934, and was executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 18th day of December 1934, as amended by the supplemental agreement which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 8th day of July 1947, and was executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 3d day of July 1947, be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) The commission may acquire, construct, rehabilitate, improve, maintain, repair, and operate bridges for vehicular or pedestrian traffic across the Delaware River

between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey at any location north of the boundary line between Bucks County and Philadelphia County in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as extended across the Delaware River to the New Jersey shore of said river. The commission may also, subject to the approval of the State Highway Department of the State of New Jersey and the Department of Highways of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, lease such bridges as lessor to, and contract for the operation of such bridges by, one or more public bodies, instrumentalities, commissions, or public agencies.

"Whenever any bridge north of the boundary line described above in this paragraph (a), proposed to be acquired by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this agreement, has been constructed pursuant to consent or authorization granted by Federal law, the acquisition of such bridge by the commission shall be by purchase or by condemnation in accordance with the provisions of such Federal law, or the acquisition of such bridge by the commission shall be pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of sections 48:5-22 and 48:5-23 of the Revised Statutes of New Jersey, and for all the purposes of said provisions and sections the commission is hereby appointed as the agency of the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania exercising the rights and powers granted or reserved by said Federal law or sections to the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania jointly or to the State of New Jersey acting in conjunction with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The commission shall have authority to so acquire such bridge whether the same be owned, held, operated, or maintained by any private person, firm, partnership, company, association, or corporation or by any instrumentality, public body, commission, public agency, or political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of, or created by or in, the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or by any instrumentality, public body, commission, or public agency of, or created by or in, a political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

"In addition to other powers conferred upon it, and not in limitation thereof, the commission may acquire all right, title, and interest in and to the Tacony-Palmyra Bridge, across the Delaware River at Palmyra, N. J., together with any approaches and interests in real property necessary thereto. The acquisition of such bridge, approaches, and interests by the commission shall be by purchase or by condemnation in accordance with the provisions of the Federal law consenting to or authorizing the construction of such bridge and approaches, or the acquisition of such bridge, approaches, or interests by the commission shall be pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of sections 48:5-22 and 48:5-23 of the Revised Statutes of New Jersey, and for all the purposes of said provisions and sections the commission is hereby appointed as the agency of the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania exercising the rights and powers granted or reserved by said Federal law or sections to the State of New Jersey and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania jointly or to the State of New Jersey acting in conjunction with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The commission shall have authority to so acquire such bridge, approaches, and interests, whether the same be owned, held, operated, or maintained by any private person, firm, partnership, company, association, or corporation, or by any instrumentality, public body, commission, public agency, or political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of, or created by or in, the State of New Jersey

or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or by any instrumentality, public body, commission, or public agency of, or created by or in, a political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The power and authority herein granted to the commission to acquire said Tacony-Palmyra Bridge, approaches and interests shall not be exercised unless and until the Governor of the State of New Jersey and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have filed with the commission their written consents to such acquisition.

"The word 'bridge' as used in this agreement shall include such approach highways and interests in real property necessary thereto in said Commonwealth or said State as may be determined by the commission to be necessary to facilitate the flow of traffic in the vicinity of any such bridge or to connect such bridge with the highway system or other traffic facilities in said Commonwealth or State: *Provided, however,* That the power and authority herein granted to the commission in connection with the approach highways shall not be exercised unless and until the Department of Highways of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall have filed with the commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said Commonwealth and the State Highway Department of the State of New Jersey shall have filed with the commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said State.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this agreement or any provision of law, State or Federal, to the contrary, the commission may combine for financing purposes any bridge or bridges hereafter constructed or acquired by it with any or all of the bridges described or referred to in any trust indenture securing bridge revenue bonds of the commission at the time outstanding, subject to any limitations or restrictions contained in such trust indenture.

"Notwithstanding any provision of this agreement, nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit or impair any right or power granted or to be granted to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission or the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, acting alone or in conjunction with each other, to provide for the financing, construction, operation, and maintenance of one bridge across the Delaware River south of the city of Trenton in the State of New Jersey: *Provided,* That such bridge shall not be constructed within a distance of 10 miles, measured along the boundary line between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, from the bridge being constructed across the Delaware River by the commission between the Borough of Morrisville in said Commonwealth and the city of Trenton in said State, so long as there are any outstanding bonds or obligations of the commission for which the tolls, rents, rates, or other revenues, or any part thereof, of said bridge now being constructed shall have been pledged; but such bridge may be constructed at any other location north of the boundary line described above in this paragraph (a). Nothing contained in this agreement shall be construed to authorize the commission to condemn any such bridge."

In witness whereof, this 12th day of July 1951, Alfred E. Driscoll has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the State of New Jersey and caused the great seal of the State to be attached thereto.

ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
Governor, State of New Jersey.

[Great seal]
Attest:

LLOYD B. MARSH,
Secretary of State.

And, on this 17th day of July 1951, John S. Fine has affixed his signature hereto as

Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and caused the great seal of the Commonwealth to be attached thereto.

JOHN S. FINE,
Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

[Great seal]
Attest:

GENE D. SMITH,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

SEC. 2. Subject to the provisions of the compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, as amended, said commission is hereby authorized to acquire any bridge heretofore constructed under the authority or with the consent of the Congress across the Delaware River. Said commission is hereby authorized to combine for financing purposes any two or more bridges heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the commission and to fix and charge tolls for the use of such bridges so combined and to pledge such tolls in accordance with the provisions of the said compact or agreement, as amended: *Provided*, That in fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of any bridge hereafter constructed or acquired by said commission or any bridges so combined, the same shall be so adjusted as to provide funds sufficient to pay the reasonable costs of maintaining, repairing, and operating such bridge or bridges and their approach facilities under economical management, and to provide funds sufficient to amortize the costs of such bridge or bridges and their approach facilities, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, and said commission may continue such tolls on all bridges heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the commission until all such costs shall have been amortized; after funds sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge or bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a letter from the attorney general of the State of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of H. R. 4900 and S. 1938 the question was raised as to whether the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission was concerned with the recent litigation governing the sale of the Tacony-Palmyra and Burlington-Bristol Bridges by a private corporation to a public agency of Burlington County, N. J., so I asked Hon. Theodore D. Parsons, the attorney general for the State of New Jersey, to express his opinion on this question.

I received a letter from him dated February 29 in which he clearly states that "there is no liability on the part of the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission in connection with that litigation," and I am glad to include in my remarks a copy of this letter for the RECORD:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
February 29, 1952.

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: This is in response to your inquiry regarding the liability of the Delaware

River Joint Toll Bridge Commission in connection with the recent litigation covering the sale of the Tacony-Palmyra and Burlington-Bristol Bridges by a private corporation to a public agency of Burlington County, N. J. I would advise you that there is no liability on the part of the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission in connection with that litigation. The highest court in the State of New Jersey has rendered its decision in this case and has denied leave for reargument. An application for review has been made to the United States Supreme Court.

The State of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey are, I know, extremely anxious to have congressional approval of the interstate compact referred to in Senate 1938. Both States are in complete agreement with the provisions of this bill as passed by the Senate. There is nothing in either the compact or Senate 1938 which affects the above-mentioned litigation or which would involve the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission in such litigation.

With best personal regards, I am
Sincerely,

THEODORE D. PARSONS.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4900) was laid on the table.

RESERVE CERTAIN LAND, PUBLIC DOMAIN IN NEVADA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4285) to reserve certain land on the public domain in Nevada for addition to Summit Lake Indian Reservation.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4323) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 5 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5990) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950.

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

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if some member of the committee could advise

why there was no departmental report accompanying the committee report?

Mr. DURHAM. There is no departmental report, as I recall, but as far as I could determine there was no objection to it. I am sure the gentleman realizes the difficulty we find ourselves in. This only gives the Civil Defense Authority the same right and privileges of acquiring property that the Army, and the Navy, and the Air Force have at the present time. They have to receive authorization from the committee on each piece of property that they acquire over \$25,000, and they also have to inform the committee of the acquisition of property between \$5,000 and \$25,000. At the present time I think the difficulty arises because of the fact that they have to go through this procedure and come to Congress for each piece of legislation.

Mr. BYRNES. I understand that is what they have to do, but I personally do not see anything wrong in coming to Congress. Did not this agency get into some difficulty some years ago in attempting to acquire some large tract of land and buildings?

Mr. DURHAM. No. Of course, the desire to acquire that property did not finally terminate in an agreement. The difficulty is that they have to come up here on each piece of legislation as far as this agency is concerned. If the Congress wants to take up the time, that is a different proposition.

Mr. BYRNES. Is it the gentleman's conception that the Civil Defense Administration is a temporary agency, or is it going to be a permanent agency?

Mr. DURHAM. Well, I hope it is temporary. Of course, we do not expect to stay in a state of emergency, I hope, all the rest of the centuries of our existence.

Mr. BYRNES. Since this is a temporary agency, I see no justification for putting it in the same class as the Army, the Navy, and Air Force, or the Defense Establishment.

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

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6319) to amend the Army-Navy Medical Service Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Army-Navy Medical Service Corps Act of 1947, as amended, is further amended by adding to title II the following new section:

"Sec. 208. (a) There shall be a Chief of the Medical Service Corps, appointed by the Secretary of the Navy upon recommendation of the Surgeon General of the Navy, for a term of not more than 4 years, from among officers of the active list of that Corps of the permanent rank of lieutenant commander or above, to serve at the pleasure of the Secretary. While so serving the officer shall

have the rank of captain in the Navy and shall receive the pay and allowances now or hereafter prescribed by law for that rank and his permanent status as a commissioned officer of the Medical Service Corps shall not be disturbed by reason of such appointment.

"(b) An officer of the Medical Service Corps who is retired for any reason while serving as Chief of the Medical Service Corps, or who having so served for 2½ years or more is subsequently retired while serving in a lower grade, may, in the discretion of the President, be retired with the rank held by him while serving as Chief of the Medical Service Corps and with retired pay based on the active duty pay of that rank."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAKE CUMBERLAND

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 359) to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Wolf Creek Dam in the State of Kentucky as Lake Cumberland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Wolf Creek Dam in the State of Kentucky shall hereafter be known as Lake Cumberland, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such lake is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such lake under and by the name of Lake Cumberland.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1499) to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind," approved August 4, 1919, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That for the purpose of enabling the American Printing House for the Blind more adequately to provide books and apparatus for the education of the blind, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to it, in addition to the permanent appropriation of \$10,000 made in the act entitled 'An act to promote the education of the blind,' approved March 3, 1879, as amended, the sum not to exceed \$250,000; which sum shall be expended in accordance with the requirements of said act to promote the education of the blind."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3166) 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, coun-

ties, or municipalities for recreational purposes," to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That 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 the States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes", is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. The Secretary of the Interior may, in the manner prescribed by this act, dispose of any public lands not reserved for power purposes to a State, Territory, county, municipality, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision for any public purposes, or to a nonprofit corporation or nonprofit association for any recreational or any public purpose consistent with its articles of incorporation or other creating authority. Before the land may be disposed of under this act for a purpose other than a recreational purpose, it must be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the land is to be used for an established or definitely proposed project.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may (a) sell such land to the State, Territory, county, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision in which the lands are situated, or to a nearby municipal corporation in the same State or Territory, for the purpose for which the land has been classified, at a price to be fixed by the Secretary, through appraisal or otherwise; (b) lease such land to the State, Territory, county, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision in which the lands are situated, or to a nearby municipal corporation in the same State or Territory, for the purpose for which the land has been classified, at a reasonable annual rental, for a period up to 20 years, and, at the discretion of the Secretary, with a privilege of renewal for a like period, or (c) lease such land to a nonprofit corporation or nonprofit association at a reasonable annual rental, for a period up to 20 years, and, at the discretion of the Secretary, with a privilege of renewal for a like period. Each patent or lease so issued shall contain reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits in the lands conveyed or leased and of the right to mine and remove the same, under applicable laws and regulations to be established by the Secretary. Each lease shall contain a provision for its termination upon a finding by the Secretary that the land has not been used by the lessee for the purpose specified in the lease for such period, not over 5 years, as may be specified in the lease, or that such land or any part thereof is being devoted to another use.

"SEC. 3. All provisions for reversion of title to the United States contained in patents heretofore issued under said act of June 14, 1926, are hereby cancelled.

"SEC. 4. The Act of September 30, 1890, entitled 'An act to authorize entry of the public lands by incorporated cities and towns for cemetery and park purposes', and the Act of October 17, 1940, entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease for park or recreational purposes, and to sell for cemetery purposes, certain public lands in Alaska', are hereby repealed."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike the word "the."

Page 1, line 6, insert a comma following the word "purposes."

Page 2, line 1, insert the designation "(a)" following the number "1."

Page 2, line 1, following the word "Interior", insert the words "upon application filed

by a duly qualified applicant under section 2 of this act."

Page 2, line 3, strike the words "not reserved for power purposes."

Page 2, following line 12, add the following new subsections:

"(b) No more than 640 acres may be conveyed to any one grantee in any one calendar year.

"(c) Where the lands have been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency other than the Department of the Interior, or of a State, Territory, county, municipality, water district, or other local governmental subdivision or agency, the Secretary of the Interior may make disposals under this act only with the consent of such Federal department or agency, or of such State, Territory, or local governmental unit. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to lands in any national forest, national park, or national monument, or to any Indian lands, or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for the use of Indians. Nor shall any disposition be made under this act for any use authorized under any other law, except for a use authorized under the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609; 43 U. S. C., sec. 662a), as amended."

Page 2, line 13, following the word "may" add the words ", after due consideration as to the power value of the land, whether or not withdrawn therefor."

Page 2, line 18, strike the words ", at a price to be fixed by the Secretary, through appraisal or otherwise;" and insert in lieu thereof the words "and conveyances of such land for historic-monument purposes under this subsection shall be made without monetary consideration, while conveyances for any other purpose under this subsection shall be made at 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the Secretary."

Page 3, line 3, insert a comma following the word "rental."

Page 3, line 6, insert the word "a" following the word "contain."

Page 3, line 16, strike all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 3. Title to lands conveyed by the Government under this act may not be transferred by the grantee or its successor except, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, to a transferee which would be a qualified grantee under section 2 (a) and subject to the acreage limitation contained in section 1 (b) of this act. A grantee or its successor may not change the use specified in the conveyance to another or additional use except, with the consent of the Secretary, to a use for which such grantee or its successor could obtain a conveyance under this act. If at any time after the lands are conveyed by the Government, the grantee or its successor attempts to transfer title to or control over these lands to another or the lands are devoted to a use other than that for which the lands were conveyed, without the consent of the Secretary, title to the lands shall revert to the United States."

Page 3, following line 18, add the following new section:

"SEC. 4. The Secretary may authorize transfers of title or changes in use in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of this act with respect to any patent heretofore issued under any act upon application by a patentee qualified to obtain a conveyance under section 2 (a) of this act."

Page 3, line 19, renumber Sec. 4 to read "SEC. 5."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Recreation Act of

June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**STOCKBRIDGE-MUNSEE COMMUNITY,
INC., WISCONSIN**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5577) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Inc., of the State of Wisconsin.

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] if this bill would add to a present Indian reservation in the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. MORRIS. It will add to it land that has, however, heretofore been acquired for the Indians. This bill is designed to put title in the Indians to about 13,000 acres of submarginal land that was acquired originally for them. This merely gives them title to the land which was acquired for their use.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it not true that instead of giving title to the Indians the ownership is now in the hands of the Federal Government, and this simply adds to the power of the Indian Bureau to control this much more land as part of this reservation? Is that not a fact?

Mr. MORRIS. I think that is not exactly true. It is true that the title now is in the United States Government, and if this bill becomes law it will still be in the United States Government for the use of the Indians. In other words, they would be holding it in trust for the Indians. In this instance these Indians have built some homes there. They have their gardens. They have spent some of their own funds and of course some of the reimbursable loan funds on the land, but the tenure is uncertain, the title is uncertain, and this is merely intended to give title to the United States in trust for the Indians.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why must we give these lands in trust to the Indian Bureau? Why cannot these Indians own the land outright? Many of them are almost white. Not one of them, I am informed, is a full-blooded Indian. Why should they not own this land like any other citizens in this country?

Mr. MORRIS. We are working with might and main along that line, but it is a rather laborious process and we will have to do it in an orderly way in order to do a good job of it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I want it done in an orderly way.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman will withhold his request for a moment, is it not a fact that if this bill is passed the title to this land, which is now adjacent to an old Indian reservation, will then be in the same situation as the title to the original or the old Indian reservation land?

Mr. MORRIS. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the bill is not enacted, there will be a cloud on the title of the land on which certain Indians have built their homes; is that not correct?

Mr. MORRIS. That is also correct. Mr. CUNNINGHAM. So the situation regarding the title then would be no different than the situation regarding the title of land in any Indian reservation, in any State in the United States?

Mr. MORRIS. I believe that last statement is correct. There might be some difference in regard to some reservations, but I will say substantially it would be the same as all other reservations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am very much in sympathy with what the gentleman says, but we have this unusual situation. There are treaties between many of the Indians and the Federal Government, which place certain property in trust from now on, let us say. That is a very delicate situation. Here is a tribe of Indians that is extremely wealthy, who participate in that treaty contract, and the land has a great oil-producing capacity. They do not want to be relieved directly or indirectly. They want the Federal Government to stay there, and be empowered in the administering of their funds.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, sir; but I do not want this to be handled this way.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, but you have that treaty. What are you going to do about the treaty?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Surely the gentleman knows that we could fulfill those treaties and do justice to the Indians.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But we have abrogated many treaties with the Indians, and that is where a great deal of trouble has come from.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman surely knows that I am not advocating any injustice to the Indians. The very fact that this land is to be held in trust is turning the clock back. The gentleman knows many of us are interested in the matter of doing away with the Indian Bureau. Why should there be an Indian reservation in the State of Wisconsin, anyhow? Those people are American citizens, and they ought to be treated as such.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will yield, I place myself in that class, but I am going to respect the contracts as we tried to get out from under this situation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would expect the contracts of the Federal Government to be respected.

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That is the last eligible bill on the Consent Calendar.

**AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF
1938**

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2697) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object.

**SUITABLE ACCOMMODATIONS FOR THE
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND CERTAIN
OTHER GOVERNMENT SERVICES AT EL
PASO, TEX.**

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6863) to make provision for suitable accommodations for the Bureau of Customs and certain other Government services at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) when the owners of tracts of land (more or less described in subsection (b)) situated in the city and county of El Paso and the State of Texas, having a frontage on South Santa Fe Street of five hundred and ninety feet, a width of two hundred and seventy-four feet, and containing approximately three and seventy-one one-hundredths acres (hereinafter referred to as the "owners") have agreed to erect upon such premises, or upon an equivalent area which has been approved by the Administrator of General Services, a building or buildings of such design, plan, and specifications as may be approved by the Administrator of General Services as suitable for the use of the Bureau of Customs, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Public Health Service, and the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, the Administrator of General Services is authorized, subject to an appropriation therefore, to enter into one or more leases at a fair annual rental for the use of such building or buildings and such premises, or such parts thereof as are necessary, for a term of 20 years after such building or buildings are ready for occupancy.

(b) Such tracts of land in the city and county of El Paso are described more or less as follows:

TRACT 1

Beginning at a point in the easterly line of block 21 in Campbell Addition to the city of El Paso, Tex., and in the westerly line of South El Paso Street one hundred and sixty feet southerly from the northeast corner of the said block 21;

Thence southerly along the easterly line of block 21 and the westerly line of South El Paso Street seventy-three and eight-tenths feet to the northerly line of right-of-way of the E. P. & S. W. Railroad;

Thence westerly, parallel with and twenty-five feet from the center line of the said right-of-way one hundred fifty and twenty-seven one-hundredths feet more or less to the north-south center line of a closed alley in block 21;

Thence northerly along the said alley center line thirty and seven-tenths feet more or less to a point four feet southerly from the south line of lot 5 projected;

Thence easterly along a line four feet southerly from and parallel with the south line of the said lot 5, one hundred and forty-four feet to the point of beginning;

Being parts of lots 2, 3, and 4, in the block 21 aforementioned, and easterly one-half of closed alley adjacent to the aforementioned property.

TRACT 2

Beginning at a point in the easterly line of South Santa Fe Street and the southerly line of the right-of-way of the E. P. & S. W. Railroad, which point is sixty-six and eighty-two one-hundredths feet northerly from the southwest corner of block 21 of the Campbell Addition to the city of El Paso, Texas;

Thence easterly along a line twenty-five feet southerly from and parallel with the center line of the right-of-way of the E. P. & S. W. Railroad two hundred eighty-nine and six-tenths feet more or less to a point in the westerly line of South El Paso Street, which point is forty-four and four one-hundredths feet northerly from the northeast corner of block 17 of the Campbell Addition;

Thence southerly along the west line of South El Paso Street and the east line of block 17, Campbell Addition, projected three hundred four and four one-hundredths feet to the southeast corner of said block 17.

Thence westerly two hundred and seventy-four feet along the southerly line of block 17 to the southwest corner of the said block and the easterly line of South Santa Fe Street;

Thence northerly along the westerly line of block 17 projected and the easterly line of South Santa Fe Street three hundred ninety-six and eighty-two one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning;

Being all of block 17, part of what was formerly Eleventh Street between blocks 17 and 21, and that part of block 21 lying south of the right-of-way of the E. P. & S. W. Railroad.

TRACT 3

Beginning at a point in the west line of South El Paso Street and the east line of block 21, Campbell Addition projected twenty-five and ninety-six one-hundredths feet southerly from the southeast corner of the said block 21;

Thence westerly at an angle of seventy-three degrees twenty-six minutes with the east line of block 21, one hundred fifty and forty-four one-hundredths feet to the P. C., thence westerly along a curve to the right one hundred thirty-nine and eighteen one-hundredths feet more or less to a point on the east line of South Santa Fe Street and the west line of block 21 sixty-six and eighty-two one-hundredths feet northerly from the southwest corner of said block 21;

Thence northerly along the west line of block 21 and the east line of South Santa Fe Street fifty-six and forty-four one-hundredths feet to a point one hundred thirty-six and seventy-four one-hundredths feet southerly from the northwest corner of said block 21;

Thence easterly along a curve to the left one hundred fifty-four and forty-six one-hundredths feet more or less to the P. C., thence easterly along the tangent one hundred thirty-five and fifty-six one-hundredths feet to a point on the west line of South El Paso Street twenty-six and two-tenths feet northerly from the southeast corner of said block 21;

Thence southerly along the west line of South El Paso Street fifty-two and sixteen one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning;

Being a strip of land fifty feet wide in block 21, Campbell Addition, and in a part of Eleventh Street which has been closed.

TRACT 4

Beginning at the northeast corner of block 21 of the Campbell Addition to the city of

El Paso, Tex., which is also the southwesterly corner of the intersection of West Tenth and South El Paso Streets;

Thence southerly along the easterly line of the said block 21 and the westerly line of South El Paso Street one hundred and sixty feet to a point four feet south of the south line of lot 5 in the said block 21;

Thence westerly four feet from and parallel with the south line of the said lot 5, one hundred and forty-four feet to a point in the north-south center line of an alley which has been closed;

Thence northerly along the said center line one hundred and sixty feet to a point in the northerly line of block 21 and the southerly line of West Tenth Street;

Thence easterly along the northerly line of block 21, one hundred and forty-four feet to the point of beginning;

Being lots 5-10, inclusive, and the northerly four feet of lot 4, and half of the alley adjoining the said lots in the block 21 aforementioned.

TRACT 5

Beginning at the northwest corner of block 21, Campbell Addition of the city of El Paso, Tex., which is at the southeast corner of the intersection of South Santa Fe and West Tenth Streets;

Thence easterly along the northerly line of the said block 21 and the southerly line of West Tenth Street, one hundred and thirty feet to the north-south center line of a closed alley in the said block 21;

Thence southerly along the north-south center line of the closed alley in block 21, one hundred ninety and seven-tenths feet more or less to the northerly line of a fifty-foot right-of-way of the E. P. & S. W. R. R.;

Then westerly along a curve to the right twenty-five feet from and parallel to the center line of the said right-of-way one hundred thirty-nine and seventy-five one-hundredths feet more or less to a point in the easterly line of South Santa Fe Street, which is one hundred thirty-six and seventy-four one-hundredths feet southerly from the northwest corner of block 21;

Thence northerly along the westerly line of block 21 and the easterly line of South Santa Fe Street one hundred thirty-six and seventy-four one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, being lots 11-15 and part of lots 16, 17, and 18, and one-half of the alley adjoining the said lots in the block 21 aforementioned.

Sec. 2. The act entitled "An act to make provision for suitable quarters for certain Government services at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1934, as amended, is hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING VETERANS REGULATIONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the veterans regulations to establish for certain persons who served in the Armed Forces a further presumption of service connection for an active psychosis.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second last proviso of subparagraph (c) of paragraph I, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the words "multiple sclerosis" the words "or active psychosis."

Sec. 2. The act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 694; 38 U. S. C., ch. 12, note) is hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. RANKIN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is entitled to 20 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to provide a 2-year presumptive period for the disease of psychosis, instead of the 1-year period which exists today. Of course, the bill applies only to service-connected cases, including presumptively service-connected cases, and would provide compensation based on the degree of disability, and would provide also for priority in the admission of such cases to veterans' hospitals.

Hearings were held by a subcommittee and the bill was unanimously reported by the full committee. It is our belief that the 2-year presumptive period is a very conservative period of time, inasmuch as World War I veterans suffering from a similar affliction had until January 1, 1925, or approximately 6 years presumptive period.

I have contended all along, Mr. Speaker, that we should treat these boys at least as well as we treated the veterans of World War I, but we have had considerable opposition at the other end of the Capitol. On the last day of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, the Senate passed a bill providing hospitalization for cases of this type, and denying compensation. In other words, they passed a bill providing hospitalization for these presumptively service-connected psychosis cases, but denied them compensation. I accepted that proposal in an effort to get some better treatment for men suffering from this dread disease. I believe that all pension and compensation benefits should be on a uniform basis, and thus the committee has reported favorably on this bill.

No estimate has been compiled as to the cost.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we have heard a great deal this morning about the shirts that have been sent to Members of Congress by the taxpayers. You wait until the mothers and fathers, widows and orphans of disabled veterans and the veterans themselves, begin to send in bloody shirts to Congress, and then you will have something to look at, sure enough. We owe these men a lasting debt of gratitude, and if I had my way I would give them the same presumptive period that was provided for the veterans of World War I, not only for the tubercular and insane cases but the paralysis cases and others suffering from permanent and total disability from chronic diseases.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman should point out that this House passed a similar bill last year, which provided for a 3-year presumptive period.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and the gentleman from Tennessee was chairman of the subcommittee that held the hearings on it; but when it went to the other end of the Capitol they turned it down and sent back the bill that provided for only hospitalization for presumptive cases. That bill came back to the House on the last day of the session, if I remember correctly, and we had to accept it to get anything at all for these boys.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman point out that the Veterans' Administration has a list of critical diseases for which they provide compensation, and psychosis is one for which compensation is provided for the 1-year period, whether or not this legislation is enacted.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but that is not long enough. The truth of the business is that these cases as a rule get worse instead of better.

Mr. EVINS. A similar bill has been passed regarding tuberculosis, and provides for a 3-year presumptive period. This act asks for only a 2-year period on this dread disease.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and 2 years for multiplesclerosis also.

At this point, I am inserting that part of the report covering the subject of psychosis.

The matter referred to follows:

[Excerpts From the Merck Manual,
Eighth Edition]

THE PSYCHOSES

Any mental disorder, including the psychoneurotic reactions, involves the total personality and extends to its depths. In the psychoses, however, the disturbance is of such magnitude that the mind is distorted more or less in entirety. The conscious portion of the ego no longer functions efficiently in its role of recognizing the source of at least some of the impulses that reach and pervade it. In one degree or another, therefore, it accepts as environmentally authentic material that actually is ideational. Thus the psychotic displays inability to correct his misconceptions about what is real and what is unreal.

Except that it includes the senile, presenile, and arteriosclerotic psychoses, this section deals only with those psychoses that are presumed to arise solely from intrapersonality conflict: schizophrenia, paranoia, and paranoid conditions, the manic-depressive psychoses, and the involuntional psychoses. Numerous other causes for psychoses exist, such as specific infections, including syphilis, epidemic encephalitis, acute chorea, and tuberculous, epidemic cerebrospinal, or other forms of meningitis. Other causes are alcoholism, convulsive disorders (e. g., epilepsy), brain tumor, metabolic disease, trauma, and drugs and other exogenous toxins. This last group of substances includes mercury, manganese, carbon disulfide, carbon monoxide, opium and its derivatives, bromides, cocaine, the barbituric acid group, peyote, mescaline, belladonna, chloral, and paraldehyde. Many of these reactions are adequately described elsewhere in the Manual (q. v.). Delirium is a temporary psychosis. Patients with mental deficiency or a so-called psychopathic personality may develop a psychosis, often displaying a typical manic-depressive or schizophrenic reactions. There is little doubt that

in most instances the psychopath is as he is because of his environment, and he and the feeble-minded individual may become psychotic because of continuing environmental stress.

Schizophrenia (*dementia praecox*)

The term "schizophrenia" means splitting of the mind, which is more descriptive of this condition than early or precocious dementia, as implied by the term "dementia praecox." Dementia, an irreparable impairment of cognitive and intellectual functions, does not occur with this condition. Rather schizophrenia may be considered as a psychobiologic reaction that arises on the basis of personality inadequacies, and results in an inability to meet the demands of adult adjustment. The reaction is characterized by progressive withdrawal from contact with persons and activities in the environment and regression to a childlike or infantile type of feeling or acting. An inferior affective capacity is one of the important results when the personality becomes disorganized or split in schizophrenia. This is displayed as an inadequate and inappropriate emotional response to situations, and represents a deterioration of emotional expression.

Etiology, Incidence, and Predisposing Factors

Schizophrenia constitutes from 15 to 20 percent of the first admissions to public mental hospitals, and 60 percent of their permanent population. The age of onset ranges from childhood to late middle life, but the psychosis is most frequent in adolescence or early adult life.

No constant or characteristic structural or biochemical change has yet been established in this condition. That the causes of schizophrenia are to be searched for in the individual's basic personality and the extent or limit of its adaptive power is the most generally accepted concept today. Childhood conditioning experiences, intrapsychic conflicts, persistent but consciously rejected instinctive urges and drives, feelings of insecurity or guilt, and other longstanding troublesome problems and frustrated purposes, in one combination or another, must be considered as potent precipitating forces.

Schizophrenia often represents only an extreme expression of the patient's previous schizoid type of temperament and personality. The contrasting poles of this type are sensitiveness on the one hand, and dullness or coldness on the other. The sensitive schizoid is timid and shy, self-conscious, perhaps stubborn and suspicious, and often dissatisfied; he is constantly being wounded. Reserved and socially inept, he may find in books a substitute for human companionship. The subjects he chooses usually are not of concrete objective type, but rather of abstract nature. He frequently is ambitious, conscientious, particular, and perfectionistic. Other schizoids lack the finer sensibilities of the group above. Many of these lack spontaneity and appear colorless personalities. This group varies from kindly, honest, but emotionally dull, unsocial and uncompromising individuals, to cold, reserved, and callous types.

Prodromal Stage

Frequently there is no abrupt transition, but rather an insidious change in mood and outlook. Long-existing disharmonies of thought, habit and interest became accentuated. The individual may seem preoccupied, be considered lazy, and may begin to believe others are talking about him or do not care for him. Such ideas of reference are common. He may become restless, taciturn, or ill at ease, yet appear unworried about odd mannerisms that make their appearance. Some ruminate on sexual topics and others on hypochondriacal ideas. At this stage the conflicts are not greatly disguised and may often be discovered without difficulty.

The Manifest Psychosis

An apparent poverty and increased disharmony in the feeling tone of the individual now may appear. However, some patients show not an absence of mood, but a prevailing one, such as euphoria or depression. But these moods will generally be found to have little or no relation to conscious mental content and none to external circumstances. Not infrequently, the opposite emotional response will be evoked by an idea or experience—an emotional dissociation or disconnection.

Since schizophrenia may be considered as a reaction characterized by introversion or the direction of the individual's energy and interests upon himself and his subjective life, and by the expression of rejected material through symbolism, one expects and finds no disturbance in consciousness or memory, and so none of orientation. The patient's intellect is inert rather than impaired.

The affect, or feeling tone, having been withdrawn from conscious mental assets and attached to complexes and other material in the unconscious, and being therefore inaccessible to the individual, the patient often feels changed throughout. He may come to feel he observes, as a spectator, his own actions which seem to him impersonal and mechanical. Such states of depersonalization are not uncommon. In his attempt to rationalize this sense of the loss of the limits of his own personality, his nihilistic ideas may increase until he feels he is dead, or no longer has body, or that there is no world.

Paralogia, a condition in which the reply to one's question indicates that it has been understood, although the answer because of defective reasoning, is erroneous, is due to the dereistic thinking which occupies much of the schizophrenic's attention. Symbols and associations, molded by unconscious instinctive drives and affects, rise into consciousness and constitute dereistic, or dreamlike thinking, a pleasurable thinking that disregards realistic, logical, and scientific concepts and thus tends to falsify reality.

Often, the dominant ideational content of the schizophrenic is delusional in nature. The delusions tend to center around themes of persecution, or grandiosity, and of sex. While these often appear grotesque, apparently they always are specific and adapted to the peculiar psychological needs of the individual.

Normally, associations and ideas progress with logical connection on to ultimate completeness of thought, but in the schizophrenic they may be so fragmented and shortened, or otherwise distorted, as to appear illogical. In early schizophrenia, a flight of ideas may occur; this later tends to develop into incoherence. Neologisms, or coined words, probably represent extreme condensations and symbolizations of complexes, conflicts, and other unconscious material highly charged with affect. Blocking, or sudden cessation of a thought—and its verbal expression—is one of the hallmarks of schizophrenia, and presumably occurs when the patient's thoughts approach affectively overcharged and forbidden psychological ground. The train of thought abruptly terminates and cannot be reinitiated.

Hallucinations, the projection of inner experiences on to the external world, are frequent, and in no other mental disorder appear so frequently in the presence of clear consciousness. These are most frequently auditory. Visual hallucinations tend to be limited to the acute phase of the disease.

The capricious, impulsive behavior of the schizophrenic probably is to be looked upon as an ambivalence of impulse. His conflicting impulses, some conscious, some unconscious, control behavior in erratic sequence, or even struggle simultaneously to

direct it. This conflict may result in acts directly opposite to those suggested to the individual. This reaction, as well as increased suggestibility whereby the individual follows out each suggestion immediately, echolalia, and echopraxia, the latter two meaning, respectively, repetition of words spoken to him and repetition of the acts of another person—all common in varying degrees in schizophrenics—may be interpreted as defense reactions against the intrusion of the disavowed environment.

Activity mannerisms may occupy a large place in the clinical picture. They consist of stereotyped (without variation) affectations of manner, speech, and gait; of grimaces, ticlike movements, puckering out of the mouth or wrinkling the forehead, and, in many instances, of elaborate and ritualistic routines of behavior.

With such disorder and disequilibrium manifest in the mental life of the patient, it is not surprising to find a certain physical disequilibrium often accompanying schizophrenia. This may be manifested in cold, cyanotic extremities, or blotchy skin and widely dilated pupils. Seizures may occur, especially in the early stages. Some patients show a lowered metabolism. During acute phases, many schizophrenics lose weight.

Clinical Types

As transitions from one type to another often occur during different phases of the psychosis, the present tendency among psychiatrists is not to attempt to divide schizophrenia into the various classic types. However, these are descriptively important.

1. Simple: Manifested by a gradual and insidious change in personality, with increasingly pronounced disturbances in emotion, interest, and activity. If hallucinations occur they are fleeting. Delusions play no important role. Interest is withdrawn from the external world and there is a diminished response to social demands. Varied degrees of this deviation may appear. Many such persons become tramps, vagrants, delinquents, or prostitutes. Apathy, preoccupation, and inactivity characterize many hospitalized individuals of this type.

2. Hebephrenic: There is a tendency to include under this classification cases not readily fitting into other groups. The ideational content of the hebephrenic tends toward fantasy, with fragmentary rather than elaborate or systematized delusions. Hallucinations are frequent, associations are markedly loose, speech is incoherent, emotional reactions are shallow and incongruous, and regressive features (soiling, wetting), and a certain silliness of response and action, often predominate. The patient becomes bafflingly inaccessible. The disintegration of personality is perhaps greater than with any of the other types.

3. Catatonic: Characterized by phases of stupor and excitement, frequently alternating suddenly, although any given catatonic episode may consist of only one phase. The catatonic form frequently has its onset, which may be acute, between the ages of 15 and 25; and more often than the other types is precipitated by an emotionally disturbing experience. The prognosis for recovery and reintegration of personality is more favorable than in other types, but after several episodes the condition tends to become chronic.

Patients in catatonic stupor show increasing inattention, preoccupation, emotional poverty, dreaminess, and frequently progress to mutism. Inattention to their bodily needs, refusal to eat, and retention of saliva, urine, and feces are common. Negativism, gesturing, grimacing, and immobility may supervene and extend for a period of extremely variable duration. The patient slowly or at times suddenly emerges from this stuporous phase. He then may become virtually normal or may pass into a state of catatonic excitement.

A form of catatonia characterized by impulsive, often stereotyped, overactivity so largely motivated from within as to appear purposeless is called catatonic excitement. The patient may appear delirious or be sleepless and thus rapidly exhaust himself. Negativism and destructiveness may be observed. The speech may vary from mutism to a rapid pressing flow.

4. Paranoid: Delusions which are illogical and unrelated to reality, hallucinations, and the usual schizophrenic disturbances in associations and affects, together with negativism, are the most prominent symptoms in this group. This type tends to make its frank appearance in persons 30 to 35 years of age. Delusions of persecution are the chief manifestation, but depressive hypochondriacal, or fantastically expansive, obviously wish-fulfilling, ideas are common.

Prognosis

A permanent disorganization of personality does not invariably result from a schizophrenic episode. Not only the catatonic, but also the other forms may be episodic in character; frequently, however, the course of the disease ultimately becomes uninterrupted. Patients may recover with little scarring, but careful observation generally detects slight losses in spontaneity, in sense of humor or elasticity of personality, and a dulling of affectivity. If the psychosis represents an insidious development from a previously distorted personality and its inherent characteristics, the prognosis usually is poor. Consequently, the mildness of early symptoms bears no relation to ultimate outcome. In the simple type, the prognosis is not good, and the course of the hebephrenic form tends to be progressive. In the catatonic type many of the patients are restored to their prepsychotic level for varying lengths of time. The paranoid type is considered particularly malignant, although remissions which may be looked upon as social recoveries do occur.

Diagnosis

Schizophrenia in its initial stages must be differentiated from hysteria, compulsion neurosis, and manic-depressive psychosis (q. v.). Various conditions such as thyrotoxicosis, fevers, kidney or heart disease, toxemia of pregnancy, may precipitate a latent schizophrenia or a delirious state resembling this disorder. Carefully appraising the patient's prepsychotic personality often helps in such differentiations.

In hysteria, the patient's psychologic motive more often is apparent, the symptoms are paroxysmal and more sudden in onset; and, unlike the schizophrenic where normal and psychotic elements exist side by side, the hysteric shows an alternation of normal and psychotic. In hysteria, the symbolization is conventional and intelligible, while in schizophrenia the use of symbols is individualized and archaic.

Compulsion neurosis: A patient with a compulsion neurosis consciously strongly resists his obsessions and compulsions, while the schizophrenic tends to display increasing apathetic unconcern. (The schizophrenic's hypochondriacal complaints lack the dramatization seen in the psychoneuroses.)

Manic-depressive psychosis: This frequently is most difficult to differentiate. The onset of schizophrenia tends to be more insidious, and the excitement paroxysmal rather than sustained as in the manic. The quality of infectiousness about the mood of the manic is lacking. The schizophrenic's delusions are more grotesque and create less tension. More often than the reverse, a psychosis at first thought to be a manic-depressive episode subsequently proves to be schizophrenic.

Treatment

Psychotherapy: According to some authorities a schizophrenic illness is to be viewed as a repudiation by the patient of an im-

agined hostile environment. To demonstrate that his conception rests on an unreal basis, it is necessary that the schizophrenic be supported by sincere and patient friendliness until he can gain insight into the fact that his illness has arisen because of his own misinterpretations. The objective is to stimulate his attention, detach his emotions from subjective material, redirect his interests to things outside himself, inculcate healthful social habits, and abstract him from his spiritual isolation. Important aids are occupational therapy, congenial companionships, and a carefully planned recreational program. The patient's distorted ideas should not be refuted, but accepted without critical comment or perhaps with an observation that they probably will change or have a different significance to him as he recovers from his illness. As the patient improves he may be allowed to interpret his own ideas, but this is not specifically encouraged. For, except by a skilled therapist, only extremely superficial interpretations can safely be given, since the psychologic significance of his psychotic ideas might be overwhelmingly traumatic to the patient.

Insulin therapy: This treatment is suitable only for institutionalized patients, since constant supervision is required. Insulin (R 14), 10 to 20 u., subcut., is given on the first day and increased by 5 to 10 u. on each succeeding day until signs of severe shock appear. (Food, of course, is withheld during the preceding several hours.) Coma is occasionally produced by a dose of 40 u., but most patients require 80 to 90 u. Subsequently a smaller amount may have the same effect, and it is wise to reduce the dose by 5 to 10 u. from time to time to test the effect. Shock treatments, at a rate of 5 to 6 times a week, may have to be continued until 65 or 70 have been given, but favorable cases often respond by or before the 50th treatment. In discontinuing the therapy, the dose is tapered off by a reduction of 20 to 40 u./day.

Wet, dry, and convulsive types of insulin shock are encountered. (1) Wet shock, the most common, starts with sweating, hunger, sleepiness, slurred speech, and confusion. Coma follows and a Babinski sign appears, to be replaced later in case of extreme shock by a general areflexia that includes loss of the pupillary light reflex. (2) Dry shock is practically the same except that the patient perspires very little. (3) In the convulsive type generalized clonic movements are characteristic. Extreme caution must be observed when patients characteristically respond with convulsions, which may occur at any time between the onset of hypoglycemia and full waking. Provided the total period of hypoglycemia has not exceeded 6 hours, an uncomplicated shock may be continued for 2 to 3 hours.

Shock is terminated by administering glucose. If the patient is in light shock and able to swallow, he is given 2 Gm. of glucose by mouth for each unit of insulin previously administered that day. Otherwise, 300 Gm. or more of glucose in a 25 percent solution is given by nasal tube; or in extreme cases, 25 to 50 cc. of 50 percent glucose I. V. (R 19). Epinephrine (R 20), 0.3 to 0.5 cc. of a 1:1,000 solution subcut., occasionally is administered to speed arousal after the glucose is given. Upon regaining consciousness, the patient must immediately take additional carbohydrates by mouth (usually several slices of bread). A carbohydrate rich meal is given as soon as the patient is fully conscious. Throughout the course of therapy a high caloric (4,000 to 5,000 C. daily), high vitamin diet is prescribed. (See Diets.)

Insulin shock therapy is attended by many dangers, among which are after-shock (a relapse into unconsciousness, perhaps many hours later), prolonged coma, severe convulsions, and extreme vasomotor or circulatory collapse.

Convulsive shock therapy: Electroshock has largely supplanted Metrazol for producing these therapeutic convulsions, as it is less terrifying to the patient, is equally or more efficacious therapeutically, and produces fewer fractures. Further electroshock treatments are usually contraindicated if a patient has not improved with 20 convulsions. Schizophrenic patients often become extremely disturbed after several convulsions, which ordinarily precludes the use of this form of therapy unless the patient is hospitalized. The relative value of insulin and electroshock therapy in schizophrenia has not yet been statistically determined, but there is some indication that insulin may prove to give lasting benefit more frequently, especially in the paranoid type. (For details about electroshock therapy, see *Involuntal Melancholia*.)

PARANOIA AND PARANOID CONDITIONS

Classic paranoia, which is rarely if ever seen, is a psychosis in which a circumscribed delusional system exists without dilapidation of conation, affect, or associative processes. (By conation is meant the instinctually motivated striving aspects of the personality that are more or less beyond volitional control.) In its less strict and more modern sense, paranoia also describes any personality reaction characterized by the mechanisms of projection and compensation. To understand many normal as well as psychotic manifestations, familiarity with the nature of these mechanisms is necessary. They may be employed to excess in practically all psychoses, but usually are only incidental or transitory except in classic paranoia, paranoid conditions, and paranoid schizophrenia. The paranoid conditions range by imperceptible gradations from classic paranoia on to the state of disorganization seen in paranoid schizophrenia. Step by step, from patient to patient, a greater admixture of schizophrenic features is seen. This is reflected in inadequate affective responses, increasingly disorganized associations, and the symbolization and projection of mental material as hallucinations. In all of these reactions there is a tendency for what is troublesome within to be projected outward in ideational and verbal form. A patient with paranoid psychosis carries to extremes the normal methods of maintaining self-esteem; i. e., by blaming others for his own failures, denying the possession of those of his traits that he dislikes, and by overcoming his feelings of insecurity with various compensatory strivings.

Etiology

The personality aspects from which paranoia arises are: the need to shield particularly sensitive portions of thought-life, hunger for a recognition that cannot be achieved, and the fears and guilt feelings these conflicts and strivings evoke. Character anomalies become continuous with the psychosis; both are based on the habitual way in which the patient reacts to his inner conflicts and outer adversities. Sexual conflicts, often unconscious, usually are operative. Homosexual tendencies, normal at certain ages and stages of development, either reawakened or never fully relinquished and unconsciously craving expression, are perhaps basic. Freud's description of this mechanism is that the man cannot admit to conscious recognition the existence of his unconscious "I love him"; to be admissible he could only say "I hate him," but this does not solve the conflict. Eventually, the unconscious thought is projected and finally enters consciousness—as a subjectively valid interpretation of environmental happenings—in the distorted form "he hates me," to which later is added "he persecutes me." It is then but one further ruminative step to the patient's conscious belief that he is important else he would not thus be singled out for attention. Grandiosity begins. (Grandiose and persecutory ideas almost always go hand

in hand.) Perhaps the more rigid the personality and therefore the less possible the recognition that conflicts exist in any part of the psyche, the nearer the symptoms will approach those of classic paranoia. Conversely, the nearer the conflicts come to conscious recognition, and hence more dangerous to the ego, the nearer will the symptoms approach those of schizophrenia. (Sometimes an individual's intellectual and emotional acceptance of and coming to terms with his homosexuality may prevent—with proper psychotherapy—a schizophrenic dissolution of personality.) In a woman, conscience-dictated frustrations of heterosexual urges may cause discontent, tension, and a general sense of dissatisfaction to such an extent that regression takes place and homosexual conflicts are awakened. She may either believe she is persecuted by women or, working out her conflict on a heterosexual plane, by men; or else that some important man—perhaps her physician—loves her and their union is being prevented only by her enemies.

Symptoms

The history may reveal that as a child the patient was especially needful of appreciation; was moody, resentful of school and parental discipline; was unable to form good play adjustments, and perhaps suspicious. A compensatory striving toward superiority may have resulted. In the growing-up stage, the rigidity and tendency toward pride may have increased, as well as the patient's inherent sensitiveness to the attitude of others toward him. Before the psychosis becomes manifest, prodromal symptoms sometimes occur. Perhaps numerous situations have caused the patient to react with wounded and bitter pride. He analyzes his moods and sensations, may become hypochondriacal, is more reserved, and withdraws from attempts to discuss his problems. He displays sullen quietness, behind which lurks haughty disdain. Periods of moody dreaminess occur. Suddenly or gradually the conception may be born that his failures have been due to the enmity of others. Now he sees new and hidden significance in commonplace events: people deliberately slight him; his situation is endangered; he experiences vague fears and becomes increasingly resentful. All suspicions are vigorously defended. Hallucinations may or may not occur; however, either through hallucinations or ideation, he comes to feel important. Perhaps now he assumes the caricatured mien of the individual he thinks himself to be. The exalted paranoid may believe himself a chosen one of God—perhaps a reincarnation of Christ. He may develop a humble air, grow a beard, exhibit idiosyncrasies in closing, and picture himself as tolerant and understanding. He believes he would be serene were he not constantly molested. Effect determines his logic. He reinterprets past events through retrospective falsification and these falsifications consolidate his new evaluations. The litigious type, probably an individual who always had been defensive about his rights, after some legal action having resulted unsatisfactorily, may launch further lawsuits. His drive is to prove himself right and others wrong, rather than the desire for justice he expresses. By these activities sensitive insecurity is protected.

Another patient may believe himself loved by some wealthy or powerful woman. He writes to her; her failure to reply is to test his love. He may see symbols in the sky, or birds may chirp in an unusual fashion to show him he is loved. In other cases, sexual impotence may represent a paranoid defensive pattern; this shields the patient from conscious knowledge of his fundamental conflicts. Or dissatisfactions with self may be projected as the wife's discontent, and thus lead to delusions of her infidelity. Deafness in insecure persons often facilitates paranoid reactions. Their seclusiveness, suspicious-

ness, and proneness to misinterpret others' actions often are overcompensated by extreme aggressiveness. *Folie à deux*, a mental disorder in which two intimately associated persons develop the same paranoid ideas, is explained by the responsiveness of the weaker and more submissive to the stronger. Generally the infected individual relinquishes his delusions when separated from the other. *Folie à deux* is not infrequent between man and wife, but is more frequent between sisters or brothers, or any two individuals with the same background.

The paranoid usually has superior intellectual endowments, which in fact are necessary for his rationalizations. Excessive use of this mechanism almost is a hallmark of the condition. His prolonged tense and expectant affective state stimulates attention, he sees connections where none actually exist, and at times his concepts are rationalized into an extensive delusional system.

Diagnosis

So-called acute paranoia is discussed under the manic-depressive psychoses (q. v.). In paranoia the ideas are more sustained and are supported by a less changeable affect, in contrast to the usual vacillations in the manic. Since the mental operations are only exaggerations of normal mechanisms, at times it is difficult to differentiate the non-psychotic paranoid from the psychotic paranoid. The patient must be deemed psychotic if the reaction is continuous, if his beliefs cannot be corrected, if they tend to spread, and if they are completely illogical. Classifying these reactions as approximating either the paranoid or the schizophrenic pole is aided by evaluating the degree of disturbance in the individual's contacts with reality. The more the repressed material comes into consciousness as hallucinations and the more archaic the form of adjustment, the nearer the reaction approaches schizophrenia.

Prognosis

Patients with classic paranoia or those with reactions closely approximating it, probably never recover; however, they may not require hospitalization. The patients' conduct often remains within bounds, society looks upon them as "cranks," they rarely act without reflection, and therefore avoid commitment more often than patients with schizophrenic-like reactions. Remissions may occur in the latter types, but the ultimate prognosis nevertheless is poor.

Treatment

Whether the patient is to remain free in the community is determined by his potential danger to others. If delusions are directed against specific persons, confinement is probably necessary; the greater the expressed hatred the more imperative is commitment. In all dealings with paranoid patients—schizophrenic or otherwise—scrupulous honesty and truthfulness are necessary. Often the patient will follow reasonable suggestions and greatly modify his behavior. The physician may become his one confidant. Despite contrary appearances, the paranoid and schizophrenic crave love, as they live inwardly in a cold and colorless solitude to which they have withdrawn not through choice but from unconscious motivation. Healthy human companionships have come to appear unattainable and, through fear of their own aggressiveness, dangerous. They withdraw to their citadel only after—to them—endless frustrations. Hence, tolerance on the part of the physician, a philosophic detachment combined with a justified humility, a sense of humor about his own ineptness as well as the patients' peccadillos, discretion, understanding, and warmth, are the tools used to ease the paranoids' tensions, to help them achieve calmer environmental adjustments, and to bring some serenity, transient though

It may be, into the lives of these sometimes turbulent and always troubled individuals. Even slight deafness in a paranoid individual should be corrected, if possible; otherwise the use of a hearing aid should be insisted upon. Help in unraveling the family problems or irritating work situations are representative ways by which the physician may be able to aid his patient.

Drugs play only an incidental and not a curative role in managing and treating these patients. Extreme tension may be somewhat allayed with phenobarbital (R 2), 30 mg. (gr. ss) 3 times daily, and occasionally a mild hypnotic such as Amytal (R 3), 0.1 to 0.3 Gm. (gr. iss to v) at bedtime, may be indicated if the patient suffers from protracted insomnia.

MANIC-DEPRESSIVE PSYCHOSES

The term affectivity means the basal tone of the feeling life, and the manic-depressive psychoses are called affective psychoses because the patient's ideas, actions, and feeling tones are in harmonious agreement. Classically, the disorder is characterized by alternating periods of mania and depression, but some patients exhibit only one phase, which may be either depression or elation. An occasional patient may have only one or two attacks during his lifetime, but periodic recurrences are the rule.

Etiology and Incidence

If the disease is initiated by a manic episode, it most frequently occurs between the ages of 15 and 25; if by a depressive episode, between 25 and 35. Its incidence is greatest among the higher social and professional group, and twice as great in women as in men. An estimated one-third of siblings of patients with the disorder become affected; thus, presumably heredity plays a role. However, factors of environment may be of primary importance, as a child can incorporate his parents' traits through emulation and identification. The psychosis usually occurs in individuals with a "cyclothymic" temperament, which may be described under three subdivisions. The hypomanic is outgoing, vivacious, optimistic, and easily swayed by new impressions. His superficial judgment often leads to failures; for these he has ready excuses. Some hypomanics are hypercritical, domineering, and argumentative. The syntonics is the "normal" cyclothyme. He is genial, sociable, uncomplicated, and a practical realist. He radiates a certain warmth and ease. The melancholic often is quiet, kindly, solemn; but may be gloomy, submissive, and self-deprecatory; his hesitation and indecision betray his feelings of insecurity. He often is preoccupied with his work.

Symptoms and Signs

The manic phase: Excitement is the cardinal symptom. It may be mild (hypomania), acute, or delirious. There is a quickening of the individual's entire tempo, which is reflected in an apparent wealth of mental associations (verbosity), tireless overactivity, and feelings of elation. The patient may be mischievous, playful, and have fleeting delusions of grandeur. Irritability and anger may punctuate his elation when his requests are denied. If "impure" affects are present—as seen in a manic with a paranoid-like reaction—he may be haughty, arrogant, and demanding and become abusive toward those who momentarily annoy him. Close observation reveals that his apparent wealth of ideas actually represents a limited range of associational products, and his wordiness is a flight from, rather than a product of, thinking. He is preoccupied with the phonetics instead of the meanings of words. Everything around him distracts his attention. Since he is not concerned with its ideational content, his talk assumes a character not unlike that of free associations, and thus often affords clues to his unconscious motivation.

The manic's increased psychomotor reactions range from simple overactivity to sustained and frenzied busyness. He may tear his clothing, decorate himself bizarrely, disarrange his room, smear the wall with feces—all without malice. He sings, shouts to any passer-by, makes obscene sexual proposals, is too excited to eat, sleep, or pay attention to any physical illness, mild or serious. Particularly when his excitement is not extreme he may not appear fatigued, yet in other instances these patients rapidly exhaust themselves. Actual hallucinations are rare, but illusions that simulate hallucinations are not uncommon. While these patients usually retain correct orientation, their poorly sustained attention may disturb this. A short mild depression often precedes a manic episode.

The depressive phase: In a considerable number of patients the episodes are confined to depressions, and often these patients' prepsychotic personality has been of the melancholic type. Manic-depressive depressions may be mild, acute, or stuporous. Many mild manic-depressive depressions are not recognized as such. They usually take the form of inertia and staleness or of hypochondriasis. In either case, the patient will be downhearted, and a patient with hypochondriacal complaints will consider these the cause rather than the result of his depression. These mildly depressed patients may be fearful, quiet, indecisive and have feelings of inadequacy. If impure affects exist, they may be irritable, sensitive, and morose, or peevish, stubborn, and faultfinding instead of sad. The more severe depressions often begin thus, but profound affective distress rapidly supervenes. This is reflected in a stooped posture and an immobile, or perplexed and troubled, facial expression. The patient sleeps poorly, wakes early, perhaps becomes constipated, and his sexual desires decrease. Because of psychomotor retardation, all physical activity becomes a great exertion. Subjectively, the patient may feel that his usual environment is strange or that a disaster is impending from which he cannot escape, and his outlook becomes hopeless. If the feelings of distress are projected, his ideas become delusional. A complaining, or a suspicious persecutory, paranoid trend may exist; or his thought life may be concerned with hypochondriacal ideas, self-accusations, ideas of guilt, remorse, and self-depreciation. His intense fear may create clouding of consciousness; however, unless a patient's attention is thus impaired by affective distress, orientation is not disturbed. Illusory misinterpretations are common, but hallucinations are infrequent. The psychomotor retardation, alone or augmented by some belief the patient holds—for instance, that he is unworthy of food—may make spoon- or tube-feeding necessary. Suicidal attempts or self-mutilations are not uncommon.

Stupor is the most intense form of these depressions: the patient makes no response to external stimuli, his sensorium is clouded, he is mute, and his face is masklike or wears a fixed expression of anxiety; spontaneous motor activity is slight or absent. A short hypomanic period often terminates the depressive episode.

Diagnosis

The psychosis must be differentiated from schizophrenia, paresis, so-called acute paranoia, and such psychoneurotic states as compulsion neuroses, neurasthenia, and hypochondriasis (q. v.). Paresis may be differentiated by history, neurologic signs, and laboratory tests. Acute paranoia is a misnomer for a hypomania in which exuberance is replaced by anger, resentment, irritability, frascibility, and perhaps delusions and litigious tendencies. Because of the obsessive ideas which a depressed patient may express, a compulsion neurosis sometimes is simulated; the differentiation is made by

determining whether the obsessions or the depression came first. The patient's solicitude about his health is continuous and prolonged in neurasthenia. In hypochondriasis, mild symptoms usually will have existed for a considerable time, and the attack does not come on abruptly as in the depressive state.

Prognosis

The prognosis for individual episodes is good and there is no residual "scarring" of the personality. However, the disease may assume a certain chronicity in which the intervals between episodes are brief or non-existent. The duration of manic-depressive episodes cannot be predicted with certainty, but on the average, manic attacks last 6 months and depressive attacks 9 months. If a first episode is a depression, it may be the last; if it is manic, others are apt to follow. The probability of future attacks varies inversely—to a degree at least—with the age when the disease first appears; if before 20, the prognosis is poor. Recurring episodes may occupy a large portion of some patients' lives; normal periods tend to become shorter as age advances. Chronic mania is uncommon before the age of 40, and the melancholia is more apt to become chronic. Repeated attacks usually leave the mind unchanged in basic functionings, but occasionally a patient may show some impairment of initiative and judgment.

Treatment

Only an occasional patient with manic-depressive psychosis can be cared for at home, and then a psychiatric consultant must be available and psychiatric nurses kept on 24-hour duty. It often is difficult to persuade the family to commit the patient to a hospital, as they do not realize to what extent the defective judgment of these patients constitutes a risk to themselves and others. When relatives are told that electroshock therapy may be indicated, and, if so, that it may put an end to the episode, they may more readily agree to the patient's commitment.

The manic phase: Manic patients want to be constantly occupied and outlets for their energy must be supplied, but not to the point of producing exhaustion. Arguments and contradictions should be avoided and the patient allowed to do as he wishes within safe limits. The patient's distractibility sometimes makes spoon feeding or tube feeding necessary. (See Melancholia.) A high caloric diet is imperative. The treatment of choice for excitement and insomnia is the use of prolonged neutral baths in tubs especially designed for the purpose ("continuous" tubs). These baths may be given for several hours daily, or continuously up to several weeks. Hypnotics are used as little as possible and repeated only when absolutely necessary. The most suitable are paraldehyde, chloral hydrate, and the barbituric-acid derivatives. Chloral hydrate (R 4), 2 to 2.6 Gm. (gr. xxx to xl), alone or combined with barbital (R 1), 0.3 to 1 Gm. (gr. v to xv), may be used. Paraldehyde (R 5) is given in doses of 4 to 12 cc.

If the patient is in good physical condition, and constant nursing attention which is absolutely essential, is available, partial narcosis, prolonged for a period of days, occasionally will terminate a manic episode. Sodium amyral (R 6) is the drug usually employed for this purpose, and the treatment is begun by giving 0.2 gm. (gr. iii) by mouth, or rectally, every 3 or 4 hours. The doses are gradually increased during the first 3 or 4 days, until the patient is kept asleep or deeply somnolent for 15 to 20 hours daily. He is kept continuously on his side to prevent aspiration of mouth contents or strangulation, and turned at regular intervals. At least two periods of wakefulness are allowed each day for feeding and nursing care. The physician sees the patient during each of these

periods. Pulse, blood pressure, and temperature are periodically determined; cyanosis is watched for, and the narcosis immediately terminated if any untoward signs or symptoms develop. If its course is uneventful, the narcosis sometimes is continued for 10 days, after which the dose of sodium amylal is gradually decreased over a period of 3 or 4 days. The effectiveness of this therapy is thought to depend on a partial dissolution of psychotic resistance to psychotherapeutic leverage. The psychotherapy used at this stage is entirely supportive. The constancy of the nurse's attentions and regularity of the physician's visits have supportive value. No interpretive psychotherapy is attempted at this time. After the patient has recovered from the episode, psychotherapy by an expert may decrease the probability of recurrence, but this is at best uncertain.

The depressive phase: General care is the same as for involuntional melancholia (q. v.). Electroshock convulsions, 8 to 10, will terminate many of these depressions, but since this is a recurrent disease and because of the amnesic features associated with the therapy, experienced judgment is required to decide to what extent and with which patients it is to be used.

In managing mildly depressed patients, an organized program which fills the day is desirable. None of the activities should be strenuous or exhausting. Repetitive, and what the patient may consider as mildly degrading occupations—such as sorting and counting various types in a keg of mixed nails, or weeding a lawn—may arouse resentment against the environment, and thus deflect the patient's aggression away from himself. Also, the patient may respond better to an attitude of cool kindness than to a warmly sympathetic approach. As the depression recedes, the danger of suicide increases, since there is less psychomotor retardation and the patient has more energy to carry it out. This fact (which relatives find difficult to understand) calls for doubled precautions during convalescence. Indecision is characteristic of all depressions, and is a cardinal symptom in some of the milder cases; therefore, the patient should not be required to make decisions until he has fully recovered, and in many cases should not resume his usual business occupation for weeks or months thereafter. At least in the psychotic depressions, the use of stimulative drugs such as amphetamine is of questionable value and in some instances may be harmful.

INVOLUTIONAL PSYCHOSES

Whether involuntional psychoses are related to manic-depressive psychoses is debatable, but for practical purposes considering them as separate entities is justifiable. They generally occur after the age of 40: In women most often in the late forties and in men in the late fifties. At these ages the woman's child-bearing potential, the symbolized source and end of energy and womanliness, is failing; and the man's physical and mental vigor, and hence the symbolized ability to coerce fate, is waning. In this psychosis, the patient's anxiety is tremendous and is accompanied by agitation, hypochondriacal and nihilistic ideas, delusions, and hallucinations. The psychodynamics probably are similar to those outlined under the manic-depressive depressions (q. v.), but with an involuntional psychosis fearsome delusions are more frequent, and lacking are the manic-depressive's psychomotor retardation and history of earlier attacks of mania or depression.

Etiology

The patient often will have exhibited such premorbid traits as intolerance, stubbornness, penuriousness, oversensitivity; a tendency to self-punishment as manifested by avoidance of pleasure, a rigid moral code for himself and others, and overconscientious-

ness. Worrying, fretfulness, apprehension, and compulsive meticulousness may have further reflected his insecurity. At the age when the psychosis occurs a sense of frustration is perhaps usual. The time may appear to have passed when earlier errors can be repaired and when unfulfilled ambitions can be achieved. Hence, old conflicts often become stronger and threaten the ego with their accompanying anxiety. This ceaseless anxiety may bring the patient to a preoccupation with thoughts of death. In some but not all instances the psychosis is precipitated by loss of position, the death of an individual upon whom the person was dependent, or breaking up of the home.

Symptoms and Signs

Insidious changes in attitude and behavior may precede the manifest psychosis by weeks or months. Spells of weeping, disinclination for effort, pessimism, peevishness, irritability, and insomnia are common prodromal symptoms. This drastic variation from his accustomed effects is recognized by the patient, and he perhaps states that he is beginning to lose his mind. When the manifest psychosis begins, depression, anxiety, and agitation are seen, and delusions of sin, unworthiness, and impending death occupy his mind. Guilt feelings may cause the patient retroactively to interpret some earlier indiscretion as an "unpardonable sin." He perhaps insists that he is to be butchered, or that he is damned and God cannot forgive him. He states that he deserves his fate, yet begs for reassurance, only to refute any that may be offered as illogical and ridiculous. He may rationalize that his inner distress results from organic changes and disease; that his brain has dried up, that his intestines are rotting away, or that he has no stomach. Hallucinations are common; God may talk to him or a deceased parent reprove him. Although the patient's consciousness probably will be clear, the subjective absorption of attention may cause him to appear confused, perplexed, and bewildered. His fear of death, projected in symbolic forms and delusions, possibly accounts for the insomnia. (Characteristically, depressed patients wake up early in the morning.) Food may be refused because the patient believes it is poisoned, or because of nihilistic ideas about the absence of his stomach, or because he thinks himself unworthy. In no other psychosis is suicide so frequently attempted. This may represent an attempt to destroy rejected portions of the personality, and thus put an end to gnawing conflicts and troublesome desires. The patient loses weight, becomes dehydrated, and picks at his skin; his respirations are shallow and his extremities cold and cyanotic. In some cases the psychosis has a distinct paranoid coloring, and these patients often will have shown prepsychotic traits somewhat like those observed in the paranoid psychoses (q. v.).

Diagnosis

In manic-depressive depression, hallucinations are less common, and the apprehension, fear, and ideas of impending destruction are less marked. Also stereotypes (unvarying repetition) of behavior or speech, or other schizophrenic-like symptoms less seldom occur. The latter are more in keeping with involuntional melancholia. Patients with arteriosclerotic psychosis who are depressed seldom exhibit the profound, sustained fear seen in the involuntional psychotic, and slight loss of memory is usual rather than preoccupation. In the psychoneuroses hallucinations are rare and there are no true delusions. Any fear these patients may have is paroxysmal, although they may exhibit sustained anxiety. In contrast to the psychoneurotic, a patient with melancholia strives more against his sensed danger and as well may display gross misinterpretations of reality relationships.

Prognosis

With the advent of convulsion therapy, recoveries have been enormously increased; 80 to 90 percent of these patients are benefited by electroshock convulsions. Previously about 40 percent recovered, but frequently only after an illness of 2 or 3 years. The prognosis for the paranoid type is less favorable. With the latter, insulin may be indicated if electroshock fails to cure. (See Schizophrenia.)

Treatment

The danger of suicide is too great to permit these patients to be cared for outside a mental hospital. A high caloric diet is essential, and refusal to eat for longer than 24 hours is an indication for tube feedings. (See Diets.) Aspiration pneumonia should be guarded against through careful technic. Paraldehyde (R 5) in amounts up to 8 to 16 cc. (dr. i to iv) is particularly useful for the insomnia. In aged infirm patients, sedatives must be used with extreme caution. Because these patients are so fearful, all changes in routine should be carefully explained beforehand.

Electroshock therapy: Absolute contraindications to the use of electroshock therapy are few; they include extreme hypertension, severe arteriosclerosis, cardiac decompensation, coronary disease, intracranial disease, pregnancy, and skeletal deformities. Deaths attributable directly to shock therapy are rare. The occurrence of fractures can be reduced to a negligible point by proper technic. Electroshock treatments should be administered only by a physician well trained in the procedure.

Curare is a helpful adjunct. By reducing muscular spasm, it minimizes skeletal trauma during the convulsions. (The drug is contraindicated in patients with myasthenia gravis, since they are unduly sensitive to it.) A preparation suitable for I. V. injection must be used (R 15). The customary dose of standardized curare is 3 mg./17.7 kg. (40 pounds) body wt., but three-fourths of this amount is safer, particularly for the first administration. Oxygen and an intratracheal airway must be at hand, as the larynx may become paralyzed from overcurarization. Overcurarization is treated with neostigmine (R 16), 1 cc. subcut. of a 1:2,000 solution. If it is necessary to repeat the latter, then atropine (R 17), 0.4 mg. (gr. 1/150) also is given to lessen any undesirable side effects of the neostigmine. Curare should be allowed sufficient time to take full effect, usually several minutes, before the convulsion is induced.

Shock treatments are given with the patient lying on a firm, smooth, resilient surface, such as a litter with a firm pad. No metal should touch the patient; hairpins, jewelry, and false teeth are removed. After the patient is lying in correct position upon the litter, he is asked to sit up. An ordinary pillow then is placed lengthwise across the litter and against the patient's buttocks; when the patient again lies down, the necessary hyperextension of the spine is effected. Six assistants are needed. Two stand on opposite sides and apply pressure on the patient's shoulders, each with his other hand grasping the wrist of the patient's arm nearest him. The patient's arms then are flexed and held firmly but not immovably against his chest during the convulsion. Another assistant applies downward pressure on the pelvis. Two others hold the patient's legs, with one hand above, and the other below, the knee. The sixth attends to the mouth gag. This may be an applicator thickly padded at one end with gauze, which is placed between the patient's molars on one side; or a firm gauze-covered roll of cellulose may be placed in such position that the canines bite on its as the mouth closes during the convulsion. The mouth opens widely when the

convulsion begins, and during this phase the sixth assistant applies upward pressure on the jaw to prevent its dislocation and keeps the gag in position to prevent biting of the tongue or lips when the jaws close.

Before the electrodes are applied, the patient's temple areas are washed with warm soapy water; and an electrolytic-conducting jelly is rubbed on. The amount of current and length of application necessary to produce a convulsion vary; representative figures are 70 to 150 volts; 300 to 1,200 m. a.; 0.1 to 0.5 second. More than one application may be required, but not more than three or four should be attempted on any 1 day. The patient is allowed a few deep breaths between each. Ordinarily, the operator will increase the current, or time, or both, with each subsequent passage of current until the convulsive threshold is reached. Once this is determined, the same settings on the machine usually will be used initially on the next treatment day. Convulsions begin with a tonic stage affecting the extensor muscles, and end—the longer phase of the two—with clonic contractures of the flexors. A convulsion may last for 1½ minutes. When it ends, the patient is kept on his back until he has taken at least one deep respiration. Then he is turned on his side and a pillow is so arranged under his head that free drainage of mucus from his mouth and throat is assured. Massaging and pinching the abdominal muscles may aid in initiating respirations and, if necessary, artificial respiration can be given. An experienced person must stay with the patient until full consciousness returns. Immediately after convulsions, patients may be so overexcited as to require restraints.

Patients develop varying degrees of amnesia if a sufficient number of convulsions are given. This usually is at first an inability to recall familiar names, and it may progress until after recovery the patient may remember few of his psychotic ideas. Severe and lasting impairment of memory may be produced if more than 10 convulsions are administered in a consecutive series. With fewer than 15, usually only a transitory amnesia results. Customarily, electroshock treatments are given one, two, or three times a week. Each patient's schedule should be individualized, taking into account his physical condition and particular needs.

On an average, patients with involuntional melancholia recover after six or eight convulsions. After the depression is lifted, most of these patients pass through a 15- or 20-day period of euphoria before they level out.

PRESENTILE, ARTERIOSCLEROTIC, AND SENILE PSYCHOSES

Each of these psychoses is a dementia caused by organic changes in the cerebral brain cells. Except in the arteriosclerotic psychoses, there is an uninterrupted deterioration of the patient's mental powers, which may begin as a simple inability to make fine ethical discriminations, and increase until almost all mental capacity is lost. The contents of consciousness are reduced both in quantity and quality; impressions are taken in slowly; associations are tarry or nonexistent; memory is defective; disorientation and confusion may exist; the capacity for integrating past and present experience is lost; and the personality may appear desiccated through lack of its usual affective responses. The presentile psychoses—Alzheimer's disease and Pick's disease—are relatively rare forms of dementia which may occur in the forties, the arteriosclerotic dementias may be seen from 50 upward, while uncomplicated senile dementias seldom appear before the age of 60. Clinically, the senile and arteriosclerotic dementias are often difficult to differentiate, except in the fifties.

PRESENTILE PSYCHOSES

Alzheimer's disease

In an individual exhibiting symptoms of dementia during the forties, this disease should be suspected. It is characterized by fairly rapid mental deterioration, memory defects, disorientation, delirium, speech disturbances, restlessness, hallucinations, and apprehensive delusions. The ability to perform purposeful movements may be impaired or lost. The most conspicuous pathologic lesion is the development of tangled thread-like fibrillary structures in the cortical ganglion cells. There also is nerve-cell atrophy and neuroglia proliferation. Dementia becomes pronounced in the later phases of the disease, and spasticity and epileptic-form seizures may occur. The typical atrophic changes usually are visible by means of air encephalography.

Pick's disease

This disease usually occurs between the ages of 45 and 60, and is twice as frequent in women as in men. In most instances dementia is well established within a year, although the memory usually is retained until the disease is far advanced. However, the fundamental dementia is revealed by the patient's inability to utilize the recalled material in forming new concepts. The symptoms arise from a relatively diffuse cortical atrophy, plus circumscribed, localized, bilateral areas of atrophy chiefly in the frontal and temporal lobes. The white matter atrophies early and the loss of ganglion cells is pronounced. The brain may be reduced in weight by 200 to 300 gm. The pupillary and other reflexes and the spinal fluid findings are not disturbed. Some patients with the disease are depressed, irritable, and suspicious, while others are euphoric. Stereotyped purposeless activity is common. A gradual aphasia occurs, but is not accompanied by the spontaneous logorrhea so frequently seen in aphasia due to vascular disease. Echolalia, apraxia, alexia, and agraphia are common. The patient becomes asthenic, requires bed care, is helpless, develops sphincter incontinence, loses all capacity for speech, and dies within 4 to 6 years, usually from some intercurrent infection.

ARTERIOSCLEROTIC PSYCHOSES

Any pronounced personality change in a person over 50, if paresis is excluded, should arouse suspicion of arteriosclerotic psychosis. Characteristic syndromes are produced if the arteriosclerosis is predominant in either the larger basal vessels or the finer arteries supplying the cortex, but any differentiation between these two conditions often is difficult. (After age 60 the picture of senile dementia may be complicated by a concurrent cerebral arteriosclerosis.) Onset on the diffuse small-vessel form often is insidious, and may first be manifested by easy mental fatigability, anxiety, irascibility, decreased initiative, loss of ability to concentrate, and perhaps a tendency to depression. Dizziness, headaches, and other unpleasant cerebral sensations may occur. The capacity for quick and accurate thinking is gradually lost, and the finer sentiments become blunted. The affections may change, and the patient may become obstinate, childish, and willful. Memory impairment, which may at first be only inability to recall a word, becomes general as time passes. Fluctuations are characteristic; memory and general alertness may be particularly bad one day and fairly good the next. Unlike the person with senile dementia, the patient usually is aware of and distressed by his disabilities. As the disease progresses, episodic outbursts of excitability, bewilderment, and confusion may occur, particularly at night. The patient may become meddlesome and quarrelsome; dress may be neglected; defective judgment and decreased inhibitions may result in sexual

indiscretions or offenses. Panic states may be seen. Ideas of jealousy and hypochondriasis, as well as delusions of persecution, and sometimes of grandeur, are not uncommon. Speech is laborious and coordination of finer movements impaired.

The first evidence that the larger vessels are sclerosed may be an apoplectic stroke or an aphasic attack. However, there may be premonitory symptoms, such as morning headaches, mental and physical fatigability, vertigo, emotional lability; short periods of confusion, especially at night; fleeting aphasia or apraxias, and momentary loss of power in arm or leg. As the disease develops, the patient often weeps at trifles. The facies become immobile, and coarse muscular tremors sometimes appear. Heart and kidney disease may be associated. Occlusion or rupture of a vessel may cause focal destruction of nervous tissue, with resultant upper motor neurone paralysis and various aphasias, and apraxias. These focal lesions, and especially those causing the serious aphasias, hasten the deterioration and dementia. Epileptiform attacks, either jacksonian or general, may occur and sometimes are the most prominent symptoms. Intercurrent mild infections usually exacerbate the symptoms.

SENILE DEMENTIA

Waning mental capacity sufficient to warrant a diagnosis of a senile dementia seldom appears before the age of 60, and it often is difficult to draw the line between such dementia and the mental state common to old age. An exaggerated tendency to reminisce frequently precedes both the characteristic amnesia for recent happenings and the concurrent recession of ready recall to ever earlier life periods. Recognizing none of this, the patient's personality characteristics are displayed in accentuated form as he attempts to overcome the new frustrations he naturally meets. Egocentricity, irritability, and resentment of any imagined interference by younger persons are common. Various compensations are attempted, exaggerated sexual activity or sexual indecencies may result; there may be ideas of marital infidelity; pride of appearance may be lost. The patient may be distrustful, prying, and suspicious. He may become disoriented and wander about aimlessly, particularly at night. Defective judgment may cause him to disregard traffic hazards, leave gas jets open, and become victimized by unscrupulous persons. Many patients hoard useless articles. Both hallucinations and delusions are common. These symptoms often are accompanied by conspicuous physical signs of senility.

The senile psychoses may be divided into types and certain of these are adequately described by their names: viz, simple deterioration—the most common; delirious and confused; depressed and agitated. The paranoid type is distinguished by delusions of persecution. With this type, orientation usually remains unimpaired and defects of memory may be comparatively insignificant for a long time; as these increase the delusions become more absurd. (See paranoia.) The presbyophrenic type usually occurs in individuals whose prepsychotic personality was characterized by adaptability, vivacious activity, and cheerfulness. This warmth of personality is retained but the patient vacillates between friendliness and irritability. Severe memory defects exist, of which the patient is unaware. Characteristically, these voids are filled by confabulations—fantasies related as realities. These patients are loquacious, restless, and constantly busy in purposeless and sometimes destructive ways. Presbyophrenia is seen somewhat more commonly in women than in men.

Diagnosis

Certain differentiating features have been touched on in the preceding text and will

not be repeated. On grounds of sheer probability, a diagnosis of arteriosclerotic dementia is given preference over that of senile dementia. The depressed and agitated type both of senile and arteriosclerotic dementia occasionally must be differentiated from involutional melancholia and from manic-depressive depression (q. v.). Differentiation is based on the patient's age and evidence of organic mental impairment or beginning vascular disease.

Prognosis

The prognosis in any of these forms of mental disease is uniformly bad. However, an arteriosclerotic psychosis is not always uninterruptedly progressive. Particularly if there is an associated cardiac or renal disease, these patients may have periods of confusion which clear after a few weeks of simple hospital regimen. Subsequently, they may retain considerable, though impaired, mental capacity for several years before either an increasing dementia or a vascular accident produces permanent disability.

Treatment

Patients with a mild form of senile or arteriosclerotic dementia may be cared for at home, but life must be carefully regulated, particularly for the arteriosclerotic. Any condition that causes mental strain must be eliminated, and light pleasant occupations encouraged. Alcohol is contraindicated. For patients subject to arteriosclerotic convulsions, phenobarbital (R 2) not exceeding 0.27 gm. (gr. ivss) daily in three equal doses is recommended. During disturbed episodes, other sedatives also are indicated. Paraldehyde (R 5) probably is the most useful; it is given in doses of 4 to 16 cc. (dr. 1 to iv), repeated every 4 hours if necessary until the desired degree of sedation is obtained. In the aged, all sedation must be used with caution.

If the patient's judgment becomes defective, it may be necessary to appoint a legal guardian. If the patient talks of or attempts suicide, or shows any other tendencies dangerous to himself or others, he should be hospitalized.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there will be any opposition to this bill. One of the great tragedies of every war is the alarming number of servicemen who are discharged with mental disorders. Especially is this true of World War II, with its widespread use of modern weapons of war, terrifying as they are and so often causing a breakdown in man's capacity to withstand fear and privation.

Everyone who has visited a mental hospital has come away with an intense feeling of pity and a desire to help those who so palpably cannot help themselves.

This bill which is before us today is aimed to help such veterans. Many of them are entirely incapable of helping themselves, and their families, in most instances, either cannot assist them or else they are reluctant to admit that the veteran son is a mental case. This latter fact has made it very difficult for many of these veterans to service-connect their claims. The close relatives have been so reluctant to bring the veteran for treatment by a psychiatrist or a competent doctor, and the necessary proof of continuous treatment from date of discharge is all too often lacking.

This fact was recognized last year when compensation laws were liberalized to make 1 year the presumptive pe-

riod. When that law was passed the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs felt that 1 year was altogether too short a period of time for presumption. When the bill passed the House of Representatives it called for a 3-year presumptive period, but the Senate at that time cut the period to 1 year. It was so late in the session that it was a case of accepting the 1-year period or getting nothing at all. But the need for a longer period is just as pressing today as it was then and if we pass this bill today I feel that we can prevail upon the other body to go along with us.

Of course, the question will be asked—as it always is whenever veterans' legislation is before us—of how much this measure will cost. The Veterans' Administration says it cannot estimate the cost, but that it will be considerable. I am not so sure of that, either. However, no matter what it might cost it is a duty and obligation we owe to those men who through no fault of their own are in a pitiable condition today. After World War I we heard a great deal about shell shock. You will recall that there were many, many cases so designated. You seldom if ever hear the term used today. Now it is psychosis, and this term is divided into many different categories. Just the same, it is the old shell shock caused by abnormal mental strain under the most terrifying and terrible conditions of war. It takes a man of very stable mental constitution to stand up under battle conditions as they exist today. Talk to the boys in the veterans' hospitals who have returned from the awful conflict in Korea. Look at their eyes, observe their actions, and note the way their nerves respond and react to situations that would not bother you and me. It takes a long, long time to mend disordered brains. It is undoubtedly the most trying and difficult task that faces the medical profession. That is the reason our neuropsychiatric hospitals are full to overflowing with veterans today. The healing process is so slow and the individual study and treatment of each particular case is so necessary to convalescence that our hospitals and their staffs are hard put to meet the situation.

I do not see how anyone can justify opposition to this bill. You give a 3-year presumptive period for active pulmonary tuberculosis and provide a 2-year period for multiple sclerosis. The bill is protected by the customary 90-day service requirement, as well as the misconduct rule.

I also would say, Mr. Speaker, that in the past year there have been a number of suicides and many murders because these men were not in hospitals. I, personally, Mr. Speaker, have helped secure the hospitalization of certain cases because they were considered dangerous to the community.

Insofar as the cost is concerned, Mr. Speaker, let me point out the fact that these veterans in time will be taken care of somewhere; they will be taken care of in State institutions if there be beds for them, but there is overcrowding in every State institution in the country. Nevertheless they will be taken care of somewhere sooner or later.

I hope the bill will pass, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein the statement on psychosis that appears in the House report. I think it will probably exceed the limit of two pages, but I ask unanimous consent that it be included, regardless of that fact.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 5891?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

TAX LIMITATION, OUR ONLY FISCAL SALVATION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, today is the 17th of March. Traditionally, it is a day of light-hearted gaiety, of fun and frolic and happiness. It is St. Patrick's Day. But alas, this 17th of March in 1952 is not a day of rejoicing. It is a day of sackcloth and ashes, of gloom and unhappiness, of belt tightening and empty purses, of wolf-at-the-door privation. It is income-tax day.

In the past week or two, hundreds of thousands of American families have been dismayed and depressed to see their meager bank accounts—carefully laid aside for a rainy day—wiped out by a confiscatory income tax. Millions of Americans have suddenly been brought face to face with the full impact of the tax bill which this Congress adopted last fall in answer to the administration's extravagant demands for more money to spend, more money to waste. And millions of American taxpayers became bitter, resentful, and angry as they made final payments to the Treasury on their 1951 income, and now look forward to still heavier taxes they will have to pay in 1952. Today the sinister prophecy of more than 100 years ago is coming true.

Mr. Speaker, why is the Federal Government spending so much money today? The President, Dean Acheson, and the other Cabinet officers say it is to preserve us from the ruthless advance of communism, to protect us from the Socialist system of poverty-stricken society which was devised by the evil mind of Karl Marx, which today threatens the prosperity and well-being of free America.

But how can a slave state threaten the existence of a free state? How can a doctrine so foreign to our well-established and well-proved concepts of liberty and justice prevail in the face of full employment, tremendous production, the highest standard of living the world has ever known, and a national income that exceeds—either in total or

per capita—any figure that any nation on earth has ever seen before?

The answer, of course, is found in the words and prophecies of Karl Marx.

In the Communist Manifesto of 1848 Karl Marx laid down his formula for the destruction of the capitalist system and the substitution of communism. Two points of the Marx formula are of especial concern to us on this 17th day of March in the year 1952. First, that all estates should be confiscated by the state so that the state, the commune, would eventually become sole owner of all land, buildings, factories, and business enterprises. Second, a graduated net income tax should be promoted because such a tax, however modest its beginning, would grow progressively to the point of confiscation, whereupon private property, private capital, private initiative, as we know them, would cease to exist.

Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way along the road that Karl Marx laid out for us. True, we have not quite reached the point of 100 percent confiscation of inheritances; however, left-wing bureaucrats are constantly urging the Congress to grab more and more of the property that changes hands by gift or by death. But in our income tax today we are closely approaching expropriation of both individual incomes and corporate earnings to pay for budgetary excesses in both civil and military affairs and in foreign benevolences. If we do not put a stop to these budgetary excesses, they are bound to result in national bankruptcy.

Not only are we completing the vicious circle of ruin that was predicted a century ago by Karl Marx, but we are also fulfilling the infamous destiny that was forecast for us in 1924 by Marx's leading disciple, Nicolai Lenin, when he said:

Some day we shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction.

Mr. Speaker, we are already spending ourselves into destruction and oblivion. Our Government offices have been invaded by wastrels, rascals, and thieves. Our economy is being guided—God save the mark—by leftists, dreamers, and potential scoundrels. Today it is entirely possible, as has recently been unpleasantly revealed, for a knave to bribe his way out of paying the tax bill that he owes. And in the disorganized Pentagon today it is the general custom—not the exception—for taxpayers' money to be squandered in outrageous purchases, and in such appalling variance of contract prices, as would bankrupt any business corporation. Bureaucrats casually shrug off the loss of a million dollars here, two million dollars there, five million somewhere else, as if money grew on trees or bushes. The unsound fiscal policies of the present Administration have fed the fires of inflation, shrunk the value of the dollar, cut in half every individual's savings, and destroyed every citizen's future personal security. And the billions we are pouring down the rat-holes of Europe provide little or no assurance that we shall be able to count on European support in our day of need.

Mr. Speaker, the process of hauling ourselves back to solvency will be no easy task, but it can be done. On this un-

happy income-tax day we of the Congress should assure the people—the taxpayers—that we are not unmindful of their problems and their distress. We should pledge them two things: First, that the administration's outrageous budget shall be cut to the very bone; and, second, that income taxes from now on will be limited by a constitutional amendment to a figure that will no longer threaten bankruptcy to every family in the land.

Specific recommendations for reduction of the preposterous \$85,500,000,000 budget have been made by various members of both parties in the Congress. Fiddling cuts have been voted in a couple of appropriations; but until the full weight of a determined majority in the Congress effectively throws up a road block to halt the spenders, we shall continue to create—and pay for—more bureaus, more agencies, more Government control, more socialism and less freedom. We should heed the words President Lincoln uttered a century ago, and I quote:

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by discouraging the rich. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

And, we might well add today—you cannot make a nation strong or mighty by impoverishing her people through excessive taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Government economy must be the first great step toward relief for taxpayers. But the second great step should follow close on the heels of the first; namely, the imposition of a tax ceiling beyond which the Government may not constitutionally go. The need for such a tax ceiling has long been recognized by economists. It is only recently—as we have approached this unhappy income-tax day—that the people of America have come to realize that something must be done soon or they perish.

The excessive and oppressive Federal tax burden of recent years has brought about a tax rebellion that is today sweeping the Nation. It is a peaceful rebellion so far, but a grim and determined one just the same. Excessively high tax rates are drying up the streams of investment capital. Industrial expansion, the creation of more jobs, and the production of more goods are being curtailed and American industry is now being forced to go to the Government with cap in hand to beg for the risk capital needed for expansion. This eventually means Government ownership, Government supervision, and Government control—and that is socialism, just what England has today.

The experience of England should be a warning to us. England's heavy graduated income tax and her confiscatory inheritance taxes finally forced her into Government ownership and socialism.

We are traveling down the selfsame road. No wonder our people say, "Something must be done. It is time to call a halt." No wonder every Congressman's mail reflects the tax rebellion now going on in every congressional district in the Nation.

What I have said about the attitude of the American taxpayer is not guesswork on my part, Mr. Speaker. It is based upon a scientific survey made over a period of more than a year. Periodically, since last year when the President demanded a \$16,000,000,000 increase in income taxes, a Nation-wide group of taxpayers has been asked, "Should taxes be increased at this time?" In January of 1951, when the tax rate was at the reasonably low level that had been established by a Republican Congress, 42 percent answered the question by saying "No. We are already paying as much as the traffic will bear." Two months later, while the 1951 tax bill was under consideration in the Ways and Means Committee, the percentage opposed to any tax increase had risen to 60 percent. Last August, when the Senate was rewriting the tax bill and reducing somewhat the increase that the House had voted, 76 percent of our taxpayers said, "No, we cannot stand any further increase in tax rates." And just recently, after the President in his January message asked Congress to find another \$5,000,000,000 of new revenue, 83 percent of our taxpayers—83 percent, mind you—stated emphatically that taxes should not be raised again; that they were now paying more than they could afford to pay and still live decently, and that the time had come to call a halt.

This is the greatest and most rapid change in public opinion that has ever been registered on any matter of national import—from 42 percent to 83 percent in 1 year's time. Yet Mr. Leon Keyserling, the Chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, has recently expressed the complacent and politically unsympathetic opinion that a fourth increase in taxes would be entirely in order. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how far do Mr. Truman, Mr. Keyserling, Mr. Snyder, and the rest of the administration spenders think they can push the American people before they create open revolt against their unwise tax policies?

In each of the past three Congresses I have introduced a House joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts. House Joint Resolution 263, introduced by me on June 12, 1951, is now before the Congress awaiting action. It calls for the orthodox method of amending the Constitution. It differs from plans which seek to initiate a constitutional convention by the demand of two-thirds of the States. However, I can well understand why many of the States are aroused and now urge a Federal tax ceiling, because the Federal Government today takes four-fifths of every collected tax dollar, leaving the State and local governments in the difficult position of trying to support themselves on the remaining one-fifth. Twenty years ago the reverse was true.

The Federal Government got along on one-fifth of the tax dollar, leaving four-fifths for the State and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, a constitutional convention is a risky experiment, for its machinery might easily be seized by subversives and its purposes perverted to objectives entirely at variance with those originally intended. I say, let the Congress act first—in the orthodox manner—pass the necessary limiting resolution, and then submit it to the States for ratification. Surely there are enough of us who recognize the necessity of giving immediate relief to the overburdened taxpayer. If the Congress acts first, then—in an orderly fashion—the amendment to the Constitution can be approved by the States and put into effect.

For many years our most profound students of economics and fiscal policy have advocated moderation in taxation, and have warned against giving too much power to the Federal Government. As long ago as 1910, Mr. Richard E. Byrd, then speaker of Virginia's House of Delegates, and father of Senator HARRY BYRD, said:

By approving this proposal—

The income tax amendment—

the State actually invites the Federal Government to invade its territory, to oust its jurisdiction, and to establish a Federal dominion within the innermost citadel of the reserved rights of the Commonwealth. * * * An army of Federal inspectors, spies, and detectives will descend upon the State. They will compel men of business to show their books and to disclose the secrets of their affairs. * * * On the one hand, the inspector can blackmail the taxpayer, and on the other, he can profit by selling his secret to his competitor. Who of us who have had knowledge of the doings of Federal officials in the internal revenue service can be blind to what will follow?

Prophetic words, those, Mr. Speaker, words which, in the light of recently exposed corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau, might well have been uttered last week instead of 40 years ago.

Nor was Senator BYRD's father the only man to see the inherent dangers of the progressive net income tax. Another great Virginian, Senator Carter Glass, wrote into his party's 1920 national platform these words:

We advocate tax reform and a searching revision of the war-revenue acts to fit peace conditions, so that the wealth of the Nation may not be withdrawn from productive enterprises and diverted to wasteful or non-productive expenditures.

Later, Senator Glass added:

In my report as Secretary of the Treasury, I specifically advocated the reduction of the maximum tax, and, indeed, of all the taxes of the upper brackets of the surtax, and laid down the principle * * * that the maximum surtax could easily be placed at a figure which would actually deprive the Government itself of revenue. * * *

This Government has no right—

The Senator went on to say—

to levy taxes for any purpose other than required by the Constitution for services economically rendered at cost. Beyond that it is public larceny.

Again, these are prophetic words—as we now realize. Our tax system of today is public larceny and nothing else. It does not even pretend to limit its expenditures to the purposes required by the Constitution—and you have only to read the testimony of civil and military witnesses before our various congressional committees to know that there is today no such thing as “services economically rendered at cost.” In fact, in the gobbledygook of Truman Washington, the simple words “services economically rendered at cost” are entirely forgotten; they have been completely erased from the New Deal vocabulary.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you another pertinent quotation—from a man who was recognized, even by the political opposition, as greatest among all Secretaries of the Treasury, Mr. Andrew Mellon. In his book, *Taxation, the People's Business*, published in 1924, Secretary Mellon said:

It is the opinion of some authorities on taxation that this figure—

Where investment will convert from tax-exempt to taxable securities—

is below 15 percent. None of them place it as high as 25 percent. It is not too much to hope that some day we may get back on a tax basis of 10 percent, the old Hebrew tithe, which was always considered a fairly heavy tax.

If the matter were not so vitally serious to every wage earner in the land, we could split our sides laughing over the simple-minded guilelessness of a Secretary of the Treasury who could see no reason why the income tax should be higher than 10 percent. But we must remember Mr. Mellon held office in a day when the national budget was \$6,000,000,000 instead of \$85,500,000,000; when receipts exceeded expenditures instead of being 10 to 15 billion dollars short; when there was honesty in the Internal Revenue Bureau and in the Department of Justice. That was before big tax dodgers could avoid payment of their taxes by knowing the right people, by gifts of mink coats, by tips on the races, or by the pretense of illness. Unhappily, that day is gone. Today we have in Government none of the fine old conservative financial geniuses who used to keep the ship of state on an even keel by handling its money matters as carefully as they handled their own.

Mr. Speaker, taxes must come down. I repeat: Taxes must come down. And since no one seems to have the moral courage to bring them down by normal means, we must adopt a constitutional amendment to do the job. Do not tell me that it cannot be done. It can be done and it must be done—in spite of the arguments of big and little bureaucrats; in spite of recent hand-wringing protestations of the O'Mahoney committee and the Patman committee to whom it is evidently much more important that present-day bureaucrats keep their fore feet in the public trough than to have the future solvency of the United States protected and preserved. Their puny arguments, which I imagine few of you have bothered to read, are so easily shot full of holes that I shall not even take the time to answer them.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed constitutional tax limitation is not—as some have tried to argue—a rich man's tax relief program. On the contrary, it will help the little-income folks—the wage earners, the small-salaried people, the pensioners, and others of limited means who today are paying more than one-third of their incomes to support the administration's grandiose spending schemes, its impossible and impractical attempts to support the world. One-third of one's income is altogether too heavy a Federal tax for people with an income of \$5,000 or less to bear.

My bill proposes to establish 25 percent as the top limit of income tax except in time of war. That, of course, is merely a tentative figure, never intended to be final, advanced to establish the principle of a tax ceiling. In operation the tax could be graduated—a low rate for low-bracket incomes, a higher rate for middle-bracket incomes, and the top rate for top-bracket individual incomes and for corporations, but never approaching the confiscatory tax rates that exist today and threaten to be even more tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, as a specific proposal—to study, to consider, to ponder over, and to amend—I offer the following personal income tax schedule as a basis or starting point:

Upon all taxable incomes of \$0 to \$2,-000 a tax of 15 percent.

Upon all taxable incomes between \$2,-000 and \$4,000 a tax of 20 percent.

Upon all taxable incomes between \$4,-000 and \$6,000 a tax of 25 percent.

Upon all taxable incomes between \$6,-000 and \$10,000 a tax of 30 percent.

Upon all taxable incomes between \$10,-000 and \$20,000 a tax of 35 percent.

Upon all taxable incomes between \$20,-000 and over, a tax of 40 percent.

Such a personal income tax schedule would result in an immediate loss to the Treasury of \$8,500,000,000, \$6,500,000,000 of which would be tax relief for the taxpayers in the first two brackets—“the little fellows.”

Along with this personal income tax schedule should go a 40-percent tax rate upon corporation income, made up of a 25-percent rate upon all corporation incomes, with a 15-percent surtax upon all corporation incomes over \$25,000. This would also result in an immediate loss to the Treasury of \$3,500,000,000.

The question immediately arises, “Can the Treasury stand an immediate total loss of \$17,000,000,000?” Judging the future by the past—and that is the only way we can judge it—the answer to our question is an emphatic “Yes.” That would still leave \$54,000,000,000 Treasury receipts to operate the Federal Government, out of the estimated \$71,000,000,000 tax expectation.

The excessively high tax rates of World War I were reduced four separate times under the urging of Andrew Mellon, and each time the business expansion that took place as a result of the tax reduction so broadened the tax base that more dollars actually flowed into the Treasury after the tax reduction than before.

Again, in 1945, the Congress passed the Doughton tax-reduction bill, reduc-

ing the high war taxes between six and seven billion dollars. This was done in the face of a Federal deficit for that year of \$21,000,000,000. What was the result? A tremendous business expansion happened almost overnight. Five million new jobs were created; the national-production index jumped 15 points; and the Treasury receipts jumped to an all-time high, ending the fiscal year of 1948 with an actual Treasury surplus of \$8,400,000,000. Therefore, judging the future by the past, we state very emphatically and confidently that tax limitation, the adoption of a tax ceiling, with the resultant tax relief, will pay off in the long run. It will be good business. Also, in my opinion, it is the only fiscal salvation in sight today for the American people.

Only last week a group of State and local officials—governors, mayors, and county officials—came to Washington to protest the growing tendency of the Federal Government to hog all the tax receipts, forcing them to get along with the leavings. My mail—and yours too—expresses the dissatisfaction and resentment of our people over our present-day excessively heavy taxes. These are straws in the wind. They should indicate to this Congress that our spend-thrift, profligate days are over, that we must provide tax reform and tax relief, and do it immediately.

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to pass a tax-limitation resolution without delay. If we want to head off financial chaos, national bankruptcy, repudiation, and dictatorship, we must act, and act now.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 45 minutes.

COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY IN ART THREATENS AMERICAN MUSEUMS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, four times during 1949 I addressed this House on the subject of Communist infiltration in one of the greatest fields of American culture—that of art. I received, and am continuing to receive, an overwhelming response from artists from coast to coast asking that I further expose the throttling dictatorship of this Red cultural monopoly. Data and information sent me from all sections of the country fit together into a graphic picture of communism, clothed in cultural immunity, working subtly to maintain and enlarge its hold on and control of art in the United States. I propose to expose Red infiltration and control in certain artists' organizations. I further will show that many great museums are being used by these organizations, and that the critical appraisal of art by some papers and magazines often aids this Marxist cultural conspiracy.

ATTEMPT TO CAPTURE UNESCO

On March 25, 1949, I brought to the attention of the House an organization called Artists Equity Association, in whose lists may be found practically all of the notorious Red artists in the country. I propose to show that Artists Equity Association is the latest link in a chain of Red-instigated artists' organizations designed to control art and artists of this Republic.

It is astounding to find that this left-wing artists' organization is ready to dominate the Visual Arts Panel of the United States National Committee of UNESCO with 6 of its 18 panel members, all connected with the above Artists Equity Association. They are: Hudson D. Walker, director of AEA, Russell M. Cowles, Stanley Hayter, Abraham Rattner, William Zorach, and Theodore Brensen, the chairman of Artists Equity's committee of international cultural relations.

The United States is going to participate in the UNESCO International Conference in September of this year and the president of AEA, Henry Billings, radical left-wing artist, has been made a member of the UNESCO Advisory Committee.

Is it not time that the State Department ceased in its attempts to promote communistic art that is distorted, perverted, and actually the sabotage weapon of international communism?

ART MUSEUMS ARE CATS'-PAWS OF REDS

Our great museums have been infiltrated by this same cultural fifth column. Here in Washington at the Corcoran Gallery, in its sixth annual area exhibition in January of this year, the sole juror or judge of painting was Philip Evergood, an editor of Masses and Mainstream, the Communist organ on culture. He was a teacher at the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York, cited by Attorney General Tom Clark as "an adjunct of the Communist Party."

The sculptors of this district fared no better. They had as sole juror Chaim Gross, known in leftist circles as "Brother Chaim" Gross, a member of the Communist International Workers Order, the Red insurance company ordered dissolved by the State of New York.

This is not an isolated case. It is a general condition. At a time when our Nation needs positive artistic expressions of true American ideals and aims, we are flooded with a horde of determined leftists parading as artists who are in fact cultural saboteurs.

ART FOR REVOLUTION PLANNED IN MOSCOW

Let us trace the sinister history of a conspiracy formed in and directed from Soviet Russia to use art as a weapon in the power-lust drive of international communism. The history of this cultural conspiracy, conceived in Moscow and carried out here in the United States, should be known to all Americans who are anxious to preserve our heritage of freedom.

The sabotaging of American art is the direct outcome of the conference at Kharkov, Russia, in 1930. I quote from the magazine Modern Monthly:

In November 1930 * * * a solemnly enthusiastic congress of artists and authors,

predominantly young and representing 22 countries * * * met in Kharkov and resolved upon the world-wide mass organization of art and literature as weapons of the working class in their struggle for power.

William Gropper, Communist artist, was present; and he has continued to be present in the series of art organizations set up in America as a sequel to this first get-together of the pen and brush phalanx of the Communist conspiracy.

According to the Daily Worker of December 6, 1930, the American delegates were instructed to form a national organization of revolutionary writers and artists upon their return to the United States. Obedient to the Soviet command, they formed the Workers Cultural Federation with Lenin's widow, Madame Krupskaya, Maxim Gorki, Henry Barbusse, William Z. Foster, Upton Sinclair, John Dos Passos, and Theodore Dreiser as members of the honorary presidium. It announced its appearance on the American scene in June of 1931. William Gropper, Potamkin, Alexander Trachtenberg, head of Soviet publishing house in the United States, who has just been arrested for conspiracy by this Government, and R. B. Glassford and Michael Gold were on the presidium. Twenty-two years ago, William Gropper became an organizer and teacher in the John Reed Club.

Regarding this Communist organization, important step in the design of Red control of art in our country, I quote from the report of Walter Steele, of the National Republic, before a Special Committee of the House Un-American Activities:

The John Reed Club is a revolutionary organization of artists and writers in the United States. It was organized by the Communists in memory of the American Bolshevik, John Reed, who was deported to Russia and died there. His remains were placed beside those of Lenin in Moscow. * * * All of the John Reed Club leaders are engaged in revolutionary activities either in propaganda and agitation, or in organizational work.

Among the many hundreds of John Reed Club artists and writers, I find Diego Rivera, Mitchell Siporin, Ben Shahn, Meyer Shapiro, Lewis Mumford, Raphael Soyer, Louis Ribak, Anton Refregier, John Howard Lawson, Louis Lozowick, and Walter Quirt.

CLEARING HOUSE IN RED DRIVE

During this period, the Red artists and writers of all countries used the Soviet International of Revolutionary Writers as their base. This was their clearing house where a comprehensive Marxist analysis of the cultural life of all nations was tabulated and used to further the advancement of Stalin's aim—"the establishment of world socialism."

To Moscow went reports of the doings of Ozenfant, Leger, Louis Aragon, Andre Breton, Paul Eluard, Elie Faure, Paul Signac, Waldo Frank, George Grosz, William Gropper, and scores of other individuals from all countries and of varying degrees of usefulness to the ambitions of Soviet power. So abject and loyal to the Communist International was one of

the 54 founders of Artists Equity Association that in 1932 he reported back to Moscow in these words:

In reply to your cable received requesting me to report on my activities and action in fighting the imperial war, allow me to state in short as follows: (1) Enclosed are just a few of the many cartoons on the subject which have been published in the Morning Freiheit, the Jewish party paper, and one of the largest circulation. I have also drawn cartoons for other publications such as the New Masses. (2) I have held exhibitions of cartoons, drawings, and painting on the imperialist war and the defense of Soviet Union throughout the west coast of the United States of America like Berkeley, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and in galleries in New York City. (3) At present, I am at work on a mural painting to be exhibited in the Museum of Modern Art which thousands of people visit weekly and I shall register my protest by exposing the war plot against the Soviet Union in this painting. (4) I am also organizing, through the bureau of the John Reed Club, a counter exhibition to the exhibition of the Modern Museum, to be held in the galleries of the John Reed Club by its members. The artist group of the John Reed Club have also been active in painting posters and streamers for demonstrations. * * *

With revolutionary greetings,

WILLIAM GROPPER.

Such intellectual and cultural sabotage provides a fundamental weapon in talent and material for the Red propaganda attack on American institutions.

USE OF ART AND LITERATURE IN REVOLUTION DRIVE

In 1935, Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, and Lewis Mumford, John Reed Club organizer now fancied in certain circles as an aesthetic philosopher, took part in the next sinister act of the Moscow-directed plot to gain control of art and literature in the United States. This was the formation of the League of American Writers as a section of the International Union of Revolutionary Artists and Writers with headquarters in Moscow, and in the following year the formation of its other affiliate, the American Artists Congress.

ART AND BOOK CRITICS ORGANIZED

The writers and critics of the League of American Writers issued a "call" in 1935, and I read from that "call":

The capitalist system crumbles so rapidly before our eyes that, where as 10 years ago scarcely more than a handful of writers were sufficiently foresighted and courageous to take a stand for proletarian revolution, today hundreds of poets, novelists, dramatists, critics, and short-story writers recognize the necessity of personally helping to accelerate the destruction of capitalism, and the establishment of a workers government. * * * We propose that a congress of American revolutionary writers be held in New York City on April 26, 27, 28, 1935. * * * It will provide technical discussion of the literary applications of Marxist philosophy and of the relations between critic and creator. * * * We believe such a congress should create the League of American Writers, affiliated with the International Union of Revolutionary Writers.

Among the scores of so-called American writers who participated in this congress, labeled "subversive and Communist" by Attorney General Tom Clark, are Robert Coates, critic; Lewis Mumford, Waldo Frank, Lincoln Kirstein, Earl Browder, Michael Gold, Van Wyck

Brooks, Agnes Smedley, Langston Hughes, Louis Lozowick, John Howard Lawson, and Alexander Trachtenberg.

My purpose in spotlighting this writers' congress is to emphasize again the Soviet-directed union of Red writer and artist that has done so much in establishing and inflating, in the public mind, the left-wing fakers as artists and by so doing badly damaged the standard of art, artists, and art teaching in this country.

ART CONGRESS, AFFILIATE OF INTERNATIONAL

Now I come to the sister congress, the American Artists Congress of 1936, the other affiliate of the Soviet International of Revolutionary Writers listed by our Government as Communist created and controlled. The initiators of this congress were George Ault, Arnold Blanch, Henry Billings, Peter Blume, Maurice Becker, Nicolai Cikovsky, Aaron Douglas, Stuart Davis, Adolph Dehn, William Gropper, Hugo Gellert, Harry Gottlieb, Minna Harkavy, Ishigaki, Jerome Klein, Louis Lozowick, the late Jan Matulka, Saul Schary, William Siegel, Niles Spencer, Harry Sternberg, and Moses Soyer. Most of these individuals knew each other in the John Reed Club. Maurice Becker was a founder of the Communist publication, New Masses, and Dehn, Gellert, Lozowick, Gropper, and Soyer were on its staff; Moses Soyer was art critic of the New Masses.

REDS ISSUE CALL FOR ART CONGRESS

The opening address was made by Lewis Mumford. His greeting to the artists was, I quote:

Friends, comrades, ladies, and gentlemen: Herewith we open the first American Artists Congress. On this occasion we are buoyed up and stimulated by a number of fraternal greetings from all parts of the world.

He then proceeded with greetings from the New Masses, the League of American Writers, and other Red groups. I might mention that Mr. Mumford answered both the writers' and artists' "call."

Another art propagandist who would prefer, no doubt, to be known as art critic and who answered this Red artists' "call" is James Johnson Sweeney, one-time editor of a publication called Transition, self-advertised as subversive. In this publication, written in English and published in France, we find the radical and Communist writers and artists of Europe and their American followers such as Max Ernst and his brother comrade of the French Communist Party, Paul Eluard, Berenice Abbott, Kenneth Fearing, Samuel Putman, former art critic on New Masses, the Trotskyite Andre Breton, the Stalinist surrealist Louis Aragon, Robert Coates, of the New Yorker magazine, Gertrude Stein and her collaborator Virgil Thompson, now music critic of the New York Herald Tribune, Emily Coleman, and scores of others. Two issues of Transition were confiscated by the port authorities and refused admission to the United States because they contained obscene matter.

Mr. Sweeney also has the dubious distinction of having the vile book, Out of This Century, dedicated to him by Peggy Guggenheim. Miss Guggenheim promoted not only the English Marxist art

writer, Herbert Read, and a coterie of European art saboteurs but also, aided by Mr. Sweeney, James Thrall Soby, and Marcel Duchamp, was instrumental in launching the careers of Jackson Pollack and others, and incidentally they discovered Gypsy Rose Lee and added her to the list of American painters.

VISITED VIRGINIA'S EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

In 1950 Leslie Cheek, Jr., director of the Virginia Museum in Richmond, invited Mr. Sweeney as a one-man jury to present an exhibition at the museum, called American Painting—1950. Needless to say, Stuart Davis, national executive director of the subversive American Artists Congress, and others of Mr. Sweeney's cosigners of the Moscow call such as Max Weber, winner of the New Masses cultural award of 1945, Niles Spencer, Adolph Gottlieb, Ernest Fiene, and many others were not forgotten by Mr. Sweeney, nor were Miss Guggenheim's cultural contributions of Pollack, Baziotes, and Motherwell, and the European antiartists Max Ernst, Ozenfant, Tanguy, and others, whose painting was sufficiently subversive to be identified as "living art" by Mr. Sweeney.

It is alarming to learn that Mr. Sweeney, as a scholar, was induced to present a series of illustrated lectures at various colleges and universities in Virginia by the general education board of the Rockefeller Foundation through its project, the Richmond Area University Center.

RUG DISTRIBUTOR IN HISS CASE

Another left-wing art propagandist connected with the Communist American Artists Congress was Mr. Meyer Schapiro who explained modern art and literature to his close friend, Whitaker Chambers, in the early nineteen twenties. Mr. Schapiro became a leader of the John Reed Club and continued his friendship with Mr. Chambers. He selected, in 1936, at Whitaker Chambers' request, the now famous rug presented to Alger Hiss in gratitude by Colonel Bykov, the Red spy ring leader.

Another propagandist included among the signers of the artists "call" was Paul Strand. According to an Un-American Activities report he is noted as being a member of from 21 to 30 Communist-front organizations. It is not surprising, therefore, to find him writing the obituary article on the death of Alfred Steiglitz, an armory show promoter, in the Communist New Masses of August 6, 1946. He ends that article with these significant words:

In this America which will be surely won, Alfred Steiglitz will be revered as one of the great engineers who helped to build its soul.

Marxist writers endeavoring to use art critiques as an instrument to bludgeon artists into the Red cultural caravan in its search for the "new world" or "Communist society" is now a familiar device to the American artist.

Paul Strand also showed up at the birth of Artists Equity Association as a member of the board of governors.

The national executive committee of the American Artists Congress included among others, Peter Blume, Paul Man-ship, Alexander Brook, Louis Lozowick,

George Biddle, Rockwell Kent, Max Weber, Katherine Schmidt, William Gropper, Yasuo Kuniyoshi, Aaron Goodelman, Arnold Blanch, Harry Gottlieb, Lewis Mumford, Henry Billings, Lynd Ward, Ralph M. Pearson, and Lincoln Rothschild. As regional members of this committee, a casual scrutiny discloses three John Reed Club organizers—the late Morris Topchevsky, of the Chicago club, Nicolai Cikovsky, and Joe Jones.

The career of Mr. Joe Jones has been aided by his Red activities. In volume 7 of the Un-American activities reports, Dr. J. B. Mathews states:

All four of the speakers . . . were Communist Party members. They are Ella Reeve Bloor, Andrew Omholt, Herta Ware, and Joe Jones.

Also, from the same volume:

Mother Bloor and Jones left the following day to make a joint speaking tour of Arkansas.

Ella Reeve Bloor, "Mother Bloor" to the Communists, was the mother of Harold B. Ware, top-notch agent of the Comintern whose master cell in Washington included Lee Pressman, Nathan Witt, John Abt, Charles Kramer, and Alger Hiss. Andrew Omholt and Herta Ware are husband and granddaughter of the late Ella Reeve Bloor.

With these connections, it is surprising Mr. Jones did not end up in the State Department.

SOCIALIZATION OF ART—A PROJECT

The American Artists Congress was politically active and in its "call" it included the usual list of grievances that the Communists exploit and advertise. The over-all aim of the congress is, first, control of the artists; second, infiltration and control of the museums, and, lastly, the usual plan for a government art program on a permanent basis; all contribute to the Soviet final dictum—socialized art.

In August of 1938 the formation of the United American Artists was announced with Rockwell Kent, notorious Red, as the president. This group was also a Soviet first political art organization and included William Gropper, Hananiah Harari, Boris Margo, Gwathmey, Harry Gottlieb, Harold Ambellan, Ad Reinhart, and others. Paul Man-ship, listed 10 times in appendix 9 of the Un-American Activities, and Elizabeth McCausland, mentioned 6 times in the same volume, both promoted causes of this organization cited "a Communist front."

Another group, named ironically "An American Group," is listed in the Un-American Activities Committee files. Besides the ever present Mr. Gropper, the usual Red art frontiers such as Saul Berman, Isabel Bishop, Adolph Dehn, Philip Evergood, and Joe Jones are present with others of the same ideological persuasion.

THE SPIDER CONTINUES HIS WEB

Next I touch briefly on the Artists League of America, located at 77 Fifth Avenue in New York, a small building in which the Lincoln Steffens Lodge of the International Workers Order is also housed. Rockwell Kent is president of

both the Communist International Workers Order and the Artists League of America. When the ALA was formed, Elizabeth McCausland, writer for the American Federation of Arts, Philip Evergood, and Lynd Ward, veteran of many listings in the files of Un-American Activities Committee reports, were made vice presidents. The aims of the Artists League of America follow the Soviet pattern and are especially directed to Federal, State, and municipal patronage.

I have endeavored to focus attention on the years of planning, organizing, and publicizing the world Communist conspirators have devoted to a single branch of culture. Growing from a seed planted in the minds of a handful of conspirators meeting behind the iron curtain, carefully tilled and fertilized by Red culturists, we now see in Artists Equity Association the most ambitious of all the Red attempts at art regimentation and control, the fulfillment of the plan of the Kharkov conference of over two decades ago.

USUAL FANFARE PRECEDES ORGANIZATION

This Artists Equity Association was launched amid fanfare and publicity as an organization of painters, sculptors, and graphic artists, formed to serve the economic interests of artists, in April of 1947, at a gala affair at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, attended by a couple of hundred artists and museum men.

Artist Equity Association has printed the names of its fifty-four founding members. William Gropper, Communist organizer, is present again as one of the founders of AEA. He is joined by seven members of the Communist John Reed Club. They are Louis Guglielmi, Raphael Soyer, Adolph Dehn, the late John Sloan, Reginald Marsh, Ben Shahn, and Nicolai Cikovsky. This is a nucleus of experienced organizers.

Then I find the late Jo Davidson who since the days of the armory show of 1913 has been active in radical art causes. His record as an organizer I will read from the Un-American Activities Committee report of July 21, 1947:

The ICC-ASP was of Communist origin. It was set up by the Reds in January 1945 through their frontier Jo Davidson.

Davidson was cochairman of the NC-ASP, the organization that staged the Waldorf so-called peace conference, and eleven founding members of AEA were sponsors of that notorious Red propaganda stunt. Five of them were organizers and teachers of the John Reed Club mentioned before. Additional Red sponsors were Aaron Bohrod, Paul Burlin, Chaim Gross, Robert Gwathmey, Jack Levine, and Max Weber. Every one of these men has been loud and clamorous in the disloyal Communist cultural bund. The majority of the founders have been connected with Communists, Communist front organizations, or Communist publications.

Artist Equity Association as an organization has passed the first requirement of a Communist front. It has Red organizers, left sympathizers, and just enough innocents to meet the require-

ments. Now who is placed as secretary of this artists outfit? None other than Mr. Frank Kleinholz, one-time teacher at the Communist Jefferson School in New York.

PLANTED RED PROPAGANDISTS

Listed on the first letterhead of Artists Equity I find 22 sponsors of the Red Waldorf conference. They are honorary President Leon Kroll, Treasurer Joseph Hirsch, the three artists who are contributing editors of the Communist publication *Masses and Mainstream*, Philip Evergood, Robert Gwathmey, and the traitor to the artists of America, William Gropper; Harry Gottlieb, Jacob Lawrence, Mitchell Siporin, Paul Burlin, Nicolai Cikovsky, Jo Davidson, C. Gross, Jack Levine, Sidney Laufman, Ben Shahn, John Sloan, Raphael Soyer, Paul Strand, Mitchell Siporin, Max Weber, Aaron Bohrod, and James Lechay of Iowa.

Now, after almost 5 years, let us see who comprise the officers of AEA, this group that is asking the artists of America to let it tend to their affairs and that advertises the service of placing its so-called artists as teachers in our colleges and schools, and that feels capable to advise the directors of our great museums.

The president is Henry Billings. I have already listed him as one of the initiators of the Communist American Artists Congress. He is mentioned as a member of the organizing committee of the John Reed Clubs. He was active in the Artists Union, a Red-leech organization of the first Roosevelt administration. In 1942 Billings, with the aid of Archibald McLeish, former Librarian of Congress, was instrumental in forcing the Reds into the Artists for Victory. Mr. Billings was a director of the Independent Citizens Committee of Arts, Sciences, and Professions, another Communist front.

Leon Kroll, honorary president, has a lengthy record in the Un-American Activities Committee reports. He was a director of the National Council of American Soviet Friendship, a member of the Artists Front to Win the War, a supporter of the Progressive Party, a member along with Paul Robeson of the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee, and a member of the Independent Citizens Committee of Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

The other honorary president, Yasuo Kuniyoshi, a member of the executive committee of the Red American Artists Congress, has been active in left-wing activities for years.

Sol Wilson is the secretary of this Artists Equity. In appendix 9 of the Un-American Activities report I find him listed along with Frank Kirk, Minna Harkavy, and Stuart Davis as an exhibitor in Soviet Russia under John Reed Club auspices. In the Daily Worker of April 9, 1948, he is on a committee protesting the arrest of Pablo Neruda, Chilean Communist. In the same year, he is a signer of an open letter to Congress asking for the defeat of the Mundt bill.

Two individuals important in Communist circles, Gwathmey and Harry Gottlieb, are vice presidents of Artists Equity Association and Joseph Hirsch, cover artist for New Masses, sponsor of the Waldorf conference contributor to Red causes, is its treasurer.

The executive director is Hudson D. Walker. As far back as 1940 I find him and Comrade Herman Baron working together on an exhibition for the Red front, United American Artists. Again, in 1945, I find him associated with the Rockwell Kent outfit, the Artists League of America. He turns up again in 1947 as a director of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, where he is joined by Philip Jaffe of Amerasia magazine and others noted for Communist activities.

From these facts it is obvious that this organization spreading its tentacles into the very fiber of our artistic life was formed by a radical group, has been predominantly officered by notorious Red artists and so directed.

The false multi-art standards promoted by the avant garde of this cultural conspiracy, the destructive "isms," the futurists, the cubists, constructivists, abstractionists, expressionists, dadaists, surrealists, and now experimentalists, work to the advantage of an organization such as this Artists Equity which needs numerical strength to carry out its long-range objectives which are mainly museum control and Federal subsidy of art. Consequently, Artists Equity is out to organize the individuals who have the urge to create.

AGITATION FOR GOVERNMENTAL ART PROGRAMS BASED ON PROPAGANDA POLL

Under the heading "Governmental art programs," Artists Equity says:

Equity has been working with joint committees made up of representatives of six of the leading art organizations in the country to prepare recommendations for a program of Federal sponsorship of art.

Artists Equity does not need to do this. It has already been done and sponsored by a group of Artists Equity members. I refer to the platform for artists of the Progressive Party, adopted unanimously July 25, 1948, at its convention in Philadelphia.

Henry Wallace asked the group known as the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions, the group that arranged the propaganda affair for the Reds at the Waldorf, to draw up a cultural plank for the Progressive Party. A program was drawn up and sponsored by 63 individuals, including 56 artists, and 51 are to be found in the membership lists of Artists Equity. This platform, or basis for socialized art, hailed by such notorious Reds as Rockwell Kent, William Gropper, and Philip Evergood, is a parallel to the Soviet art-control system.

Artists Equity, the Progressive Party, the New Masses, and the Magazine of Art, all publicize the same survey of the economic conditions of artists in the United States, made by Elizabeth McCausland, Red propagandist. Realizing that municipal, State, and Federal legislation is predicated upon a social need, the left wingers are conscious of the value of slanted surveys that attempt to prove

need and justification for their socialistic bills. Miss McCausland sent questionnaires to 500 American artists and about 40 percent replied. I will let Mr. Carey McWilliams, sponsor of almost 50 Communist fronts, sum up this survey. He says:

Of those artists who replied—

To the questionnaire—

44 percent stated that they depended largely or entirely on incomes other than art. Of these 200 painters and sculptors with * * * an average of 20 years devoted to the practice of their profession the average total income was \$4,144, but the average art income was \$548. Such was the economic plight of the American artist in a year of high incomes.

Obviously the identity of these 200 artists must be a jealously guarded secret of Miss McCausland. One wonders if she sent questionnaires to the successful artists of the class that so irks her sister critic, Aline Loucheim, of the New York Times—those whose works of art are integrated into our glorious heritage of historical monuments. Or did she confine her questionnaires to the artists within her circle of Reds and fellow sponsors of the Soviet propaganda attacks against this country?

UNESCO TAKES PART IN FRONT

In San Francisco in 1950 Artists Equity, the Visual Arts Panel of UNESCO, and a local coalition of groups headed by an Equity member, circulated a questionnaire under the title "Freedom of the Artist." A meeting—arranged in conjunction with this UNESCO-Artists Equity questionnaire—was held at the San Francisco Museum of Art whose director, Mrs. Grace M. Morley, is a member of the Panel on Visual Arts.

The first question discussed at this meeting was "Do you believe that private enterprise can support fine art of the United States today?" Others such as "Why should there be public subsidy of fine art?" and "Is the artist free if he is insecure?" show the slant of this poll. Traditional American artists of San Francisco, most of whom declined to participate, said:

The questionnaire is so obviously a plot to show that the American artists are economically depressed and exploited. * * * It is an affront * * * to be subject to an inquiry which presumes a lack of freedom while living under our American system of government. * * * This data can be used as propaganda in Europe and elsewhere. * * * Another purpose could be to agitate for another FWA program * * * another step toward a socialized state and this entire program will support Artists Equity in the assumed role of being the champion of the downtrodden American artist.

Here is Artists Equity, Red lineal descendant of the American Artists Congress, using the Visual Arts Panel of UNESCO to further unionize American artists and to agitate for a socialistic art program.

MUSEUMS USED IN BUILDING SOVIET ARCHWAY

At the American Artists Congress in 1936, the museums were discussed. Ralph Pearson, signer of the "call," reasoned with naive Marxist simplicity, that since it was evident that our way of life had failed and a new society was in the offing, the museum was a good place

to start rebuilding along the Soviet pattern of social-center or community-workshop plan where the museum is used not to develop art alone but also the mentality of the new Socialist human being.

No right-thinking American objects to museums exhibiting the work of living American artists; in fact, it has been quite customary. Many museums have art schools and lecture halls, all contributing to the culture and appreciation of beauty in our Nation. Funds left to purchase art of living American painters and sculptors should be utilized to advance the cause of art and to stimulate and encourage gifted artists. There is no quarrel with that. But the museums have a responsibility to see that no left-wing art organization such as the Artists Equity Association is able to use either the prestige or the museum facilities to advance its ambitious design for union control of art. There are between three and four billion dollars invested in museum buildings, collections, and facilities in the United States.

In the Artists Equity brochure, I find the statement:

Specifically, several exhibitions have been arranged only after consultation with Equity on its policies and recommendations. * * * A strong recommendation for a periodic competitive exhibition he—

Mr. Francis Henry Taylor, director of Metropolitan Museum—

said, had come from a group representing Artists Equity Association. * * * Discussion with Mr. Taylor had resulted in a statement by the group that the competition was urgently needed.

Both the Metropolitan Museum and Artists Equity advertised the part played by Equity in such manner as to strengthen that radical organization.

EXHIBITS UNDER RADICAL CONTROL

Now let us examine the competitions themselves. The first was called American Painting, 1950. Six thousand artists throughout the United States entered the competition. The exhibition consisted of 307 oil paintings. Of the 307 paintings selected to compete for the prizes, 170, or 55 percent, were by members of Artists Equity. The regional juries of selection, comprising Mr. Robert Hale, of the Metropolitan Museum, and 5 directors of other museums, had 20 artist jurors from all sections of the country. Thirteen of those artist jurors were members of Artists Equity Association. The national jury of selection included Mr. Hale and eight artists, five of whom were members of Artists Equity. The jury of awards selected to award Metropolitan Museum prizes amounting to \$8,500 consisted of one museum director and two artists. Both artists were members of Artists Equity.

Let us see how the members of this organization, founded in the main by notorious Reds and fellow-travelers, fared financially.

First prize of \$3,500 went to Artists Equity member Karl Knaths, of Boston, who signed the call of the Communist-created American Artists Congress of 1936. Second prize of \$2,500 to AEA Member Rico Lebrun, of California. Third prize of \$1,500 to Yasuo Kuniyo-

shi, of New York, radical, and president—at that time—of Artists Equity Association; and fourth prize of \$1,000 to Joseph Hirsch, Artists Equity treasurer and a sponsor of the Waldorf conference, sponsor of the Communist New Masses cultural award, and illustrator for Communist publications.

To say that this competition was a triumph for Artists Equity is an understatement. The exhibition as a whole was hailed by Art Digest as a "triumph of abstractionism."

DISCREDITING FREE ENTERPRISE

This so-called form of expression is described as a very important revolutionary art form by Marxist Critic Herbert Read. He calls it "art in pickle" and with surrealism, whose object is—and I quote from Mr. Read—"to discredit the bourgeois ideology in art, to destroy the academic conception of art," they both, abstract art or "art in pickle" and surrealism, the destructive art of a transitional period, are playing revolutionary roles in the development of—to use Mr. Read's words—"the art of the future—the art of a classless society." Feeling as Mr. Read does that the Russian brand of social realism is too confining for a Freudian Marxist of his talents, he says:

Nevertheless, in a world of competing tyrannies, the artist can have only one allegiance, to that dictatorship which claims to end all forms of tyranny and promises, however indefinitely, the complete liberation of man, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Americans do not believe in or have faith in any dictatorship, and the American artists are objecting to this pickling process of their God-given talents. Mounting indignation to the emphasis on the subversive "isms" and the playing up of known Communists and fellow travelers by certain so-called art authorities and museum directors is manifest from coast to coast.

The Metropolitan Museum's second competition, American Sculpture, 1951, increased this protest. It opened December 7, 1951, and closed February 24, 1952. Here again four of the six sculptors of the jury of selection were members of Artists Equity. The juries selected by the museum failed to impress many of the noted sculptors of America. Evidently the noted sculptors were right, for the resulting exhibition was received with shame and disgust. This exhibition, if it were a true cross section of American sculpture, would indicate that the expression of this age was one of confusion, of frustration and rebellion, that the artists seeing nothing of beauty and order were at odds with the existing social order. As such, this misleading exhibition of repulsive, distorted expression is good Communist propaganda.

The jury of awards consisted of Henri Marceau, of the Philadelphia Museum, and two sculptors, Jose de Creeft, Equity artist and signer of the "call" of the Red Artists Congress, and Jacques Lipchitz, European modernist, whose revolutionary sculpture met the exacting requirements of the Communist cultural magazine, New Masses.

REVOLUTIONARY ARTIST AND MRS. JOHANNES STEEL CAPTURE TOP PRIZES

This jury awarded the first prize of \$3,500 to Minna Harkavy, Artist Equity member. As a revolutionary artist, she taught revolutionary art to the Communist John Reed Club as far back as 1930. She is hailed by the New Masses, Red-culture mouthpiece, as a proletarian sculptress. Her type of so-called art, according to a Soviet propagandist, "tends toward a revolutionary change of the existing social order" and, as such, is the sabotage weapon of international communism used in non-Communist countries. Hers is the art described by William Z. Foster as the revolutionary art to be used as a weapon—I quote—"to challenge that of the existing ruling class." Minna Harkavy has consistently supported Communist causes for two decades and her radical record is of such proportions that she may be described as a notorious Red.

The second prize of \$2,500 was bestowed on Equity member Rhys Caparn, the wife of the notorious Red radio commentator, Johannes Steel, who has supported 34 Communist or Red-front causes.

Another Equity member received third prize of \$1,500.

Thus we see that the sinister conspiracy conceived in the black heart of Russia has become a threat to the standard of art in America. This has been accomplished by the revolutionary organization in the field of art by traitors like Gropper and Trachtenberg. Their task has been made easier by the advance guard of their brigade—the promoters of the destructive "isms," which had been used so ruthlessly by the Bolsheviks to destroy the cultural base of Czarist Russia during the period of war communism.

I have turned the spotlight of truth on the evil machinations of this cultural conspiracy. No immunity should be granted to the Red art termites. The loyal American artists in our cultural centers of New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and others, are determined to protect our cultural birthright from this horde of art saboteurs who would first destroy in order to control.

They must demand and get true critical appraisal in the press. They must insist that art juries be freed from domination of the leftists. And they must see that the United States Panel on Visual Art of UNESCO include no radical such as William Zorach, member of the Communist John Reed Club, and Henry Billings, organizer of Communist and Communist-front art organizations, to misrepresent the art and artists of our Republic.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VELDE. I just wanted to compliment the gentleman on his fine speech.

I do not know much about art myself, but I do know a little something about communism, and I realize the truth of a great deal of what the gentleman has to say about Communist art, especially modern or futuristic art. I just wanted to ask the gentleman this question: How does the American Communist Party use

the artist to influence the thinking of the American people?

Mr. DONDERO. In every single picture they paint contained somewhere in it is the symbol of this foreign ideology; and they are trying to create the impression amongst the American people that our legitimate art as you and I have always understood it has been supplanted by this new form. In my opinion it is just a lot of senseless slush. No one can understand what they mean, yet that is what they are trying to impose upon our people.

Mr. VELDE. The gentleman is referring, I presume, to some of these surrealistic paintings.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes. I referred to it in my speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

UNITED NATIONS WORLD

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, information in my possession clearly demonstrate that it is high time the American people are informed of all the facts and the operations of those characters connected with the magazine, the so-called United Nations World.

On the basis of this information, and in the interest of national security, I am asking the House Committee on Un-American Activities to thoroughly investigate this publication.

Without delay, the complete background of the officials of the United Nations World should be brought to light. And it should be ascertained what the connection is between the United Nations World, the United Nations Organization, and a propaganda sheet known as the National Guardian.

It is something of an understatement to say that I was astounded a few days ago when I learned that the United Nations World was subsidizing the National Guardian through the purchase of that publication's mailing list, the income from which, in connection with just one commercial mailing to quote the sheet itself, "paid the printing bill for a whole issue of the Guardian at times when there was no other money to pay for it."

Now, what about this National Guardian? The House Un-American Activities Committee already has considerable information concerning some of its officials and it is incriminating enough to make any decent American demand to know why the United Nations World does business with such a sheet. Or is this a case of birds of a feather flocking together?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. I am very happy to compliment the gentleman on his bringing out this very vital information. The gentleman mentioned the publication United Nations World. Does the gentleman know if there is any other publication reporting the news of the United

Nations conferences that uses the words "United Nations"?

Mr. GROSS. I only know of a barber shop in New York which claims to use it.

Mr. VELDE. Some time ago my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JENISON], made a study of the publication United Nations World and, it seems to me, he informed me at that time that in order to use the words "United Nations" special permission must be obtained from the United Nations Conference, indicating to me at the present time from what the gentleman has said that there is no other publication bearing that name or using the words "United Nations."

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman is correct in that.

Mr. VELDE. I feel confident the gentleman will agree with me that this is a serious infringement upon the freedom of the press. It appears to me that any publication in the United States or any of its Territories should be allowed to use the words "United Nations."

The gentleman also mentioned the publication National Guardian. I think the gentleman was present when I spoke for 1 minute about the editor of that publication, Cedric Belfrage. Martin Berkeley, who is an ex-Communist from the Hollywood movie colony, testified at some length regarding the Hollywood Communists. He was quite a high official in the Communist Party in Hollywood. He also mentioned that he was acquainted with Cedric Belfrage and described him as a most important Communist in the United States today. He further said that he was certain that he was still a member of the Communist Party in the United States today.

As the gentleman knows, I have asked that Cedric Belfrage be subpoenaed to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities and I guarantee we will try to find out just what goes with the National Guardian.

Mr. GROSS. I am very pleased to have the gentleman's observations. I want to compliment him on the talk he made earlier this afternoon before the House. He is a valuable member of the Un-American Activities Committee and I trust the gentleman's investigation will include the United Nations World and its officials as well as more than one official of the National Guardian.

For example, the committee and the Attorney General long ago cited the general manager of the National Guardian as belonging to or sponsoring a half dozen or more organizations described as Communist fronts, and as being an instructor in a so-called school cited by the Attorney General as an "adjunct of the Communist Party."

Nevertheless, this same general manager presumably was in on, and perhaps even rigged, the profitable deal with the United Nations World.

But he is not the only such individual with the National Guardian. This the committee already knows, and more can be developed in the same direction, making it additionally incumbent upon this House to probe to the bottom any dealings between the National Guardian, its officials and the United Nations World.

To sum up, deadly serious questions must be answered in the interest of our country. Among the questions are the following:

First. What is the real purpose of the United Nations World?

Second. Is it licensed to use the name "United Nations"?

Third. Is the United Nations World using the United Nations organization, or vice versa, as a vehicle to propagate internationalism?

Fourth. Who are the officials, past and present, of the United Nations World and what is or was the affiliation of some of them with organizations cited by the committee and the Attorney General as Communist fronts?

Fifth. Who are the backers, past and present, of the United Nations World, and to what extent financially?

Sixth. Why did the United Nations World subsidize the propaganda sheet, National Guardian, through the purchase of that publication's mailing list?

Mr. Speaker, if the committee will conduct a full-scale investigation of the United Nations World, ascertaining the answers to the questions I have listed and others which will logically develop, I predict revelations of additional international, anti-American snakes at work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

(Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

CORRUPTION IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon I referred to the investigation of corruption in the executive branch of the Government, and gave notice that I intended to discuss that subject at some length this afternoon under a special order. I called attention to certain testimony given before a Senate committee by Mr. Newbold Morris last week.

Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1952, I introduced House Resolution 492 to create a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate corruption in the executive branch of the Government. That resolution provides that not more than half of the 10-man committee shall be members of the same political party, all of whom will be appointed by the Speaker, who will also designate the chairman.

I want to quote the second paragraph of that resolution, which defines the scope and task that committee would have. I quote from House Resolution 492, as follows:

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of the enforcement and administration of the laws of the United States, the exercise of powers, the discharge of duties, and the administration of public funds and public property by the executive branch of the Government, with a view to determining whether such activities have been conducted fairly, diligently, impartially, and honestly.

Today I have introduced a resolution to authorize that committee, if it is appointed, to spend \$100,000 in the discharge of this task.

Certain events have occurred since January 14 when this resolution was proposed to which I want to call attention. I believe that it is now more important than before that the Congress should accept responsibility for investigating corruption in the executive branch of the Government, and discharge that responsibility effectively. It is the only way that confidence in their Government can be restored to the American people.

There is no disagreement that an investigation of corruption in the executive branch of the Government is needed. Even President Truman, himself, recognized that this corruption was so widespread and had attracted such public interest and attention that something needed to be done about it.

On January 9, 1952, in his state of the Union message, the President among other things said the following:

Our kind of Government, above all others, cannot tolerate dishonesty among its public servants. Some dishonest people worm themselves into almost every human organization. It is all the more shocking when they make their way into a Government such as ours which is based upon the principle of justice for all.

I want to emphasize this last sentence:

Such unworthy public servants must be weeded out.

Events that have occurred since that time, which I now shall proceed to describe briefly, intensify the urgency of the need for such an independent investigation.

On February 1, 1952, the President appointed Mr. Newbold Morris as Special Assistant to the Attorney General to investigate corruption. Subsequently, he was provided with \$450,000 from the President's emergency fund to carry out this task. Only within the last few days has Mr. Morris obtained the beginnings of a staff.

I believe it may be well at this point to remind the House of Representatives that originally when this matter of corruption in the executive branch of the Government arose, the President had intended to appoint an independent commission—not an existing agency in the executive branch of the Government, but a commission on which there would be appointed outstanding private citizens as members. At that time he sought to obtain a man of high public integrity, and had some discussion with Judge Thomas Murphy, of New York, for that purpose.

Subsequent to his address to the Congress on January 9, in fact the following day, on January 10, 1952, in his press conference the President announced that he had abandoned that approach, and instead he would rely upon the Justice Department to conduct the investigation. That preceded the appointment of Mr. Newbold Morris on February 1.

Just 2 days before that, on January 29, 1952, the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives adopted a reso-

lution creating a special subcommittee to investigate the Department of Justice. After some delays that committee has now appointed counsel and is beginning actual work.

The significance of that particular action, as bearing upon the propriety of the executive department investigating itself, seems to me to be this: It was only after a great deal of controversy, as I am sure my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] could confirm, that that resolution was adopted by the Judiciary Committee.

I understand from the press and from conversations with my colleagues that it was adopted in spite of the fact that the Attorney General appeared at the committee's meeting room and sought entrance, to be heard on that subject. The Judiciary Committee, after refusing to hear the Attorney General, by a substantial majority, decided that the evidence presented to that committee justified the creation of a special agency to examine the administration of the criminal laws of the United States by the Department of Justice. That action, as I say, occurred just shortly before the appointment of Mr. Newbold Morris.

There is a third event which I think has a great deal of bearing upon the consideration of the resolution that I am bringing to the attention of the House today.

On February 18, 1952, the Hoey investigations subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments commenced to hold hearings concerning the acquisition of oil tankers from the Maritime Commission by a group of prominent public persons, who made something over a \$3,000,000 profit on an investment of a hundred thousand dollars.

It appeared early in that investigation that Mr. Newbold Morris, the newly appointed cleaner-upper, played a prominent role in some features of the tanker deal. Wednesday and Thursday of last week Mr. Morris appeared before that committee and had his day in court.

After having referred to these events, I want to say that it seems to me, without considering them, that it should be clear as a matter of public policy that the investigation of corruption in the executive branch of the Government should not be conducted by the branch of the Government which is under fire.

I point out there is no disagreement that the investigation of corruption is needed. The only disagreement is who shall investigate the corruption and how it shall be done.

My purpose in calling this to the attention of the House today is to urge that the Congress assume its responsibility to the American public to make a thoroughgoing, impartial, statesmanlike investigation of this subject, so that when the job is done the public will have some confidence that it has been done honestly and completely.

I want to observe at this point that whether we like it or not the public is going to hold the Congress responsible. When we go home to our constituents, all of whom are aroused by these disclosures of wrongdoing in the executive branch, the only persons our constituents can

blame, the only persons they can get at, are their Representatives in Congress and their Senators.

They are not going to understand that the job of cleaning up the mess that has been partially exposed in the executive branch of the Government was being done by the executive branch of the Government itself and that Congress had nothing to do with it. They are going to say, "Are you not down there to represent me? And when a situation against the public interest is disclosed what did you do about it?"

I say to the majority leadership in the House of Representatives that that responsibility devolves more strictly upon them than it does upon the minority leadership, because it is only with the approval of the majority leadership of this House that any action can be taken by the House of Representatives.

Next fall when they are confronted by their voters and are asked the question: "What did you do about the situation which had the whole country aroused?" I hope my colleagues will be able to give an adequate explanation. I hope that explanation will be that they took all action within their power to have this matter gone into thoroughly and impartially by an independent branch of the Government, when the opportunity was presented.

I want to say to the majority leadership of the House that it seems to me this situation confronts them with an opportunity for outstanding statesmanship. They could gain well-deserved public acclaim by forthrightly taking the lead in ferreting out the wrongdoing in the administration controlled by their party, by purging the party of wrongdoers and restoring it to a condition making it eligible for the confidence of the American people in the forthcoming election contest.

The Democratic leadership in the House has an opportunity to rise above the narrow, petty interests of strict partisanship. It can perform a great service to the American public and to the cause of democratic government everywhere by insisting upon removal and punishment of unfaithful public servants regardless of their party, letting the chips fall where they may.

I earnestly urge the Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives to give careful consideration to the desirability of taking the lead in investigating corruption in the executive branch of the Government through an instrument in which the public can have confidence. The public will never be satisfied with the executive's investigating the executive.

Naturally, Democratic leaders in the Congress have and should have cordial and friendly relationships with members of their party in the executive branch of the Government. Yet Democratic legislators should always be aware of their primary loyalties and responsibilities as legislators. They should be jealous of the powers and functions and the independence of the legislative branch of the Government and quick to uphold and promote the agency of which they are a part. They should resent encroachments by the Executive into the legis-

lative field and resist such encroachments with all the power at their command notwithstanding the fact that they may be made by members of their own party. Likewise, when a condition of widespread corruption is revealed to exist in the executive branch of the Government, Democratic legislators should be the first to exercise the investigative power of the Congress to advise itself and the American people of conditions whatever they may be and to take such action as lies within the power of the legislature to correct evils in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor of the House on January 14 I pointed out that President Truman's high-sounding protestations against dishonesty in Government had a hollow ring when he announced the clean-up job would be done by the Department of Justice. His protestations had an even hollower ring when the House Judiciary Committee by an overwhelming vote decided that the administration of the Department of Justice should be investigated. The situation is very much like selecting an indicted criminal for prosecuting attorney. The falsity of this proposition is apparent to everyone.

I want to call the attention of the Members of the House again to a matter I have referred to several times before, namely, the prosecution of those responsible for the half-million-dollar mail fraud alleged to have been perpetrated by the Commercial Home Equipment Corp. on the Lustron Corp. In that case, an agency of the executive branch of the Government, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, after a thorough investigation by competent investigators formally transmitted to the Department of Justice the findings of that investigation with respect to the Commercial Home Equipment Corp. and urged that prosecution be undertaken.

Subsequent to that, a United States Senate committee, of which I had the honor to be counsel, the Fulbright committee, in investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation held both executive and public hearings and called before it those who were alleged to be involved in this half-million-dollar mail fraud. After hearing all of their explanations and the evidence they offered, the committee in a formal report recommended strongly that the Department of Justice proceed to investigate and prosecute this half-million-dollar mail fraud.

What happened? Nothing. The Department of Justice sat on the case. I have suggested, and I have said this on the floor of the House before, that the reason it sat on the case was the same reason we on the Fulbright committee had trouble getting the case heard and a report filed. I can give the Members of the House personal evidence of the efforts at suppression and obstruction that were made.

I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] that one of those who was urging that the report be suppressed and toned down was none other than our friend, former Congressman Joseph E. Casey, who recently has been shown to be up to his ears in tanker

deals. Mr. Casey represented James and John Gottlieb and Paul Buckley, the stockholders and directors of Commercial Home Equipment Corp.

I was called on the phone by Mr. Peyton Ford, then of the Justice Department. He asked that the committee not proceed with the investigation. Then later Mr. Raymond Whearty, of the Justice Department, appeared before members of the Fulbright committee and urged that they not hold public hearings.

That, to me, is the tip-off for the reason no action has been taken by the Department of Justice in the 2 years that have elapsed since then. It explains the reason they have now adjourned the grand jury proceedings in Chicago after hearing only one witness. Why is the Justice Department permitting the statute of limitations to run out on the part of this half-million-dollar fraud that is least controversial?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman, in my judgment, has performed a real service in bringing this situation to the attention of our committee, which is now conducting an investigation of the Department of Justice. I can assure the gentleman that I am familiar with the Commercial Home Equipment Corp. matter to which he refers, and I believe I can assure him that our committee will engage in a thorough investigation of that matter.

I would like to say at this point, and at this stage of our proceedings, so far as our committee is concerned, that to date the majority members of the committee as well as the minority members have displayed a desire to go thoroughly into these various propositions which have been placed before us, and while we have encountered some obstacles in our inquiry, and may reasonably look for more obstacles in the future interposed by those who feel the pinch, in my opinion this committee will forge ahead with its inquiry and among others will specifically look into this matter to which the gentleman has called attention.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I appreciate what he says about the attitude of the committee of which he is a very valuable member. I am very confident that it will do a useful and worthwhile job and penetrate below surface appearances and get at the real truth of the conditions existing in the Department of Justice.

That brings to my mind a matter which I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with—I do not think the general public is—and that is the role of the FBI in the investigation of corruption among public officials. I understand on rather direct and reliable authority that it is the policy of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to discontinue investigations when they run upon the name of a public official. Now that may be a very desirable policy from the point of view of the FBI. It may have kept the FBI out of hot water through not stepping on important people's toes.

I think the general public—and the Members of Congress—have the utmost

respect for and confidence in J. Edgar Hoover and in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I believe, however, that this question might have arisen in their minds: "Well now, if all of this wrongdoing that is now coming out has been in existence so long, and the FBI has been in existence so long, why has not some of it come out before through the activities of the FBI rather than waiting for congressional committees to expose it?" But the answer to that is that FBI policy has been to desist from investigating when they run upon the name of a public official unless they are specifically ordered in writing by the Justice Department to proceed with the investigation. Apparently the Justice Department has not very often instructed the FBI to proceed with investigations when their preliminary findings disclose wrongdoing by public officials.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for his very fine statement on this matter. But, even after the FBI is requested to make an investigation of a public official it, in reality, does not mean anything, because the information is generally locked up under padlock and not made available. So, what is the use of it? It is just an investigating agency.

Mr. MEADER. I am glad the gentleman pointed that out, FBI investigations are confidential. The action that is to be taken upon those investigations must be taken by the Department of Justice.

There may be many investigations of public officials that are locked up in the files of the Department of Justice, and they may have been given the same treatment that has been given to this Commercial Home Equipment case.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman think it is understandable why the Justice Department would not like to investigate vigorously cases that might embarrass the administration of which it is a part? The head of the Department of Justice is the Attorney General. What is the Attorney General? He is the President's lawyer. The gentleman now addressing us is also a lawyer, and how often has he known of lawyers setting out to convict their clients?

Mr. MEADER. I am not willing to go along with the proposition that the Attorney General is so subservient because of Presidential appointment that he will therefore fail to carry out the duties imposed upon him by law.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that an appointee is subject to the person who places him in a position? In my State the attorney general is not appointed by the Governor; he is elected by the people. He is the general attorney for the people, chosen to defend the people of the State of Minnesota, and their interests. If he disagrees with the Governor, he can criticize him or expose anything that he thinks is improper or illegal, and it has been done in my State.

But the people of the United States do not select the Attorney General. Therefore he is not their representative. Rather, he is the general attorney to defend the administration that appointed him. If he did not do that, how long would he be in that position?

Mr. MEADER. Unfortunately I will have to say to the gentleman that the point he is calling attention to is a well-taken point, in view of the individuals now occupying the positions in question.

Mr. JUDD. It is a weak spot in our form of government. The Congress, in 1922 or 1923 passed the Budget and Accounting Act to change the method of auditing the accounts of the executive agencies and checking on the legality of their expenditures. Prior to that time the executive branch audited itself, and that was not a desirable proposition for obvious reasons. That defect was corrected by setting up in the Budget and Accounting Act, an independent auditing agency, the General Accounting Office, subject only to the Congress, and headed by a Comptroller General, appointed for 15 years, not eligible for reappointment, and given a maximum of independence. Inasmuch as Congress had to do that to get fair, accurate, and impartial auditing. The day may come when we need to set up something like it to prosecute persons in the Government about whom the FBI turns up derogatory evidence. It would have to be an agency separate from and not under the Attorney General who is a member of the President's own official family. He needs his legal counsel but perhaps the people ought to have also a lawyer other than the administration's lawyer. It is asking a lot to expect a man to take action that would hurt those who hired him. People generally do not understand this situation, they think the FBI is responsible for getting rid of dangerous, or crooked, or unfit people in the Government—and they feel secure. They do not realize that the FBI merely investigates, turns its findings over to its superior, the Attorney General, and cannot do anything more, in the absence of overt acts, unless or until the Attorney General acts.

Human nature being what it is, a person is not inclined to try his best to expose and condemn and convict those who appointed him to the office.

I wish you lawyers would find some way to change our governmental mechanism so that we would have not only an independent judiciary and a semi-independent General Accounting Office but a more independent prosecuting agency.

Mr. MEADER. I must differ with the gentleman in part. I do not think the cure for the situation that exists here is structural reform. I think it has more to do with the kind of human beings that are exercising the powers that have been granted by statute. The enforcement of the law is an administrative and an executive function and must be done by the executive branch of the Government. The failure here is not in the structure of the law. We have had that structure for years, and never encountered the situation we have now.

This is a failure of human beings rather than a structural defect.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. It never occurred to the founding fathers that a day would come when men in as high positions as some of those who have been found guilty of malfeasance or corruption occupy, would descend to the level where they would put the administration or their friends ahead of the United States. But since that is a human weakness, we should not have structural arrangements which so easily subject men to such temptations.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask the gentleman, since he has raised the point, if he believes that the Attorney General is so subservient to the President that he cannot independently enforce the laws generally, which he is ordered to do by the statute creating his position, does he have any confidence that a special investigator brought in from New York, coming down here to clean up the situation that has been shown to exist, will have that independence, when he is right under the President's eye?

Mr. JUDD. No; I do not think he will. I agree with the gentleman entirely on that.

Mr. MEADER. The fact that he happens to be a Republican does not mean anything at all.

Mr. JUDD. No; of course not.

Mr. MEADER. I think this goes far beyond partisan considerations. Here is a question of the confidence of the people in the processes of democracy. Whether the clean-up is done by a Democrat or a Republican in my judgment is wholly immaterial. To appoint a Republican to give a front of independence when the situation is really one where there is no independence does not answer the situation at all, in my opinion.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has put his finger on the principal problem, and I know the gentleman from Minnesota agrees, that it is the man who is selected to do a job which is more important than the way that job is set up. However, there is something, it seems to me, to what the gentleman from Minnesota says about the structure of our system. He is an able physician and I happen to be a lawyer, so that perhaps he will listen to another alternative to the suggestion which he has made.

I have had on my desk for some time, but have not introduced both a bill and a constitutional amendment directed to the same objective. I presume perhaps the latter would be the right way to go about it. They would provide that the Attorney General be an elected rather than appointed official, elected during the off years when the President is not running, with the idea in mind of establishing a greater independence for the office of the Attorney General. In other words, he is in a way the President's lawyer, but he is more than that, he is really or should be the lawyer for all the people in the United States. It is very important that he be independent from any political influences of any kind. That is essential to the administration

of even-handed justice. I know the gentleman now address us is an able lawyer. I have, as I say, been debating the question in my own mind as to whether this might be another possible solution. I would be very grateful for any help or advice from any of the Members on that subject. I recognize the fact that there are objections which immediately might be raised to such a plan. My mind is open as to whether the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

I am by no means completely wedded to the plan myself, but I think it does deserve careful consideration by us. It may be that this very committee on which I am now serving may pass on that question at some stage in its deliberations. At least I want to tell the gentleman from Minnesota, and the gentleman from Michigan, that we lawyers, at least some of us, are trying to work out a solution which will bring about a better situation than the one which exists now. I say that as I should, and at this stage of the proceedings, without any reflection on anyone now or formerly holding public office.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution. I assure him I shall certainly be glad to study his proposal carefully and to help him if I can agree with him, and if he has satisfied himself that that is the proper solution to the difficulties we find confronting us.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I want the gentleman to be perfectly clear on this. I do not know the answer to the problem, but as a physician I recognize that here is a difficulty, a weak spot, and I have to call on the specialists in the field where the patient's malady lies for counsel and assistance. I am not trying to tell you what you ought to do. I am asking for help.

I want to say one further thing. I do not believe it tells quite the whole story to say that the degree or kind of activity and effectiveness that you get in the Attorney General's office depends upon the character and quality of the man who is appointed as its head. That is part of the story, but you have to go behind that. The character and quality of the man who is appointed depends to some degree upon the character and quality and objectives and motivations of whoever does the appointing. That, under our system is not the American people who are to be defended, but the administration which, being human, naturally wants to defend itself. I once had a conversation with the present President of the United States when he was a Senator. We were on a speaking tour together. He was reporting some of his experiences as the head of the War Investigation Committee. He was talking about a situation, the details of which I do not need to go into here, which was so bad that his committee had tried repeatedly but in vain to get the Armed Forces or the Chiefs of Staff to clean it up. It had to do with Hanford, Wash., where we now know there was an atomic-energy plant, and, of course, it was hush hush. He said, "We finally had to go to the point of telling

the Joint Chiefs of Staff that they either had to clean it up or have a public exposure made of it, and that would not be in the public interest." Then he added, and I quote, "But you know the Army—it never corrects, it just covers up." Those were the words of our President when he was a Senator and on the investigating side of the fence. Now the same thing is to be expected of the Attorney General's office under the present circumstances, where all sort of irregularities have been discovered. If there is nothing wrong, of course, there is nothing to be feared or hidden. But, the more things there are that are wrong, the more the human tendency is not to correct, but to cover up.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. In regard to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York, first of all the Attorney General is not merely appointed by the President. He has to be confirmed by the Senate in accordance with the Constitution. Then, if in order to free such appointees to the office of the Attorney General from political influence, it is appropriate to amend the Constitution and make it by popular election to that office, I wonder what would be the thought of the gentleman from New York on applying the same thing to the appointment of the Supreme Court Justices and to the entire Federal judiciary in order to insure that they be free from political influences? Would it be better that they be subject to popular elections instead of being appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate in accordance with the Constitution? I just want to make that statement as expressing my thought on the proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman. I do not want to yield for too long, because that is a subject I did not intend to discuss.

Mr. KEATING. That is true. I did not intend to discuss it either. I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan, I would be vigorously opposed to the election of Supreme Court judges by popular vote as well as opposed to the election of any of the Federal judges by popular vote. I think the situation with regard to the office of the Attorney General is in quite a different category, but as I have already stated, I am not completely sold on this suggestion myself. When or if I am, I will debate it at greater length with the gentleman from Michigan at some future time when we are not imposing on the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. I am glad the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] is present, because I wanted to discuss the testimony given by Mr. Morris before the Hoey committee.

Briefly, Mr. Morris was the president of a corporation, a charitable foundation, the China International Foundation, which, through a series of corporations, had title to certain oil tankers.

One question was whether he got anything out of it. He said he did not, but

apparently he shared in fees to the extent of some thirty or thirty-five thousand dollars, less the overhead cost of operating the law office, that could appropriately be charged to this particular client. I quote Mr. Morris' testimony on this point elsewhere in my remarks.

The question I wanted to take up with the gentleman from Minnesota is the matter of carrying oil to the Communists in these tankers. I looked at the record very carefully to see whether or not Mr. Morris was justified in resenting the implications of impropriety in carrying oil from a Rumanian port to a Communist Chinese port, shipments which were discontinued only shortly before the Korean war began.

Mr. Morris' defense, in part at least, seemed to be that by that trade his company was draining dollars out of Communist countries. It was not dollars for oil. The oil came from behind the iron curtain and it stayed behind the iron curtain, but the dollars for shipping charges, which were higher than similar runs for other cargoes, had to come out of the Communist countries. Thereby, he argued, his company was fighting communism and was weakening the Communists.

The testimony before the Hoey committee on this point is, in part, as follows:

Senator NIXON. Do you or do you not agree with Secretary Johnson's appraisal of that situation, that this was detrimental, that this action of United Tankers in hauling oil to and from Communist China was detrimental to the interests of the United States?

Mr. MORRIS. I don't know that. It might have just lighted the lamps of China. I don't know what the oil was used for.

Senator NIXON. In other words, you question Secretary Johnson's judgment?

Mr. MORRIS. No, I am not in a position to agree or disagree.

Senator NIXON. You do not take a position?

Mr. MORRIS. I can't. I am just an ordinary citizen.

Mr. FLANAGAN. On that one point, so that we will be in agreement as to what was carried to China by these vessels, let me say that the cargo consisted of benzene, peanut oil, kerosene, crude oil, and in the trip in April 1950, that went from Constanza to Dalny in north China, it carried benzene and 1,008 tons of aviation lubricating oil.

Mr. MORRIS. From China back to Romania? Mr. FLANAGAN. No, from Constanza to Dalny.

Mr. MORRIS. To tell you the truth, I don't know about the cargoes. I don't know how many people you can kill with peanut oil, but maybe you would know.

Mr. FLANAGAN. On that point, I might clear the record that that cargo, that specific cargo, left Rumania in April of 1950 and arrived in Dalny some time probably in May, some 6 weeks before—

Mr. MORRIS. Well, the answer to the Senator's question is: I am quite sure that in May of 1950, I was not aware that the Communist Chinese were stockpiling fuel to kill American boys.

The first I knew about the Korean war—I didn't know about it before it happened. Maybe you did. But June 25 was the first time I knew there was a war in Korea. I read it in the newspapers and heard it on the radio.

Further testimony on this point was as follows:

Senator MUNDT. I say, in your opinion, ECA has no relationship to communism and the

effort of the free world to stop aggressions of communism?

Mr. MORRIS. Why, of course it has. It stopped it in Italy.

Senator MUNDT. All right. One of the reasons for ECA, probably the major reason, was to help the free world rehabilitate itself so that it could stop further Communist expansion. Is that right?

Mr. MORRIS. And promote free enterprise. Senator MUNDT. Is that right?

Mr. MORRIS. Sure. You have got it. Senator MUNDT. All right. Since you and I both agree that that was one of the major reasons for ECA, did it not occur to you at the time your ships were being paid by ECA to carry cargoes, that there was something wrong about using those same ships to carry Communist cargoes to help defeat the purpose of ECA?

Mr. MORRIS. I don't think, if you will examine those charters very carefully, that those four runs defeated the purposes of ECA.

Senator MUNDT. Not entirely, but they helped.

Mr. MORRIS. I don't think they even helped. They helped to draw dollars out of Russia. Was that not good?

Senator MUNDT. In other words, your testimony is that shipping benzene and aviation gasoline to Communist China was an assist to the free world, because it took some dollars out of China?

Mr. MORRIS. No. But at that time, as I explained, it was not inconsistent, as far as we knew, with the United States policy of trade. As I understand it, we trade today with the Soviet Union, do we not? I don't know. How do we get all those furs over here? I don't know.

Senator MUNDT. There is a considerable difference in my opinion between shipments of furs and shipments of aviation gasoline.

Mr. MORRIS. Oh, my dear Senator, if you get dollars for furs, then you can buy gasoline. That is the way foreign trade works.

Senator MUNDT. You were shipping aviation gasoline to China? The tankers were?

Mr. MORRIS. The tankers were carrying it; yes.

Senator MUNDT. Between Rumania and China? Is that right?

Mr. MORRIS. If they hadn't gotten these tankers, they would have gotten some others. It would have moved in one way or the other.

Senator MUNDT. The Casey group in the hands of Greek nationals refused to take it.

Mr. MORRIS. They might have had better business.

Senator MUNDT. This was a business, according to Mr. Jarvis, on which a high premium was paid. In other words, you received more for that kind of business than you would from tankers engaged in trading with free countries.

Mr. MORRIS. Then that helps the American mortgagees to get their mortgages paid off.

Senator MUNDT. That answers the question, I think. It gives you more money for your firm, the tanker firm.

Mr. MORRIS. But not for anybody's personal profit, please, sir. Not for anybody's personal profit.

I am just asking the gentleman from Minnesota, as an expert on foreign affairs and as an expert on the situation in the Far East, whether he can go along with that philosophy, when the ECA and the Defense Departments, through their officials, had complained about these very shipments. Does the gentleman think that Mr. Morris has made a defense to that charge, and has he got any right to feel that he has been abused because people call attention to the fact that the corporation of which he is president, which holds ultimate control of these tankers, was engaging in trading with

what is now our enemy and helping our enemy to prepare itself to fight?

Mr. JUDD. I think there can be no justification for these tankers being engaged in that trade. But, taking the argument that getting dollars from the Communists was hurting them more than giving them oil was doing them good, it is obvious they would not have been exchanging their dollars for oil unless the oil was far more valuable to them than the dollars. Oil is necessary in carrying on a war machine, and our boys are being killed with vehicles and so forth that are using oil.

Mr. MEADER. It was partly aviation lubricating oil.

Mr. JUDD. Yes. They are being killed by planes which are lubricated with that oil. I do not think any kind of sophistry or excuse can justify such a trade.

Mr. MEADER. If the gentleman takes that position, would he agree with me that a man that would seek to justify his action on such a flimsy basis has failed to display the qualities of an investigator charged with the duty of making a thoroughgoing investigation of wrong doing in the Government? Would the gentleman have any confidence that Mr. Morris knows anything about going about that job?

Mr. JUDD. I have not read the hearings. I do not know that that is the sole justification he gave. Therefore, I am not going to pass on all that may be in the RECORD. I just answered the one question which the gentleman asked me.

Mr. MEADER. I did not mean to engage my colleague from Minnesota into agreeing with me on my general thesis, which is that Newbold Morris, in his testimony before the Senate committee, demonstrated clearly, if there had ever been any doubt of it before, that he is irresponsible, immature, and insincere.

He was guilty time and again of evasion, circumlocution, and tactics seeking to divert the attention of the committee away from the point at issue. He sought refuge in technicalities. He showed disrespect to the committee. They tell me that he even put that sign up in front of him, "Keep Your Shirt On," a message that his wife had given him. He put that sign up in front of him, and turned his back to the Senators when they were interrogating him.

After evasive answers Mr. Morris was three times confronted with the following quotation from the New York Herald Tribune before an answer was obtained:

Senator MUNDT, quoting from the article:

Mr. Morris also insisted that he never received a single dollar in the transaction of tankers which is the subject of a Senate investigation. Are you ready for the question?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Do you consider that a forthright answer to the American public, who expect forthrightness from their No. 1 cleanup man, when you are asked whether you received anything from the transaction and you say, "Not a single dollar," and now you say you are cut in on a \$158,000 fee?

Mr. MORRIS. Just let me look at my wife's message, will you, and I will count three—one, two, three. I said that my firm represented United Tankers and everybody knows

that my firm represented United Tankers and everybody knows that attorneys are entitled to get paid for their services and everybody knows, including you, that Mr. Wasson's services were not overcompensated for.

Senator MUNDT. All right, then. To get down to the fact. You did receive some money from this transaction as a participating attorney. Right? Am I right or wrong now?

Mr. MORRIS. As a member of the firm I did receive my share of the fee under the partnership agreement.

He engaged in attempts to bring ridicule and contempt upon the members of the committee by wholly irrelevant attacks upon them. I say that he has demonstrated clearly and without any question that he is not competent to discharge the serious responsibility of ferreting out corruption in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Morris was willing to condone and wink at this oil traffic with our potential enemies. He tried to justify the circumvention by himself and his colleagues of the maritime laws of the United States to achieve what was specifically intended to be prohibited in the statute namely, foreign acquisition of ownership and control of United States vessels at knock down sale prices from the Maritime Commission. Morris and his colleagues were willing to pay the Casey group \$450,000 for the transfer of a hollow right that was not legal ownership. They were willing to pay "Oilboat Olga" Konow some \$300,000 in addition in brokerage fees in order to do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

I say to you that attempting to defend that kind of thing demonstrates a lack of candor which ought not to exist in anyone to whom we entrust wide powers over the investigation of corruption in the Government.

I say there must be a blind spot in the eye of a person who can tolerate and attempt to justify that kind of activity. The person who is that blind will not be able to recognize a corruption if he sees one.

Mr. Morris confessed before the Senate Hoey committee that he did not really know very much about the people who put up the money that actually went into the buying of the tankers, that is, the Chinese who set up this China International Foundation. Why did he not look into their backgrounds to see if there was a possibility that they had Communist leanings.

Why was Morris callous and indifferent to the effort to make money by trading with the Communists by the China Industrial & Trading Corp.? I think he ought to have looked into matters of that kind and not gotten himself involved in this kind of situation. Any man who had so conducted himself as to lay himself open to such an attack before the Senate Hoey committee and was unable to give any better explanation than he gave is not fit to do the important job that has been entrusted to him.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. RHODES. Would not the gentleman favor legislation to have every Government official make public his total income, the source of his income, as one way of striking at the root of the evil we are now talking about?

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman, I suppose, is referring to this questionnaire that Mr. Morris has said he is going to send out. I do not know that that is the answer to it at all, and I am not sure that there is any simple panacea as a substitute for common honesty. Actually the situation here, in my judgment, is one that cannot be dealt with so easily on a structural basis, although there may be some structural improvements that can be made.

The gentleman must be familiar with the difficulty in World War II and the difficulty in the present emergency of getting people to leave private industry to do an important job in Government under emergency conditions where we have unusual economic controls. To pass a law of the kind the gentleman suggests might prevent obtaining well-qualified people from private life to do a specific Government job for a limited period of time. They might well decline to serve if you require them to disclose all of their personal affairs and their private gainful activities.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEADER. I will be glad to.

Mr. RHODES. Would the gentleman favor legislation of that kind to include also Members of Congress and the Senate? It seems to me it is quite easy to criticize, but I believe we ourselves should not hide behind congressional immunity.

Mr. MEADER. I will go along with the gentleman on that. Any degree of honesty required in the executive branch of the Government should also be required of the legislative branch of the Government, and I sympathize with the gentleman's objective.

I am not sure, however, that this simple matter of requiring the filling out of a form would guarantee honesty. I think there would be a lot of people who perhaps would do whatever they did that was wrong while they were in the Government but not reap the reward and benefit of it until they had left the Government. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with what I am talking about.

His questionnaire, certainly, would not reach that kind of wrongdoing. I do not think there are simple answers to it. I believe that the whole subject must be looked into and a final, authoritative and honest report be made by the Congress.

As a part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Friday, March 14, 1952:

MR. MORRIS STUBS HIS TOE

If Newbold Morris has been essaying the role of a modern St. George out to slay the senatorial dragon he will not win any Oscars for his performance.

It is true that both Senate and House committee investigations often take an abusive turn. It is also true that some of the questions asked of Mr. Morris were offensive. It was suggested that he must have been a "dope or a dupe." And because a corporation over which he presumably could have

exercised some control helped transport petroleum to Red China before the Korean war he has been accused, by implication at least, of contributing to the deaths of American soldiers in Korea. A man should not be expected to submit to this sort of thing without protest, and Mr. Morris would have been justified in taking vigorous exception to such questions.

But that is a different thing from the hammy performance he gave. The Senate committee was investigating a serious matter, in the course of which serious questions were raised concerning Mr. Morris. In the circumstances, Mr. Morris' behavior—the gesticulations, the loud asides, the business of turning his back on his questioners, and his own name-calling efforts—was inappropriate to say the least.

It is not feasible in this space to explore the jumble of corporations and interlocking directorates through which the tanker deals that are under investigation were negotiated. That is a job for Senator HOEY's committee.

But one thing which should be of considerable concern to Mr. Morris seems to have been established. Mr. Morris is president of the China International Foundation, Inc., which controlled the stock of a subsidiary, the United Tanker Corp. Virtually all of the money invested in United Tanker was Chinese money, although Mr. Morris insists that stock control was held by Americans.

In 1947 Mr. Morris went to the Maritime Commission to inquire about the possible purchase of some tankers by United Tanker Corp. The commission at that time had a policy against the sale of tankers to foreign interests for fear the ships might get into Russian hands. There was no sale to United Tanker, presumably because of the Chinese financial interest in that corporation. A little later, however, three tankers were sold by the commission to an outfit known as the National Tanker Corp., then headed by former Representative Joseph Casey, which immediately sold them to United Tanker. Then two United tankers were chartered by the Soviet oil agency, which used them to transport oil from Rumania to China almost until the outbreak of the Korean war.

There was nothing illegal about this, and Mr. Morris said the State Department did not object to the oil shipments. He added that he did not know former Secretary of Defense Johnson had lodged a protest against the shipments.

If not illegal, however, it seems clear that the tanker deal operated to thwart and defeat the policy of the Maritime Commission. And Mr. Morris shared in the fees of his law firm, which participated in the negotiations.

In these circumstances, his performance before the committee, including his attack on the Republican Senators, was not an admirable one. In his position, he should have been a willing and a cooperative witness. Instead of losing his temper and putting on a show, he should have endeavored to give every possible bit of information to the committee. That he did not do so is going to impair, and may destroy, his usefulness as Mr. Truman's investigator of corruption in the executive branch of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

JEWS VERSUS COMMUNISM

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on House Resolution 593

wherein the Katyn Massacre Committee asked for authority to extend the scope of its hearings outside of the United States, I had charge of the resolution on the floor of the House.

A number of Members of Congress asked me to yield during the progress of this debate. On page 2106 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 11, 1952, during the proceedings of the debate, Congressman RANKIN, of Mississippi, asked me to yield. Congressman RANKIN did not have a question to propound but proceeded to make an extended comment regarding Poland, the Polish Embassy located in Washington, the Katyn outrages, and the Nuremberg trials. Owing to the fact that the gentleman from Mississippi was not propounding a question, I immediately proceeded to search through my file envelope to find and read the contents of a letter which I proposed to present to the Congress. I did not listen to the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi as my mind was concentrated on the reading of the above-mentioned letter.

The gentleman from Mississippi, in closing his remarks, stated that he wished our committee would thoroughly investigate the atrocious Katyn outrages and also the so-called Nuremberg trials. His last statement was:

Let us not leave this question to embarrass the American people for a hundred years to come.

My reply was:

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

During the first part of his remarks the gentleman from Mississippi referred to "Yiddish Communists as controlling the leadership of communism in Russia, Czechoslovakia, and other Communist countries in Europe."

Of course I need not mention to the Members of this House that I do not in any way subscribe or endorse the import of a statement of that kind. A great number of nations and races across the water have been victims of Communist and Nazi dictators and the record will show that none have suffered more than the Jewish people from the ravages of communism and nazism. I do not need to review my record and efforts since becoming a Member of this House in combating the scourge of the Communist dictators which has been inflicted upon smaller nations and members of the Jewish race. I have done everything within my power to aid in the establishment and growth of Israel and the evidence today bears out that this small nation is our great beachhead in the Middle East in our fight against communism.

Last Tuesday I denounced on the floor of this House the Poles in the Polish Embassy for sending out Communist propaganda. Of course, the great percentage of the Polish people within subjugated Poland are vitriolic anti-Communist, but they are under the yoke of the dictators. The Polish people generally, both behind and beyond the iron curtain, should not be condemned for a few Polish Communists who have turned traitors to their race. This same statement could be applied to the Jewish

race—in fact, could be applied to any nation or race. I do not know of any nation or race of people that does not contain a few misguided representatives of their nationality who have fallen into the clutches of communism. Why should any nationality or race be condemned because of a few black sheep in their ranks?

The patriotism and the loyalty of the Jews has been tested in wartime and in peacetime. It reveals a brilliant and patriotic service to their country. The Jewish people of this country have given far more than their share of lives and money to help our country in all times of crisis. They are now sacrificing millions upon millions of dollars to help Israel survive in order to preserve their homeland and also to fight the Communist aggressor. Testimony has been presented at the Katyn hearings where a great number of heroes who died at Katyn were Polish Jews.

These remarks of mine are not necessary to establish the position of the Jewish people as far as patriotism, liberty and freedom are concerned. Their record speaks for itself.

During World War II, the Jewish representation in the armed services was far above its pro rata allotment. A large concentration of Jewish people live in metropolitan centers. Agricultural, mining, and metal industries, and so forth, which were favored by draft exemptions did not apply to metropolitan centers. Besides the relatively large proportion of Jewish boys taken in the draft, there were approximately 35,000 Jewish volunteers. Statistics show that honors conferred on Jewish soldiers for valor in action included no less than 1,100 citations. These included the Congressional Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Croix de Guerre and other decorations. The records also reveal that more than 10,000 Jewish commissioned officers were in several branches of the service. The total of Jewish casualties was from 13,000 to 14,000, including 2,800 who made the supreme sacrifice. The figures tell of a sacrificial devotion and patriotism to their country which is in line with their age-long battle for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the bottom of page 2106 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 11, 1952, immediately following the last comment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that the words: "Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct," be stricken from the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WILLIAM TREADWELL STONE

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Treadwell Stone has resigned from the State Department. The State Department should have fired Mr. Stone when I exposed his connection as a member of the editorial board of Amer-

asia in a speech in the House of Representatives on May 14, 1947, nearly 5 years ago. This speech can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 4, pages 5296-5297. That portion of my speech pertaining to Mr. William Treadwell Stone is as follows:

Let me give you some idea of the personnel conducting the present program. Top-flight assistant to Mr. WILLIAM BENTON is William Treadwell Stone, Director of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. Here is his record:

Member of the editorial board of *Amerasia* from 1937 through November 1941. Chairman of this board was Frederick Vanderbilt Field, now a regular columnist for the *Daily Worker* and a member of the Communist Party. Managing editor was Philip Jacob Jaffe, indicted and fined for the possession of confidential Government documents, charged by Hon. George A. Dondero on November 28, 1945, with being in close touch with Earl Browder, until recently head of the Communist Party, United States of America, and Tung Pi Wu, Chinese Communist delegate to the San Francisco Conference. Mr. Stone's membership on the editorial board of *Amerasia* covers the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact during which this magazine described the war in Europe as imperialistic, declaring that "Germany, industrially powerful but poor in resources and weak financially, is attempting to take by force what Great Britain possesses."

Jaffe's Communist alias was J. W. Phillips (Washington Daily News, June 7, 1945, page 1). Mr. Field was executive secretary of the American Peace Mobilization, a Communist front which picketed the White House during the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact.

Writing in *Amerasia* of August 1937, together with such well-known defenders of Soviet foreign policy as Frederick V. Field, Edgar Snow, and Harriet Moore, Mr. Stone comments as follows on relations with Japan:

"Nevertheless, the case against invoking the Neutrality Act, as presented by the State Department and a considerable section of the press, is not altogether convincing * * * on the other hand, if the events at Shanghai have precipitated a general war, as seems likely, a policy of drift which allows munitions shipments and trade in war materials to continue would not advance the cause of peace or reduce the dangers of American involvement. * * * Furthermore, the possibilities of collective action under neutrality have apparently not been explored by Washington" (p. 293).

This statement should be compared with the official line of the Communist Party, U. S. A., at the time as expressed by Earl Browder, its spokesman in an NBC broadcast on August 28, 1936, as follows:

"How long will the American people, who have so convincingly shown their unmistakable desire for peace, continue to hold aloof from collective efforts for peace which alone can check the war plans of the Japanese militarists in the Far East and of their ally, Hitler, in Europe? * * * President Roosevelt—hangs on to a policy of so-called neutrality or isolation which in practice has encouraged the Fascist aggressors. * * * It was this ineffective method which emboldened the Japanese militarists to advance their war plans against China and the United States."

The following article, quoted in part, is taken from *Amerasia* of October 1940 published under joint editorship of Mr. Stone, Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Field, and others, apparently with their full knowledge and approval. The article is entitled "American Far Eastern Policy; for Democracy or Imperialism?" by

Frederick V. Field and reads in part as follows:

"Our Government is, as it has repeatedly stated, interested in the imperialist status quo. * * * Finally, it may be said that I am expressing an isolated, private view. * * * Over the Labor Day week end more than 22,000 men and women, of whom 6,000 were delegates, met at the Emergency Peace Mobilization in Chicago. * * * Two thousand went on to Washington to lobby and demonstrate against the conscription bill. * * * Because, to them, the building up of a great military machine for the purpose of becoming a partner in a war of rival imperialisms is not consistent with true national defense. I say, therefore, that the views I have expressed are not those of an isolated individual. Rather, they are the views, springing from deep convictions, of millions and millions of Americans who refuse to be duped into war or into an American form of dictatorship and fascism."

No statement appeared in *Amerasia* to challenge this viewpoint, by Mr. Stone or anyone else.

Again, under the joint editorship of Mr. Stone, with Messrs. Jaffe, Field, and others, there appeared in the January 1940 issue of *Amerasia* an article by Harriet Moore entitled "Two Wars or One," from which the following excerpt is quoted:

"It"—the United States—"should exert its influence to stop the European conflict as soon as possible by means of negotiated balance-of-power peace."

No statement appeared to challenge this viewpoint.

Mr. Stone was formerly with the Budget Bureau as administrative consultant at \$9,800. He is said to have drawn up the plan for the Cultural Division of the State Department.

He has been in charge of selection of personnel for foreign broadcasting.

He is reported to have appointed George Shaw Wheeler, while Stone was in London for the Board of Economic Warfare. Wheeler has a long record of Communist affiliations and activities. Because of this record, Wheeler was removed by the Civil Service Commission and later reinstated as a result of left-wing pressure.

Mr. Speaker, since I exposed Mr. Stone's affiliation with Mr. George Shaw Wheeler, Mr. Wheeler and his wife both deserted our country for behind-the-iron-curtain communism. He and his wife are now living behind the iron curtain.

At that time Mr. William Benton was Assistant Secretary of State. Exception was taken to my reference to Mr. Stone and his association with George Shaw Wheeler in the above speech by Mr. Benton. I replied to his exception by letter on June 26, 1947, which may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 12, page A3173. That portion of my letter to Mr. William Benton pertaining to Mr. Stone and George Shaw Wheeler is as follows:

I am indeed surprised that exception should be taken to my reference to the association of Mr. William T. Stone with Mr. George Shaw Wheeler. You evidently do not know and were not informed by Mr. Sargeant of the circumstances surrounding Mr. Wheeler's clearance by the Civil Service Commission. Mr. Wheeler was cleared by the Civil Service Commission as a direct result of pressure by certain individuals like former Congressman John M. Coffee and others with a significant list of Communist-front affiliations and sympathies. Mr. Wheeler can be proven to have been a Communist stooge inside the Socialist Party.

Men who have returned from Germany have testified to his pro-Communist activity in that important strategic area. Files in my possession show that David A. Morse contacted William T. Stone, Chief of the Foreign Economic Administration in London and told Stone that he (Morse) wanted a statement from the FEA that Wheeler was trustworthy and could be continued on Morse's staff; that a day or two later Stone talked with Morse and stated that he (Stone) was convinced in his judgment that Wheeler was completely trustworthy and should be continued in his present post and that as far as Stone was concerned there was no question or reservation in his mind. This clearly indicates that someone is lying in connection with this case.

In further reference to Mr. Stone, you say that the editorial board of *Amerasia*, of which he was a member, never met. Would you consider sound the judgment of an individual, in such an important spot as Mr. Stone, who allows his name to be used on the masthead of a magazine involved in espionage activities (see case of Philip Jaffe), which has advocated without protest from Mr. Stone, a negotiated peace with Hitler's Germany, and which numbered among its contributors Frederick V. Field, whose Communist views and record are a matter of public knowledge? Mr. Stone's connections with *Amerasia* cannot be properly defended, nor can his employment by your Department.

Mr. Speaker, the *Amerasia* case will go down in history as a monument to the ability of the Communists to penetrate Government agencies and as a reminder of the stupidity and lack of security provisions in certain Government agencies. No comment is necessary regarding the several investigations as to how *Amerasia* officials were able to obtain secret Government documents. Those investigations were a total and complete failure.

However, the State Department was fully aware that one of their employees was connected with *Amerasia* and was an associate of the known Communists connected with that publication. Yet the State Department, in the 5 years since I have exposed this, have taken no steps to get rid of this individual. Mr. Speaker, did it ever occur to you that these individuals which I and other Members of Congress have been trying for years to remove from the Federal payrolls have never once raised their voices against communism in any way, shape, manner, or form?

The recent hearings held by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary developed some information that indicates Mr. Stone had more than a passing interest in the attempt of Frederick V. Field, his associate with *Amerasia*, in securing a commission in the Armed Forces Intelligence Service. This information was available to the State Department but it is apparent that they have given no consideration to the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States. In upholding the Feinberg law of New York State, the Supreme Court said:

One's associates, past and present, as well as one's conduct may be considered in determining fitness and loyalty. From time immemorial one's reputation has been determined in part by the company he keeps.

Mr. Stone's associates on the editorial board of *Amerasia* are sufficient to raise

a question as to his fitness and loyalty. If Mr. Stone's reputation is to be determined by the company he keeps, then the record of the activities of such people as Philip Jaffe, Harriet Moore, Frederick V. Field, Thomas A. Bisson, and Owen Lattimore should be considered by the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, it cannot be said that the State Department did not know or had not been informed regarding the background and activities of Mr. Stone for I presented the proof to them nearly 5 years ago. Is it any wonder that some of us in Congress have become thoroughly disgusted with the failure of the State Department to weed out those undesirable known to be loyalty or security risks. On the evidence, there can be no doubt that Mr. Acheson and the members of the State Department Loyalty Board are more interested in seeing that the administration might not be embarrassed than they are in doing their patriotic duty by ridding the Department of persons of questionable loyalty. Is it more important to keep their faces from becoming red than it is to protect America? Are we to stand by and permit this sort of thing so that Mr. Acheson can continue to claim no one was dismissed by the State Department for pro-Communist activities, while investigations prove there are many who should have been dismissed long ago? How long must the American taxpayers be saddled with additional burdens for pensions and gratuities under accumulated leave, and so forth, for persons whose loyalty to our country is questionable? There are thousands upon thousands of our boys giving their life blood for our country and millions of patriotic citizens sweating it out with the bare necessities of life for the defense of this Nation, while right here in Washington top level officials in the administration, as well as the low-graded Government employees, resign when faced with the knowledge that the Loyalty Review Board, in reviewing the decision of the State Department Loyalty Board might find room for disagreement with the State Department decision and arrive at a decision that would result in their removal from the Government service. How long, I say, must we stand by and watch this performance?

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding all of this information and more regarding Mr. William Treadwell Stone which was in the files of the Loyalty and Security Board of the State Department for all these years, how do you think Mr. Stone's superiors in the State Department regarded him? Do you think they regarded him as one whose loyalty had been under investigation—not once but several times—during the past 5 years? They did not. They regarded him as one who should be completely trusted with the Government's most highly classified top secrets.

Very recently Mr. Stone was a special assistant to Mr. Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Public Affairs. Mr. Stone as a special representative of Mr. Barrett, was permitted to sit in meetings of the Psychological Operations Coordinating Committee where real hush-hush top-level

secrets were discussed between various defense and intelligence agencies on the subject of psychological warfare. POCB had a working committee headed by Mr. Vincent Wilbur, who was also the acting executive secretary of POCB. Mr. Stone, who was a special assistant to Mr. Barrett, was Mr. Barrett's representative on the working committee of POCB.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the beginning, Mr. William Treadwell Stone has resigned. What are the facts surrounding his resignation? The Loyalty and Security Board of the State Department had recently cleared Mr. Stone. It would be interesting to know how many times they had cleared him in the last 6 years. After a Department loyalty board clears a person who is a suspect, the Loyalty Review Board takes over the case on what is known as a post-audit. During the post-audit the Loyalty Review Board reviews the decision of the Department loyalty board to ascertain if, in their opinion, the Department loyalty board was correct in their conclusions.

It is the practice of the Loyalty Review Board to stop processing a case on post-audit immediately upon being notified that the individual has resigned.

Mr. William T. Stone's case followed very closely the pattern of the John Stewart Service case, up to the point of Stone's resignation. Both had been cleared by the loyalty board of the State Department. The Board was satisfied to pass on the loyalty and security of Mr. Stone on the information presented in the file. However, the eligible decision of the State Department Loyalty Board in the case of Mr. Stone was subject to review or post-audit by the Loyalty Review Board. Apparently when Mr. Stone discovered that his case was being reviewed by the Loyalty Review Board, and undoubtedly having in mind the action taken by that Board in the case of John Stewart Service, Mr. Stone thought it better to resign. More than 30 days passed before the fact of Mr. Stone's resignation was made known to the Loyalty Review Board. Why?

If Mr. Stone chooses to deny this reason for his resignation, let him, in the same breath, ask the Loyalty Review Board if they will be so kind as to accommodate him by making a final determination of his case after a complete investigation by the FBI.

The acceptance by the State Department of Mr. Stone's resignation permits him to collect payment for all his unused and accumulated annual leave, which, according to my understanding, is approximately \$6,000. Further, it is my understanding that the payment of unused annual leave would not have been allowed had Mr. Stone been separated either as a security or loyalty risk. The acceptance by the State Department of Mr. Stone's resignation further permits him whatever benefits he may be entitled to under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

In order to fully protect the Government—which in turn means the people—President Truman should amend his Executive Order No. 9835, to make it mandatory for the Loyalty Review Board to make a final determination on every

individual case, notwithstanding the fact the person under review has resigned. As the case of Mr. Stone now stands, he can be employed by any department of Government—even the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, this is the day we pay our honor and respect to St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland. He will always be remembered in verse, song, and speech for having driven all the snakes out of Ireland. Is it not about time the President, the Secretary of State, and all the others responsible for the loyalty and security of employees in our Federal Government drive the Communist and pinko snakes out of Government? This is not a reflection on the large percentage of Federal employees whose loyalty is beyond question. Those employees are just as anxious as I to see that employees whose loyalty is questioned are dismissed from their jobs. It is high time those in high places stop trying to fool the Congress and the people and give us action instead of lip service by getting rid of all employees of questionable loyalty, instead of permitting them to resign after untold amounts of the taxpayers' money has been spent to prove their disloyalty.

Mr. Speaker, while Mr. Stone has been a very controversial figure in the Government for the past 5 years, not one word has been released by the State Department concerning his separation. When will the State Department learn that they must deal honestly with the public?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE AMERICAN AIR FORCE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been seriously concerned about the progress being made in the development of our Air Force. I am not concerned about the quality of that which we have. I believe in material and personnel we are far ahead of the Communist. I do not believe that there is a pilot within the Chinese Communists' air arm who can match our pilots in sheer ability and courage. This has been tested on a thousand air battlefields; and this is the factor more than any other single thing which has prevented our planes from being wiped out of the skies over Korea.

I have before me a dispatch from Tokyo, dated March 4, 1952. The first sentence of this dispatch reads:

Outnumbered American Sabre jets attacked formations of Communist MIG's south of the Yalu River for the first time in 3 days and destroyed two and damaged five others in four flashing dog fights.

And then again in the body of the same article:

The four separate air actions pitted 27 Sabres against 50 MIG's, 28 Sabres against 40 MIG's, and 27 Sabres against 60 MIG's. * * * Allied losses Monday, if any, were not announced * * *. Through February 29 the allies have lost 153 jets, mostly to ground fire.

And then again in the same article:

Capt. Jack C. Schwab (337 Dorchester Street) Boston, Mass., got his first kill of the Korean war when he downed a MIG in the battle between 23 Sabres and 100 MIG's just south of the Manchurian border.

The dispatch from which I read extracts is not unusual. It is the variety of news which comes almost daily to us, informing us that our jets must fight engagements against what seems to me to be hopeless numbers—and yet because of superior training, ability and better material, our men come out of these contests fairly well. The battle for supremacy, however, is becoming more intense and more severe each week, and our losses, even though many may be from ground fire, should give us cause for serious thought.

This failure to produce combat planes in quantities which we need them at the present time may be due to a number of factors. It may be due to a change in plans made at the eleventh hour which has held back production of a modern type combat jet plane. Undoubtedly this factor has played some part in the failure to get our production of this type of aircraft underway at an early date. On the other hand, I believe the failure to properly allot critically short materials has played a much more important part in the collapse of our jet production program. The American radio commentator Drew Pearson mentioned this over the radio Sunday night and I thoroughly agree with him in the strong presentation for the need of additional jet production. There may be materials vitally needed to produce jet planes in critically short supply, but this type of production should have the green light for priority on these materials over every other item, unless it be some production of atomic materials. We cannot afford to let civilian demands or other governmental demands take from us materials which must be had in order to produce the modern combat planes which shortage is being so badly felt at the present time.

Of course, all branches of our Defense Establishment have been fighting for priorities of critical materials. The civilian economy likewise has felt the pinch of metal shortages and has felt as though it was being starved. Generally speaking, I believe that our defense production is moving along rather nicely. In reference to the production of planes, I believe that we have failed dismally.

Last week in one of the Senate committees, the matter of the proper handling of defense priorities in critically short materials was discussed. During the course of this investigation, one of the witnesses from the Defense Department, as I recall, stated that priorities were often decided by the toss of a coin to determine whether the Army, Navy, or Air Arm would receive available critical materials. I am glad that a top spokesman from the Defense Department said that no such action was taken by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by top defense officials, and that such action was taken at a lower level.

We who are concerned over our own national defense may be inclined to feel

somewhat better from this lackadaisical denial. At the same time there are those who feel that perhaps tossing a coin for the decision on such an important matter, as Julius Caesar who rolled the dice before crossing the Rubicon, may have been as efficacious as the method employed in many instances in the past to decide what allocation was most important from a time element.

With dispatches indicating a growing preponderance of Communist air power in the Korean theater, the Pentagon and the NPA should be seized with no indecision as to what action to take. We must have far greater production of jets. It is not fair to daily pit our pilots against odds of four, five, and six MIG's to one American plane. If there are any shortages, available supplies should be resolved in favor of a greater production of American jet pilots. Tossing a coin may be the effective oriental way of making decisions of great magnitude, but it is certainly not the American way of whipping a serious production problem.

A good friend of mine with a large industrial background of experience has suggested that perhaps a civilian committee formed from earnest patriotic American businessmen throughout the country should be organized to aid in our plans to produce the planes we need. During the course of World War II we met our production goal of 75,000 planes a year; but my guess now is that our production of jets is less than 1,000 per year and this at a time when our men are fighting against terrific superiority in numbers in the swirling skies over Korea. It is not surprising that the grief-stricken widow of our greatest Korean ace aviator should cry out in anguish when news of his death reached us over the necessity of daily sacrificing our men to an unfair and unequal combat.

Such a committee, as has been suggested, could be made answerable to Congress and not to the executive department. I think that such a committee should work in close cooperation with the Armed Services Committees of Congress. It would help locate our bottlenecks industrially speaking and make recommendations as to how they may be removed. Such an industrial civilian committee might perform the creditable feat of putting the United States of America back in the jet production lead in the world.

Regardless of the suggestion, a stepped-up jet production is now vital. To delay further in making strong decisions is certainly gambling with the future of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, America is unhappy. America will continue to be unhappy as long as she lags behind Russia in needed production of jet airplanes. Let us correct this situation before we have the far worse experience of having MIG's in the skies over the United States of America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, permission to sence was granted to Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN), on account of official business, for balance of this week.

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. JONES of Missouri and to include an address delivered by the President of the United States on last Saturday.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include an article by Eberhard P. Deutsch, entitled "A Decision for the People of America," notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$189.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. DORN and to include an article.

Mr. PERKINS and to include a joint statement.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include several newspaper articles.

Mr. WERDEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include a broadcast made last Thursday night, March 13, by Fulton Lewis, Jr.

Mr. JACKSON of California and to include extraneous matter in three instances.

Mr. DONDERO and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska.

Mr. ADAIR and to include an editorial.

Mr. GOODWIN and to include an editorial.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska and to include correspondence from a constituent.

Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) in two instances, in each to include an editorial.

Mr. ELSTON and to include an editorial.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS in two instances, in one to include newspaper articles.

Mr. RADWAN and to include an article.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a letter.

Mr. STIGLER and to include an essay written by a constituent.

Mr. STEED and to include a magazine article, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the printed RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$210.

Mr. PHILLIPS and to include an article.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. HAVENNER) and to include a news item.

Mr. HARVEY and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BURNSIDE.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3219. An act for the relief of Robert E. Vigus; and

H. R. 5317. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the George H. White Construction Co. of Canton, Ohio.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1851. An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 18, 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:

1247. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the Secretary of Defense and the semiannual reports of the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force for the period July 1 to December 31, 1951, pursuant to section 202 (d) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1248. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1249. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of orders canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1250. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress,' approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25, 13 U. S. C. 216)"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 13, 1952, the following bill was reported March 14, 1952:

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7072. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted March 17, 1952]

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. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6375. A bill to amend the Agricultural

Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6578. A bill to provide for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agriculture, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6839. A bill to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6863. A bill to make provisions for suitable accommodations for the Bureau of Customs and certain other Government services at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 15. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 4924. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the transfer to the Administrator of General Services of functions relating to the acquisition and assignment of passenger-carrying motor vehicles and to the control of office furniture and equipment; with amendment (Rept. No. 1523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 5350. A bill to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAMSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5264. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAMSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 287. A bill relative to granting and giving instructions in civil and criminal cases in the district courts of continental United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1526). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Interim report pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong., H. Res. 107, 81st Cong. as extended by H. Res. 51 and H. Res. 323, 82d Cong., and H. Res. 116, 82d Cong.) entitled "Commerce with Latin America" (Rept. No. 1527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Progress Report No. 14, pursuant to section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act (Rept. No. 1528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 13, 1952, the following bill was introduced on March 14, 1952:

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 7072. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[Introduced and referred March 17, 1952]

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 7073. A bill to aid in meeting the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by providing for the training or retraining of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 7074. A bill to aid in meeting the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by providing for the training or retraining of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 7075. A bill to provide for representation of independent labor organizations on the Wage Stabilization Board, Economic Stabilization Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 7076. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for self-employed lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 7077. A bill to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 7078. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), so as to extend the period during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded certain veterans who were prevented from receiving such training by reason of hospitalization or other incapacity; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7079. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 7080. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 7081. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the \$50 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 7082. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to complete the survey of the Pecatonica flood area, and to appropriate \$25,000 for such purpose; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 7083. A bill to authorize the purchase of land and improvements in Gunnison County, Colo., to facilitate research into range improvement and rangeland management in the Rocky Mountain area and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 7084. A bill to facilitate the development of small reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 7085. A bill to provide for an addition to the George Washington Memorial Parkway by the transfer from the Administrator of General Services to the Secretary of the Interior of the tract of land in Arlington County, Va., commonly known as the Nevius tract; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 7086. A bill to regulate the repayment to the United States of advances made to the States and local subdivisions thereof under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. Res. 572. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 492, Eighty-second Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER. Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, transmitting a copy of an interstate civil defense compact as ratified and approved by the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 7087. A bill for the relief of Samuel and Gregory Goekjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Romola Nijinsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7089. A bill for the relief of Paul Bohus-Vilagos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 7090. A bill for the relief of William Robert DeGraff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 7091. A bill for the relief of James Sech-chau Hwong and Mrs. Tseng-hwa Chow Hwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 7092. A bill for the relief of Ester Andreasen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 7093. A bill for the relief of Irene Ezitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 7094. A bill for the relief of Pio Valensin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 7095. A bill for the relief of Ruth Ann Holecek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 7096. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. James D. Wilmeth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7097. A bill for the relief of Kang Duk Yee or Mrs. John J. Hassett (married name); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7098. A bill to restore United States citizenship to a former citizen, Atsuko Kiyota Szekeres, who has expatriated herself; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 7099. A bill for the relief of Harus Sugahara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 7100. A bill for the relief of Peter Hirsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 7101. A bill for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7102. A bill for the relief of Pietro Murgia; 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:

634. By the SPEAKER: Petition of National Commander, Philippine Pacific War Veterans, Minneapolis, Minn., relative to numerous bills now pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and requesting the privilege of appearing before said committee to present petitions and views on these bills; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

635. Also, petition of George W. Taylor, and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

636. Also, petition of E. K. Collings, and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

637. Also, petition of Louise Russell, and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

638. Also, petition of M. B. Claypoole, and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

639. Also, petition of Enily Baldowski, and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

640. Also, petition of city and county clerk, Honolulu, T. H., relative to resolution No. 107, requesting the return of the entire area of Fort DeRussy Military Reservation, in the heart of Waikiki, city of Honolulu, to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

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

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

Our Father God, in a world that lieth in darkness, swept by fitful winds of despair and doubt, we pause at this sheltered sanctuary of Thy grace to make sure that the light within is not dimmed. Make our spirits great enough for these great days. Upon our feverish lives drop the still dews of Thy quietness, that in simple trust and deeper reverence we may be found steadfast in an unstable

day, always abounding in the work Thou givest us to do, knowing that our labor is not in vain in the Lord.

"Thy love hath led us in the past.
In this free land, by Thee, our lot is cast.
Be Thou our Ruler, Guardian, Guide,
and Stay,
Thy word our law, Thy paths our
chosen way."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 17, 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 and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1499. An act to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind;

H. R. 1511. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mid Valley Bridge Co., Hidalgo, Tex., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande;

H. R. 3166. An act to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes;

H. R. 3589. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works;

H. R. 5891. An act to amend the veterans regulations to establish for certain persons who served in the Armed Forces a further presumption of service connection for an active psychosis;

H. R. 6319. An act to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6863. An act to make provision for suitable accommodations for the Bureau of Customs and certain other Government services at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.; and

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Wolf Creek Dam in the State of Kentucky as Lake Cumberland.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4515) to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, March 18, 1952, he signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 5317) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment

upon a certain claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co., of Canton, Ohio, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. BRIDGES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that, as in legislative session, Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

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

PETITIONS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Woman's Press Club of New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to strengthen the antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Baltimore Chapter 48, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Baltimore, Md., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide increased annuities for retired civil employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 1739. A bill to amend section 331 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, concerning the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1335).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5369. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands located within, and in the vicinity of, the Federal Communications Commission's primary monitoring station, Portland, Oreg.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1337).

PURCHASE OF CERTAIN MORTGAGES BY FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 140) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages, and I submit a report (No. 1338) thereon.

I may say that this joint resolution was introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. A similar joint resolution has been introduced in the House, and I am informed has been reported today by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

In effect the joint resolution amends the Housing and Facilities Act of 1951 which provided for an authorization of \$200,000,000 for prior commitments by